

**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**  
**December 11, 1980**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to the other members of the Assembly a delegation from the Wilkie and District Centennial Nursing Home Board. They are going to meet with the Minister of Social Services immediately after question period and I would like to introduce them with your leave, Mr. Speaker. They are Mrs. Edith McIntosh, Mrs. Eileen Walby and Mr. Roy Carpenter. I know they will have a very enjoyable day, a successful meeting afterwards and I wish them a safe journey home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to introduce to you on behalf of the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources, the Hon. Reg Gross, a group of people from the Rush Lake Co-operative Committee who are here in Regina to tour some of the facilities and to join us for question period. I am sure they will have an enjoyable stay in Regina and in the Assembly and I look forward to meeting with them for coffee after. Thank you.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Commitment on Public Utility Rate Increases**

**MR. LANE:** — I'd like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. The government opposite and the Premier have refused to table the constitutional position to this Assembly prior to appearing before the constitutional committee. He refused to make the cabinet announcement during the term of this Assembly and last year refused to make any announcements of public utilities.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I'll take the next question.

**MR. LANE:** — It's all right to be on your feet when Mr. Speaker is on his feet, I believe the ruling was the other day.

To the Deputy Premier: in light of the past record of not making announcements in this Assembly, will you today make a firm commitment on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan that between the adjournment of this session and the spring session there will be no public utility rate increases in the province of Saskatchewan and that not rate increases will be announced until the next session when this legislature can debate them and perhaps reject them?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will have every opportunity to debate any action that the government takes, whether it relates to utilities or not, when we reconvene in the spring session. The hon. member knows that no government can

give any kind of an undertaking one way or the other. The corporations are carrying on the business of providing service to the people of Saskatchewan and decisions will have to be made by those corporations as they arise. The Legislative Assembly will have an opportunity to question those when the House reconvenes in the spring.

**MR. LANE:** — Supplementary to the Deputy Premier. Would you not admit that, given the council boards' inflation projections and the existence of a very severe rate of inflation and the cost-price squeeze on the consumers of Saskatchewan, it would be highly proper for a government to make a commitment that no utility rate increases would be given, made or announced until such time as this Assembly had the opportunity to debate them. That would be a sign of a concerned government and a good government which would make such a commitment.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle no doubt know that there will be a budget, as there is each and every year, announced by the Minister of Finance which will hopefully take into consideration all of the economic factors including the so-called cost-price squeeze which the hon. member refers to. The policy with respect to taxation and other matters is fully set out in the budget, which is the subject of a six or seven day debate in this Assembly. I think the record of this government for showing concern for those who are caught by the unfortunate federal policies of former Conservative and Liberal governments is a good record.

### **Utility Rate Increases**

**MR. LANE:** — Would the Deputy Premier agree that the failure of your government to make a commitment that there will be no utility rate increases between now and the next session is a dereliction of your duty as a government to protect the consumers and the public of Saskatchewan from the onerous public utility rate increases and excessive profits that they have faced in the past?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — I can certainly answer that I do not agree with that assessment by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. If the hon. member for Qu'Appelle were able to undertake that the Alberta government, for example, would not have any rate increases with respect to natural gas from the time that the House now adjourns until it next reconvenes (this increase on natural gas rates has a direct bearing, for example, on power corporation rates), then I think his question would have more direct meaning. Quite obviously he can't, nor can the Alberta government, nor can the provincial Government of Saskatchewan.

### **Increases in Land Lease Fees**

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, at the conclusion of yesterday's question period I asked you a question pertaining to the very dramatic increases in all leases controlled by the lands branches. Mr. Minister, this issue has been brought to your attention twice and both times as you answered you elaborated on the formula involved in computing them.

Mr. Minister, at a time in 1980 when our cattle herds were in jeopardy, both levels of government, yours and the federal government, were striving to maintain the cow-calf operators. My question is: is it not a direct bureaucratic contradiction that you are subsidizing a given producer, and at the same time you are jacking up his lease fees? Is this not a classic example of the right hand of the bureaucracy not knowing what the left hand is doing?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, no it is not. There were two aspects to the drought assistance. One related to finding grazing for the livestock in the early part of the drought. As the hon. member knows, this was resolved by significant rainfall on the latter part of June. I will say that it was resolved in a dramatic way by significant rainfall across the province in the latter part of June, on into July, and into August, which provided good grazing and which provided for a good condition for the livestock. They came out of the pastures and the grazing land in pretty good condition. I'd like to say that some I've seen were as good as at any time.

