

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Public Accounts Committee

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to report to you and to all members of the Assembly on proceedings in the Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Speaker, the comptroller has publicly stated to the committee on the record that the loss on the investment that the government had in Pioneer Trust was for the year ended March 31, 1985 — that is for the fiscal year 1984-85. In the annual report of the Provincial Auditor and in a separate report he has filed with the committee, he has stated that the provincial government sustained and recorded a loss on Pioneer Trust in the fiscal year 1984-85.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, members of the committee sought to examine the Department of Finance involvement in the events . . .

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. State your point of order.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that we are in routine proceedings, presenting reports by Standing, Select, and Special Committees, and my understanding is that there is no report coming from that committee of public accounts, Mr. Speaker. If the member has something to report . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Is the member making a report from the committee, or is it the member's own report?

Mr. Shillington: — It's my report on the activities of the committee, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Okay, one moment please. I would . . .

I would refer the member to *Beauchesne's*, Fifth Edition, paragraph 640:

It is the opinion of the committee, as a committee, not that of the individual members which is required by the House, and, failing unanimity, the conclusions agreed to by the (committee) majority are the conclusions of the committee.

So there is no place here at this point for your report.

Mr. Shillington: — With leave, such a report could be presented, and I therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask for leave to report on the activities of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe if you refer to *Beauchesne's*, you'll find that it cannot be a committee of one individual but must be a report of the majority . . . Order, please. I've just read to you what *Beauchesne's* says on the issue, and

it says nothing about leave. It says a report of a committee must be the consensus of the majority of the committee. So it cannot be given now.

Mr. Lingenfelter: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it's my understanding that, with leave, the House can decide to do what business it would like to do. My colleague from Regina Centre has risen asking for leave to give a personal report as a result of things that happened in the committee this morning.

I find it interesting that on Monday leave was granted to the member from Regina South; all the members on this side agreed to it, and now the Speaker isn't allowing that kind of a change to the agenda.

My point of order is that by leave we can change the agenda to do whatever we want, and we're asking you to put that on the order right now and see if the Assembly agrees to it.

Some **Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I believe that under this order of business it's not possible to move with a private report, but before orders of the day, if the member had leave, he could move it at that time.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Weiman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure I rise in the House today to introduce some guests from my constituency. I realize there has been a tremendous amount of speculation on whether we would be here or not. I was fully confident that we still would be here because His House never recesses until Nora Sutherland and her class from Fairhaven School come to the Assembly.

I want to introduce Nora Sutherland, along with Howard Sproat and Jim Longstaff, as well as the students that they have brought with them today — 78 in number. They are grade 7 students from Fairhaven School. And I would ask the members opposite to please give me the respect so that I can introduce my guests without carping and caterwauling from across the floor.

Again, as I stated earlier, it's a great deal of pleasure that I have students once again visiting. This is the fourth year in a row that you've come. I'm grateful for it. I look forward to meeting with you. I will meet with you at 3 o'clock for pictures and refreshments and to answer any questions that you may have. And I would ask the members, the respectful and polite members of this House, to please greet you in a warm manner.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Collapse of Pioneer Trust

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Acting Premier. It deals with your government's arrogant and ham-handed attempt to cover up the events

and decisions which resulted in the collapse of Pioneer Trust company.

You have used the government majority in the Standing committee on Public Accounts to prevent questions from being asked there about the Pioneer Trust fiasco, the biggest business failure in Saskatchewan history. In effect, your members have slapped a gag order on this committee with the motion that says no questions may be asked about Pioneer Trust.

In light of the fact that this gag order has clearly blow up in the government's face, will you withdraw your orders to government members to lift the cover-up on the Pioneer Trust affair, and will you order them to allow a full, public review of the events and decisions which led to this fiasco?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I, of course, don't have first-hand knowledge of what goes on in public accounts since I don't sit in public accounts. My understanding is that as it relates to the public accounts and the auditor's report that was being dealt with in public accounts for the year under review, the latitude that is normally extended was extended . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know what the hon. member from Regina North West is carping about.

I also recall, Mr. Speaker, that a few days or maybe a week or 10 days ago in this House, on a similar line of questioning to the Minister of Finance, you did, as I recall, extract an agreement to table certain documents once the wind-up was completed.

I don't know what more the hon. member wants, but I believe . . .

An Hon. Member: — Headlines. He wants headlines.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Perhaps my colleague is right. Perhaps all that you do want is the headlines. But I believe that members have, in fact, treated you fairly generously.

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you may take this matter lightly. I can assure you that members of this side of the House and members of the public don't treat this matter as a joke. They blame your government for badly mishandling the entire affair, and they demand, and have every right to, a full accounting of what happened, and how.

This House has set up a committee to provide such an accounting. I remind the Acting Premier that the Provincial Auditor reports on losses connected with the Pioneer Trust collapse in his 1984 and 1985 annual report. I remind him that the comptroller is on record as agreeing that these losses occurred in the 1984-85 fiscal year, the year under discussion before the committee. Finally, I remind you, Mr. Acting Premier, that all the major government decisions, which ultimately cost the Saskatchewan taxpayers millions of dollars, occurred during that fiscal year.

Mr. Acting Premier, how can you deny members of the committee, and ultimately the public, the right to ask these questions, and how can you suggest that these

questions are none of the public business?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I have confidence in the members that sit on the committee of public accounts, and I will leave the business of the committee of public accounts to those members.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Acting Premier, and I wish to point out to him that the mandate of the committee appointed by this House is in part as follows — supported, I may say, by all members of the Assembly in November of 1982 — and the date, I think, is important. And the mandate in part is as follows:

. . . to examine, assess, report, on to the legislature, and follow up with the administration, the regard for efficiency in operations and the effectiveness of programs in achieving their stated objectives.

