

AFTERNOON SITTING

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 136 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2)

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, (No. 2). The main purpose of this Bill is to accommodate the transfer of the office of the legislative counsel and law clerk from the public service to the Legislative Assembly. This Bill arises from extensive consultation with the Board of Internal Economy, and the bill is as proposed by the board. The proposed Act will establish the legislative counsel and law clerk as an office of the Legislative Assembly, reporting to Mr. Speaker. The duties of the legislative counsel and law clerk will be those that are provided for in the rules or those prescribed by Mr. Speaker. The arrangement will enhance the services provided to the Legislative Assembly and private members generally.

The Bill will also change the mechanism by which the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly is appointed. At present the Clerk is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Board of Internal Economy. Since the Clerk of the Assembly is an officer of the Assembly, it is more appropriate that the clerk be appointed by the board.

The Bill also makes a minor change to the provisions of the Act related to the superannuation provisions applicable to full and part-time employees of the Legislative Assembly. The superannuation for these employees will now be the same as for employees in the public service.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2).

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Our caucus, the opposition, will not of course be opposing this. It does effect one important change that I want to bring to the attend of members of the Assembly. I think it's for the good. The power to appoint the Clerk and the staff of the Clerk's office has heretofore been a de facto function of the Executive Council. The Clerk is now appointed by the Speaker. I think that's appropriate. It has not been an issue within the career of any member of this Assembly except the member for Regina Elphinstone. But during the Thatcher period there was a clerk who left, I think, rather under strange circumstances. I think it has not been a problem since and I can't envision it being a problem with the current staff. The member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden might have some faint memories of those days.

It hasn't been a problem in the last couple of decades, but it is always well, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the staff of this Assembly are guaranteed their independence and freedom from political interference. I think that is effectively guaranteed when it is the Speaker who makes the appointment, who makes the recommendation to the board. So I think these changes are worthwhile, and it does encompass, I think, at least one important change which members of this opposition intend to support.

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

Bill No. 137 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act

HON. MR. LANE: — The amendments to The Public Service Superannuation Act, Mr. Speaker, are related to those proposed for The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, and The Public Service Act.

One clause of The Public Service Superannuation Act states that that Act applies to some of the staff of the Legislative Assembly. Since The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act clearly states

that the public service superannuation provisions apply to employees of the Assembly, this existing provision is redundant and inconsistent. The Bill therefore proposes the repeal of the redundant provision.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — As was the case with the last Bill, our caucus will be supporting this Bill.

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

Bill No. 138 — An Act to amend The Public Service Act

HON. MR. LANE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move second reading of An Act to amend The Public Service Act. The Bill is complementary to the amendments proposed to The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

Since the legislative counsel and law clerk is being moved to the Legislative Assembly from the public service, the provisions to The Public Service Act that refer to the legislative counsel and law clerk as permanent head in the public service would be inconsistent and are therefore proposed to be removed from The Public Service Act.

At the same time it is desirable to remove certain other references in The Public Service Act to the Clerk of the Assembly and other officers of the Assembly which were not removed when the Board of Internal Economy was created in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Public Service Act.

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

Bill No. 141 — An Act to provide for the Postponement of Tabling of Certain Documents (No. 2)

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is frequently moved during the fall session to allow for documents to be tabled in the spring. Given that we did not commence a new session this fall, we had advice that indicated this legislation might not be strictly necessary. But in keeping with our open, above-board approach to government, we're asking for the consent of the legislature to table documents early in the new session.

I understand that, as a result of this provision, we will be required to table documents by the 15th day of the new session. Let me assure the House that it is the intention of the government to commence a new session in the spring. As a result, documents will be tabled in a similar way to the way they were tabled this past year.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to provide for the Postponement of Tabling of Certain Documents (No. 2).

MR. SHILLINGTON: — While we have, I think, no particular interest in obstructing the work of the House, I think members of the opposition have some serious . . . have some concerns about this Bill.

The concerns, Mr. Speaker, stem not from a postponement of the tabling of documents in and by itself in the strictest sense. I am reasonably satisfied that all of the annual reports which should have been filed in the year 1985 have been filed. I believe all the reports which we would normally have got in March of '85 have all been received. In fact, I think they were received by the middle of April.

This Bill becomes necessary only because we have not started a new session, and I think that is inappropriate. If we had started a new session, if we would have had a throne speech in the middle of

November, as would normally be the case, we might have had to have a table of documents Act, but it would read differently.

Mr. Speaker, what this Bill in fact does, this Bill authorizes the continuation of this session virtually endlessly. I think that's a very poor way to run a government. This is the first year in the history of this province in which we have not had a throne speech. I think it's desirable for the government to discipline itself and organize its thinking and think out a year's program and have a throne speech. It is useful for the opposition to have a throne speech to hear the government's plans and have an opportunity to discuss issues in general without having to refer them to any particular Bill. This is the first year in the history of this province we haven't had a throne speech. The effect of this Bill is to authorize the continuation of this session endlessly, and I think that's inappropriate, Mr. Speaker.

One of the criticisms of the Trudeau government which people made was that those federal sessions dragged one endlessly without accomplishing a great deal. It tends to produce ragged, disorganized, and a very poorly administered government. I think that this Bill which authorizes this session to continue is inappropriate. This session ought to be brought to an end. We ought to go back to the practice of having one session a year, and this business of dragging sessions on is a most unfortunate way to run a government, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a very few words. I invite anyone to look at the blues today and note that this is day 80 of the session, and on day 80 the government decides that they have not got around to tabling all the things that the law requires them to table and that they propose to extend the time for tabling still further. I don't know when a government is going to get around to tabling the things which they are required to table in a session, if they're not managed it by day 80.

This is surely one of the longest sessions. It is very difficult to imagine why a government would not have tabled all of the material legally required to be tabled in the session up to this time, which not only is day 80 of sitting days, but we are now moving beyond 12 months of elapsed time since the last session started. We're about 13 months and 80 sitting days, the government hasn't yet tabled the documents which the statutes require, and it decides that it needs more time and therefore wishes to defer the tabling of documents.

That is a government which is withholding information from the public. It is not tabling things which previous legislatures have deemed appropriate because those are the reasons why the legislative provisions are there. And it yet again, after, as I say, 13 months of elapsed time since this session started and 80 sitting days since this session started, decides that it's not yet prepared, not yet ready, and wishes further to delay the tabling of material. That's a sad commentary on a government, and I will be opposing the Bill.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make many remarks on this, but I would feel it almost obligatory to make a comment on this Bill which is before us today.

I begin by saying that things have really changed in the last three years in this Assembly when I look at what this Bill proposes to do. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, 80 days —80 days since this legislature and this session began, and still the government needs to seek permission to delay the tabling of some documents which either it is unprepared to table or unwilling to table. And I think that that is really inexcusable.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, I submit that . . . I'm going to be a little harder than some of my colleagues have been. I submit that the government does not want to reveal some information, in my opinion, that would be available in the normal course of events, and I don't think that that's any way for any responsible government to behave or to act. It's inexcusable that the government does not have its act together. It was elected to govern. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is an example of a government that is not governing.

I think it's time that the Premier, for example, stopped his whole approach of cheer-leading and

began to consider the business of governing as a very serious matter, because that's what each and every one of us in this Assembly are elected to do.

I think the fact, as one of my colleagues indicated, that the government has not had a throne speech this year indicates one other point — that the government is floundering. It is indeed floundering, and it's unable to put together the kinds of proposals that normally one would expect to see in a throne speech. It lacks purpose and lacks direction, and I suggest that this Bill here does a disservice to the citizens of Saskatchewan.

(1415)

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 29

McLeod	Currie	Swenson
Berntson	Klein	Hopfner
Lane	Dutchak	Weiman
Taylor	Embury	Gerich
Duncan	Martens	Schmidt
Pickering	Smith	Glauser
Hardy	Domotor	Sauder
Myers	Muirhead	Baker
Schoenhals	Petersen	Morin
Dirks	Hodgins	

NAYS — 7

Blakeney	Koskie	Shillington
Tchorzewski	Lusney	Sveinson
Lingenfelter		

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

Bill No. 143 — An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly and Executive Council (No. 3)

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of a Bill to freeze the salaries, allowances, and indemnities of ministers and members of the Assembly for another year.

As the elected representatives of the province, we have a duty to set standards for the Saskatchewan people. As well, we cannot expect the employers of the government to hold the line on wage increases if we are not prepared to do the same. The Bill before the Assembly deals with precisely the same salaries, indemnities, and allowances as did the Bill last year.

It will be my intention, Mr. Speaker, to ask for leave to proceed with this Bill to its conclusion through the committee stage and third reading today. However, if we're unable to do that, it will be my intention to deal with this Bill as a very early item in the spring session and, in a retroactive way, to January 1st of 1986, at which time we will recover those sums paid under the existing legislation.

I move, Mr. Speaker, second reading of An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 3).

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

Bill No. 142 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 (No. 3)

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, prior to my remarks I would like to send a copy of my remarks over to the members for Regina North East. This is a late Bill and I think it only fair that he have a copy of my remarks so it will help him in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to move second reading of this Bill, The Urban Municipality Amendment Act, 1985 (No 2). This Bill is strictly housekeeping in nature.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last spring, The Urban Municipality Act is a major new Act, and it is usual to make adjustments to such Acts during the implementation stage.

Mr. Speaker, in amending this Act we are trying to be as responsive as we can in listening to and addressing the concerns of urban municipalities. The Urban Municipality Amendment Act, 1985 that was passed by this Assembly last spring included a transitional provision to give all urban municipalities, the authority to make 1985 business assessments according to business assessment rate set by regulation, made under the previous urban municipality Act. By this, I mean rates that applied before the new urban Act came into force in November of 1984.

Following the passage of that Bill in 1985, the city of Regina discovered that because of a unique feature in the way Regina approached business taxation, the amendment did not apply to some 1,000 businesses in Regina. The city has informed us that if this loophole is not corrected, about 20 per cent of the city's businesses will not be required to pay business tax for 1985.

The city of Regina approached my department at the beginning of this session for an urgent amendment to close the loophole so that it would be able to legally collect these taxes. If the loophole is not closed, the city may not be able to collect about \$1.3 million in revenue. The loss of this amount would also impact on the revenues of the school boards in the city, as the city shares business taxes with the school boards.

Mr. Speaker, we are not aware of any other urban municipality in a similar situation as the city of Regina. However, we have drafted this amendment in general terms so that any municipality in a similar situation will be able to take advantage of it. I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill will not frustrate legitimate appeals to business assessments made by the city. These appeals will be permitted to go forward in the usual way.