The other aspect of the drought was providing feed for the winter. I say to the hon. member that that was the major aspect of our drought program — providing fodder for the winter months. That has been done. I think the livestock people are pretty happy with available feed supplies, and I think they are pretty happy with the job done by the drought assistance program in the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, let's assume that everything you say is true (which it isn't; obviously you don't know the situation all over or you wouldn't talk this way). I would like to question you on the formula that you have used to compute some of these figures. Producers, who have had hay leases have gone to your department to the lands branch and have said, "I won't pay it because there was no hay in this lease." Would the minister tell me by what portion of the formula the lands branch rebated anywhere from 30 per cent to 50 per cent when a person took this course of action? And my further supplementary is: would you provide the names of people who have had this rebate, and would you further tell us what you have done with those who have begrudgingly simply taken their bill, put a cheque in the mail, and sent it without protests? Are they going to get this rebate also?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any rebate being paid. I will pursue this rebate issue as put forward by the hon. member for Thunder Creek, and respond to him on the issue of the rebate on hay leases. I am not aware of any being paid. I will check whether there was a deduction on the bill or whether there was a rebate. I will check that for the hon. member and provide the information for him.

I find this a very sensitive issue and I think there are two sides to the argument. If a farmer were leasing hay land from a private individual, would he pay the lease? Would the private individual expect the lessee to pay the lease? I think likely he would. Yet the hon. member for Thunder Creek says that the government, which is leasing land under the same kind of circumstances in a general way, should not charge a lease fee to the lessee who is leasing this land. I understand the problem, but I see two sides to the argument in addressing the problem.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — This sounds extremely like a debate.

**MR. THATCHER:** — I have a new question for the minister in the form of a final supplementary. Mr. Minister, on Monday you refused to stand up for the farmers against the grain companies. On Tuesday you refused to stand up for the farmers against the environmentalists, as typified by the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. Today you won't stand up for the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — This sounds like another debate.

### Crop Insurance Payments

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I have been contacted by several groups of people in my constituency — from the town of Kenaston, Hawarden, Loreburn, Bladworth, Davidson, Elbow, Strongfield, Simpson, Imperial, Stalwart and Hanley — advising me that they had not received their crop insurance payments.

I talked to crop insurance this morning, Mr. Minister, and they enlightened me that at the time a man applies for crop insurance, they guarantee payment within six weeks. Can you tell me, and inform this Assembly, why, when the average date of application has run for 9 to 14 weeks, these people have not been paid?

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of the question. I find it difficult to agree with the hon. member when he says that the time application is made until the time they receive payment should be a specific space of time. I would be inclined to argue on behalf of crop insurance that, from the time the crop is adjusted until payment is made we could look at a specific space of time. To argue it is the time between when application is made and payment is made, I think, is very difficult. I think we have to look at the time from adjustment to the time of payment. I don't know whether there have been any commitments made by crop insurance to particular farmers on a set time frame for making payment. If there have been I will check it and find out why the payments haven't been made. Additionally, I will find out for the member the overall policy and application of the policy by crop insurance.

I point out to the hon. member that this year it will be the highest payment the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation has ever made — \$128 million roughly. That requires some management and some administration and I think we should give them an opportunity to respond, through me, to the hon. member, on what is happening with crop insurance this year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. All I want, Mr. Speaker, is the money in the hands of these farmers. Many of these people are also complaining that they borrowed money on the strength of their crop insurance payments. They are being charged high interest and penalties on their unpaid premiums for crop insurance. Mr. Minister, will you compensate these farmers for their late payments, which you have held back for several weeks now? You sock it to them on one hand by your interest charges and penalties, and you steal it from them with your other hand by your late payments.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I share the member's concern in seeing that the money gets into the hands of the producers as quickly as possible. I'm sure that every person working for crop insurance shares the same kind of concern.

I say to the hon. member that I don't agree with the federal government's policy on interest rates either. I don't agree with it now. I didn't agree with it last spring when his party was in office in Ottawa. I think the issue of interest rates should not come into the operations of crop insurance but should be separate from it, and you should be addressed by national governments whose job it is to deal with interest rate policy in this country.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Government Commitment on Lewvan Expressway**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — A question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Minister, earlier this week you indicated to me in a private conversation that if the government had made a commitment to the city of Regina, the government would live up to its commitment. Are you aware, Mr. Minister of a letter which was written to the city of Regina by the government in 1969, a copy of which I will pass on to you, if you so desire? The letter indicates that the government would pay for the cost of the Pasqua-Lewvan expressway from Regina Avenue to the No. 1 Highway. Are you further aware, Mr. Minister, of a letter written on January 10, 1975, by your deputy minister, saying, 'The department is responsible 100 per cent for constructing the Lewvan expressway'?