Now, Mr. Deputy Premier, can you indicate why a fiasco like Pioneer Trust, which ended up costing Saskatchewan taxpayers many millions of dollars, is not a candidate for questions about the efficiency and effectiveness of your government? And if you agree with me that it is, would you suggest to the members, your members on this committee, that they open the committee for discussion on this very vital matter which the auditor has pin-pointed in his report to this legislature, which was referred by this legislature to that particular committee?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, as I understand, and as I said earlier, I don't sit on the committee, but as I understand the committee, it is operating under the normal parameters that have traditionally been the situation in this legislature. And of course, it being a committee of this legislature, this legislature can order it to examine anything at any time, I would expect. But that's a whole different question, and I would expect that that would require a substantive motion from the legislature.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, at least, the normal parameters are being followed in public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary, Mr. Deputy Premier, you will know that the report in which this material is brought to the attention of this legislature, the report by the Provincial Auditor, has been referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

And I ask you, sir: do you not agree that the function of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts is to review these reports? And do you not agree that it is appropriate, and indeed necessary, that the Public Accounts Committee examine into such an affair as this which has cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan millions of dollars, and which has been laid bare, at least in part, by the auditor, so that members of this House can do exactly that — examine into it in the Public Accounts Committee?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I'm told, Mr. Speaker, that the committee, in fact, was allowed to examine the three specific investments of the government in Pioneer Trust. I'm also told that the chairman walked out in a huff and displayed some very childish behaviour and wasn't really interested in examining these things at all.

Mr. Sveinsson: — My question to the Deputy Premier is simply this: is it the intention of your government to muzzle all committees when politically significant events do hit the floor of the committee, muzzle them with motions from members of your committee, on orders from cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I mean, that's the dumbest thing I've ever heard. But I don't expect it's the dumbest thing that I'll ever hear from that particular member, Mr. Speaker, because he breaks new ground in that particular arena every day.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's absolutely asinine to think that that committee takes its orders from cabinet. That committee is a representative committee of this legislature; it reports to this legislature, and that's where it starts and ends, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. The member did the same thing yesterday. He rose on a supplementary and then jumped a second time on a new question, and that's not the way to get the floor here. I'll take the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Order, please.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Deputy Premier, on a supplementary question to our leader. The motion that was passed in committee reads, in part: that this committee not now consider the affairs of the same, referring to — regarding Pioneer Trust.

I'm quoting from page 197 of the *Hansard*, from our committee:

... regarding Pioneer Trust, this committee not consider the affairs of same.

And I ask you, Mr. ...

An Hon. Member: — Who moved it?

Mr. Engel: — And that was moved by Mr. Glauser. My question to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, is: can your majority muzzle the committee on public accounts on questions that are raised by the Provincial Auditor, and referred to by Mr. Kraus, as saying that ... What I was saying was: the actual payouts of the unsecured depositors didn't occur until '85-86; notwithstanding that, we did recognize the loss on the investment that the government had in Pioneer for the year ending March 31, 1985. In light of those two statements by the auditor, and in light of the fact that your majority tried to muzzle our committee, will you overrule your committee and say that the rules that the Public Accounts Committee can operate under will operate and will stay in force and not be muzzled?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, obviously, at least two members opposite don't understand what this committee is. This committee is a committee of the legislature. I can't overrule the committee. That committee reports to this legislature, and it's representative of this legislature. And I have no power to

force it to do this or that; only the legislature has the power to do this or that.

The only member that has real influence on the committee, I expect, is the Chairman, who is an NDP member, the member for Regina Centre, and he has far more influence as chairman of that committee than I do as a member of this legislature.

Mr. Sveinsson: — With respect to the original question. I think you failed to answer the question in an attempt to defile my personality. But I ask you sir: through your members of cabinet, through ministers of your government — and don't forget I was once a chairman of one of your committees, taking direction from some of your ministers — will you not admit that you have attempted to muzzle this committee through a motion by the member from Saskatoon, and have effectively stopped the debate on Pioneer Trust in this committee through that motion.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone, anywhere, will believe that that member took direction from anyone or anybody.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hampton: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Deputy Premier. And I, sir, am a little bit different than him, but I want to ask you basically the same question. You go ahead and have all the laughs you like. I want to ask you again, seriously, and I was a member of your caucus ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Hampton: — Mr. Deputy Premier, I was a member of your caucus until late December, and I ask you sincerely: did at any time prior to today, and up until today, anyone in your cabinet or the inner circle of cabinet ever influence any committee or give them any direction, be it any of the standing committees, Crown corporation, and/or public accounts? And bear in mind, Mr. Deputy Premier before you answer me, that I was in fact a member of your caucus until December 28th of 1985.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the hon. member defines inner circle. I would expect that the Premier is included in that though, and the only time that I can recall any influence on members of that committee is when that particular member was removed from that committee, Mr. Speaker.

Hiring Practices of the Public Service Commission

Mr. Sveinsson: — A question to the minister in charge of the Public Service Commission. With respect to colour-coding job applications within his ministry, he suggests in the press yesterday that his never happens.

I ask the minister: are you misleading the public of Saskatchewan intentionally in this matter? Will you discuss this matter with one Diane Martin, a constituent of mine who recently was accepted into a job position with the dental program and, after a colour-coding by a member of your government, was turfed out because her

brother — I'm sorry I said yesterday it was her son — her brother is an NDPer?

I suggest you're misleading the public. I suggest, sir, that you should try to construe the truth a little more considerably and consider the actions of your department when, in fact, employment of a constituent of any one of the members of this House is at stake. And I suggest to you, sir, that you admit that it . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, I have some facts that I would like to present to the Assembly today which I think all members will find very interesting and will call into question — will call into question — the integrity of the comments just made by the member opposite.

The individual in question, that the member just mentioned, applied for part-time employment to job-share as a dental assistant with another dental plan employee, and she believed that she had been accepted. She was subsequently informed that a job offer would not be sent to her at this time, and here are the reasons.

In April several applications . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if the members opposite would like to hear the answer, I'm going to provide it to them. In April several applications were . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, in April several applications were received for part-time employment in which two part-time employees would job-share by working the equivalent of a full-time position.