Finally, this Bill provides for fairness between businesses that traditionally paid a business tax and those which formerly paid a licence fee in lieu of a tax.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge all members to support the Bill.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to first of all thank the minister for sending over a copy of his remarks prior to moving this Bill and also for his coming over and discussing with me the intent of the Bill last night. That was indeed helpful.

We're not, as the opposition, going to oppose this Bill, of course. We're not prepared to let the city of Regina and the school boards suffer or pay a price because of some things that were not done previously. I just want to say that I think maybe the minister should have added that this amendment is made necessary also because of an error in this government's new Urban Municipality Act which was proposed in November of 1984 and the things that followed from it, and because those mistakes were not corrected in the spring session of 1985 in Bill 91. It's a case of some sloppy drafting, and we have seen now documents not ready for tabling. We now have seen a Bill brought forward which is

necessary to correct very serious mistakes that have been made before.

I have checked with the city of Regina; I thought it was important to do that. And it has been confirmed that the city of Regina was indeed at risk of up to \$1.3 million unless an amendment is passed to solve this problem. I think that that's worth considering when we consider this Bill.

I just want to conclude by saying that another reason I checked very carefully is because I am told, and my research has shown me, that the last time the government amended The Urban Municipality Act with Bill 91, which was as recent as last spring, that cost the city of Regina some \$500,000. And so I think it's important for us to be diligent when we get legislation from this government to make sure that they have done their homework.

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

(1430)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 120 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Does the minister wish to introduce his officials?

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — Yes. To my right, the deputy minister, Dan Gilewich, and to my left, Larry Aebig, director of the municipal finance employees' superannuation plan.

Clause 1

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I'm not going to hold up the committee on this Bill. As was indicated by the minister in his remarks, this Bill comes forward as a recommendation not only from the commission but, I understand, the Public Accounts Committee. Am I correct on that?

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — Just the commission.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The reason I asked that is because I notice that the member from Rosthern in his remarks had said it was a combination of recommendations from the Public Accounts Committee as well as the Provincial Auditor, and I was wondering what that was all about.

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — The auditor is another item that's handled separately.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Can you tell me, Mr. Minister, how is this plan funded? Is it funded strictly by contributions of employees, or is there matched funding? What's the basis of the funding?

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — It's by contributions and reinvestment.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — What's the financial status of the plan?

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — The financial status is about 138 million.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Is that telling me that it is fully funded and it's not like, unfortunately, too many superannuation plans which have fairly extensive liabilities? Does that not apply in this case? I think that's the case, but I'm not sure.

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — That does not apply in this case. This is fully actuarially sound, and it stands on its own.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — One more question. Does the fund have matching contributions from

employer and employees, or is it just employee contributions?

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — It's employer and employee, of matching contributions.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Clause 4, there is a proposed House amendment, amending section 4 of the printed Bill as follows:

amend subsection 4(3) of the printed Bill by adding: 'where it appears for the first time' after the word 'deferred.'

Clause 4 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — I'd like to thank the officials, and the opposition for their questions.

Bill No. 127 — An Act to amend The Cancer Foundation Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Does the minister wish to introduce his officials?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce the officials that are with me today. The legal adviser in the department is seated beside me, Mr. Gerry Tegart, the department's solicitor; behind me, Mr. Michael Littlewood, the administrative co-ordinator in the department; and behind Mr. Tegart, Mr. Ted Wright, the director of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan.

Clause 1

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, you've explained this bill by saying that the cancer foundation will be allowed, as a result of this Bill, to borrow certain sums of money. Under the present legislation, do they have power now to borrow, and this is extending it, and if so, how much will they now be able to borrow for building and that sort of thing as you've explained it?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose for the amendment to the Act is that, as it stands at this point in time, the cancer foundation can only borrow for interim financing, or in other words until the payment comes from the government. What this will do, and this is basically directed to the financing of the new facility in Saskatoon, it will allow them to borrow for capital projects, which they have not had that mandate before, and there is no limit.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — In the presentation or the proposal for the Saskatoon facility, what is the scheme for repaying the amount that will be borrowed for capital expenditure? Have they set in place a mechanism and a formula for repaying the loan? Just a word on that. I would appreciate just a broad outline.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I'd have to advise the member, at this point in time, we do not have that information. They haven't apprised us of what the repayment schedule . . . In fact, they haven't done the borrowing yet. This just empowers them. But it will be something similar to . . . They will be on the footing similar to the way the base hospitals can operate, following this type of legislation.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Of course I'm more curious than demanding the information, because of course it will be up to them and they are perfectly capable of making those kind of arrangements. And we'll be voting in favour of the Bill as we have so far.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Thank you very much.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this committee, a number of senior citizens from the city of Weyburn. They're in here today having some meetings with a view to putting a project together in our town for the betterment of all senior citizens in Weyburn.

And although they may call themselves a senior citizens group, I can assure you that they are young at heart and attacking this project with great enthusiasm and vigour. I would ask all members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming them here today.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I would like to join with my colleague and friend from Weyburn in introducing the group of seniors here today. Today I see Al Yeaman and others in the Speaker's gallery, and I want to join with the minister in welcoming them here in this deliberations and the observation of the passage of a number of Bills we've been working on during the past few weeks. And so, welcome here.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 139 — An Act to amend The Public Health Act (No. 2)

Clause 1

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I'd like to introduce one more of my officials who has joined us for this Bill, Mr. Andy Hazlewood, who is a director of public health inspection for the province of Saskatchewan. He's seated behind Mr. Tegart.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could explain what exactly is being changed here. If you would just give a little outline of this section in terms of what you're up to.

Mr. Chairman, I guess the question, if he needs more information, is what is changed here? It seems to me that the section you're introducing seems logical that that would have already been in place, but tell me what is changed.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — It's really narrowing the powers of inspection to a dwelling, where a person would live. And under this the change would be that, unless you had the consent of the occupant,

you would have to have a warrant to enter a dwelling.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my officials and to thank the opposition for their line of questioning.

Bill No. 133 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983 (No. 3)

HON. MR. LANE: — I'd like to introduce, to my left, Carl Shiels, executive director of the driver and vehicle safety services; and at the back, Ken Schultz, who is the director of systems and records of the Highway Traffic Board. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is a House amendment.

(1445)

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The House amendment is not until we get to Clause 5, I believe.

Clause 1

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, as you have indicated and as we have reviewed it, the amendments proposed here are necessary as a result of the changes made in the Criminal Code by the federal government and proclaimed on December 4th, 1985.

I take it that you are not prohibiting in here the right of farmers to drive their tractors. You indicated the other day that through your great effort that you have been able to clarify the situation with your counterpart in Ottawa.

I have only a couple of specific questions to refer to, and, Mr. Chairman, I might just proceed. They'll only be a few, and then we can go clause by clause.

Just in respect to clause 4(1) of the Act: 'Clause 160(a) is repealed and the following substituted:' I take it what you're doing there is including and counting as a previous conviction, a conditional discharge which applies within the Criminal Code?

HON. MR. LANE: — The amendment to the definition of conviction is necessary to ensure that a conditional discharge does not result in a conviction being wiped out. There could have been an interpretation in the past that if a conditional discharge was given that the conviction was, in fact, wiped out. For the purposes of The Vehicles Act, of course, the suspension will still apply as a result of the amendment.

MR. KOSKIE: — And it's counted as a previous conviction in so far as suspensions?

HON. MR. LANE: — Yes.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

MR. KOSKIE: — In clause 4(2), that is just a clarification of the list of offences included in which suspensions occur. Is that not correct?

HON. MR. LANE: — It will include both the new provisions and the old.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's a proposed amendment to section 5 of the printed Bill as follows:

Amend subsection 162(1) of the Act as being enacted by section 5 of the printed Bill, by adding the word 'and' after clause (a).

Clause 5 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

Clause 8

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's an amendment to clause 8 of the printed Bill as follows:

Amend clause 188(b.1) of the Act as being enacted by section 8 of the printed Bill, by striking out 'vehicles' in the fourth line and substituting 'vehicle.'

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clause 9

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's an amendment to clause 9 as follows:

Amend section 9 of the printed Bill by striking 'deemed to be in the second line,' and substituting 'is deemed to have been.'

Clause 9 as amended agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

Bill No. 123 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to the Assembly the officials that are with me; Lorelle Schoenfeld, who is the Crown solicitor of legislative services; Ron Hewitt, director of legislative services, and behind me, Roger Welsh, personnel policy adviser, Department of Finance.

Clause 1

MR. KOSKIE: — In reviewing the revisions of The Provincial Court Act and reviewing your comments, Mr. Minister, you have indicated there that there are chartered-related amendments designed to remove provisions which may be considered discriminatory on the basis of sex, etc., marital status, age, and so on. In checking it through and reviewing it, I was not able to come to grips with those comments of where your amendments applied, as so stated in your particular comments.

HON. MR. LANE: — Well by way of example, section 12 of the Bill, the amendment removes the clause which presently makes remarriage of the spouse a ground on which the pension benefits are terminated. Removal of this provision will bring the section in line with the charter. Section . . . (inaudible) . . . is virtually the same.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 6

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's an amendment to section 6 of the Bill which follows the main section 6(e) of the printed Bill:

by adding the word 'of' before the word 'his' in the first line.

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clause 7

MR. CHAIRMAN: — An amendment to section 7 of the Bill as follows:

Amend subsection 37.1(1) of the Act as being enacted by section 7 of the printed Bill, by striking out 'section 37' in the first line, and substituting 'sections 31 and 37.'

Clause 7 as amended agreed to.

MR. KOSKIE: — On clause 7, the new section 37(1) I'm wondering here why you felt section 37(1) was necessary in light of the provision that is included in section 41(1)? Our information is that it's somewhat of a duplication, what you have in new section 7, 37(1) and over in section 11, 41(1).

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, the difference is that section 41(1) deals specifically with judges who are over 55 and elect to take the early retirement. Section 7 of the Bill refers to those who perhaps have had 10 years on the bench that are not 55.

Clauses 8 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 11

MR. KOSKIE: — Just in respect to clause 11, the early retirement provision, Mr. Minister, I'm wondering there, you have established basically a formula within the Bill for early retirement. Does this follow precedents of any other jurisdiction, first of all; and secondly, what studies did you do in order to arrive at the particular early retirement provision as set out in here.

HON. MR. LANE: — We're not aware of any precedent although there may well be. It was done in consultation with actuaries and was designed from that perspective.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I am unable to follow the formula set out in paragraph 41(3). Can you just run me through a pension on that one? How does that work? I guess I don't know what the words 'linear interpolation' mean, to start with, but I'm wondering how your formula works?

HON. MR. LANE: — It's a commonly used legal term, and it basically means an average, if you go to the table at the back between the factor and the years remaining to normal date of retirement.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Now do you want to tell us how it works?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Would the minister tell me, yes, how the formula works. It's a serious question.

