

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Wednesday, June 4, 1980

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

Public Meetings re Emma Lake Development

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Minister of Rural Affairs. Yesterday, Mr. Minister, you tried to leave the impression that the Emma Lake development was not, in fact, a very serious matter. It has now come to light that your department has called for public meetings next week in the city of Prince Albert and the city of Saskatoon. The cottage owners I talked to indicated they are going to be very stormy meetings. Would you now admit, Mr. Minister, this is a serious question, and could you also advise the Assembly as to which cabinet ministers will be in attendance at those public meetings?

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs(Rural)): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, First I want to indicate that the meetings were not called by the department. The cottage owners requested a meeting which we would attend, and we agreed to meet with them. So those meetings were not called by us, but by them. I will be at the meeting, and my deputy minister will be there. As far as I am aware, we are the only ones who will be there.

MR. ANDREW: — I take it Mr. Bowerman is not going to be at the meeting. Mr. Minister, Given . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I would ask the hon. member to refer to members by their title, or their constituency.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Minister, given the fact that there are public meetings being called both in the city of Saskatoon and Prince Albert, I think this is an acknowledgement that it is a serious issue and concerned citizens should have this opportunity. I understand, Mr. Minister, in the joint meetings between your department and the two R.M.s involved, the message was very clear — the whole question of the Karasiuk development was not negotiable. Would the minister not agree, and not admit that this leaves a distinct impression with the public (and I think, a clear impression with the public) that there is going to be influence peddling in this particular case?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, there will be no influence peddling in this case.

The situation with regard to the Karasiuk development is that the R.M. of Paddockwood, in its discussion with Mr. Karasiuk, had made some commitments. We were attempting to get from the R.M. of Paddockwood, an agreement to come into a complementary zoning by-law situation. They were agreeable to that but they suggested they felt they had some outstanding commitments to the Karasiuk development, and they were wanting to have at least some commitment with regard to Mr. Karasiuk to agree to sign a complementary zoning by-law.

At the meeting, we put forward that proposition. Instead of the massive, or large

development which Mr. Karasiuk proposed, there will be a somewhat restricted development on that side of the border, in the Paddockwood area, which really amounts to nine residential developments. As I indicated yesterday, nine residential developments in the R.M. of Paddockwood are certainly not going to upset the development patterns in that area.

Letter to Premier's Office from Reeve Kelly

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — A question to the Premier. Yesterday in question period, Mr. Premier, it was brought to your attention that the answer to a letter addressed to our office from Reeve Kelly was supplied by Karasiuk Holdings. In the discussion you said you passed the letter to the member for Prince Albert, who was associated with Karasiuk Holdings. Today I notice in the Leader-Post that the member denies ever seeing the letter, or any copies of it. My question is: which one of you is telling the truth?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (PREMIER): — Mr. Speaker, I can only give you my idea of how the letter may have gone to Karasiuk Holdings. I simply do not know how it got to Karasiuk Holdings. All I know is what I believe happened to the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm having difficulty since I'm getting three or four questions. The answer is that I obviously am in no position to say where Karasiuk got the letter. I can only say what we have done in our office. I have told the House what we have done in our office and I have no further light to shed on where a citizen may have obtained a particular document.

MR. TAYLOR: — In your letter of apology to the reeve, you indicated that you were going to conduct an investigation. Yesterday it was evident you were hanging out the member for Prince Albert to dry; he denies it. If the member for Prince Albert did not leak the letter, who did leak that letter to Karasiuk Holdings?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The answer is that I do not know. It may well have been, for all I know, somebody in the R.M. office, who obviously had copies of the material. But I am not saying that happened. I am saying that I cannot speculate. I tell you what I did. I cannot speculate to explain things that I have no additional information to offer.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Premier, this is a very serious matter when an individual citizen or an elected reeve of a municipality writes to the Premier of this province in a confidential manner and these matters are let out. Will you continue your investigation as to the leak of this letter to Karasiuk and report to this Chamber who leaked that letter from your side of the government?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I know of no evidence to suggest that anything was leaked from 'our side of the government'. The fact we have in hand is that Mr. Karasiuk obtained, apparently, a copy of material which I had sent to the R.M. and wrote to the reeve. He may have obtained it from some source in the government; he may have obtained it from source in the R.M. I cannot say with conviction that he obtained it from any source in the government, although obviously that is quite possible.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — The Premier indicated yesterday that he caused an investigation. Would you now table the results in this Assembly of your investigation

into the leaked letter?

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY: — I don't know how the hon. member conducts his investigations but I didn't have the police in. I don't have a police report, so I don't have a document that I can table. I can advise the House that I found no evidence that, let us say, the Department of Municipal Affairs was in touch with Karasiuk. We could not find any evidence that the material moved from municipal affairs to Karasiuk. I have no evidence that anything moved from my office to Karasiuk. Therefore I am only left to speculate that the material moved from my office to the Department of Municipal Affairs, to Mr. Feschuk and to the R.M. Presumably from one of those sources Mr. Karasiuk obtained the letter. There is nothing very difficult about that but that is the only presumption I can make. If there is another presumption to be made I would be delighted if all hon. members would enlighten me further.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR: — Are you telling me, Mr. Premier, that if a citizen of this province writes to you that the letter will go down to other members, to R.M. offices and that you may not keep this correspondence confidential? Is that what you're telling me?

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's what I'm telling you. A great number of citizens write to me and far from my keeping them confidential, it is my regular practice to refer them on to some other employee of the Government of Saskatchewan for action.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR: — Mr. Premier, that referral can end up in the hands of private companies that have vested interest. Is that what you're telling me also?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am saying that is clearly not impossible. Mr. Speaker, I have said it is clearly not impossible. The hon. member has asked, how did it get there? Well, it got there presumably by some method which was 'not impossible'. I have advised the House what I did with that material. I do not know how it got into the hands of Karasiuk.

Mr. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you failed to answer one of the questions posed to you by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, and I would refer you to your answer yesterday in which you said, 'and I supplied him (referring to the member for Prince Albert) with a copy of the letter which referred to him and a copy of my reply to that letter.' Now these are your words Mr. Premier. The member for Prince Albert says he did not receive the letter from you. Now who is telling the truth, is the question that was asked you. Did you in fact supply the letter that we referred to here. And, if so, why is the member for Prince Albert denying having received that letter?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm obviously going to have to be a little more careful in my answer. I will report precisely what the situation is and you may make your own judgment. That letter arrived in my office during my absence in Europe. It was answered from my office. So when I say that I supplied it that's not strictly accurate. It was signed by the deputy minister, Mr. Wallace, who sent a copy of the material which was received, together with my reply . . . Or let me put it this way. The material in my office indicates that a copy of the letter received from the R.M. together with a copy of my reply was sent to Mr. Feschuk. Now that is what my material indicates.