A review of the staffing levels required in the dental plan indicated the improved dental status of children would permit the plan to effect a small staff reduction without adversely affecting the program. This was identified when the Minister of Health discussed Health estimates . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — The reductions would be achieved by not filling certain positions when they became vacant. But no permanent or probationary employees will be laid off.

Mr. Speaker, with several in-service applications on file, and based on the department's obligation to those individuals, the decision was made to not consider any out-of-service applicants at that time. In this instance, part-time employment will be offered to two permanent dental assistants, presently employed, who have requested a job-sharing arrangement. If other vacancies occur which cannot be accommodated by present staff, then out-of-service applicants would be given full consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I think that indicates very clearly that appropriate personnel policies were followed concerning this particular position which the member opposite has been talking about.

Mr. Speaker: — Why is the member for Canora on his feet? Is it a supplementary? When you stand, if you're asking a supplementary, please state that.

Mr. Hampton: — I so address my question also to the same minister. Mr. Minister, I'm asking you, that if I provide to this Assembly, on Monday next, the names of several individuals with the documentation, are you prepared to stand in this legislature and give the same kind of an answer as you did today?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not about to respond to hypothetical questions. I am prepared to respond to particular instances that are brought to my attention.

Now one was brought yesterday by the member for Regina North West. He did not provide any specific information at that time. He made allegations in the newspaper . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order, please.

Protection of Saskatchewan Jobs for Saskatchewan Workers

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Labour, and it has to do with the protection of Saskatchewan jobs for Saskatchewan workers.

Mr. Minister, your government owns 16 per cent share of Ipsco in Regina and, I assume, has provided government grants or incentives for the expansion now under way at Ipsco.

In light of that, can you, Mr. Minister, explain why one of the major subcontractors on this expansion, which is held by an out-of-province company, has so far hired only out-of-province residents to perform the work in Regina?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the question's rather vague, and I'm not sure which particular company he is referring to. But if he's referring to the Salem Industries company from Pittsburgh, which is installing the continuous slab caster, this is a specialized piece of equipment. And none of these casters have ever been installed in Saskatchewan before, so we don't have people who know very much about them.

Secondly, I understand that this company has a union, and the people are hired through the union. And I've had some difficulties with inter-union jurisdiction with respect to where workers can come from. And I'm having that particular problem right now with the boiler makers where, at the P.A. pulp-mill, on some shifts seven workers are being hired from Manitoba and only four from Saskatchewan. And so I'm having quite a problem trying to get Saskatchewan workers into this problem, with all the inter-jurisdictional problems within union.

Now if you could give us the name of the company, we could narrow it down.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I'm quite prepared to

do that. The company is an Alberta company called Bramet Industries Ltd. It's a spin-off company of HMW (Constructors) Ltd., of Edmonton, Alberta. It is my understanding that this company has its employees working on a schedule of nine days on, five days off, so that the workers can go home to Alberta, and that this contract involves about seven months' work for up to 25 people at the peak of construction.

What I am asking is this, Mr. Minister: what guarantees do you have from Ipsco and the general contractor overseeing this expansion project that Saskatchewan workers will be given first crack at all the jobs on this project?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a country; Canada is not a sovereign province.

First of all, you have to remember that our constitution and our charter of rights say that we are all Canadians and we can work anywhere in this country. And I tell that member to ask the Leader of the Opposition why he voted for that charter and why he implemented that, and now he can see what it's doing to this province. So you ask yourselves — you implemented that charter and you agreed to it.

With respect to Ipsco, it is not a Crown corporation. And if you say our share is 22.5 per cent, I won't dispute that, but we can't control the company with 22.5 per cent. I will take notice of this company and look into it further.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan owns a substantial share in the company. The Government of Saskatchewan has provided some funding for the expansion, I understand. Therefore, you would think that the Government of Saskatchewan ought to have some influence on the policies with regard to this government's policy of Saskatchewan first.

Mr. Minister, if you practise this policy of Saskatchewan first, as was assured to me last December by the minister who introduced the Bill on the upgrader, I ask you: why don't you enforce, at least by persuasion, this policy as it applies to Saskatchewan workers who have applied for jobs and have been told that no, there is no jobs available to them because the company can bring all its employees in from Alberta?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I've already told you I'll take notice of the specifics. But I also want you to know that according to my knowledge one Kim Thorson, the former NDP member for Estevan, is a board member. And I will be phoning him to check with him to what they're doing here.

So we have certain problems because we are a province in a country, and there is freedom of movement of labour in this country. We will look into the matter further. And there is no direct control by this government over Ipsco.

Employment of Terry Leier

Mr. Engel: — I have a new question for the Minister of Labour. Does the Department of Labour, or the minister's office, employ one Terry Leier, the PC party's official

agent for the next provincial election and, if so, what are his duties and his salary?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Engel: — Well, I have a question to the minister in charge of the Crown Management Board; he took notice with respect to Mr. Leier's trip and a trip to London, England. Is the minister able to tell the Assembly when this trip took place, and whether or not it was as part of Mr. Leier's government duties, or was it a vacation trip?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — As I understand, that question was asked some weeks ago in here. I checked with Mr. Leier; I checked with the president of CMB (Crown Management Board). Mr. Leier's trip was a personal trip paid for personally by him, and I guess we can't stop a person from doing that.

There was a further question to that particular question with regard to an AeroPlan. The AeroPlan did not apply in this particular case. He was not a member of the AeroPlan, and the AeroPlan was not used to buy his personal trips. So if he was going to Europe, or you're going to Europe, then I guess if you're going to take that trip and spend your own money, you're jolly well entitled to do that. It was not government money; no government involvement; no government work involved.

Freedom of Debate in the Legislature

Mr. Shillington: — My question is to the Acting Premier. Mr. Premier, members of this caucus have expressed their opposition in the strongest possible way about your government's repeated attempts to stifle debate in the legislature.