HON. MR. LANE: — Are you asking for an example of how you would interpolate between the two? Let's assume that you are one-third of the way between one and two on the years remaining to normal date of retirement. You would then take one-third between the .915 and .839 as your factor. That will give you your factor which then you use and you refer back to the figures used in the various paragraphs to determine the amount.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I then ask you, the pension grid . . . I know the member from Quill Lakes asked you this and I didn't quite follow your answer. Where did you get this particular level of benefits from? Is this something that's used somewhere else, or was this something that you negotiated, or where did it come from?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well if we go to clause (b) of 41.1, the first subclause is what they would get if they didn't retire earlier. Then it's reduced by the factor set out in subclause (ii). Okay? That's how the calculation arises from the base, down to two. Okay.

You asked me the source of the proposals. I'm advised that it was based with advice of actuaries, and what not. We're not aware of a precedent, but that doesn't mean that there may not be some. We're not aware of one, but it was done in consultation with actuaries.

(1500)

MR. KOSKIE: — As you indicate, the first part there is the calculation. The second part of the formula is a bonus, and it applies for judges who take advantage of early retirement option prior to January 31, '86 — would get a monthly bonus to their pension of \$100 per year of service to a maximum of \$1,000. What I'm really asking you: does this in your opinion end up with pretty lucrative and pretty rich early retirement pension benefits?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, it's not, and I use the term guardedly, not as lucrative as, for example, the one that was brought in for the public service.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — As I understand, it provides for a form of early retirement which wasn't available previously. Is that right? How many judges are there in the provincial court and how many would be eligible for this early retirement as it now stands?

HON. MR. LANE: — Forty-eight in the court. Nine would be eligible.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What is the purpose for bringing in this provision for early retirement? Is it an attempt to get a younger bench, or what exactly is the policy behind this program?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well the policy behind it was a request from the provincial court judges that there were some that felt they had served for a considerable length of time and for whatever reason want to retire and thought it would be fair to step down early. So it's a request from the provincial court judges.

MR. KOSKIE: — The nine that you indicated that are eligible for early retirement — on average have they spent a considerable length of time at the bar, or appointed as a judge rather? And what I'm asking with respect to the nine that you're talking about here that are eligible, have they been appointed as a judge for any considerable length of time? Or is it a note that it would apply up to 10 years? And would the large number that are eligible have just over that minimum number of years, that 10 years?

HON. MR. LANE: — All, of course, are over the 10. Three are at least 23 years.

Clause 11 agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to.

Clause 14

MR. CHAIRMAN: — In clause 14 there's a House amendment as follows:

Amend section 14 of the printed Bill by striking out '55' in the first line and substituting

'54.'

Clause 14 as amended agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

Bill No. 135 — An Act to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act

Clause 1

MR. KOSKIE: — Just in respect to this, the one provision, and it would be section 38.7 and that's the appeal to the review panel. I take it that the review panel that is being used is not provided for within the provisions of the Act that we're dealing with, that you are using a panel other than that is established . . . It's established under another Act, is that not correct?

HON. MR. LANE: — The panel is set up under The Mental Health Services Act.

MR. KOSKIE: — Do you find that to be a suitable arrangement?

HON. MR. LANE: — They're the ones that always did it under The Mental Health Act, so it's worked in the past. I assume it will in the future.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's an amendment in clause 2 to:

Amend section 2 of the printed Bill by adding the words 'of The Mentally Disordered Persons Act' after section 38 in the first line.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

Bill No. 140 — An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act (No. 2)

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 136 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council (No. 2)

Clauses 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 137 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 138 — An Act to amend The Public Service Act

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 124 — An Act to establish a Dental Plan for certain Teachers

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Is the minister ready to proceed?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Okay. The officials here today, Mr. Chairman, are Bill Wells of the Department of Education and Arleen Copeman of the teachers' superannuation commission.

Clause 1

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, a few questions. First of all, as I indicated earlier, we have supported this Bill. The only regrets I have . . . I'll wait then, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I began to say, the only regrets I have about this legislation is that now that I'm on a leave of absence as a teacher, I'm not sure I qualify.

But on a more serious note, can I ask the minister, because I know there are others who are affected who take leave of absence from time to time, not only members of this House, but teachers for other reasons, whether they go to work for the Department of Education or doing consulting somewhere as they get seconded. Can you tell me whether a person who has taken a leave of absence, say, for a year, qualifies for benefits or not?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, they do qualify as long as they're under contract with their employing board, and it includes full-time, part-time teachers, but not temporary.

(1515)

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I see. That was going to be my next question. Temporary teachers — I am assuming you mean teachers who are employed for a year on a one-year contract and then have to be rehired maybe again for a temporary contract for another year and then a third year and so on. Because there are, indeed, some teachers who are now hired on that kind of basis. Are you saying that a temporary teacher who is hired on a temporary basis from year to year to year is not going to be eligible?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all I'm not aware of a temporary teacher being hired on a yearly basis. Temporary is not a full year.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well I beg to differ. I happen to know some teachers who are being hired in large and growing numbers on temporary contracts one year at a time. I come from a system in which that's done. I'm not commenting so much on that practice, although I have some concern about the growth of that practice. I'm only saying that I believe that someone who is hired on that kind of a basis over a prolonged number of years should qualify. I think it's important that we clarify that.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, you know, a temporary teacher is defined in The Education Act. And if you look at your Bill, clause (f) states very clearly, 'other than a temporary teacher as defined in The Education Act.'

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — How does that qualify the temporary teacher for the benefits under this plan?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — It excludes them, Mr. Chairman. It says, 'other than a temporary teacher as defined in The Education Act.'

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I see. Well, apparently that's in the agreement, so there is not much that can be done. But I'll have something to ask about that later. I want to say that I think that's unfortunate.

If there was not a situation where the uncertainty which school boards face today from the point of view of funding, and therefore makes many boards feel that they have to hire growing numbers of teachers on a temporary basis — I assume so that at the end of a year when they find they're in financial difficulty they don't have to dismiss the teacher, because the temporary contract has run out — if that situation wasn't being created to a large degree, which I submit is being done by the kind of policies that your government has proposed in the last several years from the point of view of funding, it wouldn't be such a problem. But the fact is that there are many temporary teachers who are not only hired for one year, they're hired for one year, their temporary contract runs out, then they're hired again for another year on temporary contract, and so on.

And I really only ask the minister if she would take that under consideration and hopefully bring it forward as something that the government will initiate in the next round of negotiations, because I really think it's a problem.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, just for the member from Regina North East's clarification, and I suggest it does need some clarification, particularly when it comes to the facts, I think he would be aware, for instance, in the last year, this is the only province in all of Canada and the territories that has actually added to its teaching profession — added in terms of numbers, including full-time teachers. Now after several years of seeing a decline, I would suggest that that's very positive in terms of what it does for the quality of education in this province.

I think the member knows full well . . . I would be more than glad to take into consideration some items for next year's bargaining, but that's where they should be, at the bargaining table and not in this Assembly.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well I really don't want to prolong this committee and I fail to understand why the minister feels she has to get so defensive in answering a straightforward question, which I think is quite a legitimate question, not meant in any way to be critical of the government or the minister or the department. I'm really a little flabbergasted by it all but, be that as it may, we'll continue with the questioning.

I just want to ask the minister: I note that in the Bill this teachers' dental plan is going to be administered by the teachers' superannuation commission. I don't have any objections to that. I'm wondering if there's any particular reason why it is the teachers' superannuation commission. It seems to me that may not be the best place for it, but there must be some rationale for it. What's the rationale?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think that STF would probably agree with the member from Regina North East that that perhaps is not the best place for it. It was at their request as one of the conditions at the bargaining table.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That's fair enough. I simply wanted to know. If the teachers' federation, which represents teachers, feels satisfied with that, I have no reason to question it.

Obviously this will mean that there will have to be an increased number of staff in the superannuation commission to administer the plan. Can you tell me how many staff will be required and whether the staff is in place? And I know it may not be possible because the legislation isn't here, but if it's not possible, then are you prepared to put that staff into place immediately?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, it will require one new position, a clerk typist 3, and I believe interviews will be taking place next week.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — What's the projected cost of this plan, both to the government, which

means the taxpayer, therefore, and to teachers?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, a full year's cost will be less than 1 per cent — no cost to the teacher. It is very similar to PEBA (Public Employees Benefits Agency), the public service plan, and the cost is the government's cost.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — What will the plan cover? If it will help the minister, so that we don't take the time of the House, if you can provide it to me in the form of some outlines or written documents that would be adequate. And if you can't do it right now, I would be satisfied if you could do it at a later time, but soon, because I have received calls from teachers and I would like to be of assistance to them if I can. I know that there are counsellors in the different school superintendencies, or school divisions, able to do that, but I still would like to be able to be of help.

So if you do have that, I would appreciate it, and then we won't have to take the time of the House.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said, the plan is based on the public employees' plan, and perhaps we could just send this over to them. Teachers will be getting the same thing when the plan goes out.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Just another question here. I noticed that a separate carrier will be mutually selected by the teachers' federation and the Government of Saskatchewan, and that the tendering process for selecting the carrier is under way. That was the last time I heard it; that was about a week ago. Is that tendering process still under way or has that now been resolved?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — The tenders have been sent out, Mr. Chairman, for the carrier. January 3rd is closing date, and the selection will be by January the 15th.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, minister. Am I to understand that when it is indicated that the selection will be made by the teachers' federation and the government, that means that the teachers' federation will have equal say in this? And that's what I'm assuming and I'm not questioning it. I just want it confirmed.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — The same process will be used as is done with the group insurance.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — One final question. This plan is a result of negotiations that took place in the past year — sorry, second last question. I want to ask the ministers: is this plan negotiable? Is it possible in the next round of negotiations, for example, for the parties to the collective bargaining agreement to negotiate further improvements or changes to the plan?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Yes.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I heard the minister say, yes, it is negotiable, and I think that's important. Can I just go back to my first question, and then I will let the Bill go, other than going clause by clause. That is, would the minister undertake to send me confirmation as to how teachers on leave of absence, and which teachers on leave of absence, will be able to be eligible under this plan. And I know the members over there think I'm asking for myself. That's not necessarily true.

But there are indeed people who are at university now, who have inquired with me, and I would like to know so that I could write back to them. Can you do that for me? And when might you be able to do it, please?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well I thought perhaps you were on a leave of absence, but I would be glad to send it over to you.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you very much. I indeed am on a leave of absence because I am

doing this job as a member of the legislature on full-time, because other than some ministers who do a lot of part-time ministerial work, I, as MLA, feel it's incumbent on me to do this job because there are a lot of people in my constituency who I think can use the services of an MLA, which they have not had for some time.