I am unable to say further whether or not the material went forth, although I suspect it did. I am not able to say whether or not it proceeded through the mails, and I'm not able to say whether Mr. Feschuk received it. I tell you with precision what was done in my

office, and why I said, perhaps carelessly yesterday, that I had sent a copy. What had happened is that my office sent a copy during my absence in Europe and that is precisely the situation.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Question to the Premier. In your letter to the reeve of the R.M. of Lakeland you indicated that you were investigating the means by which Mr. Karasiuk came to possess a copy of the letter, and that is dated November 13, 1979. When I asked you about your investigation you very pointedly indicated that it was limited to the department, I believe, of rural municipal affairs and your own department. It would look like your limiting of the investigation to those two areas, and not asking the member for Prince Albert what happened to the letter, indicates that the Premier himself is covering up the political patronage or misuse . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: — Order, order.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I have indicated what I have done and I should add one other point because it will probably come up. The department of the Provincial Secretary was contacted as well, because the letter suggested that there might have been a technical violation of the real estate agents' licensing act, or The Land Titles Act or whatever — some legislation at any rate. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that an advertisement was placed . . . My information is that no lots were sold, no money was collected, etc., but in any case it may well have been that the advertisement should not have been placed, never mind whether any lots were sold. Because there might have been an irregularity, they were consulted. I therefore consulted the department of the Provincial Secretary, the Department of Urban Affairs which was then dealing with it, and my own office, to see whether or not they had had any contact with Karasiuk. I could find none.

MR. LANE: — You didn't contact the member for Prince Albert?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I did not contact the member for Prince Albert.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Because I reached the conclusion that he had probably contacted his employer, Landmark, and I reached the conclusion that Landmark had probably contacted Mr. Karasiuk.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We'll be back on this tomorrow, so be around.

MR. BLAKENEY: Fine. I am attempting to advise the House as fully as I can what I have done and what assumptions I have drawn.

Operating of Earth Stations in Saskatchewan

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister in charge of Sask Tel. Mr. Minister, you are no doubt aware that the British Columbia government has set up an earth station on the legislative lawn in B.C. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is, if individuals in Saskatchewan want to purchase and operate their own earth stations to receive messages or signals from the telesat satellite, will our government allow them to do this?

HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't now what we

could do to disallow it. We couldn't certainly disallow it for an individual on a farm, or I guess if someone wanted to set one up on the legislative grounds we couldn't disallow it. We don't have that opportunity. The licensing of earth stations comes to the Department of Communications in Ottawa. You'd have to ask the question of the Minister of Communications in Ottawa to see if they would in fact license this. We have no opportunity to say yes or no to an individual such as this.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Minister, then with the court procedures taking place right now, and if Telecable Saskatoon loses and you win, are you telling me that all the telecable operators in Saskatchewan will have to go out of business and the people will have to purchase their earth stations in order to receive cable television or television from the Telesat satellite?

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the situation with regard to people who take signals from Sask Tel is completely different. We have agreements with people such as Saskatoon Telecable, Regina Telecable, Prairie-Coax and Battleford's Cable Vision. We have specific agreements with those people that they must receive their signals from Sask Tel. They saw fit not to take the signal from Sask Tel. As a result there was a scrambling of the signal, just because we felt they were in violation of our agreement. That's exactly why it was done. It had nothing to do with the ownership of an earth station by some individual. That simply has nothing to do with it. The fact of the matter is that we scrambled their signal because they did not take the signal from us, which they had agreed to do.

MR. LANE: — Question to the Minister. Are you giving the assurance that if an individual in Saskatchewan sets up a receiving disk, Sask Tel will not jam the signal?

MR. CODY: — No, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member for Qu'Appelle can tell me how we could jam the signal, maybe we will have a look at it. But I just don't know how you'd jam the signals going into an individual's television set. We don't have the opportunity. Not every individual has a headend in his own home. It's only the cable operators who have headends. I don't know how else you would jam a signal unless you maybe took a four-ton truck and drove it in front of the dish.

Work Slow Down by Interns

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Premier. The intern work slow down is continuing, and the Minister of Health has adopted a hands-off stance in this dispute. And as the interns have expressed a desire to enter into arbitration, will you as Premier intervene in this dispute before serious consequences result?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that, shortly put, is that I have no intention of intervening at this point. This is a dispute between PAIRS (Professional Association of Interns & Residents of Saskatchewan) and the postgraduate committee. The spokesman for the postgraduate committee is in no sense an employee of the Government of Saskatchewan. The PAIRS people are not employees of the Government of Saskatchewan. They are negotiating and sorting out their arrangements and I think it would be inappropriate at this time for the Premier of Saskatchewan to interject himself into those negotiations.

MR. SWAN: — I would like to go with a supplementary to the Minister of Health. It has been brought to my attention that medical students are now filling in for the interns and are working 27 hours to 36 hours without sleep. Would you not agree that a dangerous

precedent is being set by having medical students substitute for interns?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the information the member is putting forth is the accurate situation as it now exists. I would . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You are suffering from a very serious disease, member. No, you didn't catch that from me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I think it should be drawn to the member's attention that in the province of Quebec, it is my understanding that the interns and residents have been on strike for a number of weeks and that they are carrying on at this particular time. I indicated to the press the other day, when I was asked a question, that I encouraged the two groups to get together as quickly as possible to resolve the situation. It is not wise at this time for the government to get involved. I will check the facts to make sure that the member is correct in what he is saying, and if it is true then it does concern me if people are working 27 hours to 36 hours without any sleep. I am told by my officials that the doctors and nurses could carry on for some time without any serious consequences, and also that the interns and residents have given us the assurance that they will come to work in emergency cases.

MR. SWAN: — A supplementary to the Minister of Health. Would you not admit that because of your government's hands-off attitude, you are forcing medical students to make medical decisions that they are not qualified to make, and because of this you are placing the health of patients in jeopardy?