My question, Mr. Acting Premier, is: will you introduce, on Monday next, the legislation with respect to pensions so that there may be the fullest possible public debate and examination of this controversial legislation, or, as we suspect, is it your intention to introduce some legislation in the dying days of the session so that we won't have an opportunity to debate it, and the public won't have an opportunity to examine it?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I was hoping I would get some indication as to when the dying days might be. I understand that you have been quoted, or members of your caucus have been quoted, as saying that this session won't end until at least August.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, in our budget speech delivered by the Minister of Finance some weeks ago, there was an announcement of a home-makers' pension plan that will require legislative measures to be put in place. That legislation, I fully expect, will be introduced and passed in this session of the legislature.

An Hon. Member: — When?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And the hon. member asks when? Well let me tell you, it will be soon. And I will . . . Just for comparison sake, Mr. Speaker, I think it was in 1971 — it might have been 1975 — that the campaign literature of that party promised a home-makers' pension plan and we

are still waiting for it. So ours is going to come on a whole lot faster than that. We're going to finally deliver on your promise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Before orders of the day, and by leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a member of this Assembly on Tuesday, and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contribution he made to his community, his constituency, and to this province.

Bernard Joseph Leger Boutin, who died May 27, 1986, was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Kinistino from 1982 until his death. He was born at Cudworth, Saskatchewan, on March 29, 1953, and received his education in that area. He and his wife Lucie Marie were married in 1972 and have five children. He was a farmer in the Domremy area of the province.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with members of the bereaved family.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to those of the Deputy Premier in extending our condolences to the bereaved members of the family of our colleague, the member for Kinistino.

Mr. Speaker, we're here to recognize the work and to mourn the passing of this young member of the legislature who suffered such an untimely death. It's always a matter of sadness when one of our members leaves us by death. And some of us who have been in the legislature for some time recall a number of our colleagues who have died while in office. But I'm thinking of the last four or five that I can recall, and in each case they were people who had enjoyed some period of life — two-score years and ten or more in each case.

In the case of Ben Boutin, where he was still in his early 30s, I think we all must concede or recognize that that adds an extra measure of tragedy.

We have here a case of a young man who leaves behind him a wife, and I believe it is five young children. And we have here a family which has therefore been suddenly deprived, bereft of the guidance and support and comfort which a husband and a father can offer, and at a particularly crucial time in the upbringing of a young family.

Because he was a young man, he had not had a full opportunity to develop a political career. He had served one term; had indicated, as my understanding is, that he

would not seek re-election on this occasion; would devote himself to establishing his farm operation and to being the husband and father of his children; but that he reserved the right and the option to re-enter politics on another occasion when his family had grown a bit. That will not now be open to him, and it will not be open to the electors of Kinistino to re-elect him at some future time.

Ben Boutin struck us here in the opposition as a quiet person. He was obviously of a somewhat pleasant and jolly disposition, which perhaps goes with red hair, I don't know, but at any rate, certainly was a pleasing person to be with and a pleasing person to meet.

He had, understandably, as a new member, taken a relatively limited part in the proceedings of the House. But, as I say, that goes with being a new member. I know members opposite will make the point that the Premier made yesterday, that he took an active part in the caucus of his party and, as we know, was active in his constituency and serving his constituents.

I know all hon. members — and I do in an official way on behalf of the official opposition — want to extend our deepest condolences to Mrs. Boutin, the children, and the extensive Boutin family, and to wish them the support of their faith at this, what must surely be a difficult time in their lives.

I know that other hon. members will wish to add their voice, and I, in a personal way, want to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Boutin, to the young children, and to other members of the bereaved family.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today is not a very happy occasion. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back, if I can, a few years ago when many of us were all elected to this legislature for the first time. Ben and I and many of my other colleagues were all of the same era. In April '82 we were all elected, and we all came to a room where many of us were strangers.

I've best come to know Ben Boutin through a friend of mine, Louis Domotor, the member from Humboldt. We had spent many, many times discussing various things and maybe over-reacted, basically, because we were all green and we thought we were really going to change the history of the province in just a matter of a few days. And I guess Ben and I came to know each other through many of these discussions — discussions where we not always agreed on, but we always appreciated each other's opinion.

There's never really, I guess, enough to say, Mr. Speaker, when one passes through this life. Such is the passing of Ben Boutin who represented his constituents well in the constituency of Kinistino. And well, I know, because my wife is from his constituency, and I have many relatives that live in his constituency. And I've had many discussions on the directions of our government and the stands that Ben had taken, which they not always agreed on, but still I would appreciate the fact that they were respected.

(1445)

Ben's contributions, I guess, if you will, probably cannot be measured as an individual's contributions to Saskatchewan or to his riding. But maybe, as well, any of the contributions that are made through this Assembly cannot be measured by anyone's individual actions, but by team-work, team effort. And that was Ben's way.

Ben was a strong individual. He was strong in body, strong in mind, and strong in heart. So when we talk about the markings of an individual, no matter, Ben was not the one to be concerned whether he was going to be remembered in history, or who was going to remember him. I know, in the many discussions we've had, his priorities were family, religion, and government. And with that, I think that's where it actually just lay, and that was his strengths.

As a family, I'm reminded . . . and we still talked of it. My colleague here to my right — the member from Saskatoon East — when we were at a function and Ben had his wife here in Regina, and my colleague, Kim Young, from Saskatoon East, went up to Ben as he was away from his wife, and in a tone, Kim asked Ben, he says: who is that good-looking young woman over there? And he pointed to his wife. And Lucie was pregnant at that time, and Ben, as proud a husband as he was, looked at Kim with a smile and he says: that's my wife — a very proud, very proud husband.

For the father aspect of it, it's hard for any of us to be able to imagine for the children. I know that in our conversations he spoke of his children many times and was wondering at times why he was here in Regina, why he took the step he did take. But it didn't hold him back. He tried to make the best of both worlds.