Thank you, minister, for answering the questions. I have no further questions in general terms, and we can proceed with clause by clause.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 126 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

Clause 1

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I have one question for now. How many teachers are to be affected by this? Do you have numbers as to how many teachers will be affected by this?

(1530)

HON. MRS. SMITH: — We're making an estimate or an assumption of approximately 1,500.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — You're using, I assume, figures of present, temporary teachers. So therefore there are 1,500 temporary teachers in the teaching field today. Mr. Minister, for temporary teachers, how will the premium be applied? Will they have to pay a full year premium, or is this for teachers who indeed are employed for a full year?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, they begin to pay in the month that they start and finish at the end of the school year.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — So they will pay the full annual premium?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — No. It's prorated.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Okay. Thank you very much. That's all the questions I have on this Bill. It's part of the agreement, and it's a good move.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 125 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Clause 1

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — One question, Mr. Chairman. There is an amendment here which will allow teachers to count all periods of maternity, paternity, or adoption leave up to one year, and then there's the legal terminology. Am I understanding it correctly when I interpret, that means one year in one situation, and then let's say two years later if there is another need for a maternity or paternity leave, then it also becomes another year and so on? Or is it just one year, period?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, it's the combined total number of leaves up to one year.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — So it's one year for a lifetime. In a lifetime you can get a total of one year. Okay.

The next question. I note that there is a lot of concern by a large number of teachers about the superannuation plan which is now in place. There is the annuity plan and then there is the formula plan. Can the minister tell me, because there is an extension here for people to be able to transfer to the annuity plan, is this matter open for negotiations as well, or has the government basically decided that that's the way it's going to be?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well perhaps if I take the last question first. Yes, it's negotiable. It's an item that's usually at the bargaining table every year.

To your first question, it is an extension of two years, 1986 to 1988.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Fine. I was aware of that. I didn't ask that question. I simply made a statement.

I'm glad to hear the minister say that it's negotiable, because I hope that that will mean that in future negotiations, this minister and the Minister of Finance, both of who interfered quite directly in the collective bargaining process that took place for this last agreement by making statements which I think have caused trustees to be concerned, as well as teachers, saying basically what the limitations of the negotiations were.

The Minister of Finance stated very clearly and explicitly, there is going to be a zero per cent increase in this particular contract for 1985. Now I simply say that that has never been my impression or interpretation of what fully free collective bargaining was all about. I've always had the opinion, and I still hold to it, that the bargaining takes place at the bargaining table, where it should, and not through ministers of the Crown who try to set the stage for bargaining in public statements which are made and, unfortunately, were made.

So I simply want to say that since the minister is now saying, at least two times, that these things should be settled at the bargaining table, I am satisfied that this government will now refrain from doing that, and I will accept it at that. If it's not, Mr. Chairman, I submit that because I did read press reports after the agreement was signed that the Saskatchewan school trustees were not very happy with the actions of this minister — and I certainly know a lot of teachers were not happy with the action of the minister and the Minister of Finance — and I do hope that that kind of process will not take place again.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps just a brief comment, and perhaps let us deal with some facts instead of rhetoric. We are dealing with the superannuation bill. I have had the question asked, is this negotiable. I guess one of the interesting things of this year's negotiations that took place was the number of requests for consideration and discussion that came from teachers, in terms of the superannuation formula plan versus the annuity plan, which teachers saw as needing to be addressed in some form. Certainly there were comments put forth as to when it was changed, which was about 1979 or 1980, as my memory serves me correct on it. I do not believe that the minister at the time was the member from Regina North East. His term had been a few years earlier than that, and then of course he moved to the Department of Finance.

I think to suggest that there is interference in collective bargaining is simply rhetoric and no more. And I think one has to go back and read all the statements that were said. I have no difficulty with the Minister of Finance, whether at some or another it might very well be an MLA from Shaunavon, making statements to the public to the fiscal direction that the province would like to go. I don't think governments do that in isolation of individuals, or of bargaining units, that it takes a very concentrated effort, and an agreement of where they want their province to go.

I think if the member from Regina North East goes back and reads particular wording, he will find

that the door was not closed on collective bargaining. As a consequence, he will also see that over the last two years, teachers have had some pretty major gains in the working benefit area, and I allude to the 30-year-and-out clause that was given last year. Now, while that is not directly on salary, Mr. Chairman, it certainly has a cost factor to it and a benefit to the teacher. Teachers had been after the 30-year-and-out clause in this province for many, many, many years. And I'm pleased to say that it was the first one in Canada last year. And of course, then the dental plan was another one this year . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I would caution the minister that she must stick to the Bill here.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that's an excellent ruling. I just want to ask — and I wasn't going to ask this, but the minister reminded me in her comments — has the department minister calculated what effect, financial, having no increase on the salary grid in 1985 will have on the pension of a teacher?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, we have not done an actual calculation on the salary down the road in terms of the 1985. I think if one were going to do it, you know, I guess I would have some questions. Are you going to include the one and a half to 2 per cent increase on the increment, are you going to take that into consideration, or are you just going to take a flat rate?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, okay, just for the purposes of expediting the process here, I will not expect the minister to give me the answer. Obviously, she says she's unable to right today, but I'm going to ask the minister to give me an undertaking, and I hope that I can get this before too long. Let's take one example, because I don't think we want to work it out for teachers in all steps of the salary scale and so on.

Let us take a teacher who is on the final incremental step, class 5 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, that's not me. Let us take that one example, and if you want, if the members wish, I will ask for some more examples, but I'm trying to be helpful. Give me that one example: teacher, class 5, at the top of the salary scale, 15 years from retirement eligibility, what that teacher would have been able to qualify for as a superannuated teacher in the pension plan had there been a 4 per cent increase in the salary grid, and what that teacher will, in fact, qualify for because there is no increase in the salary grid. I'd like you to give me that comparison.

I don't expect you to be able to calculate here, so I will not ask for it here, but will you give me an undertaking to have your officials through you or otherwise provide it to me?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I will, in consultation with the Teachers' Superannuation Commission, refer the question and look at some of the assumptions that also have to be built in with it.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The minister has not answered my question. Will she undertake to provide me with that information?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — I said, yes, along with the assumptions that have to be built into it.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Can you tell me what those assumptions might be?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I think it's fairly obvious. You know, if you want to talk about the salary level and you want to know the comparison 20 years down the road . . . Are we going to have no assumptions that there's an increase in 1986, 1987, 1988? Those are assumptions. Or are you going to do the calculations on a flat rate of the 1985 class 5 teacher based at this level? I mean, let's be realistic about it. Those are the assumptions that one has to take into consideration. Inflation goes up this much, salaries go up this much, and we'll built it in.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That's fair enough, and I know that the superannuation commission, because I have had some experience with the Teachers' Superannuation Commission, will have

access to what are the projected, in their view, inflationary figures and so on. I think that's fair, and I'm prepared to accept that. I'm glad that the minister will be providing me with that information.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 5

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's a proposed amendment to section 5 of the printed Bill as follows:

Amend section 5 of the printed Bill by adding 'that' after 'of' where it appears in the first line and the second line.

Clause 5 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

(1545)

Bill No. 132 — An Act to Provide Heritage Grants to Certain Senior Citizens

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The minister may introduce his officials.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, to my right is my deputy minister, David Innes; behind him is Ron Davis; and behind myself is John Edwards.

Clause 1

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I have here in my hands the budget speech for April 1985.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It was a good speech.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — If the member from Weyburn considered that a good speech, I suggest he go talk to some people in Saskatchewan about it. The reason I have this here is because it's quite relevant to the Bill.

I noticed that in that speech, the Minister of Finance indicated that there was for senior citizens going to be a new program for senior citizens with limited incomes, and therefore, he was pleased to announce that starting with the 1985 tax year the government would introduce a new property tax credit for seniors. Then it lists the amounts that seniors would be eligible for and so on.

I want to ask the minister: what happened that the government felt it had to change the program in something like six or seven months? This was announced on May 28th. I have the press release issued by the minister, and less than a year from that time, the government felt the need to change the program.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, a couple of things., We wanted to make the Bill and the grants as simple and as rich as we possibly could. And when we lined up this program with the program that the member refers to, we felt this one was simpler and richer and of more benefit to seniors; so we naturally took the choice and adopted this program.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, let me ask the minister again, so that he can really be sure of what he's saying. Is it not true, minister, that the only reason that we have this legislation, instead of

the May 28th tax credit program, is because the federal minister of Finance refused to include this provision in the income tax form, and therefore, you had to change the program? That's why I'm going to, later on in consideration of this Bill in this committee, ask you what assurances you have, and I'm going to ask you to table the document that indeed your new program will not cause certain costs to senior citizens. Is it not true that the reason you had to change was because the federal government refused to include this in the income tax system?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — The answer, Mr. Chairman, is that that is incorrect. They were quite willing to include it in their tax form. We decided to proceed with this simpler and richer program and deliver it here at home.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — How is this program, Mr. Minister, different from the old program? I know how it's different, but from the point of view of beneficiaries, how will people, for example, who have an income of \$25,000 or more be better off under your new bill, which we are considering, than they would have been, for example, under the property improvement grant program?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Between 25 and \$30,000 they will be receiving slightly more benefit than under the PIG program, on average.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Are you telling me, Mr. Minister, that a senior citizen who has an income of \$25,000 or more will receive more benefit under this program than they would have received under the property improvement grant program?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Yes. What I'm saying is that if they earn between 25 and \$30,000 and they're getting the half benefits, which are 350 and 250, on average they're getting a better pay-out than they did under the PIG program.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Minister, how much was the maximum tax rebate under the property improvement grant that a senior citizen was able to receive — property improvement grant plus the rebate on the education tax? Can you remember and can you recall for us what that maximum was?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, the average pay-out under the PIG program was 335. Now you know and I know that the maximum was 510. But the average pay-out, actual pay-out, was 335.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The maximum was 510. What's the maximum that a senior citizen in that category will get under this plan?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — And I take it we're talking about people over 25,000 in income — 250 and 350.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — You will agree, Mr. Minister, that there are certain people who are senior citizens who used to get a rebate on property taxes, education and property taxes, which are now going higher and higher and becoming more and more onerous. The people who used to get a rebate for education and property taxes are going to get less benefits under this Bill than they had under the property improvement grant program and rebate on education taxes. There are some people who will get less.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Some will get less. Most will get more. If you're a senior earning \$30,000 a year, I suspect that you need the money less than the senior earning \$15,000 a year, and that's how the program is set up.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well that's interesting. I'm glad the minister has clarified that we're now introducing a means test on senior citizens. I think that's in contradiction to his earlier comments when he introduced the Bill, in which he said very clearly that every senior citizen in Saskatchewan deserves a dividend for what they have invested in building this province. Those comments which you made, Mr. Minister, in second reading of your Bill, don't seem to correlate with what you're saying here today. Somehow this dividend no longer exists. I think anyone, who pays education

