

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**June 5, 1980.**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**QUESTIONS**

**Emma Lake Development**

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Question Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in the June 3, 1980 edition of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix the member for Prince Albert is quoted as saying that he never saw the letter dealing with the letter relating to the Emma Lake development. He never saw the letter or any copy of it, and he denied putting any pressure on the government.

Now yesterday in the media, Mr. Premier, I think the member for P.A. changed his mind and indicated that, in fact, he did have the letter; but he stopped short of responding to the question of government influence peddling. My question, Mr. Premier, is why was your investigation, which you indicated you undertook, so restricted and why did you not further investigate the question of influence peddling?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, no investigation was done with respect to influence peddling, because so far as I am aware, even after listening to the comments in the last several days, there is not a scintilla of evidence to suggest that anybody engaged in any influence peddling.

**MR. ANDREW:** — I take it from your statement, Mr. Premier, that you have no intention then of taking any action whatsoever against the member for Prince Albert, or to investigate at all the allegations.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any allegations, and if the members opposite wish to make some specific allegations of influence peddling, I wish they would do so and not engage in innuendo. With respect to the member for Prince Albert, I have advised this House that according to the records in my office a copy of a letter — in no sense, by the way, a confidential letter since it was addressed to, I think, not less than five ministers of the Crown — together with the reply that went from my office, went out to the member for Prince Albert. That is what my records indicate.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Question to the Premier. Would the Premier not admit that the original position of the member for Prince Albert — that he hadn't got the letter and, basically hadn't leaked it, and his subsequent changing of his story yesterday — indicates to the public that there is a very serious matter here of perhaps influence peddling; and would the Premier not feel that he has an obligation to investigate the actions of the member for Prince Albert, given his highly contradictory statements to the public?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, whether or not someone remembers receiving a copy of a letter, and whether or not someone recalls subsequently that he may have received a copy of a letter (and I don't know what the member for Prince Albert has said), fails in

**June 5, 1980.**

my mind to raise any evidence of influence peddling. And if there is any better evidence of influence peddling, I wish people would, as I say, let us have the evidence and not engage in this innuendo. There is not a scintilla of evidence, and until some is put forward there is no justifiable reason for investigation.

**MR. LANE:** — The Premier has had this matter before his desk for some considerable period of time. And you very pointedly, in your answers yesterday, indicated you had limited your investigation to the department of the Provincial Secretary, your own office, and the Department of Rural Affairs.

My first question to you is, did you investigate or ask the member for Prince Albert, as to the original transaction in which he was involved (selling the land to Karasiuk Holding), whether any personal commitments were made to ensure development?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not know on what basis I would engage an investigation on the basis of any letters received from the R.M. There is, by the way, in any letter I've received from any R.M., no suggestion, that I'm aware of, of influence peddling.

All the material that I have received has been referred to the proper department — the Department of Municipal Affairs (Urban) up until April 1 of this year and the Department of Municipal Affairs (Rural) subsequently thereto. They are dealing with a zoning matter and that matter has been controversial. It has been a dispute between two R.M.s. Incidentally, I note in the news reports that there is somehow a suggestion that the land in question is located within the R.M. which is writing. One of the interesting points is that the land is located in the neighboring R.M. and that is the nature of the dispute.

As I say, I have had a good number of conversations with my colleagues in the cabinet concerning this matter, and the matter of the dispute between the two R.M.s has been the subject of correspondence and continues to be the subject of active consideration by my ministers.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary to the Premier. You've had problems with this member before and I refer to the Norcan . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. If the member has a supplementary I'll accept it.

**MR. LANE:** — Given the track record, would you not admit that your limiting of your investigation and your lack of concern indicates a rather lackadaisical approach to what is a very serious matter?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I regard that as an innuendo of impropriety levelled against the member for Prince Albert, of which I say there is absolutely no evidence. A comment like that does no credit to the member for Qu'Appelle.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Jamming of TV Signals**

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre):** — In light of the recent court judgment handed down by Chief Justice Johnson, denying an injunction to Saskatoon Telecable to have Sask Tel not jam the receiving dish or station in Saskatoon and denying the

citizens of Saskatoon House of Commons' proceedings through a channel, I'd like to direct this to the minister in charge of Sask Tel . . . Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor or do six of them over there have the floor?

I would like to ask the minister in charge of Sask Tel what steps his department, or what steps he has taken to ensure that the citizens of Saskatoon can see House of Commons' proceedings?

**HON. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones):** — Mr. Speaker, there's very little that Sask Tel can do to ensure that the citizens of Saskatoon do now have the opportunity to see the House of Commons debates live. The reason for that is that we don't have under our control whether or not a program can be viewed. With this particular program the signal is available, and we are in the process of asking the Saskatoon Telecable people that they in fact allow the subscribers now to view the House of Commons debates. However there is very little that we can do to force them in any way to show the House of Commons debates.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask if he will be doing more than asking; if he will be very, very strongly urging that Mr. Forster not deny the citizens of Saskatoon and area (and I have had numerous complaints from them) the House of Commons' proceedings?

**MR. CODY:** — Mr. Speaker, the only thing we can do is try to convince Mr. Forster and Saskatoon Telecable people to in fact allow the subscribers now to enjoy this program. I am writing today (or my officials are) to their solicitors. I think it is only ethical we write to their solicitors due to the fact that we are in a court battle. They are writing to them asking if they would now not agree to allow the subscribers in Saskatoon to see the House of Commons' debates live, due to the fact that the injunction which they seek was not given. We are hopeful that this happens. Whether it will happen or not, I am not sure. I am hopeful that the subscribers in Saskatoon will have the opportunity. But if Saskatoon Telecable continues not to take our signal, there is really nothing that we can do. I would hope they do.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Telephones if he is under the impression that the actions and the words of members opposite over the past couple of weeks have severely damaged, or have done something which will deny the citizens of Saskatoon the ability to see the proceedings?

**MR. CODY:** — Well, not wanting to be political of course, . . . I certainly do think the actions of the opposition have in some way damaged the relationship here. Because I think the member for Wilkie, in his constant debate in the committee of the whole and in second reading, indicated on many occasions that he thought what Sask Tel was doing was completely inappropriate — completely wrong. I don't think it did anything to help mend relationships between Sask Tel and the subscribers in Saskatoon and in fact the Saskatoon Telecable people. I really believe that had the members opposite . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I wonder if we could have order while the minister finished his answer?

**MR. CODY:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, it simply shows . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**June 5, 1980.**

**MR. CODY:** — . . . and it clearly indicates today, one more time, that it's a pretty soft spot we have hit in the opposition here in that they know . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I will take the next question.