MR. ROLFES: — The member should have thrown away his written supplementary question. I indicated to him already that the interns and residents have given us assurance that in emergency cases and urgent cases they will go to work and make absolutely certain nobody is put in jeopardy. Secondly, we do have professional nurses and doctors who will have some extra workload put on them. But I can give this House the full assurance that no one will be put in any jeopardy whatsoever in either urgent or emergency cases because of the impasse that we presently have.

MR. SWAN: — A supplementary to the Minister of Health. The information I have is correct and it was phoned to me by a medical student who is working in the hospital here in Regina. He is concerned that if the circumstances continue the way they are, and any med student makes a wrong decision that you as a government, and the hospital in particular, can be sued because the medical practices that are being practised now are not legal. What are you prepared to do to bring this into line?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I simply do not accept that at all, because those are not the facts. The fact is that medical decisions are made by licensed medical doctors. Even interns and residents are supervised by medical doctors who are licensed and the ultimate decision and responsibility for a medical decision must be borne by a medical doctor. So the assumption that you are making is simply a false premise and therefore I cannot accept the accusations made by the member.

Rural Bus Service

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have directed my question to the minister responsible for rural transportation but apparently he left in a tantrum because of the questions from this side of the House. Therefore I will

direct my question to the minister responsible for STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company). The people of the Radville and Ceylon area are continually concerned about a bus service to and from Regina. You have indicated on previous occasions that such a service will not be available from STC. In light of the recent announcement of a rural transportation service between Wishart and Wynyard, the fourth such service in the province under the rural transportation program, would the minister consider such a service to the Radville-Ceylon area?

MR. CODY: — Mr. Speaker, it doesn't fall under the purview of STC to recommend or deny the services with regard to the particular service he speaks of; it comes under the Department of Highways and Transportation. I can't answer whether or not we can consider that particular type of service. The service, however, that we do from time to time consider, is new bus services for STC. We have in fact considered the one he speaks of but the economics are just simply light on the end, and we cannot see our way clear. However, I can certainly take the question under advisement and ask the Minister of Highways and Transportation if he will have a look at the service under the department's program.

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, in way of a supplementary, I contacted a Mr. Bishop, the manager of Moose Mountain Lines, this morning. He said it could easily be tied in with their Bengough-Ogema-Pangman run. Would you indicate to the minister responsible for rural transportation that he could, in fact try to implement such a program under the rural assistance program to that community?

MR. CODY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll take it under advisement. I simply can't say one way or another. I will ask the Minister of Highways and Transportation if it is a possibility and we can also check the validity of the statements from Moose Mountain because we work very closely with all the bus people in Saskatchewan, whether it be Greyhound, Moose Mountain, Trailways or whoever it is. If they can serve better than we can at a more economic rate, we see no reason why they shouldn't. We certainly will have a look at it and I will bring it to the attention of the minister.

Premier's Presence in House during Debate on Bill No. 105

Mr. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the Premier realizes the serious ramifications of Bill No. 105. Since this morning the member from Nipawin will be making references to speeches in the past from you as the Premier, I wonder if you might spend some time in the House today and listen to these discussions?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the words of the hon. member for Nipawin would be well worth listening to. I think they have been well worth listening to for 12, 14, 16, 18 or 20 hours. I do, however, have some other commitments. I'm sure the member for Nipawin's words would be constructive in dealing with the problems of Canada. But I have another commitment to meet with former premier Robarts shortly after the question period and I think he might be even more helpful in deciding what we ought to do to preserve and strengthen Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cowley (Provincial Secretary) that Bill No. 105 – **An act to amend the Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act** be now read a second time.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party): — Mr. Speaker, before I commence today I would like to draw attention to the tremendous amount of money that we are now saving the Government of Saskatchewan. Today I received from the Attorney General the order of business for today, and Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough it is nothing more than a copy of yesterday's order of business with the date scratched out and today's date placed on it.

Mr. Speaker, I know most members last evening were extremely desirous of getting into this debate. I explained to them how they could do so. They are also terribly, terribly desirous of getting on with the people's business, of doing these important matters, and for that reason I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Motion to adjourn debate on Bill No. 105 negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 2

Collver	Ham
---------	-----

NAYS – 39

Pepper	Allen	Bowerman
Smishek	Romanow	Kramer
Robbins	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	Mostoway
Kaeding	Hammersmith	Kowalchuk
MacAuley	Byers	Rolfes
Cowley	Tchorzewski	Cody
Lusney	Nelson	Engel
Poniatowski	White	Solomon
Berntson	Larter	Lane
Taylor	Rousseau	Swan
Pickering	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Duncan	Andrew

Point of order

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be kind enough to clarify for me and other members of the House, what the practice and the rulings of the House are pertaining to motions to adjourn debates. My understanding of the rules is – I cite for Mr. Speaker's consideration, March 6, 1973 – that the rule is summed up as follows in a motion made by Mr. Steuart:

The debate continuing on the motion and the amendment it was moved by

Mr. Steuart, 'that this debate be now adjourned.'

Mr. Speaker ruled the motion out of order on the grounds that the member had already moved a motion to adjourn the same debate.

There is another precedent April 2, 1973.

Mr. Wiebe moved this debate be now adjourned. Mr. Speaker ruled the motion out of order on the grounds that the member had already moved a motion to adjourn the same debate.

The Journals Summary, Speaker's Rulings and Statements, I think put it succinctly:

Motion to adjourn debate cannot be moved twice in same debate by same member – 216, 284, 290.

I think the facts are clear; in this case, the member has moved at least three or four adjournment motions in this debate and I would like to know, is he in order to do so?

MR. COLLVER: — I believe that the circumstances described by the Attorney General are different. First of all, the motion to move adjourned debate, as I recall the incident, occurred as a result of the member having already received an adjourned debate. I believe that is against the rules and that once a member receives an adjourned debate he is not entitled to move another one.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would say that since the House adjourns at the conclusion of each day, moving a motion of adjournment the next day is not the same circumstance as described in the Attorney General's citing from the Journals. It seems to me that a member has a right, when he does not receive an adjourned debate, to request another adjournment from the members because the members may have changed their minds in the intervening period, from the time the House adjourns until the next time it meets again the following day. So I would say that the circumstances the Attorney General has brought to the attention of the House are not precedents in fact but are merely suggestions that have happened before. In the circumstances that that the Attorney General has described, in terms of my request and Mr. Speaker's ruling to allow a request for adjourned debate each day for the last three or four days, Mr. Speaker is right in these circumstances to have done so because the House in fact adjourns and the next day allowing one member . . .