taxes and has contributed to this province for a lifetime, should be able to have a break on those education taxes. They have paid their dues, and they have paid it so that you, and I, and other people like us, and those who come after us can have some opportunities that many of those people didn't have. And I think that that's a wrong move on your part.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out to the member that if you take a senior renter, for instance, under the old program, his maximum that he could receive is \$155. He will now be receiving 500 or 700, depending. He is getting a much, much richer program now than he did. The average pay-out for the home owner was 335. The senior now will receive 500 or \$700 — much, much richer than the old program. And the program, obviously, will be going to those who need it the most.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Minister, let me ask you some questions on the SIP (Saskatchewan Income Plan) program. You indicated in your remarks in second reading that people who are eligible under the SIP program are not going to be affected in any way. Can you clarify for this House how that will not happen? What assurances or what steps are you taking to make sure that people who are receiving SIP will not have those benefits reduced because of this grant program?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, the SIP program of course is a provincial program. Therefore, we can set the policy, and that's the policy we've set.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — How are you going to determine that people will not lose benefits from SIP?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — We've set that policy. I mean, they'll receive the same benefits under SIP as they do now.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That may be simpler said than done, Mr. Minister. Let me explain why. As I read the Bill, I note that it says at one point that all income which senior citizens are eligible for will be taken into consideration to determine the eligibility under your new program. Does that not mean, Mr. Minister, that this grant will now be income taxable and therefore affect the amount of income that the senior citizens will have? The property improvement grant, I remind you, was not taxable, income taxable. Is this program of yours now going to be income taxable?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Again, Mr. Chairman, because SIP is provincial, we can set the policy. And that's the policy we've set, that it will not affect that benefit. SIP, as you know, and SAP, as you know, is not taxable and neither will this income grant be taxable.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Are you telling me, Mr. Minister — and I'd better just give you the title again — that the heritage grants to senior citizens program will not be income taxable? That senior citizens who get \$700, to use one example, of grant, that that grant is now no longer going to be taxable, either federally income tax wise and therefore, not provincially? Is that what you're saying?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — That's correct.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Can you provide to this House and therefore to the senior citizens of Saskatchewan some guarantee of that, other than just simply standing up and saying it? Surely, in the preparation of this legislation you would have done — and I have no doubt that you did it — that you would have contacted the federal minister of finance or revenue and got an interpretation and got an assurance in writing. Unless you have that, I'm afraid that your assurance is not good enough. No reflection on you, Mr. Minister but knowing how the income tax system works, I don't think that's good enough. Unless you have a guarantee from the federal government, the taxation department, then I think senior citizens in Saskatchewan have reason to be very concerned about how this will affect them. Do you have such assurance from the federal government, and in what form do you have it?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Revenue Canada has advised us that it would not be taxable and the written

decision will be given to us when they receive this legislation, whenever we pass it.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I'm afraid, Mr. Minister — I know we probably won't change your mind — but that's not good enough. The federal government does not need the legislation to give you that assurance. Those negotiations by a government who's got its act together usually take place before the legislation. Otherwise, how do you know what you're bringing before the House? Surely you can't stand up in your place and tell me you're bringing this into the House and then you're going to go to the federals — after it's law and this is in place and all the other benefits that existed under the tax rebate system and the property improvement grants, after they're gone, you now have a law; then you're going to go to the federal government and negotiate. Is that what you're saying you're going to do?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously as I've informed the member, we have discussed this with Revenue Canada and that's their advice to us. It won't be taxable and the written opinion will follow.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — From what level of Revenue Canada do you have this assurance?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that obviously the Department of Finance who would have negotiated this, did it through their normal channels with Revenue Canada's senior people. And that's apparently the normal course of events.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, Mr. Minister, you're asking us to buy a pig in a poke, and you're asking senior citizens in Saskatchewan to buy a pig in a poke. The Premier has assured in his announcement and in press interviews, the senior citizens that they would get the full benefit of this. His very credibility is at stake — not that there's much there — when you stand up in this House and I say that you can't tell us now definitely that you have got that assurance in writing. That's unheard of.

I mean, you expect the senior citizens of Saskatchewan now to be comforted with your record that everything is in hand. I don't think that's good enough. I want to know, Mr. Minister: have you or has the Minister of Finance been in touch with the appropriate ministers at the federal government level in the form of letters to determine what their view is on this?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Now, Mr. Chairman, you know, they don't change. I can remember at elections past they tried to scare the seniors on health care, and now they want to scare the seniors on this program. I don't think the seniors are going to buy it. I'm telling you that the thing is not taxable, and it's not taxable.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, it's strange, when the minister over there or any of their ministers get up against the wall, they have to get defensive again. I think senior citizens have to be concerned, and they are.

Let's look at the record. There's a hearing aid plan which is a benefit to senior citizens, for which people are now waiting over six months to get their hearing tested; it used to be a turn-around of 30 days. Because you have cut staff so drastically in that program.

There's a Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living program which is now not supplying people who need crutches for weeks and weeks while they wait.

The waiting lists in their hospitals are growing. People needing hip operations, which are very painful situations to live with, are waiting for a year to get in to have that operation. You expect people who are suffering under those kinds of circumstances to take your word. I don't think that that can be.

We have cancer beds closed during the summer because there is not enough staff to keep those beds open. Are you telling me that in the same way as you're asking us and the senior citizens to wait for you to negotiate, are you asking them to wait the same way as they have to wait for a cancer bed? Mr.

Minister, cancer can't wait.

(1600)

And I submit to you that the citizens of this province, who have every right in the world to get the benefit of this program, can't wait for your assurance because you didn't do and your government didn't do its job in negotiating this with the federal government before you brought this program into this House. It's obviously a hastily conceived program in the event that you might decide to call an election. That's widely known. And therefore the work isn't done.

And I ask you once again what kind of an assurance, other than simply standing up and saying it — and that's no reflection on you; it's just that I am a little sceptical about what the federal government might say — what other assurance are you able to give us that this will not be taxable and that senior citizens will not have their guaranteed income supplement payments reduced when they get your grant?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well a number of things, Mr. Chairman. I realize the member has drifted off the Bill a bit. But I think when you line up this government's programs against the previous administrations' programs for seniors, there is hardly any comparison at all. I mean, that member, who was the finance minister, decided not to build any nursing homes for seven years. I mean, and then he gets up and he wants the seniors to trust him. Well, come on. I could read you the list again, but I'll try and stay on the Bill, Mr. Chairman — the list that I read out in my second readings speech of the new services for seniors that this government has provided, together with the 1,500 more nursing home beds that we are building. But all I can tell the member is that we have been advised by Revenue Canada that this is not taxable. And that is all I can tell you.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the minister that I'd like him to tell me and give me a year in which the former government did not open nursing beds in Saskatchewan . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. The members to my left say we're trying to get done. That is the exact reason I'm on my feet — to keep members on the Bill so we do get done.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Until a further time, my final comment on this is that we are considering here a program that I think the seniors of Saskatchewan have a right to have. I think there are better programs that could be available than what the government is proposing here, but it is some assistance, and I think that that's good. Nobody has more right to get a dividend from what has been built in this province than our senior citizens, your parents and mine and our grandparents and so on.

I just want to tell the minister that, in the city of Regina today, there are, as of November 1, 1,011 people waiting for nursing home beds. Two hundred and fifty-nine of them are of a priority urgent category. This government has indicated they're building 30 beds, nursing home beds. That means it's going to take them 30 years to catch up to the waiting list and that's just not good enough. And if that's what is going to be the result of this legislation, then I think, Mr. Minister, you are just not doing a good enough job.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, if the information which we got from this government wasn't so notoriously unreliable, we wouldn't be asking you for your sources. The difficulty we have with the ministers of this government is that the information you give us almost routinely turns out to be inoperative after a while.

Mr. Minister, I want to ask the question that the member from Regina North East asked you and I would ask for the courtesy of a reply. From whom did you obtain the assurance that this would not be taxable? To put it mildly, this has been a controversial program with the Department of National Revenue and I would have hoped that you would have had this tied down relatively tight before you brought it in here. Who did you get the assurance from?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll answer the question again. Our Department of Finance got the opinion from senior officials in Revenue Canada. I might point out to the members that, of course, there's a great deal more co-operation now between this government and the government in Ottawa than was previously the case. But I can simply tell the member that that is the opinion from Revenue Canada.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why on earth didn't you get in writing, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, we will be getting it in writing once they get this legislation.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why didn't you get it in writing before you asked us to vote on this Bill? To put it mildly, Mr. Minister, your optimism is a bit foolhardy considering the amount that is involved here.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I mean, I presume the member's going to vote against this Bill for that reason. I mean, I hope he tells his seniors that. They're going to be pleased to hear that. But as I will repeat to you again, once they've gone over this legislation, once it's passed and they get it, they will give us a written opinion.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well I wish the minister wouldn't demean this debate with a silly nonsense that we are trying to frighten seniors. We're trying to ensure, Mr. Minister, that the senior citizens don't lose part of this through the back door.

Again I ask you, Mr. Minister: why didn't you get it in writing? Don't tell this Assembly you didn't have time; you had time. The Minister of Energy, who hasn't been universally applauded for the fashion in which he handled the Saskoil Bill, at least managed to get a ruling from the Department of National Revenue within a few days. He wasn't going to tell us about it, but he did.

Why, Mr. Minister, didn't you do the same thing — get a formal ruling from the Department of National Revenue instead of what I assume . . . What I have to assume, Mr. Minister, is this is a very informal assurance. If it was anything other than that, I assume you'd give us the details. Why didn't you get the formal assurance of the department?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, all I can tell the member, that we have their verbal opinion, and the written opinion will follow in due course.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I want to ask another aspect of it. Other members will no doubt want to get into it and others, I am sure, will probably express some concerns about the income tax and the GIS as well.

Mr. Minister, I'm wondering about the details of this. When do seniors get the application forms; when may they expect their cheques, and so on? Can you give me the time frame within which this program will operate each year?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — We expect, Mr. Chairman, that the applications will be ready early in the new year — physically printing them. The turn-around time will be pretty quick. A couple of weeks, I guess, would be turn-around time. So you might want to target February.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I take it, Mr. Minister, that you're going to get the forms. Do you have a form that you could share with us that you have in a preliminary state?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — No, apparently, because we have to get the legislation passed and the regulations passed before we do the form.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well you don't have to have the Act passed before you draft your form, Mr. Minister. I take it, however, that the usual state of preparedness of this government prevails and they've done nothing and won't do anything until they have to.