### **Investigation of Consultant's Report re R.M. Dispute**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — A question to the Premier. After receiving the correspondence which you have, did you investigate in any way why the report of the consultants which were hired was ignored; did you investigate that in your investigation?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the report of the consultants was ignored and I am advised by my colleagues that a number of reports have been received. There was a Rosenberg report which I gather was not ignored or was acted upon; and there were several other reports. So far as I am aware in resolving this dispute between the two R.M.s, no single report was followed but compromises on both sides were arrived at.

**MR. LANE:** — Can you explain why you did not investigate why the applications for development had been rejected? Can you tell us why you didn't investigate the government's change in position?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I advised this House that I investigated one matter; that is how a letter which was forwarded by me reached the hands of Mr. Karasiuk (apparently reached the hands of Mr. Karasiuk) because I was subsequently advised by Mr. Kelly that he had received it from Mr. Karasiuk. That is what I investigated. I had every confidence that other matters related to the zoning and the dispute as to the appropriate boundary between the R.M. of Lakeland and the R.M. of Paddockwood would be properly handled by the appropriate ministers. I have no reason to believe that this is not so.

In our government I have confidence in my colleagues. That proposition may come as a surprise to members opposite and I would understand why it came as a surprise to members opposite. But it certainly is my view of how to operate a government, and until some further evidence is offered as to inappropriate conduct by my ministerial colleagues, I will continue to repose confidence in them.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Mr. Premier, on three separate occasions in this Assembly you indicated you replied to a letter from Mr. Kelly back in September or October of last year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I am referring to the letter that you referred to on Tuesday, yesterday and again today, which you indicated today was not in any way a confidential matter. Would you then be prepared, Mr. Premier, to table that letter or admit that you never did reply to that letter in the first place?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to ask Mr. Kelly whether he has any objection to tabling the letter. As I say, it's addressed to me, to Mr. Smishek, to Mr. Bowerman and to Mr. Kaeding and it says, 'Dear Mr. Premier and ministers of the Crown'. I will read the reply in total. It's addressed to Mr. Kelly and it's dated October 11 and members opposite already have it. They already have it because it was attached to a letter that they were quoting from. The hon. member for Arm River already has it and he can show it to his colleagues.

It reads as follows:

To Mr. Lewis G. Kelly, etc.

On behalf of Premier Blakeney I am writing in reply to your letter of September 25, 1979, concerning zoning in Paddockwood. (And this is Kelly, reeve of Lakeland.) I note that your letter has been sent to the Hon. Walter Smishek, Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban), the Hon. Edgar Kaeding, Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural), who will be able to respond to your concerns about the current development. You have also written to the Hon. Ted Bowerman, who will be able to reply to your question about the future of the sewer lagoon.

The Premier is aware that this problem has been difficult to resolve in spite of the efforts of the Department of Municipal Affairs. Thank you for continuing to keep him informed.

Yours sincerely, D.M. Wallace, deputy minister to the Premier. Copies to Smishek, Kaeding, Bowerman, Feschuk.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this letter came back to me again, and it came back to me again quoted by the member for Arm River in a letter; it was attached to a letter from Mr. Karasiuk to Mr. Kelly. This letter was quoted in this House by the member for Arm River: 'It is regrettable that you must continue to find, etc., etc., quoted in this House. I have a copy of this letter too, which came to me from Mr. Kelly and is marked 'Personal and Confidential.' I point out that the members who were complaining about my making available to Mr. Feschuk a letter addressed to five ministers of the Crown had no compunction whatever in reading in this House a letter from Karasiuk to Kelly marked 'Personal and Confidential.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — A question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural). Given the minister's statement that the municipalities of Lakeland and Paddockwood will be left to solve the current problems at Emma and Christopher Lakes, and in view of the fact that the R.M. of Lakeland has accused the government of blackmail, I would like to (with the Speaker's indulgence) read a short quote:

Members of council and the executive of the Emma and Christopher cottage associations are in a state of shock following the meeting of the two councils with your deputy minister last Thursday night. But to compound the matter by suggesting that for each lot developed in the R.M. of Lakeland at Christopher and Emma Lakes approval will be granted for a lot to be developed in the R.M. of Paddockwood in the lakes areas is nothing short of blackmail.

How does the minister expect to see the situation resolved when the two R.M.s have been frustrated by his government to the point where they accuse him of blackmail?

**HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural)):** — Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the people who wrote that letter were somewhat misinformed, and I would almost like to say deliberately misinformed. The quotations from that letter are not accurate. The agreement we have made, or at least the discussions we have had, with the R.M.s

indicate that we are saying to them that we want them to agree to joint zoning by-laws which will allow them to make decisions jointly on development in that lake area. We have not said to them that there will be one lot for one lot in each municipality. We have said that there must be an opportunity given to have development in both municipalities. We have not said there would be lot for lot development. This is a matter which is going to have to be discussed between the two R.M.s; hopefully they can get together rationally and make a decision whereby they can provide development in that area.

Part of the argument that the member for Kindersley is making is that there are ecological problems and we should not be allowing any more development. That may be true. The R.M.s have that study in their hands and they can use that study to make whatever decisions they want to make. But if they make the decision that there should be more development, then we are saying there should be no reason why equal opportunity should not be given to the R.M. of Paddockwood to develop in that area also. There is nothing to say that one area should have a restricted right to develop.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural). You indicated on previous occasions, Mr. Minister, that there was in fact an agreement between the two R.M.s. I take it now you're withdrawing that remark and that you simply had discussions and there is no agreement?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Yes, I think that one could say that. There is no agreement written in blood which says this is what they must do. We, through our community planning division, will ensure that no permission is given for further development unless certain specific agreements are made. And those agreements will be fairly specific.

### **Postponement of Surgery at St. Paul's Hospital**

**MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — A question to the Minister of Health. On the news this morning it was reported that St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon had to postpone two open-heart surgery operations yesterday due to the lack of staff. Would you consider open-heart surgery as an emergency situation?

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received my medical degree, so I would refrain from making a medical judgment on that particular case.

I want to inform the member that that information is not accurate. My understanding is that there were no postponements at St. Paul's. There was one postponement yesterday at the University Hospital. Open-heart surgery was to be performed yesterday on one of the cases. That was postponed until today — that surgery is being done today. I can tell the member on the other postponement, which surgery will take place next week — I'm very closely related to that particular case. The patient is related to my family, and I regret very much that the postponement had to take place, but I am told he is in no danger, and that the surgery will take place just as quickly as the medical profession see fit to perform that operation.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, are you telling me that the news in Saskatchewan is not accurate? Would you now agree that the slow down by the interns and residents is having a serious effect on medical care in this province?