I agree with the Attorney General that were the member to request an adjourned debate two or three times between House adjournments that he would definitely be out of order and would not be allowed to do so under the rules. So I suggest with that you discount what the Attorney General has suggested and that Mr. Speaker has been correct in his decision to allow the member to attempt to adjourn debate after the House has adjourned each time.

MR. SPEAKER: — On the point of order raised by the Attorney General and the comments made by the member for Nipawin with regard to the point of order, I find that essentially the comments made by the member of Nipawin are correct. The member can seek an adjournment of the debate; if it is negatived the member may continue to speak. If he doesn't continue to speak at that point, he loses his right to speak. If a member attempts adjournment of debate and it is negatived, he cannot attempt to adjourn the debate until an intervening matter has been entered in the journals. This

June 4, 1980

means the member could seek leave again tomorrow if in fact we were debating the same bill. Essentially I find that the member for Nipawin is correct in his observation of the rule. He has the opportunity to continue with the debate at this time.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — A further point of order?

MR. ROMANOW: — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the March 6, 1973 ruling, where on the motion involved, there had been an adjourned debate. It was private members' day. One week or two weeks in advance, the opposition was asking for Return No. 109. Then when it came up on March 6, 1973, the debate continued on the motion and then they put another motion for adjournment. It's argued that this debate had now been adjourned. Perhaps I don't understand, but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'd like to respond to the citation the Attorney General made – April 2, 1973?

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. The second one was April 2. I don't know about the facts on that one. Just to refer to it here:

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 50, The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972, be now read a second time.

The debate continued and then Mr. Wiebe moved that this debate be now adjourned, implying a second adjournment. Mr. Speaker ruled the motion out of order on the grounds the member had already moved the motion to adjourn the same debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Without an intervening . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Oh no, clearly days had passed in-between.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That ruling was wrong. The Speaker is right.

MR. ROMANOW: — I just want to know what the rule is because . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you questioning the Speaker's ruling?

MR. ROMANOW: — Never! I'm asking for clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I have had some quick research done on the matter. I found the two citations the Attorney General brought forward which I neglected to comment on before because I was appalled by the amount of research that would be necessary to discover the facts of the matter. I have now had that research done.

I find that on April 2, 1973, I believe it was the member for Morse, Mr. Wiebe moved adjournment, and it was ruled out of order because he had successfully moved the adjournment on March 5 preceding that.

On March, 6, 1973, on page 216 of the journals, the member for, I believe it was, Prince Albert-Duck Lake, D.G. Steuart, moved two adjournment motions in a row, back to back, so therefore there was no opportunity for an intervening entry in the journal.

Therefore, his second motion of adjournment was out of order.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll wait for the Attorney General to overcome his chagrin at having lost another one. It's a pity, Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney General's researchers, with all of the vast resources at the command of the New Democratic Party in this legislature, and also the resources held by the Attorney General, can't dig up enough background material to be able to be reasonably convincing when opposed to, as the member for Souris-Cannington said, a self-professed, uneducated jerk. So it is a pity when the Attorney General can't win one or two on that basis.

Now I know he is going to have his researchers just absolutely eagerly and enthusiastically attempting to find some other ploy by which he can prevent the actual rules of the House from becoming apparent to all the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last evening before we retired, I brought forward a point which I think is relatively key to perhaps the decisions the individual members might be making in terms of this bill. I think some of the NDP members, and certainly some of the Conservative members, may have it on their minds. Now I don't say that lightly, Mr. Speaker, I don't say the Conservatives necessarily discount what their leader has said, and that is that he would support this bill because it removes the money for some people who are attempting to break up Canada. Those were his words publicly, and perhaps that is what the Conservative members seem to think. Now that may not be true, so these remarks are designed primarily, if you like, for the NDP members. An attempt may have been made to fool them about the real meaning of the bill, because you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when the member for Biggar brought forward the resolution, he stated that the bill, in prior times, was deficient.

That means, Mr. Speaker, the bill somehow didn't think about the situation which might happen if a member crossed from one party to another (in other words, if a particular member crossed from one party to another, hadn't run in the election prior under that same banner and thus had changed his total view by going to a new party). The bill hadn't contemplated the fact that the research grants, the money for the leader's office, and the money for the leader of the third party would be affected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the NDP members opposite, that is not true. Right here in the province of Saskatchewan that very same occurrence happened within the lifetime of most of the members of this legislature. It happened, as a matter of fact, not four years ago. When I say, not four years ago, it was less than four years ago that it happened in this very same legislature. I want to just draw this to the members' attention again, and to emphasize this point for those NDPers who may have listened to some others in their caucus say, the reason you should support this bill is because the bill was deficient. It didn't make clear the fact that if a member changed from one party to another, didn't run under that party's banner in the previous election, the research moneys and the grants to the leader should be discounted. It didn't make clear that it's wrong for a member to do that.

Now the fact is that less than four years ago, the Conservatives in this House, as you will remember, were third party, and the Conservatives in this House as third party received the moneys that had already been passed back in 1976. And, Mr. Speaker, in a few moments I'm going to get to the remarks of Mr. Allan Blakeney when he rejuvenated the bill or reassessed the situation in 1978. I'm also going to get to some additional remarks by the Attorney General in 1979 when he rejuvenated that act, when he

rejuvenated that bill.

But this was subsequent to the creation of third party legislation in this very Assembly. The Conservatives in the House had 11 members; the Liberals in the House had 13 members; and the Liberals received the benefits of being the party in opposition. They received the moneys that were granted to the opposition party in this Chamber. They received the grants and research help that the opposition party got, and the Conservatives received the grants for third party status. Less than four years ago, when this was in existence, there were 13 members for the Liberals, 11 members for the Conservatives.

The member for Thunder Creek, who was elected as a Liberal, crossed to the Conservatives, and it gave the Liberals 12 in the Assembly and the Conservatives 12 in the Assembly. What happened as a result of that move? Well, what happened was this: the grants to the Liberal Party were reduced and the grants to the Conservative Party were increased. And the decision made by the legislators in this very Chamber was that the only fair way to deal with the two parties – as a result of a member changing, crossing from one party to another – was to lower the opposition and raise the third party so that they were even. So they added together the amount of grants granted to the Liberals, or the opposition, and the amounts granted to the third party (at that time the Conservatives) and divided in two. Those were the grants made to each party. Now I want you to keep in mind that this happened as a direct result of the member for Thunder Creek crossing from the Liberals to the Conservatives.