Mr. Minister, have you got the regulations drafted and could you table draft regulations for this so that we'd have that information?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — They are being prepared. They're not in a final form. I don't think it's usual in this House to table the regulations in any case. But they're being prepared as we speak.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, there haven't been since '82. You're right about that. Previous to '82 it was commonplace, where regulations were an important part of a program, to table them with the Bill. I recognize that practice has fallen into disuse with this administration which, as I say, can never get around to doing anything until a couple of months after it should have been done.

I take it, Mr. Minister, that what you're telling us is as soon as humanly possibly you're going to have the application forms available, and as soon as they return them with the necessary information, you will return the cheques. So they might look for them by around the 1st of February. Is that what you're saying?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, not the cheques. I said the application forms would be ready around the 1st of February. They'd get out . . . There's two weeks, February or March, when they'd receive the money back. The forms will be ready by the 1st of February.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, they're going to be fascinated to get their form, but I think everybody's interested in when the cheque is coming. Mr. Minister, when might they expect to receive the money?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, if we use the experience from the seniors' home rebate, the bulk of the money will probably be going out over three months, probably February, March, April, depending on the bulk of applications that come in. but the experience has been that those are the three months normally that the bulk of those programs are expended.

(1615)

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, in order to apply, they have to supply the Minstar with evidence of their eligibility. I assume that's the birth certificate in the vast majority of cases that would establish their eligibility, but I'd like your comment on that. How does a senior citizen prove his eligibility, and how do they establish annual income and the annual income of spouse? What documentary evidence do you intend to require?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, the residency would be established by the SHSP (Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan) number. On the form itself, if they've filed an income tax form, we will just ask them to report their total income. And if they have not filed an income tax, that is if they're not earning sufficient income to have to file, they will just simply indicate that on the form. That's it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — So you're saying that you're not going to require any evidence of income under normal circumstances, just get them to put their income in the form.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — As reported to Revenue Canada.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you spoke of the senior citizens' programs of your government, and certainly whatever we may think of their quality, we certainly can't fault you on quantity. You can correct me if I'm wrong, but in April of this year the program which was then extant was a property improvement grant together with a senior citizens' school tax rebate. That was the extant law at the 1st of April.

By April 10th you had announced that these would be cancelled and for them would be substituted a refundable tax credit. By — was it June? — you had announced that the 1st of April program would

be reinstated, effective in 1985. I think I've got that right. In November you are announcing that the April 10th program — that's the refundable tax credit program — is no longer operative. And you have a new program which we'll call the senior citizen's grant program.

Will you confirm that I have the right sequence of programs. First, the property improvement grant and senior citizens' tax credit; then that was canned, and then you had a refundable tax credit; then the old one was reinstated for 1985; then the refundable tax credit was cancelled in November; and now you have this new one before us. Have I got the right sequence? And which ones are still going to be extant after this legislation is passed?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we were very pleased to have the heritage program for seniors this year, which the member has noted that we announced in the spring. And we now have this program that we're announcing today, which is the ongoing program. It'll be in place for years and year, and I might add, Mr. Chairman, we are very pleased to provide this assistance to seniors in the province and that I know by talking to seniors in my seat that they were very happy to receive them and they'll be very happy to receive the benefits under this new program as well.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I thank you for that comment which was not in any sense responsive to the question. Would you answer this one: why did you dismantle the refundable tax credit program which you introduced in April?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the member was in the House when we started this debate, but that question was asked. The answer is very simple. We wanted to make the system richer and simpler and more straightforward, and when we lined this program up with the refundable tax credit, this one won in all three categories so we decided to adopt this one.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, this is not what your Minister of Finance said in April. He was very, very proud of his refundable tax credit program. Isn't it the fact that you couldn't negotiate the arrangement with the federal government and had to abandon it?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well again, Mr. Chairman, I guess the member wasn't in the House but that question was asked as well. No, that's not the case. They had agreed to run that program for us. We simply decided to choose this simpler, richer program for seniors, all of whom will be very happy to receive it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I don't know what has happened between April and November that has caused the program which was commended to us in April to be abandoned in November because it's too complicated, and you haven't explained why the program which was the flagship of your budget in April — that tattered document which hardly has a single vestige of anything remaining — why have you joined with your colleagues, the Minister of Social Services and others, in attacking what was brought in in April and attempting to substitute it with something else. Why have you decided that the April program which you then said was a good idea is now too complicated?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the Opposition would prefer the refundable tax credit over this program. I could take it from his comments that he would wish to see that in place, rather than this richer program and this simpler program for seniors. And he can have that view. It is our view that this program is richer and simpler than that other one, and when we lined them up together we said, well let's do this for the seniors. Let's give them a richer program than we first contemplated; let's try and make it similar, which this is. And that's the program we adopted.

Now the opposition may want the other program, and that's fine. They can put that in their platform if they wish. We think that the seniors will choose this program over the other one.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, if you assume my view was as you stated it from what I said, then the patent lack of logic by which you reach your conclusion is just another

re-enforcement to the fact that you are applying something to the problems which your department is facing, but none of it is logic.

The question was very simple: why did you decide that the April program, which you commended to this legislature short months ago, is now too complicated? That's a fairly simple question. Do you think you can answer it?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's interesting to note that the opposition doesn't like this program. And they can hold that view. I don't think the seniors hold that view. I mean, the opposition holds that view. I don't know how many ways you can explain to the opposition the simplicity of this thing and the richness of it. And when you line it up with the other program, it's a better program. So obviously we took the better program. We know that the seniors are going to like it, and I guess the NDP don't like it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we have once again a comment from the minister which is in no sense responsive to the question. But I take it that the minister doesn't know the answer; otherwise he would surely give the committee the benefit of his answer.

The question was, once again: why did you decide that the April program which you commended to this legislature was too complicated? I've asked that twice; you have declined to answer it twice. I'm not going to ask it again, because I can only conclude that the minister has not the remotest idea. And I take it he didn't draft either of the programs and he is therefore unable to compare them as to their complexity.

I ask this question, Mr. Minister: you have given some comment with respect to whether or not this money is taxable. Have you considered whether or not the money affects the grant, the receipt of the grant affects the ability of a senior citizen to get guaranteed income supplement? Would you repeat your answer to that?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Revenue Canada advises us that because the grant is not taxable, it would not affect the GIS.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The amorphous Revenue Canada. Would you be good enough to indicate who in Revenue Canada has indicated to you that this will not affect a senior citizen's right to get guaranteed income supplement?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, as I've pointed out to some of your colleagues, our Department of Finance talked to the senior officials in Revenue Canada, who gave our Department of Finance that ruling. Obviously we'll get a written ruling in due course.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, these questions are by no means theoretical questions. We have to recall the fact that there were property improvement grants in this province for many years —more than 10 years — and all of them were not taxed by the federal government until 1984, the '84 tax year, when people were called upon to pay this money. And some will recall what happened in 1984, and the federal government has said that property improvement grants in the hands of farmers and small-business men are taxable.

So we can't assume that the federal government is not on the prowl. Since 1984 they have been taxing property improvement grants in the hands of farmers and small-business people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, and without demurral or protest from this government, as we know, because you get along very well with them. Farmers had not paid this for 10 years until their 1984 tax year, when they paid their taxes in 1985 — without demur, because why would you demur? After all, you get along very well with them and you wouldn't want to rock the boat.

(1630)

Now I ask you: are you going to get along equally well with them when they say, well, seniors, too

bad, we've changed our mind? This is not a rebate but this is in fact income and you will have to pay some tax on it and it will affect your ability to get GIS. Will you have a government which reacts the same way as it did when, after more than 10 years of non-taxability, the federal government and Mr. Mulroney starts collecting money from farmers and small-business men for the property improvement grant? Not a word of demur. Will we likely hear a word of demur when this program equally becomes taxable in the hands of senior citizens?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I could agree with the member opposite. We do get along well with the federal government. If you want to look at the oil upgraders, and if you want to look at farmers, and you want to look at any number of programs that are now in place in Saskatchewan because of that co-operation, I could agree with them.

But I can only repeat to him that the ruling is that this thing isn't taxable. If the Leader of the Opposition and if the members of the opposition wish to go out and try their scare tactics again on senior citizens, that's up to them, but we are telling them that it's not taxable, and it won't be.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — May I ask: in clause 2, where it refers to annual income, what will be considered under this Act to be annual income?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman that which is reported as total income on their income tax form.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — In other words, grants under this program, because they will be issued by the government, will therefore then be considered as part of annual income?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Obviously the grant wouldn't enter into it because they're not declaring it as income.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — They wouldn't be declaring it as income for eligibility purposes under this program, but wouldn't they be declaring it as income for income tax purposes?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — No.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Since the minister is not prepared to table any documents to give us assurances of that because he has yet to negotiate that with the federal government, I guess we can't pursue it any further. I just want to again underline our concern about the lack of preparation prior to bringing this kind of legislation in the House. We've had an example of no assurance from the federal government, no negotiations by the minister, nothing concrete, so it's again a maybe. It may be and it may be not. We have had a case of asking for regulations, which I don't think can be that complicated. The minister says they are not ready. In other words, nothing under this program is ready except this legislation.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the minister, that that is not a very effective way to bring in any kind of legislation of this form when there are a lot of people out there wanting to know clearly what implications it has unto them. I know we're disappointed, and I'm sure there's a lot of senior citizens in Saskatchewan who are disappointed as well.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, if I'm misinterpreting this, I assume you will assist me. This legislation, whoever, does not appear to recognize common-law marriages. I take that to be the meaning of section 2(i), the spouse means a legal spouse. I take that to mean that that does not recognize common-law marriages.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would tell us what the wisdom behind that is. I think particularly when we're dealing with senior citizens, some of the common-law marriages are of long duration; they're decades long. Some of the relationships have gone on for decades. I wonder why you cannot recognize those relationships, Mr. Minister.

Let me tell you what I think the practical effect of this is going to be. People who live in common law are each going to get \$500, I understand. It has nothing to do with residence or taxes. Each of a common-law husband and wife, it seems to me, will be entitled to \$500 each. It has, I think, the opposite effect to what you expect.

It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that you're going to discourage . . . I don't see why it matters at that age whether they're married or not. But assuming it does, you're going to discourage the legitimization of those relationships, because as I read this legislation, and if I'm misreading it, I assume the minister will assist me, both of common-law spouses are each entitled to this grant because neither one of them have a legal spouse.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, it's the opinion given us that this does include common law. If you read all of subsection(i):

‘spouse’ means the legal spouse of an eligible applicant or, where an eligible applicant does not have a legal spouse, the person who, at the time an application is submitted, lived and manifested an intention of continuing to live together permanently . . .