Ben took life seriously, and probably the way life goes there's really no justice. I guess maybe God works in strange ways. I guess what we have to do is believe that there is a better world. I believe that Ben is in good hands.

I would just like to say that I'm going to join along with my colleagues, and personally I would also like to send my condolences to Ben's family. We're going to miss him.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hampton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments will be brief, because Ben and I were extremely close. Over the last couple of days I've had the opportunity of speaking to Lucie over the phone a few times. I recently spoke to Ben. He had mentioned to me that he was coming down to this city as soon as the next time that it rained so we could spend some time together and get caught up on past events and future events.

And I think that I am truly going to miss the man an awful lot. When he passed on and I first became aware of it, certain thoughts go through your mind, good and bad, and I can't help but think today as we mourn his passing, one of the things that I would have to concede to Ben, that he was a better man than me.

And this, I hope, is not in bad taste. It goes back to the time he and I went shopping here in Regina and I purchased a new pipe. He was with me; he decided to buy one also —

said that perhaps he should take up smoking a pipe. And on various occasions we smoked them.

A week or 10 days later when he returned to the Assembly after being up to the farm, he had a small, circular container in his pocket and he said to me: as well as the way that you taught me to smoke the pipe, he said, I think that it's fair that you should learn to chew what I have here. And he passed this small, cylinder can to him, commonly known as snuff — passed it over to me. And I have to say, from that moment until this, I still concede he was a better man than me. I tried it; I turned green; I became extremely ill; and, Mr. Speaker, I do believe I missed the evening sitting that night. I was not able to be here on account of that small can.

However, on a more serious point, over the last four years Ben and I became, as I say, quite close. We discussed a lot of things from farming to farm machinery to politics to family. He was very committed to his family and to his farm, and also a very committed Conservative he was.

I think that his death is very untimely but we don't have any control over that. I also believe that of those that go is the will of a power greater than us, and we have to accept it. But I also want to express my condolences to Lucie, to the children, and to all Ben's relatives. And I thank them for giving me the honour of being an honorary pallbearer at the funeral tomorrow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I too would join with others in a few words with regard to Benny. I think we look at Benny in two ways: Benny as the man; and Benny as our colleague in this Assembly — a colleague of all members in this Assembly. Benny the man was probably known to many other members of this House better than he was known to me. Benny was part of our caucus, and others can speak far more eloquently and probably with far more emotion and conviction than can I.

Benny did, obviously, reflect the importance that he held his family. He obviously reflected the importance that he held to his way of life as a farmer, as a citizen of rural Saskatchewan — the roots from which he grew and for the roots for which he found most of his life and where he wished to spend the days of his life. That individual, or any individual who is prematurely taken from this world and prematurely taken by tragic circumstances, obviously saddens, and saddens all.

But I think we also must reflect as a member of this Assembly, an honour that I hold very, very important, and I think all who have served here hold important. And I think we reflect today because that is one characteristic or quality of Benny Boutin, that he is also a member of this Assembly and a colleague of ours — a colleague of 64 people. It's in that regard that I would wish to reflect upon Benny Boutin, and perhaps what Benny Boutin might hear, or certainly the way I understood Benny Boutin to feel with regard to this institution.

Before I do that, I simply would joint with others in expressing our condolence, or my condolence and my family's condolence, to Benny's family who must surely in this time of mourning find it very difficult to cope. And I am advised and I am convinced that their inner strength

will get them through that troubled time. I do wish them well — a young family with a great hurdle. I do wish them well in the future, individually.

When a death like this happens or a tragedy like this happens, as members of the Assembly, when it happens to a person that is one of us, sometimes we then reflect upon this institution. And our reflections, as we remember Benny, reflect upon this institution, and we look inwardly, as perhaps Benny would have us do. And I think in doing that, I think it's important for Ben, for the years ahead for his family, as they reflect on their father and the history of their father and what their father had done.

As the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd says, Ben Boutin came in with the large government change in May of 1982 and he, like many before him, came full of ideals, came with a perhaps ordinary person's view of what this institution was about; that he would be able to leave his mark, to make his changes, to reflect and respond to what he understood the people that he represented, the people from which he had come, would like to see and would like to see government do.

And I think if we are to be fair with ourselves and fair with Benny, we could probably summarize that four years later Ben Boutin was probably frustrated and probably to a degree disillusioned by this institution. And I think that those who have talked to Benny would certainly be of that view.

Benny Boutin was a private member, a back-bencher — call him what you will — as many before him. And many, I'm sure, share that same view. He found as a private member the difficulty to work in this institution, to perhaps work in the parliamentary system, in the political system of this province and of this country. And I think it would be fair to say that Benny started to have doubts as to the value of this institution. Again, that's not to be saying anything negative of Ben Boutin. I think it is probably what Ben would have said.

Benny never professed to have the skills of a great orator. Benny did not master, nor did he seek to master, the skills of the 30-second clip or the skills of the outrageous statement or the skills of being in the headlines on a daily basis. Benny rather spoke in the way that he was raised and the people that he reflected. He spoke the same way that people in his community spoke, and that was what Benny Boutin was.

Benny Boutin never changed and this system never changed Ben Boutin. I think it would be fair to say from members on this side of the House that Ben often was frustrated with our cabinet form of government its complexities, its procedures that somehow frustrated him or disillusioned him; that it was too complex and complicated to get the things that seemed so simple and that seemed so simple to the ordinary person to get done.

I think Ben was . . . These frustrations, I think, are probably and have existed long before Ben Boutin ever came to this Assembly. But those frustrations, while felt by many, were felt by Ben Boutin in a real way and felt in a way that, while others can write about them and speculate about

them, only those that sit here and experience that can really understand them.

(1500)

Ben Boutin did not relate to the media. When I talked to Ben Boutin, perhaps as much as any person I've met in this Assembly, Ben Boutin had contempt for many of the media people — contempt in the sense that he felt that somehow his views were not important, somehow he did not have the mechanism, the vehicle, the understanding, to be able to say what he wanted to say through the system of media. And while that's maybe not why we should be critical of the media . . . but certainly an ordinary member found that very difficult and very frustrating.