**MR. ROLFES:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with that. I indicated to the member

yesterday that all emergency cases will be dealt with just as expeditiously as the medical profession see fit. I am told again by my officials, and by the administrators of the hospital that no one is in emergency danger at this particular time, and they will monitor the situation case by case. If they feel surgical operations have to take place they will be done immediately. I am told in this particular case this individual has had the heart condition for a number of years. It was convenient for him to come into Saskatoon at this particular time, and a delay of a few days is not going to have any medical effect at all on the individual.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, a supplementary. I referred not to the case which you mention at the University Hospital, but to the two at St. Paul's Hospital which were postponed yesterday. You assured me yesterday that in emergency situations, interns and residents would work. What are you prepared to do now to see that the interns and residents do come in to work and deal with emergency health care in the province?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the member is aware that we do have an additional problem at this particular time in that some of the residents are writing exams; some of them are out of the province writing exams at this time, so there is an additional problem. But I can assure the member again that all those people who require emergency care, or emergency surgery, will be taken care of, and the particular impasse which we have right now will not have the dramatic effect on any individual whom you are referring to.

I can also indicate to the member that my understanding is that a conciliator has been assigned to the impasse, and Sig Walters will be going to work at 11 o'clock next Monday, I believe.

### **The Labour Standards Act re Interns and Residents**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Unionest Party):** — I have a question to the Minister of Health. Would the minister explain to this Assembly why the provisions of The Labour Standards Act do not apply to the interns and residents in the province of Saskatchewan in that they are required to work overtime without reimbursement?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question in any detail. That should have been directed to the Minister of Labour, but as far as I understand the situation, they are exempt because the working conditions which residents and interns have is part of their educational course. They are students and employees at the same time and therefore, The Labour Standards Act does not apply to them as it would in other cases.

**MR. COLLVER:** — A new question, Mr. Speaker. The minister will be aware that there are other examples of students who are working, who are required to obey the regulations of The Labour Standards Act. An example of that would be the students at the technological institute in Saskatoon who have to go out and weld and are students at the same time. But the rules of The Labour Standards Act must apply to them. Would the minister examine the possibility with the Department of Labour of seeing that The Labour Standards Act is applied uniformly and fairly throughout Saskatchewan, which would end the difficulties and problems that the interns and residents seem to be having in the province?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think the interns and residents would not look very positively on that particular approach, because it would lengthen their course extensively. I think that they would object to what the member is suggesting. Therefore,

**June 5, 1980.**

I think that there would . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And maybe they might quit striking. You want it both ways.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I think he's answered the question for me so I don't need to investigate it any further.

## **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):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, like the ongoing saga of The Edge of Night, here we are again. Will the evil NDP get their way? Will the monopolistic majority win in Saskatchewan against the minorities in the province? Tune in again tomorrow, same time, same station, same party . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Same words.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Oh, not quite the same words.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I go on today with the body of my remarks, I wish to open with a line from John A. Macdonald, which he said some hundred years ago. He said, now that I have concluded the preliminary remarks, I wish to get into the main body of my argument. Mr. Speaker, that's precisely what I intend to do.

I have been listening for some considerable time, and waiting with eager anticipation, for the members to my right to stand up for their principles and pick up on the one overriding issue that Bill No. 105 poses to the people of Saskatchewan. This morning a member of the NDP caucus, who shall remain nameless, approached me in the corridor of this building and said to me, keep it up Dick; you're doing the NDP a terrific favor because the more you're out there on this bill, the more you detract from the Conservatives and the more you build up the NDP. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the expression of one NDP caucus member this morning who will remain nameless.

I have been waiting, Mr. Speaker, as I said, with eager enthusiasm for the members to my right to stand up for what they believe in and to take the main body of this bill and what this bill stands for and present it to the people of Saskatchewan as it should be presented. That is, I have been waiting for them to say that with the overwhelming power the NDP government has taken unto itself over the last nine years, now the last vestige of control over the NDP is starting to be attacked by the NDP. The members to my right have said repeatedly in this House that the Crown corporations committee doesn't work to investigate the work of Crown corporations. How many times have they said it in this House? Well, just in this session alone at least a dozen. They have said that the NDP has taken power unto itself, and I am going through this morning to indicate how many times the NDP has attacked the people of Saskatchewan with increasing powers provided to the cabinet and to that ruling clique.

And I have been, Mr. Speaker, as I said, waiting eagerly for one entire week for the Progressive Conservatives under their new leadership, I have been waiting with



enthusiasm for them to stand up and take this issue to the people, to bring about a real understanding among the people about what the NDP is trying to do to the people of Saskatchewan. One entire week they have had to bring that to the attention of the people. Mr. Speaker, it's coming to the point where obviously they are not going to do that. They are not going to point that out to the people of the province. I believe it must be pointed out.

I believe, and the member for Swift Current believes, that the overriding issue of Bill No. 105 is the power-hungry NDP. That, Mr. Speaker, is the overriding example of what Bill No. 105 will do to the province of Saskatchewan. That is what it's doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main body after the preliminaries, I must say that there are two or three other items which I do intend to touch on at a later date. One is that Bill No. 105 is against the principles of equity. I know Mr. Speaker will appreciate that I am without the research help and secretarial help that other parties in this legislature have. He will also know that from time to time in the past week I have had occasion to read from the odd text, but not very much. The vast majority has been a cappella. I would say to Mr. Speaker that I have had one or two speeches prepared for me by outsiders, and I do intend to deliver them in this debate. One is entitled The Growth of Democratic Government, because we have stated in our amendment, and we believe, that Bill No. 105 is against the principles of democracy. And the other is how Bill No. 105 attacks the principles of natural justice. Those speeches will be delivered in due course, Mr. Speaker.

But I would say in this main argument, the main objection to Bill No 105 is the power that the NDP is trying to take unto itself in the province of Saskatchewan. Now I have a great deal to say on that, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that other members will want to enter into this debate. I know that other members who believe in the principles of natural justice, and who believe in the principles of good sound debate, will recognize, Mr. Speaker, clearly and easily that because of the rules of this Assembly and because the Unionest caucus is only two members, the only possible way for the Leader of the Unionest Party to be able to rebut any arguments brought forward by other members of this Assembly in this debate is to be able to come back into the debate. But because of the rules of this Assembly, unless I am allowed an adjourned debate I will not be able to come back in to rebut the argument. And the principles of good debate everywhere, every member will be aware, insist that whoever is putting forward an argument should have an opportunity to rebut the corresponding arguments.