Nothing could be closer to the existing circumstances. The member for Thunder Creek did not seek office in a by-election. He sought office in the election in 1978.

The members in this very Assembly at that time made a specific decision to alter the grants and research moneys for those parties, as a result of that member's going from one party to another even though he had not been elected under the new party's banner. And I'm going to quote for you now the remarks of Mr. Allan Blakeney at the time he brought forward the changes to The Legislative Assembly Act on April 10, 1978.

Now, you will recall Mr. Speaker, that last evening and yesterday afternoon, I went through the remarks of the member for Biggar who introduced the changes in 1976. I went through some of the remarks of the Attorney General, who introduced the changes to The Legislative Assembly and The Executive Council Acts in 1979. And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the remarks of the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan when he introduced changes to The Legislative Assembly Act and The Executive Council Act on April 10, 1978. He said as follows (I refer all members to page 1280, April 10, 1978, Saskatchewan Hansard):

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 30 – An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1976 the Lieutenant-Governor in Council issued an Order No. 17776 authorizing the Executive Council to appoint a committee to review the service facilities of perquisites and allowances and salaries of the members of the Legislative Assembly, the Speaker of the House, the Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party. Members will recall the agreement that we

proceed on this basis. The committee was in due course appointed and comprised a chairman, Mr. Justice E.M. Hughes and other members. Judge Raynell Andreychuk and Mr. Charles S. Mitchell. Under the chairmanship of Judge Hughes the committee was directed to devise methods of adjusting allowances and salaries and to submit recommendations to the cabinet.

The committee recommended the need for expansion and increases in the role of remuneration of members of the Legislative Assembly for a number of reasons. It perceived an increase in the MLA's workload, a trend toward membership as a full time vocation, constituency work as a year round undertaking, it conceived that members supplementing present remunerations with personal funds, that remuneration to cabinet ministers, MLAs, the Opposition Leader and the third party leader would be third lowest in Canada and that remuneration to the Premier was the lowest.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasis here that these were the recommendations of the committee chaired by Justice E.M. Hughes. These were the recommendations submitted to cabinet by Justice E.M. Hughes.

The committee submitted its first interim report on August 14, 1976 and its second interim report on August 18, 1976 and you will recall that we have acted on a number of those. We considered (said the Premier) the bulk of the recommendations of the first report in the 1976 amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to interject here. The Premier of the province of Saskatchewan stated that the initial reports of the Hughes committee to investigate this entire matter of MLA's salaries, perquisites, responsibilities, payment to the Premier, payment to the cabinet and to the third party leader, were first implemented in the 1976 amendment which as introduced by the member for Biggar.

The present bill, Bill 30, represents the government's further action to ask this Assembly to follow through on the remaining recommendations . . .

Now keep in mind, we have first a committee chaired by Justice E.M. Hughes. Then we have the present chancellor of the University of Regina. Then we have a former president of the Saskatchewan Association of Municipalities. These were three of the most respected individuals in the province, who were undoubtedly outside of the political arena and who were recommended as such by every single member of this legislative Chamber at the time. This committee studied the problem for well over two years. This legislature examined the problem in 1976, in 1978, and again in 1979. Yet the member for Biggar, in 1980, has the gall to say the Hughes committee, the legislature in 1976 and he himself, the legislature in 1978 and the Premier of Saskatchewan, the legislature in 1979 and the Attorney General, that all of these, Mr. Speaker, could have committed an oversight and that the bill was deficient – and not only these things on the record, Mr. Speaker, but the actual practice of the Assembly paid to the leader's office, to the leader, to the caucus, and for research and secretarial help, were in fact adjusted as a direct result of that member's crossing. Yet the member for Biggar has the gall to stand up in this House and say the bill was deficient. That, Mr. Speaker, is why no one, no independent observer of this legislature, is buying that act. There are some in Saskatchewan who say, as the Conservative leader said, stop the Unionests from getting public grants. Now they are wrong, Mr. Speaker. Those who say that are wrong. But at least they are being honest and straightforward. At least they are saying what they feel about the situation. They are wrong because that is an attack on

the rights of members of the legislature to be equal in their abilities to present their case.

The member for Shellbrook, from his chair last evening stated that he believed that this bill was the equivalent of requiring any member who does not run under one party banner to go back to the people and seek re-election in a by-election. Nothing could be further from the truth. If that bill were brought before the people of Saskatchewan, if that bill were brought forward in this House and was not retroactive, the government members might receive some support for it. If they make it retroactive then it is merely an attempt to attack existing members who have chosen to do what members have been doing in Saskatchewan, in Canada and in Britain for many, many decades.

But that is not what this bill is about. If the members on the NDP side of this House want to bring forward such a bill to ensure that no member may cross the floor of the House, at any time, unless he resigns and seeks office again in a by-election, they may do so. As I say, that bill might receive some support. If that is the principle you are trying to attack, then bring forward a bill that attacks that principle. Don't bring forward a bill that attacks minorities. Don't bring forward a bill that attacks existing members for doing what has been done in Saskatchewan, Canada and in Britain for decades. Don't bring forward a bill that attacks two members of the House for exactly the reasons that you rewarded the Conservative group in this House when the member for Thunder Creek crossed and created an equivalence between the Liberals and the Conservatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be interested to hear what the members opposite and the members at my right think about those precedents and that principle. But they have refused, Mr. Speaker, on three or four separate occasions to allow me the privilege which is existent and the courtesy which is existent in every law of debate ever put forward in a fair manner and that is the ability to rebut whatever arguments they bring forward.

I have attempted for four straight days to enable others to get in to make comments on what they think of the example of Mr. Thatcher, the member for Thunder Creek, crossing to the Conservatives and the allowances for research, secretarial help, leader's office and leader's remuneration being adjusted. I am going to get to the remarks in a few moments, Mr. Speaker, of Mr. Blakeney on that very subject, that very topic on April 10, 1978 when he introduced Bill No. 30 – An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

The member for Regina South, from his chair, continues to say, let us have our say. I've said fine, allow me the courtesy to be able to rebut arguments.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I didn't say that.