I suppose in the end the best one can say of Ben Boutin is, Ben Boutin was a decent man. Ben Boutin was very interested in his family. Ben Boutin was very proud of his family. Ben Boutin was a religious man. Ben Boutin was an ordinary person, stood for office, very proud of the fact that he sat and was a member of this Assembly, frustrated by it — but I don't think a person that would be prepared to walk away and give up from it.

Ben Boutin was a friend of everybody in this Assembly that ever met him and knew him. Nobody disliked Benny. Everybody, I think, tried to understand Benny. In the end, Benny Boutin will be remembered in history as a member of this Assembly — an honour experienced by few, but an honour that is only understood by those that sit here. Ben Boutin was frustrated by it, but Ben Boutin always tried to do what came naturally to him. And I think that is a stance, an important part, of any character.

Ben Boutin was my friend. Ben Boutin will be missed. And I am sorry.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to join with other members in paying our respects on the occasion of the tragic and untimely death of one of our members, Ben Boutin. During the four years that he served as a member of the legislature, we all got a chance to know him and to respect him. We learned that beyond the sometimes shy and soft-spoken person we saw in public was a warm, friendly man with a ready sense of humour.

Over the past four years, Ben Boutin and I became more than just colleagues from opposite sides of the Assembly; we became close friends. I had the occasion to spend some leisure time with Ben Boutin over these last four years. He would often tell me how he wished he could spend more time back home with his wife and his young family, and more time on his farming.

Mr. Speaker, when Benny Boutin made the decision not to seek re-election, it didn't come as a surprise to me, as I knew through the many conversations that Benny Boutin and I had, that he was wrestling with this problem for some time. And as I said, it didn't surprise me.

I first met a member of the Boutin family many years ago, in Benny's brother, who was the parish priest at Carrot River at that time — Father Boutin. He came into the

legislature a couple of years ago, and Benny and I slipped out of the House and went down and had a lengthy discussion with his brother, Father Boutin. And we spoke with each other for about an hour.

And I can't help but reflect on that, Mr. Speaker, when I think of the two brothers sitting there. One was a parish priest and the other one was a politician, and both very proud of one another and both working for the same goals. It was an hour that I spent with the two Boutin brothers that I will always cherish.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Boutin's tragic and untimely death has shocked and saddened us all, and I extend my deepest sympathies to his wife and to his children. We have lost a fellow member and a friend. They have lost a husband and a father.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of this motion of condolences to his family. Thank you.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to join condolences and say a few words about Benny. Ben was in the neighbouring constituency to mine, and I remember Benny just after he got nominated, and prior to the election, at a box social. He was proud, friendly, and concerned. Four years and a little bit later, tomorrow, he met his untimely death, and tomorrow we will bury Benny.

The best think you can say about anybody is if you attend — to be there — and you look around his community, you can say: his family is proud of him; his community can be proud of him; and what else can you ask for?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Morin: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to join in offering condolences to the family of Ben Boutin. I had the pleasure of knowing Ben before we came here in 1982. And in fact, back 10 years earlier, in 1972, I worked as parts man for the summer, and Ben Boutin would often come in with his dad, and they'd buy parts from me and the for the company I worked for. And one thing I learned about the Boutin family at that time, were that they were very, very strong and hard-working people, and we came to know that about Benny here in the Assembly.

After we got elected I ran into Ben, and I said, by gosh Ben, are you one of the Boutins from around Wakaw-Domremy? And he said yes. And we kind of reminisced, and we figured out that we'd known each other 10 years earlier. And it was kind of nice to come in here, among all of the strangers and people that know and really knew who they were or much about them, and to know that there was someone there that you had known.

Ben Boutin was the kind of man who would have a smile on his face, and he'd like to tell you a joke. And we don't have enough of that. The kind of reservation that we run into here as members, and we all run into it — it's usually being told that you can't do something that you wanted to do. And Benny would be the kind of guy who would want to not be told why he couldn't do anything, but rather he'd be the kind of guy who'd want to be told, when do we start?

And I want to just make these few brief comments because in the history of the legislature there's a little book kept on each of us, and it will state our name and our religion and, you know, what we did here — we were elected on a give day and we served for a period of time. The book in the future on Ben will not really reflect what the man had to offer, and I would like to join with my colleagues in wishing the family well.

Mr. Young: — I too, Mr. Speaker, have the honour claiming Benny as one of my friends. He would day after day and night after night, attend with us . . . we would usually go out for supper together after the session. In the government members' lounge, when time permitted and quorum was in order, me and Benny and some other people that had things to do with agriculture, we would talk about our farm machinery and our cultivators and all of the nice thoughts, the pleasurable thoughts, that we had looking forward to putting the crop in in the spring or taking it off in harvest.

And I can remember looking at Ben with a lot of envy. I viewed him as a big, quiet, honest man, and barrel-chested. I'll never forget his big hands, the freckles on his big hands, and the body that he was blessed with; and the values that I guess aren't hereditary like the body, but the things that go with you throughout your life like your body — his ideas towards his family and to his farm.

I'm a third-generation farmer on my farm, and it becomes something where you don't really claim ownership to it; you're just passing through. And I know Benny's family were farmers, and I think that he hoped, like I do, that his kids would be farmers. And it becomes a way of life in every sense of the word. And with Benny, farming was a way of life. His family was a way of life. He had a very nice wife and lots of kids, a nice farm; and a lot of people in this province would be envious of the life that Ben had.

His contributions here in this House were many, in my opinion. I have always been of the opinion, and I've stated it on many occasions, that a government cannot be composed of pin-stripe lawyers; and when it gets to that stage, it will fall. And unless it's representative of the people of the province . . . certainly you need your pin-stripe lawyers and your executive types for some functions, and you need the heartbeat of the province as well in order to be a full caucus and a full government.