So, Mr. Speaker, that having been said, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS – 2**

Collver

Ham

**NAYS – 35**

Pepper

Allen

Smishek

June 5, 1980.

Romanow  
McArthur  
Mostoway  
MacAuley  
Vickar  
Cody  
Nelson  
Lingenfelter  
Larter  
Swan  
Andrew

Baker  
Shillington  
Banda  
Feschuk  
Rolfes  
Prebble  
Engel  
White  
Lane  
Muirhead  
McLeod

Skoberg  
MacMurchy  
Hammersmith  
Byers  
Cowley  
Long  
Poniatowski  
Solomon  
Taylor  
Katzman

**MR. COLLVER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am interested to see that we are not prepared to proceed with the people's business, but rather with Bill 105. It appears there may be some waning of support in terms of the opposition to Bill 105. The adjournment vote started out 40 to 2; then it was 39 to 2. Today it is 35 to 2.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! It is not within the order of the debate for the member to reflect on the vote which has been taken. I think that is what the member is doing now. He is not debating the principle of the bill. I think he should stick to the principle of the bill.

**MR. COLLVER:** — O.K., Mr. Speaker. The reason I did that (to explain it to you) was to indicate the support for the principle of the bill. Perhaps that is out of order. That is why I did it and I accept your ruling, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, just before I get into the main body of my remarks, I want to read for the members who are in attendance (because I know that once I get into the main body of my remarks, there will be a mad dash for the door) two brief letters which I have received of recent date. One was of a very personal nature; the second one was received by the member for Swift Current. This is pertaining to Bill 105.

The first of these notes, as I said, is a personal note from a personal friend, on an entirely different matter, from an eminent judge in western Canada. I am not going to say who that judge is, because they are not allowed to involve themselves in politics. I do want to read his remarks because they are of some interest and pertain to this bill. He talks about missing us as a family and if we are coming to his city, to please let him know.

Keep up with the good work on the filibuster. I agree with your position entirely (while in truth I don't wish union with the United States) as it represents (he says, referring to the bill) a dangerous precedent in Canadian legislative history.

It is told that Louis XIV had a prophet brought to him to hear of the future. After some reluctance the seer gave the king some prophetic advice: 'Do not build prisons lest thy children inhabit them' — a prophecy which the NDP government might well heed.

Just a personal note sent to me on an entirely different matter. Here's a note received by the member for Swift Current to indicate the perception of people to Bill No. 105. This is from Alberta, by the way; not even Saskatchewan — from Alberta.

Dear Dennis: Just a note to say that your and Dick Collver's names are popping up quite frequently on our local radio station. There were two one-hour open line shows getting people's opinions regarding your new party. There were a number of calls supporting western separation but the idea of joining the U.S. came up pretty cold. A caller, who phoned in saying it was just unheard of to think someone could organize a party to join the U.S., prompted me to call in saying that Conservatives in Saskatchewan ten years ago were also unheard of too. Is it true that the government is passing legislation to make your party invalid? We are of the understanding that legislation is being drawn up so that 'no party can be formed or financed which will cause a break-up of Canada'. Are we reading it right?

After hearing Mr. Blakeney say on the Watson Report program that Dick Collver is not a man to be taken lightly, legislation to this effect doesn't surprise me. That is the only way the NDP knows how to stop you two. It is sad to see Saskatchewan have to resort to governmental powers to stop people's ideals. This is something that would be more expected to happen in the U.S.S.R. and your big fight is going to be freedom of speech. Good luck in your endeavors.

But I repeat, your big fight will be for freedom of speech and organization. If the government passes legislation against your ideas, keep up that fight. Ex-Saskatchewanites, Jim and Shirley Runzer.

P.S. We hope we don't hear in the future that you and Dick have been banished to the salt mines of Chaplin for ten years hard labor. About six years ago, Jim was almost thrown out of his own house for making the statement we should join the U.S. You have a rough road ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the perception that people have of this bill. It is not, Mr. Speaker, as I've said time and time again, whether or not a person ran in the last provincial election. We have shown that time after time after time in this debate. That is not the issue. The issue is whether or not an individual has the right to believe in any suggestion, providing they are prepared to work within the laws of the country. That's the issue.

Now Mr. Speaker, if – and I say if because I am still convinced that the NDP members opposite, and even the Conservatives to my right, will come to their senses before this bill passes; I am still convinced of it – so I say if they pass this bill, they are building their own prison and if they build that prison, every citizen of the province of Saskatchewan has to live in it.

Think about what has happened in the province of Saskatchewan since 1971. You may believe, Mr. Speaker, and others in this Assembly certainly believe . . . Just as a quick aside I'm pleased to see the member for Prince Albert return to the Chamber; it's a pleasure to have him involved in the debate. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that. Well, you see, freedom of speech and association, for the benefit of the member for Moose Jaw North (and I will get into the main body of my remarks if we keep having this kind of aside), can be restricted, Mr. Speaker, by guns. They can be restricted by barbed wire. They can be restricted by red tape. But the real issue in this entire debate is the final and complete straw regarding the basic freedoms in Saskatchewan. That is the last possible resort for anyone who doesn't believe in total government takeover by the province and in total government domination of all of the means of production. The last possible stop

**June 5, 1980.**

against that is this Assembly. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the very fundamental core of the issue in Bill No. 105.

Think about what has happened since 1971. I recall when the NDP came to power in 1971, they said it was because of the autocratic government provided by the then premier, Ross Thatcher, that they had to enter into the governmental powers of Saskatchewan. I recall the advertisements, Mr. Speaker, that were shown and the greed they said Ross Thatcher's government perpetrated. I recall the advertisements with great piles of money going out to the Prince Albert pulp mill, and with great mounds of money being handed out to the private enterprise friends of the then Liberal government. What was the NDP's reaction to that? They took over all power in the pulp and paper business in the province of Saskatchewan. They eliminated all the small mills in northern Saskatchewan and left the pulp and lumber industry in the hands of one monolithic private corporation in the case of pulp (the Prince Albert pulp mill), and one monolithic corporation in the case of lumber (Simpson Timber). All the rest was in governmental hands.

In my constituency of Nipawin alone, some 80 individuals, small businessmen in the province of Saskatchewan, were eliminated as a result of this governmental takeover of the lumber and timber industry and the pulp business. Eighty individuals lost their means of livelihood because the government took over this business.