MR. COLLVER: — You see, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to hear their say. If you won't let me have the opportunity to rebut in this legislature, then for goodness sake go outside the legislature and explain away these facts that I am presenting to you today. Explain them away to the people. Explain them away to me. Convince me at any time, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not an attack on minorities. Convince me that retroactive legislation designed to remove the rights of two members of this legislature who have been recognized in this legislature before is not what you intend with this bill and I would be more than happy to take my chair and vote with you.

But if you can't convince any independent observer of that, if you can't convince the

people of that, then bring forward a bill which you mean. Don't try and slip in the back door what you mean at the front door. Because then, Mr. Speaker, you attack only yourselves.

Mr. Speaker will know, because I have made it public before, that unless Allan Blakeney resigns his seat in Regina Elphinstone and actually seeks office in a by-election . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'm sure the member made a slip; but it's common in this Assembly and others to refer to the member by his title or his constituency. That is especially true when it's across the floor.

MR. COLLVER: — My sincere apologies for that, Mr. Speaker. It was entirely a slip. I was looking at Hansard and seeing the Hon. Allan Blakeney and that is why. I should have said the Premier.

Unless the Premier accepts the challenge to resign his seat in Regina Elphinstone and run in a by-election in Nipawin, I am not going to seek re-election in Nipawin in the next provincial general election. I have announced that. That's pretty straightforward.

Therefore, it's not for me that I wish you to stop making this mistake and stop bringing forward this kind of legislation that attacks minorities. You may not believe this, Mr. Speaker, and the members may not believe this, but it is for them that I am fighting this bill. If, Mr. Speaker, I had not already made a commitment in this House to donate all personal moneys to the United Way in Nipawin, then the members could accuse me, perhaps, of wanting to put forward this bill for personal reasons. But that having been said, and that commitment having been made, and the moneys already in the hands of Donor's Choice, and the instructions already given to the Clerk to deposit on a continuing basis that money, as long as it remains in effect, to Donor's Choice, I see no other reason, and the members can see no other possible reason, than that they are making a serious error.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, go on with the sterling words of the Hon. Allan E. Blakeney, Premier of Saskatchewan, member for Regina Elphinstone, the Leader of the NDP for 10 or 11 years — the leader all members opposite have followed for 10 or 11 years. Let me read to them his words on April 10, 1978 pertaining to the amendments he was bringing forward at that time, and pertaining to the committee of independent, outside observers who studied the situation in Saskatchewan for two years or more and all of their recommendations were then brought into line in 1978. And he goes on in that same statement:

The present bill, Bill 30, represents the government's further action to ask the Assembly to follow through on the remaining recommendations of the first report and the further recommendations outlined in the second report. Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the bill do not strictly refer to matters considered by the committee. I will touch on those in a moment.

Section 2 of the bill attempts to allow rural members the convenience of individual telephones. I'm not going to go on to read the Premier's comments on section 2 of the bill because it pertains to rural telephones. Suffice it to say that the committee made recommendations on rural telephones.

Section 3 is a direction implementation of a recommendation of the first report of

the Hughes committee. The committee recommended that the Speaker of this House receive a \$35 allowance for each day he attends to the duties of his office between sessions.

Mr. Speaker I know, was thankful for that provision in the bill. And I won't go on to bore the members with the Premier's further comments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, sections 4 and 5 are not dealt with by the committee, the Premier says. Otherwise, quite frankly, I would have brought forward the committees' recommendations. Even though they studied it, even though they presented it to the members of this House, even though they looked at it, they did not specifically make recommendations with reference to the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party. Otherwise I would be in here with both feet leaping on the words of the Hughes committee. This is the Premier of Saskatchewan on sections 4 and 5:

They represent a clarification of the payment of allowances and grants to the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party and to the Premier in the event of a change of government. There is a curious anomaly in the statute as it now stands. The statute now provides, curiously enough, that the Leader of the Opposition shall be paid as the Leader of the Opposition up until polling day and thereafter. If there is a change of government, the person who then becomes Leader of the Opposition, shall be paid in that office. However, The Executive Council Act provides that the person shall be paid as Premier while he occupies that office. You see a little anomaly there because . . .

And Mr. McMillan, one of the demised Liberals in the House interjects, 'Your demise.' Mr. Blakeney goes on.

Well not particularly. If I were preparing for my demise, I would leave it quite as it is. In 1971, when there was a change of government, the act, because of the anomaly, provided that the Leader of the Opposition, soon to become Premier, stopped getting paid on polling day and didn't start getting paid as Premier until he was sworn in seven or eight days later, whereas the person who had been Premier was paid as Premier during this period and also as Leader of the Opposition during this period. This was a matter which was adjusted by agreement. I don't know what was the degree of legality by paying the Leader of the Opposition that salary until he was sworn in as Premier and the Premier until he ceased being Premier, which is the sensible arrangement and which is being enacted here in this legislation. This is correcting a mere anomaly in the current legislation.

No, Mr. Speaker, I brought the words of the Premier in that section to the attention of the House to show the detail in which the then Premier of Saskatchewan, his office, his vast research staff, the cabinet, the Executive Council at the time, and the government caucus examined this bill. They examined this situation with such detail and such precision that they found there was an anomaly in the law as between the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition such that there was the potential for double payment to both offices. By agreement they had before eliminated that double payment, but now they were bringing it forward in their legislation. That, Mr. Speaker, is how clear-cut, how precise, how concise the examination of this act was on April 10, 1978 after the Hughes committee report.

Now, I want you to listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Here's another example of the same thing from the words of the Premier of Saskatchewan.

Section 6 was also not dealt with by the committee but the government felt that the equal distribution of the allowance to opposition whips should be provided for in the act in the event of a tie in the opposition.

This was in April 10, 1978. The government members themselves and the Premier of Saskatchewan looked forward to the day when there would be a tie in the opposition. And after April 10, 1978 but before the provincial election in October, 1978, the member for Thunder Creek crossed to the Conservatives from the Liberals and that very tie that the government had decided could happen, in fact, happened, and the allowances were adjusted accordingly for that period of time.

Now listen to this:

The matter of a tie in the opposition was dealt with in so far as the Leader of the Opposition's salary was concerned, and the leader of the third party's salary was dealt with with respect to the grants for their offices but through some oversight, the matter of the whips was not dealt with. In order that the two salaries for whips might be pooled and divided, this sections provides that to be done.