My final question on that, Mr. Minister, is: are you further aware of a letter written by the same deputy minister in July of this year, saying, 'The department does not intend, in the foreseeable future, to construct any portion'?

My final question, Mr. Speaker, is: as a result of the statement you made to me the other day, are you still prepared to live up to the commitment that was made twice by your government to the city of Regina?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making reference to a letter that was sent in 1969. I do not have the letter in front of me. I don't think that in 1969 we were the government. We were in 1975, but not in 1969. But he is making reference first of all to 1969, if I hear him correctly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, all right. I wonder if the member wants to speak with his hand. He might do well to produce the copy of the letter for me, and then I'll be able to respond. I do not have a copy of that letter in front of me. I also do not have a copy of the 1975 letter in front of me.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm aware, it was not the Department of Urban Affairs which wrote the communication. It might have been the Department of Highways. It is not the deputy who is responsible to me. But, I am indeed prepared to examine the correspondence and the documents and respond to the hon. member at a later date.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The other day, on Monday I believe it was, I asked the Premier the same question and he took notice of the question for the Minister of Highways. The Minister of Highways is not here today. I'm asking you the same question. The letter does come from the Minister of Highways. My question to you, Mr. Minister: are you prepared to live up to the commitments made by your government to the city of Regina for the cost of the expressway from Regina Avenue to No. 1 Highway, that commitment having been made twice by the Department of Highways, in 1969 and 1975?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to examine the nature of the commitment he is telling me about. If our government made the commitment, then certainly we are prepared to live up to it. Our government has always lived up to its commitments. I am not prepared to answer for other governments, which may or may not have made commitments.

### **Restrictions on Liquor Advertisements**

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — A question to the Premier. yesterday at your news conference you indicated that you were considering having cable operators delete wine and beer ads which they are currently running. Mr. Premier, do you not find it rather hypocritical that you can make cable operators delete certain types of advertising, yet in Teletheatre, of which your government owns 60 per cent of the operation and also a majority on the board, you still allow that particular cable company to continually show pornographic movies which are absolutely degrading to the women of Saskatchewan? They show them as sex objects and it's absolutely disgusting.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I will try to deal with the question of the hon. member. Firstly, the matters are not matters of hypocrisy. The reason for restrictions on liquor advertisements does not deal with any moral views as to whether or not people should consume alcoholic beverages, but rather indicates a conviction by the Government of Saskatchewan that it is not socially wise to encourage the additional consumption of alcoholic beverages. This has been the view of the Government of Saskatchewan which I have led. It was the view of the Government of Saskatchewan from 1964 to 1971; the member for Thunder Creek will be advised as to some possible motivations of that government. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the reason why successive governments of Saskatchewan for many years have decided . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I think we can use the question period productively or we can waste the question period. If the members continue howling across the floor when members are either asking questions or answering questions, it uses up the time of the question period in a useless way. I just encourage you to allow the members to answer or ask the questions so that everybody can hear them.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I just repeat the reasons why, in my judgment, our government and previous governments for decades have taken a position against the electronic advertisement of liquor. On the other hand, with respect to movies, if in fact there are pornographic movies (I'm not a subscriber to Teletheatre and don't have the advantage of hon. members opposite of viewing the movies), all I can say is that members opposite will lay the appropriate charges with the appropriate legal officials. Those who have aired pornography will obviously have to answer under the Criminal Code because the movies, as described, are clearly obscene. I don't know whether in fact they are or not. With respect to whether or not any cable operator, Teletheatre or other, should operate by way of screening or censoring the movies offered, clearly there are differences of view on that. I don't have a view since I am not familiar with the operations of Teletheatre nor am I the minister.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Supplementary. I find it rather strange. You say that it's socially unacceptable to show beer and wine ads. Are you saying it is socially acceptable to continue to allow movies, which degrade and demoralize women, to be shown on prime time TV by a company of which you own 60 per cent? Where are your priorities?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it will be known that Teletheatre is a service which is by no means widely purchased in Saskatchewan. Presumably only those who wish that kind of fare subscribe to Teletheatre. I am not familiar with what is on it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Well find out.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I don't accept the view that it's my job to know what is in every book published by the Government of Saskatchewan. Members opposite may take that

view; that is not my view of my duties.