What has been the result of that takeover? There was a loss of jobs in the northern part of Saskatchewan; a loss of jobs for native people in the northern part of Saskatchewan; a diminution of the lumber industry in our province; and a diminution of the ability of our northern forests to produce means by which people might live decent lives in the province of Saskatchewan. Oh, we hear many things about the Carrot River pulp mill. We hear many things about the Meadow Lake operation. But we also hear time and time again of government shut-downs at Big River, government slow-downs at Carrot River. And where are the little guys? Where are the small businessmen, where are the small entrepreneurs who used to go out in the bush? They're no longer there. So here we have three giant operators in the northern part of Saskatchewan – Simpson Timber, Prince Albert Pulp, and the Government of Saskatchewan. Far and away the largest is the Government of Saskatchewan. Oh, they are creating jobs in the North all right – government jobs. They are creating opportunities in the North all right – paper pushers' jobs for I don't know how many.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. The member is speaking about a subject which I believe is out of order in this debate. Bill 105 which is before us deals with the nature and amount of grants to the third party, among some other things. I cannot, and am not able to make the connection between what the member is talking about and this bill before us. Therefore, what the member is saying is out of order, and I ask the member to bring himself to order.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Right, Mr. Speaker. And for your benefit, I certainly will make the connection between Bill 105 and what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that Bill 105 is a takeover of power by the NDP government by eliminating the opportunity for minority parties in this legislature to present their cases fairly and reasonably. I'm saying that that takeover of power is analogous to other takeovers of power that the NDP government has perpetrated in the province of Saskatchewan. I'm giving examples of how detrimental that takeover of power in the timber industry was to the people of Saskatchewan. I believe that the same kind of takeover of power by the use of Bill 105 will have the same kind of detrimental effect on the people of Saskatchewan.

Now those, Mr. Speaker, are the linkages between what I have been saying and the main body of my argument. I said that this morning. The main body of my argument against Bill 105, in addition to these other matters which I've mentioned, is the fact that the NDP government has taken power unto itself. The last vestige of control over that power is the legislature in the province. If minority parties are not allowed to develop on the same basis as every other party in this province, just because of what they believe in, the detrimental effect on the people of Saskatchewan will be felt and felt sorely. I think I'm entitled, Mr. Speaker, to draw that to the attention of the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker will recall in Beauchesne's, of course, that the member is to get the benefit of the doubt in terms of relevance. I've linked, I believe to anyone's satisfaction, the talk about whether the NDP, which is the majority power in this legislative Chamber, which is the majority government in this legislative Chamber, is taking its position as majority and attempting to thwart the wishes of the minority. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to carry that a step further to state that the NDP has done this before, and I think I'm entitled to do that.

Now I want to go back to what I was saying, Mr. Speaker. I hope that has linked it for Mr. Speaker. I hope that has linked it for you, Sir, so that it will show you the point that I am attempting to make about the power base of the NDP and about how they are increasing this power in the province. Mr. Speaker will be aware that in the preceding time of this debate I have not mentioned this fact. And I said earlier in the debate that I hadn't done so because I was waiting for the Progressive Conservatives to do so. Since they have chosen not to do so, I think it is absolutely essential that this particular matter, before I am precluded from debate in this legislature, be brought to the attention of the people of the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that the timber industry is certainly one where the NDP took over all power.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I have cautioned the member once about talking about the forest and timber industry in northern Saskatchewan. I do not consider that to be an analogous situation with the bill that is before us. In my mind, an analogous situation is the Thomas Berger case which the member for Nipawin mentioned in his speech earlier, because according to the speech the member put forward, grants to Mr. Thomas Berger for postage or some such thing were cut off by the appropriate jurisdictional body, the House of Representatives or whatever it may have been. I made my decision about the forest industry in northern Saskatchewan not being part of the principle of this bill. I intend to stick to that and I'll ask the member not to debate the fact that I have made that ruling.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Fair enough, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker will recall, of course, the takeover by the NDP of the potash industry in the province of Saskatchewan. He will recall that the NDP was faced with court battles such as it is going to be faced with in terms of Bill No. 105, was faced with the fact that companies and citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, so it said, refused to pay their taxes and refused to pay the due that the NDP government thought it would have from the potash industry. Mr. Speaker will be aware that the NDP government chose to bring in legislation which effectively threatened the potash industry in Saskatchewan with nationalization.

Now here was a group of individuals, a group of people, a group of corporations in the province of Saskatchewan who were a minority group. The Unionest Party in

**June 5, 1980.**

Saskatchewan is a minority group. Here was a group of individuals that the NDP government decided to attack. It attacked them because they lost in the courts. It attacked them because it said it wasn't getting paid the taxes which were due. What happened? More power was placed in the hands of the NDP majority government in Saskatchewan. More power!

What was the only check on that power, as ineffective as it was? The only check on the NDP power grab in the potash industry in Saskatchewan was the legislative Chamber in which the Liberals, the official opposition, participated in a filibuster that brought the matter to the attention of the people of the province. The people of the province in 1978, unfortunately I say, accepted the NDP government and accepted that move by the NDP government to take over the potash business in Saskatchewan. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it was only as a result of action in this legislative Chamber, not only by the official opposition but also by the minority Conservatives in this Chamber and outside this Chamber, that this matter was brought to the attention of the people. The people believed that somehow in some way there was a check on the NDP government's power grab in the potash business.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you will recall the events that occurred as a result. As a result of that power grab in the potash business, hundreds of millions of dollars had to be borrowed on the New York market. They were borrowed at a time when the Canadian dollar was at par or higher with the U.S. dollar? And today, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian dollar has dropped by some 18 points since that point in time and the people of Saskatchewan have had to suffer as a direct result of that power grab.

But more than that, how have the people suffered as a result of a majority government taking over 55 per cent of the means of production in the potash business using its majority power? Well, they have suffered because more than half of the jobs in the province of Saskatchewan are now in the potash industry and are now only with the government. But those workers, those individuals working for the potash business in the province of Saskatchewan have come, I think, to accept that fact. Why have they accepted that fact? Because they think in the back of their minds that somehow the Saskatchewan legislature will protect their best interests as citizens of the province of Saskatchewan.

Potash workers in Saskatchewan are a minority group. This Bill No. 105, in attacking the rights of individual members of this legislative Chamber retroactively, means that any member of the Assembly in the future, who stands in this Assembly and states the position of a potash worker succinctly and well, can have his rights and privileges and basic fundamental human rights withdrawn by the majority in order to make him kowtow to the wishes of the majority. The potash workers themselves will have that final arbiter, the one they believe will protect their rights, placed in jeopardy.