You see, Mr. Speaker, in 1976 legislation was introduced in this House creating third party status for the Progressive Conservatives who were then the first third party to occupy this House. Through some oversight in 1976, the Premier says, although they dealt with salaries, they dealt with the moneys provided for in terms of the leader's office (you understand that indicates that they dealt with it directly), in the event of a tie the matter wasn't dealt with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just made a mistake in my own presentation, because the member for Thunder Creek crossed before April, 1978 and the tie actually existed. So the Premier of Saskatchewan and his Executive Council actually foresaw the event of a tie, actually foresaw that eventuality because it was already in existence. And what created the tie? The member for Thunder Creek crossed from the Liberals to the Conservatives. That's what the Premier said in 1978. The matter of a tie in the opposition was dealt with; but in 1978 they didn't bother or had forgotten to bother with the eventuality of a tie in so far as the whips' offices were concerned. They corrected the legislation when the tie already existed, brought about by one member crossing to another side.

Section 7 provides a 2 cent per voter increase in members' communication allowance; I don't think that refers to third parties. Section 8 implements two recommendations of the Hughes committee for a per diem allowance; I don't think that is dealt with in there. Section 8(b) allows for a constant rate per mile; that is not dealt with. This was recommended in the first report as a means of eliminating discrimination against members who live a considerable distance; I won't bother with that. Section 9 determines when the various provisions of the act will come into force. Now, I want to read what the Premier said in 1978 with respect to the act coming into force:

Section 9 determines when the various provisions of the act will come into force. The act comes into force on the day of assent with the section dealing with whips' allowances being retroactive to November 15, 1977 . . .

Why? Because November 15, 1977 was subsequent to the point in time when the member for Thunder Creek crossed to the Conservatives and in fact the tie existed.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go on and read into the record a few remarks by others on this bill. This is one example where retroactivity was not an attack. This is one example where retroactivity was a recognition of a fact. The tie existed. It was brought about by the member crossing the floor, brought about by his changing his mind about his own party, under which he was elected. The Executive Council reviewed it, looked at what happened, examined the situation and retroactively changed the legislation to recognize the tie.

I am going to be interested to hear how the members opposite and their Premier answer the questions in that regard, with reference to the changes that are being made in Bill No. 105. And I look forward with enthusiasm to hearing those comments. He goes on to say:

. . . in order to apply to the 1977-78 session, and I believe that that is in order.

Do you hear that, Mr. Speaker? 'I believe that that is in order.'

We will need to check the records to see what was done with respect to the session last fall. The proposal was prepared before we terminated last fall's session and there may be a necessity of checking that very small point. The section dealing with communications is retroactive to April 1, 1978, a few days ago, since that simplifies the calculation to make it effective for the fiscal year.

No one objected to that kind of retroactive legislation in this Assembly – in order to help with fiscal accounting measures.

In other respects the matter would come into effect on the day of assent.

That is the normal course of events in a bill. Now, keep this in mind, Mr. Speaker. In order to recognize the tie which existed as a result of a member crossing the floor, the Premier of Saskatchewan made the whip section retroactive. It made one other small matter retroactive, in order to help with fiscal matters. All other matters in that bill, the final recommendation of the Hughes committee report, were made effective on the day of assent. Now, Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1978 a member crossing from the Conservatives to the Liberals did not upset the government. As a matter of fact it not only didn't upset them, they said they were changes which the government felt were desirable to recognize that crossing of the floor. They are desirable!

If hon. members feel there is a reason for varying any particular provisions (now he calls for all hon. members to come forward), we are more than willing to consider proposals which honorable members might put forward.

Now remember, the Premier's research staff, the entire Executive Council, and the NDP caucus have already reviewed this bill in April of 1978. They know that the tie exists between the Liberals and Conservatives because it has existed since 1977. They know that tie was the result of the member's crossing from the Liberals to the Conservatives. They know that the money that went to the opposition and to the third party was then divided and halved in order to provide equal amounts to the equal opposition members. They know that. They have all reviewed it and now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan invites all hon. members in this Chamber, having gone through all that procedure in the Hughes committee, to review the act and to consider proposals which hon. members might put forward. He said:

Very clearly, this is not something which the government takes a firm position on.

What do you think of that, Mr. Speaker? This is not something the government takes a firm position on – April 10, 1978. But on June 4, 1980 the government is sure as heck taking a firm position on one of those matters, even though there is a precedent in this very same Assembly with reference to caucus grants, research grants, leader's accounts and with reference to the leader's pay. There is a precedent in this very same Assembly when a member crosses the floor it changes everything, but the government doesn't take a very firm position on it. But today, two years after the event has occurred, when two members of this Assembly cross the floor to another political party the government says, we don't like that other political party and therefore we're going to take a firm position.

It is something (the Premier goes on to say) which all honorable members will wish to consider since it deals with our own remuneration, always a difficult area for us in this legislature. We welcome any contributions or suggestions that honorable members may wish to make in committee. With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 30, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Now wait until you hear this. What is the very first question that comes on the paper? Is it about the tie in the opposition? No. Is it about third party status? No. Is it about the fact that a member crossed the floor, and suddenly the members were no longer the opposition but were now only one-half of the opposition, and their grants went down and the third party's went up, and their leader's pay went down and the third party leader's went up? Was that the question? Oh no. Here's the question from the member for Rosthern:

Before the Premier takes his chair, will he answer two questions for me? The first question is, is there consideration of a formula rather than two cents each time the – was that considered on the mailing? (The Premier answers the question.) The second question is on the telephone. The date effective, I assume is the date the bill is passed? Are you not going back to your original suggestion that Mr. Speaker sent letters to all the MLAs about originally?

Mr. Blakeney: Yes, the act doesn't fully cover the policy. The policy will be that SaskTel, if we agree, will install these phones, and where somebody has already installed the phone, will be reimbursed.

And he goes on to talk about the reimbursement pertaining to telephones. Those, Mr.

June 4, 1980

Speaker, were the comments of the member for Rosthern at the time. That's it. Those were the questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to you what Mr. Cy MacDonald, the member at the time for . . . I don't think the seat is any longer in existence. I forget what his seat was now to be quite frank.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Indian Head-Wolseley.

MR. COLLVER: — Indian Head-Wolseley. I'm sorry, it is still in existence. Mr. Cy MacDonald rose on behalf of the then Liberal party. Now keep this in mind; the Liberal Party was now no longer the opposition party in full. They were now exactly equal to the Conservatives in the legislature, Mr. Speaker, you would think that under the circumstances of that tie, as a result of one of their very own members crossing the floor from the Liberals to the Conservatives, that the Liberals whose grants and allowances were reduced, whose leader's salary was reduced, whose leader's office expenses were reduced, would focus on that section of the bill because it was so unfair and unreasonable. You would think, wouldn't you, Mr. Speaker, that they would have far more reason than anyone in this Chamber to question third party status in the House, wouldn't you? Well, I think the comments of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley are most interesting.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on behalf of the Liberal opposition. First of all, I have no area of disagreement with Bill No. 30.