And Benny certainly brought us to sobriety on all sorts of points dealing with agriculture and common sense issues. And as far as I was concerned he brought us a long ways in the formulation of our policies which came from caucus and eventually were implemented into the laws of this land.

You can't feel sorry for Ben — he's dead. But with respect to his wife and his children . . . I know my father died in 1981, and I had the benefit of his upbringing and the memories that you have of your father. His kids are going to be left with pictures and stories and possibly at the best a few foggy memories of what their dad was. There's no bringing that back. But I think that, Mr. Speaker, Ben died in the process of providing for his wife and his children, and that's a very noble task, Mr. Speaker.

(1515)

Mr. Petersen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to join in passing along my condolences to the family of the member who has just passed. Ben was a friend of mine and loved farming. And a lot of his energy in the Assembly here was put into agriculture issues, and he was a member of my agriculture committee.

He was what we called our "French Connection," if you would. He had a good command of both the English and the French languages and, when speaking to federal members who came from Quebec, we sure wowed them when he stood up and spoke to them in the language they knew the best. And he really shook them up when he threw in a few words of Ukrainian, to boot.

He was a proud Canadian — proud of his heritage, proud of his family, proud of his farm — and we'll miss him greatly. Thank you.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I also rise to add a few words to those that have already been stated by several of my colleagues in the House today.

I first met Ben in 1982. And I was like he — I came into this arena as a rookie, and had the good fortune to sit not too far from Ben. I think for a while he thought perhaps it was his good fortune, too.

Ben had certain ideas and beliefs and principles. But, more importantly, he had a very clear vision of how this system should work. He did not like the system. If he said it once, he said a hundred times: it needs cleaning out — very clearly. And he never quit saying it for the four years that he was here.

He had no time, absolutely no time, and no patience for the political games and the rhetoric. And he had even less time for any kind of bureaucratic red tape that one might have to go through to get something done for one's constituency. He only knew what had to be done and what should be done. And he would often say, "don't talk to me about when it might be done; just do it."

He did not like the process of politics. And I suspect it was one reason why he ran; he wanted the process changed. He didn't think of himself as a politician. And when I would say to him, "Ben, you're a politician like everybody else in here," he would say, "No, I'm not."

And over the four years that he was in here, he retained what I consider to be a fairly healthy cynicism towards politics. And that, perhaps, is what kept him with his priorities straight and a very honest manner.

If you were a minister, Mr. Speaker, that fit into Ben's priorities, you very quickly learned of what those priorities were and the goals that he had set for his constituency. Early in our first year, in '82, Ben began laying down his desires for the Kinistino constituency senior citizens — I very quickly learned where Middle Lake was on the map, and Birch Hills.

And today, I remember attending a sod-turning

ceremony. In fact, it was one of the most unique that I've ever attended in the four years that I've been in here, and it was at Birch Hills. And when I got there, we went out into a field where this nursing home was going to be, and there was Cubs and Brownies and a lot of people from Birch Hills and around there.

And in the middle of the field was a great big green tractor, and there was no shovel to turn the sod, and I said to Ben, "Ben, where's the shovel?" And he said, "right there." And here was this nice, big, green, shiny tractor. And I said, "But Ben, that's a tractor, that's not a shovel." And he said, "I know, but this is Birch Hills and we are the twin to Texas." And I have never forgotten it.

I soon learned that in Ben's goal a lot of other people mattered. And when it came to our young people, Ben wore his heart on his sleeve, and I very quickly learned that education and schools were as important to him as any other institution within the constituency. And it didn't matter of the location if it was some little thing that needed fixing at Cudworth, or once again, Middle Lake or Birch Hills, it was important to him. He used to say to me, "It is important what we put our children into. If we can spend a lot of money on office buildings, the Legislative Buildings," he would say, "for adults, is it not equally important to put the same kind of moneys for our children?"

He was very proud of his French heritage, but he held very strong and vocally his views on French education, and he would often say to me, "No segregation." He would say, "That's bad. What's wrong with this world? It's big enough for all, and we all have to live together. Why can't we do it?"

Besides his strong views on French, Ben was one of the few members in this Assembly that used to quietly spend some time telling me and asking questions on some other issues such as women's issues. And he would often say to me: "You know, I don't pretend to understand it all." He says, "You know. Lucie can throw a bale of hay as well as I can." He said, "She can probably farm better than I can; I don't quite understand it." But he wanted to understand it, and he cared about the women within this constituency.

Along with his strong views, it was perhaps tempered with a sense of humour. And with the red hair also came, every once in a while, a sense of a temper. Ben's priorities were, very clearly to each and every member in this House, his family, his faith, and his farming, and there is absolutely no question or doubt about that.

When politics looked like it was to be set aside from the farm or his family, he had the good wisdom and the strength to know it, and then to make a very difficult decision: family and farm first.

Mr. Speaker, the pain of death and of losing a family member, a loved one or a friend, is never easy to accept. In this particular case it is extremely difficult because it is early in life, and it leaves behind him five children and Lucie. Lucie and the children have some very difficult days to face. I have no doubt that Lucie will be able to it from what Ben has spoken of her. And I'm sure with the

support of the family — Ben comes from a very large family — and the support of the community, that they will, indeed, in time be able to face them squarely again.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I, too, add my regrets to the death of Ben Boutin.

Mrs. Caswell: — On behalf of my friend and colleague, Louis Domotor . . . I can't recall his . . .

An Hon. Member: — The member for Humboldt.

Mrs. Caswell: — Thank you . . . the member from Humboldt. I'm sure you'll understand if we don't get things straight today.

Louis, I know, had a great deal of respect for Ben, and I most certainly had. And I think that we judge success in different terms. And then there's a day like a few days ago when Ben dies and reminds us what really our values are. To say that Ben was not a politician, Ben was not one for the double deal and the secret agenda and for wheeling and dealing, but you can say that Ben was always a friend.