When the NDP government in the potash business controls not only 55 per cent of the corporate actions in the field of potash but also controls totally the production of potash and also sets the rules and regulations for labor standards, for the ability of trade unions to function, for how the potash company of Saskatchewan shall conduct itself as it relates to the potash workers . . . As a matter of fact, every single rule, regulation or law under which the potash corporation in Saskatchewan functions is under the direct control of the NDP cabinet and the NDP majority government. But the people believe that, somehow, in some way (even though all that power in the potash area now rests with the NDP), their legislators in this Assembly, whether they be in the

NDP backbench, or whether they be on the opposition side of the House, can and will if necessary rise in their place and speak against that majority, if they believe honestly and sincerely that the majority is not acting in the best interests of the workers in the potash business.

The member for Regina Victoria, or the member for Regina Rosemont, may from time to time feel so strongly on behalf of some of his constituents, whether they be a majority or a minority, that he will feel compelled to rise in this legislature and speak out on behalf of that minority group. But if Bill 105 passes this legislative Chamber, no citizen in the province will be able or want to believe that the legislature is sacrosanct, that the legislature is the final arbiter. And those members, as a result of the passage of Bill 105, and seeing what a majority government can do to minority members, will think twice – no, they'll think 10 times – before they ever rise in their places to speak out on behalf of minority opinions in their constituencies.

The potash workers, therefore, in Saskatchewan, even though they have accepted the potash takeover, even though they have accepted the NDP government's control of everything now in the potash industry, from the company through the rules through the regulations through the laws through the orders in council – the total and complete domination of that industry – will no longer believe that they are protected from that majority rule, if you pass Bill 105. Mr. Speaker, if you can do it to one member of the legislature, the majority can do it to all.

You may feel that this won't happen. You may sit in your chair and say, oh yes, but the majority would never do that to me. I might have said that myself, before the member for Biggar introduced Bill 105. And you might sit in your chair and say, oh yes, of course, but I am a member of the majority party, and because I'm a member of the majority party, the majority party wouldn't do that to me. I am one of their boys.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that in this very Legislative Assembly, it has been done to one of the NDP boys. I refer to a former Speaker of this Assembly, Mr. Dewhurst. I think every single member of this Assembly will recognise what happened to Mr. Dewhurst, who had to sit in his place as the Speaker of this Assembly, while the controlling group sent their minions out to his constituency and worked in his constituency against him while he had to sit in this Chamber doing his duty. He returned to his own constituency to find that he no longer had the nomination, and all he was doing was his duty.

It has happened within the NDP itself. So don't think that you are immune because you are a member of the majority party. Don't think that you are immune to that kind of attack because you sit on the government side of this House. You are not immune to that kind of attack. None of us ever is. The only protection against anarchy and totalitarianism, the only preservation of freedom and a free will is eternal vigilance.

Put yourself in the role or in the steps or in the boots of the potash workers in the province of Saskatchewan – a minority group, at the moment a privileged minority group, a very well-paid privileged minority group. But the day may come for the potash workers of the province of Saskatchewan, as the day came for the hearing aid dealers in Saskatchewan, who only numbered 37, when the majority in the name of the majority enacts regulations and rules that may wipe them out.

The member responsible for education tests in Saskatchewan asks what this has to do with Bill No. 105. Well, let me explain what it has to do with the bill for your benefit.

**June 5, 1980.**

In our judgment, perhaps not in yours, Bill No. 105 is an attack on minority members of this legislature. It is an attempt to coerce members of this legislature to believe precisely what you want them to believe. I have said that before. But the main argument, the main discussion on Bill No. 105 pertains to the ever-increasing powers of the NDP government and the deterioration of the only institution which holds that majority power in check and that's this legislative Chamber. That's what potash workers have to do with Bill No. 105. That's what the takeover of the potash industry has to do with Bill No. 105.

If for example, Mr. Speaker, the majority government in Saskatchewan were held in check by any other institution or organization, if it were not able to pass laws that protected its own to the detriment of others, if there were these other checks and balances, then it would have nothing to do with Bill No. 105. But under our parliamentary system, the only check against a majority government's rule is either built-in rights in the constitution, which we do not have or an active, and in fact intelligent, completely free opposition to that majority rule. That's what it has to do with Bill No. 105.

If (and I say if) the NDP government had not in its wisdom decided to take over the potash industry (as one example and I'm going to give others), or to take over the control of the timber in the North (as another example, which I won't go into any further because Mr. Speaker asked me not to), if they had decided to leave those in the private sector, then this might have nothing to do with Bill No. 105. Then perhaps the legislature in the province of Saskatchewan would not be the last vestige of hope for people whose rights may be taken away . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't. I have not said that 100 times. As a matter of fact, I have waited for one entire week for the Conservatives to attack the NDP for bringing this bill into play, and to attack the NDP on the basis that Bill No. 105 is nothing more than an NDP power play. I have waited for the Conservatives to do it; they decided not to do it so I feel I have to do it myself. I have not suggested one time, in the last week of debate, that this was an NDP power play. I have talked about the majority in this legislature but I have not talked about the NDP and their takeover of power in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it is important. This is the last place, in so far as individual citizens are concerned, where power hungry, power mad, power greedy individuals who take over . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, we must be striking a nerve here; we're getting a lot more action, Mr. Speaker, than what we have had in the last 3, 4 or 20 hours of debate. We must be striking a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, to keep your sanity! Well, the one thing you could do to keep your sanity, quite frankly, is to allow an adjourned debate. Then for goodness sakes, all you would have to do is go on with the people's business and allow a person a chance to get back and rebut what you may say, and that's fair enough. But you decide not to do it, every single day. Don't tell me you're tired of listening to me. If you're tired of listening to me, allow an adjourned debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to return to what I was saying about the potash industry in Saskatchewan, and the takeover of power. They took over power in the potash business through blackmail tactics – precisely what is being attempted in Bill No. 105! I'm sure the member for Moosomin wants to continue to debate from his chair, but perhaps he might wait until he has an opportunity at some point in the future to enter into the debate. I notice one of the members opposite said 60 years; well, that might be the case. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know yet, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what the book of records says. This isn't a record-breaking contest; this isn't an attempt to break any record; this is an attempt to bring to the attention . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .



**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I would call the hon. members to order here. We can't be carrying on conversations back and forth across the floor. Members when speaking should direct their remarks to the Chair.