Do you hear that, Mr. Speaker? Here are the Liberals. Their money's gone away. They are not equal in the House. They are now equally paid. They were formerly the opposition, but a member crossed from them to us and suddenly they were even, and here's what he says:

I have no area of disagreement with Bill No. 30. In fact I have found that in most cases when legislation which affects individual members is introduced in this Assembly, all governments of all political stripes are normally overly cautious and in most cases are never out of line with what is really the public interest or the good of the members of this Assembly.

Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker? He says most of the time when amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act and The Executive Council Act are concerned, governments are overly cautious, members are overly cautious, and they have the best interests of everyone at heart. Why then does the Government of Saskatchewan find it necessary now to pick that particular bill to attack the member for Nipawin and the member for Swift Current? Why? I asked this question yesterday; I've asked this question every day I have stood on my feet. Why do the Progressive Conservatives want to attack members in this Assembly who happen to represent a minority in this Assembly when in the past no such attacks have occurred? Because governments have been overcautious and members have been cautious (in the words of Mr. MacDonald and I'm not citing to you some member of the House who was not respected.) Everyone who ever sat in this Assembly respected Cy MacDonald, respected his views and his understanding of the operation of this Assembly, and his feeling for this Assembly.

We may not have agreed with him politically, and we may not have agreed with his tactics, but we certainly respected him for his respect of this Chamber and of the rights of individual members.

Now remember, these amendments represent the possibility of a tie.

In the Premier's own words (with reference to the whip) if the Liberals in the House at the time this happened had any thought, reason, or any upset with the principles of that bill, they would have immediately jumped on that section of what the Premier said, and said, it is unfair; it is unreasonable; it's unrealistic; we are the only opposition in this legislature because we were the only ones who had sufficient members elected. They would have stood on their feet, given the principles of Bill No. 105 and said, of our 12 members, all 12 have been elected here as Liberals. And over there, of the Conservatives 12 members, only 10 were elected as Conservatives; 2 were elected as Liberals and therefore we are the opposition. That's what they would have said if they had the principles of Bill No. 105. That's what they would have said, but they didn't.

Mr. MacDonald goes on to say:

. . . even though most of them are housekeeping in nature, some have a bit of variance, and are certainly of that nature and I'm sure that all members will endorse them and I think the general public of Saskatchewan will also endorse them. However, I do have one feeling that is contained in the general attitude of the Assembly in Saskatchewan in relation to changes affecting individual members and I honestly believe that it is time that this Assembly matured to the degree that it has matured in Ottawa.

Things that affect individual members of the Assembly, irrespective of political party or government or opposition, that there should be a degree of consultation, or a mechanism whereby all parties would have an opportunity to discuss and have an input into these changes. In saying that I refer to . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the main thrust of what the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, Cy MacDonald, said in this Chamber on April 10, 1978, in response to the Premier. The main thrust of his remarks was:

. . . I refer to election expenses; I refer to boundary changes; I refer to any financial matters affecting individual members, and, of course, I think that the theory in Ottawa and the theory in most Houses is that this is not a government matter.

Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker? A most respected member of the House said, it wasn't a government matter. The Premier of Saskatchewan said, we welcome any contributions or suggestions. He said (the Premier, I want to recall) ' . . . this is not something which the government takes a firm position on. It is something which all hon. members will wish to consider, since it deals with our own remuneration.'

No firm position is taken in 1978. The Liberals have just been euchred out of being the opposition. They elected all 12 of their members to the legislature. The Conservatives only elected 10 as Conservatives. Two of them crossed the floor and suddenly, Mr. Speaker, the main thing the Liberal Party had to put forward at the time pertained to an independent organization. That's why they said, it pertained to an independent organization.

Did any government member listen to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley? The answer is no . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hope the member for Kelsey-Tisdale has

an opportunity (I wouldn't want to repeat the remarks I made this morning, but perhaps he may not wish to concern himself about remarks made previously in this debate), for his own information and edification, in order to be able to explain it not only to himself but to others of his ilk, to read the Hansard of this morning and then answer that to any serious person in Saskatchewan. That's all I ask the member to do, read it and then explain how you can recognize it at one time, but the next time, because someone else has different views, you don't recognize it. Then try to get away with the position you have taken, that it is merely an adjustment of a previous oversight in this bill. This entire matter has been well-considered. I go on with the remarks of Mr. Cy MacDonald, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, in 1978. He goes on to say:

I would like to see, and as I said honestly . . .

Now we all remember the member at the time, Mr. MacDonald, had a tendency to do that. In his remarks he kept implying that the remarks he had made before were not very honest. He said, now I want you to listen to my remarks, honestly.

. . . that I think the Premier and the government would be very, very wise in developing an all-party device of input and consultation in regard to all matters which affect us as individual members of the Assembly, and of course, affect the work we do and method and manner by which we get elected, how we get paid, and what are our pensions. Of course we attempt to do that in some ways by the appointment of independent committees, such as the Hughes committee, where we all get inputs. This is not intended as a criticism of the present government because I think you could go back to our government and all governments, and I think we have had a progression of a little more maturity in the handling of these kinds of problems as the years progress.

You see, Mr. Speaker, suddenly the member for Indian Head-Wolseley at the time, Cy MacDonald, gives the government some kudos and gives the government some praise, says the Government of Saskatchewan has progressed in this matter. With every precedent in Saskatchewan, in Canada and in Britain against them; with the precedent in this very House less than four years ago against them; with the words of the Premier of Saskatchewan two years ago against them, the only question you can ask is, why now is the government taking such a firm position on Bill No. 105? The reason they are taking such a firm position on Bill No. 105 is that they don't like what two members think and that's all; nothing else! They don't like what two members think and they want to eliminate them, to make them less than full members of this Assembly. That is what they want to do. That is what they are trying to do and that's why I'm fighting it. It's not for these two members but for any two members of any assembly, anywhere, to give them the right to stand up and say what they believe, to say what they think and stand for what they believe, not for what the government tells them to believe.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is 12 noon.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.