And I'm sure with the sincerity that is expressed around this room on all sides shows that Ben was a friend to everybody. And few of us can say that we have the kind of personality that people say: that person is an honest person, and that person cares; and if there was differences, the person still knew what was important.

Ben was a very generous person, and he was very concerned about the small things. If I forgot to bring money to the cafeteria or whatever, if Ben was there, not only would he give it to me, but he'd give it to me without, you know . . . and be embarrassed if I thought that I shouldn't have come to him and just asked for a little care about that. I'm sure he really cared that way about his constituents.

But there was one way in which Ben and I enjoyed some competition, and I think it shows Ben's basic values and his love for children. He would always come up to me and say, well, the Boutins are keeping track of the Caswells. We just about have as much children as you, Gay. And he was very proud of his family; and his children are about the same age as mine. And I often thought, since we don't have a farm, that we should take the children to play at the Boutins and they can enjoy each other.

People often have said to me, oh, you have now five children, or six, children, and that's a lot. It must be so hard on you. And I would always answer, oh no, it's not hard; I have a husband. But Lucie can't say that any more. And I think about my mother who had her ninth child after my father died, or my father went out of a home into a hospital, and the child was born . . . my last sister never saw her father. And my mother called her daughter, Faith. And I don't understand what it's like to be left without a husband. But I hope Lucie will remember that she does have her God, that she does have her faith. He's looking after Ben, and He will look after the children and her.

Mr. Tusa: — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add a few words of condolence to the family of Ben Boutin, added

to the words that have already been said this afternoon by his colleagues here in the House.

Ben and I got to know each other in 1982 after he was elected to the House, and in the last few years I have grown to respect the values and principles for which Ben Boutin stood.

As other speakers before me said, Ben Boutin's main loves were his family and farming. And he loved to talk about both, and he did. And him and I spent a good amount of time discussing both these topics. We would naturally talk about farming, and, me being a farmer as well, we had much in common in that area. And we would talk about the crops we would grow, about the machinery we had — and we would compare — and the innovative practices followed by him.

And even though I don't have a family, Ben Boutin spent much time talking to me about his family. He talked and he said that the family was the corner-stone of society. And he talked about his love for his wife and his family, and the hopes and dreams he had for them.

I recall about a year ago Ben and I were at a CPA convention, and as fate would have it, we roomed together for a few days. And as you sometimes do, you stay up most of the night at these conventions, and we talked about these things towards the early hours of the morning. One thing that stands out, and I will remember, is the unique plan he had to get to know his children real well. Benny told me that they had already discussed this plan as a family, and they had all agreed to it.

(1530)

And he said that the plan was simply this. Because of the rush of the our society and the busy-ness, and because this did not allow — especially on farms, perhaps, more than cities; I don't know — him to spend as much time as possible with his children, they had made a deal. And the deal was this: that when his children quit school, regardless of whether it was high school or university or whatever, each of them, whether they were male or female, would spend one year at home with him, not just with the mother, but with him. Each of them would have to spend one year working with him, and this would give him the opportunity to get to know them and to talk to them on a very personal level before they went out into the world as adults. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, remembering this, that Benny will not have that opportunity, and his children will not have that invaluable opportunity.

His constituents, Mr. Speaker, were also well-served, and we discussed the many things you had to do as an MLA. And I remember Benny telling me that the hour of the day or night didn't matter if a constituent needed help. For example, he told me about getting up at 4 o'clock in the morning to go out with a farmer who was complaining about a road that was being flooded — just one example of the dedication he had to his work and to his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would just like to state that I believe that Benny Boutin was a man of honour and integrity. In a world that is sometimes jaded with

cynicism and a lack of trust between individuals, Benny Boutin was a man who rose above this. The four years he spent in this legislature did not ruin his principles of honour and integrity; indeed, they enhanced these values which he so believed in.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Boutin is a loss, not only to his family and to his constituents, but to all of Saskatchewan. We will all miss him.

Mr. Meagher: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to join with my colleagues from both sides of the House in extending my condolences to the Boutin family and expressing our sorrow at the untimely passing of our colleague.

Ben Boutin was a member that I got to know very well personally because, together with our colleague, the member for Shellbrook-Torch River, Lloyd Muller, we formed a bit of a car pool and rode together from the Prince Albert area to Regina. And that presented an unusual opportunity to talk to one another in a way that isn't often available to us in our busy lives, when we have three or four hours together in a car to discuss things.

I found Ben to be an individual who did hold convictions very deeply, particularly religious convictions, and discussed them freely. And that's an attribute that's not too common in this day and age in our pluralistic society. But he had no reservations at all about discussing his convictions and his philosophy, and he was very proud of them; and he was proud of his heritage; he was proud of his community; and he was proud to be an MLA and serve.

But of course, most of all, as has been mentioned, he was proud of his family. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that all of them are proud of him, and they have good reason to be because he was always one of them.

And as has been mentioned, he wasn't a politician in the ordinary sense of the word. He was one of the folks and retained a very close contact with his people. His devotion to his family — and it wasn't just the immediate family, but the extended family, which was his community and his constituency and the whole province, was really the basis of his political philosophy. And, of course, in that sense he wasn't an ordinary politician, but kind of a representative of the people and he believe he could do his job best by always being one of them. And I think that his contribution in this Assembly is a significant one, but one that will be appreciated as time passes, because of values that he stood for, and the principles that he stood for are things that are sorely needed in our society, and we will appreciate them more as time passes.

The member for Shellbrook, Lloyd Muller, and his wife have been with the Boutin family since yesterday, and I know that he would want me as well to express his views here today, and that he would wish to be able to join us in extending condolences to the Boutin family. So on behalf of my colleague and my family, and all of Ben's friends in Prince Albert, I want to express our condolences to Ben's family and extend our offer to help in any way that we can, both to his family and to other members of his community. Thank you.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I would move, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Health, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley:

That the resolution just passed, together with a transcript of oral tributes paid on May 28th and on May 29th, to the memory of the deceased member, be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

I so move.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 3:42 p.m.