And just on the one point that was raised on the question of sanity, it isn't a condition of being a member of this House that you have to be sane. I call on the hon. Member for Nipawin.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I couldn't agree more with your remarks on sanity. That's a fact; it is not a condition of employment and that's for sure.

Mr. Speaker, I might just draw to the attention of the hon. members that — I'm sorry the Attorney General is not here, but for the information of the hon. members who are here — the Attorney General and I share an interest in boxing. We both believe it is the ultimate sport, and, Mr. Speaker, I must say to you, every time he comes in here the Attorney General says, give up, Dick. I only say to him, remember the one great Canadian heavyweight champion, George Chuvalo . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm going to return to George Chuvalo. The one the member for Saskatoon Centre mentioned from his chair — I don't think I'm going to comment on that particular bout, although I might have a few things to say.

The only reason George Chuvalo is remembered as the Canadian heavyweight champion is that he was able to go the distance with an opponent whom, it was obvious to everyone, he could be beaten by, and that was Muhammed Ali. He went against this opponent and everyone told him, you're going to be whipped because the man is too good, and he was too good. The man was and is the greatest heavyweight champion in the history of the world, but, Mr. Speaker, George Chuvalo went the distance with him and he's remembered for that.

Perhaps I don't want to be remembered for anything other than bringing sanity to this House. The Speaker himself . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I wouldn't join your party. Honestly, I swear to you on my word of honor, I wouldn't cross again — one switch in a lifetime. That's all you're allowed. I've switched parties once; you're only allowed one switch (although some have done so two or three times, but I don't happen to be one of those). But let me tell you, you would be the last party in the world . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order!

**MR. COLLVER:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know. Mr. Speaker has asked for order. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I'm still in the ring. I don't know what round this is; it might be about round number 7 in a 15-round bout. I don't know what the score is at the moment; the eventual outcome is that you have the ultimate knockout punch. It's right there in the green book of rules. You just call closure and it's over. That's all you have to do. If you want me to stop talking, give me an adjourned debate or call closure. Just like that — quick like a bunny. The knockout punch — bang, whoosh, down on the floor I go. Just like that.

O.K., Mr. Speaker, back to the potash industry in Saskatchewan. What other ramifications are there of this NDP power grab without the checks and balances offered by this Assembly, by a free Assembly which is incapable of the majority's using its power to blackmail minority members?

What else is at stake? Well, I say the very essence of the trade union movement is at stake. The trade union movement in Saskatchewan is not only dependent upon the majority, but trade unionists are starting to find out, in some areas, that having a majority government doesn't always ensure a fair and impartial hearing. Being the backers of the NDP, the trade unionists are finding they don't always get a totally fair and totally impartial hearing from that majority government. This is because from time to time, in order to maintain power, the NDP is required to take certain steps in its majority position which run contrary to the interests of the trade union movement. For example, in the recent dairy workers' strike the majority NDP, together with others in this Assembly, was required in the public interest to legislate the dairy workers back to work. The trade unionists, a minority in Saskatchewan, are very concerned. What is their only hope if the majority who they were backing politically, and feeding politically, suddenly decide that to retain power we have to get rid of our principles of the trade union movement, and enact that kind of legislation many, many times. Their only hope, the only possibility for them, if they want to stay within the law (and I'm presuming in all these remarks, Mr. Speaker that the minority groups – the potash workers, the dairy workers, wish to operate within the law) is that if the majority government goes too far, a minority group on the other side will, without blackmail, without coercion, stand up and fight in this legislature at least for long enough to block prohibitive legislation that would wipe out their rights. And that's what they believe in. They believe in that so strongly that they are prepared from time to time to accept the majority government's rule, and to accept the majority government's decisions.

But if you pass Bill 105 the workers' union in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and others, because of your total domination and control of that industry, will no longer believe that it is possible for legislators in this Assembly to be free to stand up for what they believe in. They will believe that the moment the majority has to take that kind of decision and a minority member stands up to oppose it, the government will bring in a bill like Bill 105 to wipe out their rights as free members of this Assembly.

That's what they will believe; I don't care how much politicking you do. I don't know how many times you go out there, and I don't care how many times you go out there, and say the principle of the bill was to take money away from those guys who supported the break-up of Canada. That is not how people understand this bill. The average person in Red Deer . . . These are only a couple, I could bring you dozens of this kind of letter, like one by Howard McConnell, the law professor at the university – dozens, just addressed to me. That's not counting the ones addressed to the member for Swift Current. That's what people understand this bill is all about. You can go and try to sell them on the other junk for 25 years, and you won't sell them. They know that to be true. If you take away that one hope which people have that somehow this legislature controls your autocratic, all-powerful approach to government, you as individual members will suffer accordingly.

The Progressive Conservative Party has, since 1973, been trying to convince the people of the province that these government takeovers are out of order; that the government taking all power unto itself is wrong. I know because I was out there trying to do it myself. Time after time after time since 1973, I received the identical response from people across the spectrum of this province. Why are you so worried about the potash takeover, Dick; you always can control them in the legislature? Why are you so worried about the elimination of the timber industry, Dick; we have the legislature to protect our rights?

But, Mr. Speaker, if the members do not believe that that is precisely what the people of this province and the people in their own constituencies in fact believe, I submit they should go and ask them. I submit they should ask them whether that's what they believe. I submit that's what they should ask when they say, why were you prepared to support our takeover of potash and our takeover in the timber industry? (I'll get on to some of the other takeovers in a minute.) They will find that almost to a man and to a woman they will say, because we have the protection of the legislature of Saskatchewan; we have opposition and individual members even on the government side who, if they go too far, can stand up against a majority decision. And they will say, because we get a vote every four years.

I'm going to get on to that in a moment. I'm going to get on to the so-called vote that people get every four years relative to an all-powerful government that can attack individual members of this legislature and attempt to blackmail them into its kind of thinking.

But I say to every political mind (because most of the minds in this Chamber are political) that it is the worst kind of politics to attack people where they live. It is the worst kind of politics to take away people's hope that they live in a free country. That's the worst kind.

We couldn't convince them from 1973 through 1978 that these takeovers were not in their interest and I told you why we couldn't convince them that the takeovers were not in their interest. But every one of those people out there who has been alerted to the dangers of government takeover can be sold that product, if you alert them to the fact that not even the legislature or its members are any more sacred than the potash companies, or the timber companies, or the poor guys in northern Saskatchewan who used to cut timber and used to have sawmills – whether it's I who am doing the selling, or whether it's the Conservatives who are doing the selling, or whether it's the Liberals who are doing the selling, or whether it's another party that is doing the selling. That's a product that can be sold in this province. Even the legislature is no longer sacred from the monolithic majority.