Which is common law, I guess.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.

Clause 5

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to clause 3, Mr. Minister, is it the intention to have all forms verified by affidavit? Is that the intention of the department? Clause 3(2). Is it the intention to have all forms verified by affidavit? If it is, it's a bit of a nuisance because some of these old people have got to go find a commissioner for oaths somewhere.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — It's simply a signed declaration on the application form.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I see. Well I guess it does say ‘by affidavit or otherwise.’ The presence of the word ‘affidavit’ there suggested to me that they would have to, in the normal form, get an affidavit completed before an commissioner for oaths. That's no great problem with people of our age. That can be a bit of a nuisance with older people who have to travel out of their residence to get a commissioner for oaths.

I'm not sure I quite understand how your system is going to work, Mr. Minister. I wish you'd explain it to me.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, how it's going to work is that they're going to have the form, and at the bottom of the form there's going to be a little declaration that all that they reported is true, and they sign it.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We are now on clause 6 and I would like to inform the House that there is an amendment introduced by the Minister for Urban Affairs, which reads as follows:

Amend subsection 6(2) of the printed Bill by striking out 'in the current year' in the second line.

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 11

MR. SHILLINGTON: — With respect to section 8, Mr. Minister . . . The chairman is moving along with such commendable rapidity that it's difficult to get up on your feet before he's gone on a couple of sections.

With respect to section 8, I take it that there'll be no recourse from the certificate. If the certificate's filed, what right does a pensioner have to say, hey, I never got an overpayment; hey, it's not true? How does the pensioner protest a certificate once filed? What's his recourse for protesting such a thing?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, there is no formal appeal mechanism. Normally in these cases, and the same would happen, I guess, under the old PIG system, if someone had a problem they get hold of the department and we would try and fix it somehow. But there's no formal appeal system there.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why doesn't the Crown put itself to the same test as everyone else does, and that is just get a judgement in court if there's been an overpayment?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that this is a standard clause in these types of Bills, dealing with overpayments. I can't really tell you much more than that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well I just want to state my objection to this. I don't intend to hold this up. I just want to state my objection to this. If the citizen should be given a right to protest a claim from me if I think I owe him a debt, I see no reason why the citizen should not have the same protection against the Crown. And I want to state my objection to the violation of civil liberties which is inherent within this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Are there any questions relating to clauses 9, 10, or 11 that any members may have wanted to ask but couldn't?

Clause 11 agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

Bill 131 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (No. 2)

Clause 1

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The nub of this Bill is to take away from senior citizens the right to claim a refundable tax credit and removing from the seniors this substantial benefit, and would the minister explain why he is taking away this right from seniors?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, quite simply because we're replacing it with a much richer benefit, and I might add it's difficult to take away something which they never had, but we have been over this before in the other Bill that we just passed. The replacement to this Act, this program, of course, is much richer, much simpler and will give much greater benefits to seniors in

the province of Saskatchewan.

(1645)

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I just want to make the obvious comment, Mr. Minister, that when you abolished the PIG grants and the related grants last spring, we told you that that was inappropriate and you persisted. You brought in the tax credits. We told you that it was impossibly complicated for senior citizens and that it wouldn't result in a sufficient grant, and you persisted, Mr. Minister. Now you're back at the bat for the third time.

I only want to say, Mr. Minister, that the *Leader-Post* said about the Minister of Energy, when we said he guessed he wasn't right all the time, that being contrite is no excuse for not having it right the first time. All I can say, Mr. Minister, is, I wished you had got this right the first time in the budget. This is yet another example of how carelessly and slovenly that budget of last April was put together.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 142 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 (No. 3)

Clause 1

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The last time I took the minister's word for a matter relating to municipal taxation in Regina, I wasn't long in regretting it.

Mr. Minister, you described in general terms the problem in your second reading speech. I wonder if you could give us some more detail. Specifically what was it that you overlooked in passing last year's legislation? Exactly what was it you overlooked, what classes, and what class of property is it will be affected by this, and in what fashion will it be affected?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, this deals with business tax, local business tax. The situation arose because there are about 1,000 businesses that were licensed by the city under the former urban Act. But under the new Urban Act they had to be assessed a business tax rather than a licence. However the city was unable to add the assessment rates for the businesses to the former assessment regulations before those regulations were repealed.

This amendment, therefore, gives the city of Regina and other other municipalities — but we're not aware of any that ran into this problem — the legal authority to use the new regulations made under the Act for assessing the rates in 1985. In other words, they're okay for '86 because they've got it all done now. But they hadn't got it done for '85, so that this will allow them or make it legal for them to have assessed and collected those taxes in '85. Without it they could be challenged — the city could be challenged — and their loss could be \$1.3 million.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — How is it that this only affects the city of Regina and not other municipalities, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — It relates back to what the city was licensing, rather than putting a business tax on. The city of Regina was the only urban municipality in the province that, for these 1,000 businesses, they were licensing them instead of assessing them. Everybody else in the province was assessing these types of businesses, but the city of Regina wasn't.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that last year — or is it this year because the session has gone on for such a long time — you brought forward an amendment to The Urban Municipality Act which was Bill 91, and that cost the city of Regina \$500,000 — half a million

dollars — which you, because of your concessions to certain real estate developers, and in light of the fact that the city of Regina, I read here, is now facing a potential deficit in 1985 of \$800,000, having used up because of your neglect and lack of funding to urban municipalities its \$2.8 million surplus over the term of your government, which was used for reducing the amount of property tax increase and so on. Can you give us an assurance here today that in the next budget, whoever the next minister of Finance might be, that there will not be a further reduction of funding to the city of Regina and other cities as there was in the last budget?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, we have wavered a great deal from this Bill. We are dealing in this Bill with a certain segment of business assessments dealing with business tax, nothing to do with land assessment at all. And I would also point out that if the city of Regina built up a deficit in this current year, they did so having already received the increased taxes from the land he's speaking about.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What you're doing, in essence, Mr. Minister, is rounding out the business tax. Has the government considered going in the opposite direction, that is acceding to the demands of many business people that this is a form of double taxation? Has the government considered abolishing property tax and giving the municipalities grants in lieu therefore, as has been suggested to this government by quite a number of business people?

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member spoke first about business tax and then said we should abolish the land tax. Well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He meant business tax. I'm quite aware of the views of small on the business tax and, being a listening government, we will listen to it and we will consider any number of things for any number of people in the province, that being one of them.

I mean, it's interesting to note that of course this business tax problem just arose this year. It wasn't around during the '70s, of course, when they were in power. It has in fact been around a long time and business folks have been complaining about it for a long time. So I can tell you that we will consider that along with any other items that affect the people of Saskatchewan.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my officials for their contribution today, and thank the opposition for their questions, and I move we report the Bill.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 141 — An Act to provide for the Postponement of the Tabling of Certain Documents (No. 2)

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 143 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 3)

Clause 1

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, I was wondering whether you could outline in the Assembly the financial impact of the provisions of this Bill and the amount of money that is being saved by putting the freeze in respect to the members of the Assembly.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I'm informed by my officials who have been going through this that's very close to the area of \$80,000.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The saving will be \$80,000. The interesting part of that, I suppose, Mr. Minister, is a point of comparison. The other day when we were asking questions about ministerial travel, when we added up the bills, it worked out to about \$1.2 million in travel for the cabinet. That didn't include legislative secretaries or these little committees that you send up where your MLAs are travelling around.

I think what we have to do is put it in context the political highlighting that you're doing here in the one area of MLAs' salaries. I agree with you that we should be freezing it at a time of restraint. But I would add that ministers, when they're thinking about their Christmas holidays at taxpayers' expense — and there are a number of them who are planning those right now — that they would consider cancelling them because it will be much more than \$80,000. We're talking about 1.2 million for cabinet ministers to travel around the world. We're saving \$80,000 here for 64 members, just to put in context, and I wanted to make that point.

(1700)

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, I hear the hon. member from Shaunavon as we reach the last Bill of this session, and in his true Christmas spirit saying things like: that ministers are planning Christmas holidays on the taxpayers' expense. I will say to the hon. member of Shaunavon, and every member of this House, and everyone in Saskatchewan, that that is absolutely not true. That is absolutely not true. It's the kind of statement that I would not have expected, although I guess we have come to expect from some members over there, that we have come to expect. I'm really surprised at him saying that.

And for him to suggest when they sat there in second reading and said, yes, we will be voting for this Bill which we believe is a responsible Bill . . . There's no question that it is a responsible Bill in these times. In the middle of some negotiations with government employees and so on, it's important that we do this. And it's important to note as well, Mr. Chairman, this is the third year in a row that MLAs' salaries have been frozen if this happens — and in fact, Mr. Chairman, the fourth year in a row that cabinet ministers' salaries have been frozen. I would say that if you want to talk about responsibility, there is an example of responsibility.

I would invite the NDP to vote against this. If they want to speak against it and then sit there and sanctimoniously vote for it, so be it. But I would invite them to vote against it; vote where their hearts really are in their own hip pockets. If they want to do that, that's fine. But I would say that all members on this side of the House will be voting for this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister will sanctimoniously stand in his place and say how he is saving taxpayers' money by keeping back \$80,000 from 64 members. But I want to point out that in other areas . . . For example, one cabinet minister's expenses last year were \$63,000 — \$63,000 for one individual who included in that a trip to Hawaii in February for about \$4,000. Now that one individual spent more than we saved in freezing all the MLAs' wages.

It's not that I'm against freezing MLAs' wages, but where the phoniness is, Mr. Minister, where the phoniness is, is that you're not doing it in any other areas. In the area of travel you spent \$1.2 million of taxpayers' money. And more than that, Mr. Chairman, they will not give the detailed breakdown of where that money was spent; they refuse. When we ask in question period they say, put it on the order paper. When we put it on the order paper they amend it so that they don't have to give it.

And I say to you, this sanctimonious Bill that you bring in to say that we're going to save the taxpayers \$80,000 — and that's something, \$80,000. But look at the other end where the cabinet ministers are flagrantly spending the money of the taxpayers, \$1.2 million a year in travel, \$3,400 a day — \$3,400 a day in expenses — and they stand here and say, we're going to save the taxpayers' money by passing a Bill to freeze the salary of the MLAs.

Now I say to you that that is hypocrisy. Because if they were serious, Mr. Chairman, what they would be doing is standing and saying as well: we are going to quit the world travel, travel around the world with the thin-veiled excuse that you're trying to get business. And when we look at what business has come after going to Japan, and China, and Vienna, Paris, is a broken-down old relic of the 1970s from Edmonton, Peter Pocklington, coming here with a \$3 million bacon plant. That's what we get for the \$1.2 million in world travel that we've done.