If I were a potash worker in the province of Saskatchewan today, I would be darned frightened by what government has done. I would be darned frightened about my future. I would be darned frightened about any government that has total and complete control over my means of livelihood without any opportunity for me to have any say whatsoever, none at all.

Some jocular member from across the way suggested Mr. Speaker, about IMCC. The alternative with IMCC is that the worker who works for IMCC can at least come to the government to appeal. But what does the poor guy who works for PCS do? Does he go to IMCC to appeal? No, because they have no possible way of redressing the problem. That is what we are trying to say. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

For the sake of the member for Wilkie, they didn't open up anything there. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is all-powerful in its area. Because it is directly controlled by government (all of the rules), no potash worker can have his rights helped and stood up for. He can't appeal to the government because they run it. But somewhere in the back of his mind, as I said, he has always had the belief that the legislature of this province would protect his rights. But now not even the legislature is sacred; not even the legislature is safe.

**June 5, 1980.**

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — So long as the NDP is in power, they are protected.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who said that?

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in taking you back a little further and taking you to another area of government takeover. That is The Natural Products Marketing Act and the way it came about. That, Mr. Speaker, was NDP government control of the farmers and the hog producers. . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And you know, the member opposite says to me, talk to the hog producers. I am going to say to him, which ones do you want me to talk to, the ones who are in business now or the ones who have gone out of business? Because let me tell you, it is the minority that is in business now; it is the majority which is out of business as a result of The Natural Products Marketing Act. . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

You see, Mr. Speaker, there is not even an understanding there. From over 1 million hogs a year production to 383,000 — I say (and I have said for some time), that was a takeover of the farm business to the detriment of the people of the province, to the detriment of the few people who were producing hogs in the province. Today, most of them are out of business. Now that is a government takeover. That was the NDP taking power to itself.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hogwash.

**MR. COLLVER:** — And what about the hogwash of the few producers who are left, saying it is a wonderful thing for them? Do you know why they think it is a wonderful thing for them? Because the vast majority of them were NDP supporters. That is why they think it is a wonderful thing for them. They are part of the majority. That, Mr. Speaker, brings us back to the attitude of Bill No. 105: believe as we do and we will protect your rights. If everybody in the province were NDPers, we would protect all their rights. But let you be a little different; let you think for yourself; let you be some poor minority guy who is in the hog producing business . . . And I can name you dozens — dozens and dozens — who stood before this legislative Chamber, who stood before the member for Kelsey-Tisdale with tears in their eyes saying, don't put us out of business. Don't do this to our families. And they said, you're not NDPers; you don't think like we do. Get out of business. That is the point of Bill No. 105. Think like we do. Act like we do. Talk like we do. Goose step like we do. And we will be right in there with you. Goose step with us fellows and we will protect your rights. But have a different idea, have any kind of a different idea, and, Mr. Speaker, . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Isn't this fun, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — I'm having a little difficulty, believe it or not, hearing the hon. member for Nipawin, and I'd ask all hon. members to allow the hon. member for Nipawin to continue. The member for Nipawin.

**MR. COLLVER:** — Mr. Speaker, you can see in your absence that there was a little frivolity from time to time. The point is that when the NDP government holds all this power in its hands, if it cannot protect the rights of those citizens who refuse to go along, or who don't want to go along with your ideas, or who don't want to dress like the Minister of Telephones, who don't want to do that, I say to you that those citizens have no more protection under the law . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I don't know where they stand. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I didn't.

Mr. Speaker, by the time I was finished with the battle against the NDP I didn't have a

whole heck of a lot of money to put anywhere, and that I can tell you. As a result of the member for Saskatoon Centre yelling 'Switzerland' and yelling 'Bessborough' for about three years, it was difficult for me to find any business partners from then on. But I prevailed. Solid determination prevails, and who knows, I may even have found some other business partners since those fateful days, and perhaps we can replenish the lost stocks of moneys that had to be raised on behalf of the third party when we started, Mr. Speaker (just to refer it back to Bill No. 105).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've shown that the NDP takeover in potash without the protection of a legislature with a free and unfettered minority in opposition, is to the detriment of the potash workers. I've shown that the NDP takeover of the hog business in Saskatchewan through The Natural Products Marketing Act was to the detriment of the hog producers, and they had no other rights than those that they had in this legislature, with an unfettered minority opposition. That's the only chance they had. At least their views were heard. They were still taken over; the NDP still took that power unto itself. But at least their views could be heard.

Is the next step after Bill 105 – when and if the Conservatives get their act together, and find an issue of extreme importance – to put in a retroactive bill to remove their research and secretarial rights? Is that the next step? Well, Mr. Speaker, the member says no. But who can say? Who possibly can say? Because when you attack one small group, then the next group will have to fall in line. They'll believe they have to fall in line. I've shown that for the hog producers. I've shown that for timber. I've shown that for the potash workers.

But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the most vicious takeovers by the NDP government in Saskatchewan, and the one which is the most insidious, and the one which prevents freedoms from developing and flourishing – and if they haven't got a legislature to draw these matters to their attention, if they haven't got an unfettered minority to be able to present them, then there is no freedom left – is the land bank takeovers in the province of Saskatchewan. We have listened, Mr. Speaker, in this legislature while opposition members brought forward abuse, after abuse, after political abuse, after abuse, after abuse of the land bank awards in the province of Saskatchewan – that's centralization of power. Mr. Speaker, how in the world could those be presented to this Assembly if the opposition forces are not unfettered? How can they possibly be presented in a fair and reasonable and rational way, when the opposition forces are going to be concerned, as a result of Bill No. 105, that tomorrow or the next day their party is going to be wiped out? They are no longer going to be a party. They are no longer going to be an opposition. And they find themselves, as Mr. Cy MacDonald (the former member for Indian Head-Wolseley) said, with no office in the building, with no research help, no secretarial help.

And how, Mr. Speaker, in this modern day and age can any citizen of Saskatchewan feel safe if an unfettered minority group is not allowed to flourish and thrive in the Saskatchewan legislature. That's next, for the benefit of the members to my right. This NDP power grab, Mr. Speaker, must be stopped, and it must be stopped now. We cannot wait any longer. When they can take on the potash people, that's one thing.

I have some other examples to go into, Mr. Speaker, but at the moment it appears that it's 12 o'clock. As I read the clock, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's 12 o'clock. Am I correct?

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.