So I say to the minister, when he talks to me about saving the taxpayers' money when we're looking at a \$1.5 billion deficit because of their mismanagement, to stand here and pretend that this \$80,000 has anything to do with good management and sacrifice on their part, at the same time as we see minister's expense accounts at \$63,000 a year per minister, for a total of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Over a year, that's right — over a year — \$1.2 million, then the people of Saskatchewan should know that this is a phoney Bill, one to cover up what is really happening. Because the ministers don't need the increase. They simply add it on to their expenses — add it on to their expenses. Their expenses for some ministers were \$20 an hour, eight hours a day, every day of the year, in expenses.

Now what my people are telling me in my constituency is, how can anyone spend \$20 an hour every day of the year in expenses? What do you do to spend that much money? Farmers on the farm who are being kicked off by the bankers and by the government are saying, how does the Minister of Highways spend \$20 an hour, eight hours a day, every day of the year, to make up for the 63,000 in expenses that he has?

And it's a fair point. It's a fair point. Farmers don't understand it. The member for Morse, when he goes out to his farmers who maybe once a week get to go to Swift Current and have a meal in town — veal cutlets for five bucks — say, how do you spend \$20 an hour every day of the year, eight hours a day, every day of the year for 365 days? They don't understand it. They simply don't understand it.

And I say to you, to come here sanctimoniously and move a Bill that will keep the salaries of MLAs at the same level they are, save the taxpayers 80,000 so that ministers can go out and spend it travelling around the world, is the height of hypocrisy.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — All I can say in reply, Mr. Chairman, and I think the Bill spends for itself, the intent of the Bill speaks for itself, the public of Saskatchewan will appreciate the responsible nature of this Bill. And I would urge all members to vote for the Bill. And I would hope the members of the NDP will vote for the Bill.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you have indicated here that what you're doing is making a pretence, really, and a sham out of restraint. This is what is happening here — \$80,000. And it looks like you're freezing everybody's salary and it's going to be significant.

But let us take a look at what you've done when it comes to the size of the cabinet — 25 in cabinet at a time when we're supposed to be in restraint. And we ran a government without deficit and managed this province with 20. Five extra cabinet ministers to run the mess that you've put in place here. Not only that, and you take a cabinet minister and cut five cabinet ministers back, and how much would you save for the taxpayer? About 70 or \$80,000 just to cover their salaries, and then all the extra expenses of every one of these cabinet minister would be significant.

You take a look at the legislative secretaries. This outfit is pouring money into the hands of all the back-benchers. Twelve legislative secretaries, minimum of 65, \$6,700 each. And you go on.

Look at government advertising. It has been a disgrace in this province in a time of restraint. Over 12 to \$15 million on government self-served advertising. And you come forward and you expect the public to believe that this is a government with ideals, who are really putting in a sense of restraint. What hypocrisy?

And I'll tell you, you won't get rid of, and the people of Saskatchewan won't believe you. They know

your approach is wrong; that you're extravagant; that you're wasteful and there is a tremendous amount of taxpayers' money that's being wasted.

As my colleague has indicated, this government has flown around the corners of this world, all over the world, and absolutely no performance as a result of it. We had the member from Regina South, when he first assumed industry and commerce, the first thing he did was to take a trip at \$33,000. Your performance, I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, you have travelled the world, not only cabinet ministers and civil servants, but you have included back-benchers as never before in the history, and you have taken them off on a trip to China — \$23,000.

You have officials of corporations flying around on world tours. The chairman of the board of the potash corporation, \$28,000, and you come into this legislature and pretend in a . . . what hypocrisy! What phoniness! I'll tell you the people of Saskatchewan are sick and tired of the waste and the mismanagement that is so characteristic of this government. I'll tell you, you won't fool them — you won't fool them and fake them out by putting in a \$80,000 restraint on salaries.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

MR. SCHMIDT: — Well first of all, Mr. Chairman, I want it to be known that I'll be voting for this Bill. I want to make that quite clear. But there are some elements here that are concerning to really the integrity of the House and to the members of this Assembly, and they should be considered.

Now I don't need the increase that I'm going to vote against or vote out, and it's a very good thing that I don't need the increase, because it seems to me that as a member of the legislature, I am paid less than many of my constituents. I also paid more than some of them; much more than farmers, but I am paid less than teachers with my educational level, and I am paid less than my neighbours who are railroaders and are running trains, and it seems to be that running the Government of Saskatchewan should be at least of equal value.

And the principles of continuously limiting the salaries of MLAs leads to some problems. I do not need the extra money and I said it's a good thing, but if we continue to have the salaries of our legislators fall lower and lower as compared to other elements of society, we are going to end up with only two kinds of people who can serve in this Assembly; the wealthy and the people with nothing better to do. I mean there are some people in our society who you wouldn't want here and would be over-paid on what I get. On the other hand, how many people would be here if the pay was only your travel down here and your hotel? And what calibre of people would you have? You'd have either people with nothing better to do, or people who were wealthy, and I don't think those are the kinds of people who should be limited to running for office.

So, therefore, I will vote for the Bill, but I'm speaking against the principle. I'm speaking against the principle of not paying the members of the legislature something equivalent to the value of their work. And I want to make that quite clear, and I want it to be on the record that this is a personal principle of mine, that you have to have some fairness in salaries throughout society. I find it hard to believe that the members of this Assembly are not worth their pay, because they are. And I find it hard to believe that they are worth less of an increase than what this Assembly is granting to teachers and government workers.

I believe in restraint, but I also believe in fairness and I believe in democracy, and it seems to me that this year will not endanger it, but if this principle continues and salaries were frozen forever, there is only people like myself and a few others who could afford to be here. And while I'm not suffering, and I can't say to my constituents, I am suffering — I mean, that would be a blatant lie — but I am not getting rich on what I am getting paid here, and if it wasn't for the fact that I had no debts before I got here, I don't know if I could afford to stay.

So what I'm saying is, I'm opposed to the principle of not paying members what they're worth, and it

seems to me at some time we have to establish a formula and stick with it. And I'm not saying that we should be given an increase that exceeds what's been offered to teachers and to government workers; that would be grossly unfair. But I'm saying that our increases . . . We are worth as much as other government workers, and why should we limit ourselves.

So therefore, I will be voting for the Bill, but I want it quite clear that I'm opposed to the principle, and at some time or another, I believe we should peg these salaries to a certain level of government workers, whether it be teachers, or whether it be some other government workers, or somebody else that's paid by the government, and then we will get what they get.

And I consider that teachers are valuable and that my neighbours who are railroaders are valuable, but I find it very hard to believe that the members of this Assembly are less valuable to society. So that goes on the record as my opinion. I will stand for that opinion anywhere in this province and justify it, but I will vote for this Bill because I believe in restraint and I think we should show an example.

(1715)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 120 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

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

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DOMOTOR: — By leave now, I move this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 127 — An Act to amend The Cancer Foundation Act

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I move third reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 139 — An Act to amend The Public Health Act (No. 2)

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — I move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 133 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983 (No. 3)

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

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 123 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act

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

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 135 — An Act to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act

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

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 140 — An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act (No. 2)

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

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 136 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council (No. 2)

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

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 137 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 137 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 138 — An Act to amend The Public Service Act

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 138 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 124 — An Act to establish a Dental Plan for certain Teachers

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 124 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 126 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I move it be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 125 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

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

Motion agreed to.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — With leave, Mr. Speaker, I move third reading and it be passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 132 — An Act to Provide Heritage Grants to Certain Senior Citizens

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, I move first and second reading of the amendments.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, I move Bill 132 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 131 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (No. 2)

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, I move Bill 131 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 142 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 (No. 3)

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, I move Bill 142 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 141 — An Act to provide for the Postponement of Tabling of Certain Documents (No. 2)

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I move Bill 141 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

Bill No. 143 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 3)

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 143 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 5:32 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill No. 116 — An Act respecting the Transfer of Revenues from Oil Resources to Farmers in the form of Refunds in respect of Fuel Costs

Bill No. 122 — An Act to amend The Heritage Fund (Saskatchewan) Act (No. 3)

Bill No. 134 — An Act to amend The Livestock Investment Tax Credit Act

Bill No. 120 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

Bill No. 123 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act

Bill No. 124 — An Act to establish a Dental Plan for certain Teachers

Bill No. 125 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Bill No. 126 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

Bill No. 127 — An Act to amend The Cancer Foundation Act

Bill No. 131 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 132 — An Act to Provide Heritage Grants to Certain Senior Citizens

Bill No. 133 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983 (No. 3)

Bill No. 135 — An Act to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act

Bill No. 136 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 137 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act

Bill No. 138 — An Act to amend The Public Service Act

Bill No. 139 — An Act to amend The Public Health Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 140 — An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act (No. 2)

Bill No. 141 — An Act to provide for the Postponement of the Tabling of Certain Documents (No. 2)

Bill No. 142 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 (No. 3)

Bill No. 143 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act (No. 3)

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 5:35 p.m.

MOTIONS

House Adjournment

HON. MR. McLEOD: — I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Taylor, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley:

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

I so move.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, with leave, prior to adjournment I would like the opportunity to wish everybody a merry Christmas. At this time usually we pause to think about our family and friends, and particularly those that have worked so hard here in the legislature, and in the public service, and throughout Saskatchewan to make 1985 as good a year as possible.

I want to extend to all the public of Saskatchewan a merry Christmas and the best in '86 on behalf of all members of the legislature; certainly from the government side, extend merry Christmas and our very best to the members in opposition. And to everybody in Saskatchewan I'll say, I hope for the very, very best in '86-87 and on into the 1990s. And Mr. Speaker, merry Christmas to you.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to extend to my colleagues and friends in the legislature, on behalf of the opposition, a wish for a very merry Christmas. People who watch the Assembly, I'm sure, believe that we are total enemies in watching the cut and thrust of the debate. But I suppose at times like this it's very important for people to realize that while we disagree rather vehemently with the principles that our particular parties stand for, that on a personal relationship there are few people who understand what politicians go through in their day-to-day life, and we, as elected members, can only understand. I want to say to the members opposite that while we disagree vehemently with things that are being done, on a personal level the wish of a merry Christmas is indeed a sincere one.

I would like to take this opportunity, as well, to thank the members opposite for their support during the year that they gave to me on the occasion that they will be well aware of — many cards of support and friendship. I appreciate it very much, and wish on behalf of our caucus a very merry Christmas and a sincere happy new year. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Before putting the motion on adjournment, I'd also like to take this opportunity to wish each one of you from myself and from the staff of the Legislative Assembly a very pleasant Christmas season, a time to go home and enjoy with your family the holidays, and hope to see you early in the new year.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:40 p.m.