I take the view that members opposite or any other member of the public presumably wishes that fare if he subscribes to it. It is not a widely available service like radio, ordinary television, or cable television. Not only is it not provided free, not only is it not provided on the basis of the payment of your mark-up charge for cable television, you must pay an additional charge, I understand, to get Teletheatre. Obviously, the number who will decided that they wish that type of entertainment is relatively small, and presumably they make their own judgment as to who should see it in their home.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Supplementary. I believe that your government initiated the whole concept of Teletheatre. Do you not agree that you have to bear some of the responsibility? You have a majority on the board of directors. They make the decision thanks to your creation of that particular outlet.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I simply am not aware of our creating Teletheatre. My understanding was that there were other cable operators and that we were a relatively small minority when Teletheatre started. I may not be fully informed on this. However, the point is whether or not . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I'll take a new question. The member for Thunder Creek.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Premier, you probably aren't aware that your government created a medium . . . Mr. Speaker, just give me a brief preamble for the Premier's edification because he is pleading ignorance on this. Your government created a medium known as CPN (Co-operative Programming Network). CPN subsequently went broke. Your government in concert with certain other forces or people in this province created a medium known as Teletheatre. You started out initially owning 30 per cent of Teletheatre. Recently, you raised your equity to 60 per cent. Teletheatre is now 60 per cent owned by your government.

Mr. Premier, the question which has been posed to you today and other times in this Assembly is this: how do you justify the moral hypocrisy of your creation? Teletheatre, whose sole function is to show movies, many of which are unedited versions (whether they are moral or immoral, I don't know) of Hollywood movies, which are very suggestive to say the very least, and use horrible, disgusting language, and everything else? At the same time that you say this is acceptable at 7 o'clock in the evening or at 8 o'clock in the evening, you say that an innocuous beer or wine ad is not morally acceptable. That is what we are asking you. Mr. Premier, the ice isn't really thick enough on Wascana to walk on yet. So why don't you answer the question instead of trying to skate on ice?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — First, the ice on Wascana Lake is thick.

Secondly, our objections to liquor ads are not on the basis that they are pornographic, not on the basis that they're obscene, but rather on the basis that additional consumption of alcoholic beverages is socially undesirable. I don't know what type of activity pornographic movies might suggest ought to be increased, so I don't know whether that would be socially desirable or undesirable. I am just saying that if the objection to liquor advertisement is an objection to the increase in consumption, that objection does not apply to material which members opposite may deem is obscene or

pornographic. There may well be other objections to obscene or pornographic material but they're in no way related to liquor advertisements — no way related.

The member opposite is very well informed on Teletheatre and he has the advantage of having a great deal of particular information which Prairie Co-ax Cable had that I don't personally have. He has the advantage of being very familiar with a company which was in on the ground floor of this company. I, therefore, am not able to debate with him on the details of this.

I do say, however, that as the hon. member points out, the Government of Saskatchewan was certainly not the majority shareholder in this company when it started. The Government of Saskatchewan did not (in the sense of the word suggested by the hon. member for Maple Creek) launch this venture.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — I have one other matter. Mr. Speaker, this has to do with respect to Bill No. 20. I would like to beg leave to inform the Assembly that His Honor, the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this bill, recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly. It was a bill that we debated yesterday in second reading, but there was no formal recommendation. It's a money bill attached to the bill, and I'm now giving that recommendation verbally.

Recommendation agreed.

### **STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER**

#### **ALLEGED BREACH OF PRIVILEGE**

As a result of a point of privilege raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I have examined the CKCK TV transcript headed as follows: Transcript — Jerry Hammersmith — Supper Newscast — Tuesday, December 9, 1980.

Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, section 84(1) states:

Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established. The Speaker required to be satisfied, both that the privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving such precedence (or as it is sometimes put, that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed); and also that the matter has been raised at the earliest opportunity.

The essence of the point of privilege raised by the Leader of the Opposition is:

The rules committee as well as Mr. Speaker have been impugned by the public utterances of the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I paraphrase . . . what he said is that the rules committee of Mr. Speaker was going to Great Britain on a paid holiday at taxpayers' expense. I would ask Mr. Speaker to make a ruling as to whether the trip arranged by your office for the rules committee to Great Britain is in fact a holiday paid by taxpayers' expense.



However, the transcript shows that the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake said in part that the member for Qu'Appelle is "proposing to take a four-day holiday at taxpayers' expense." I can neither support nor deny the contention that the member for Prince Albert believes the member for Qu'Appelle is planning a four-day holiday at taxpayers' expense. I have not discussed that matter with the member for Qu'Appelle since he has not attended any of the 12 meetings of the rules committee since it was established in May, 1979.

The final decision to go to Great Britain was a personal decision of each member who, I assume, was guided by his own standards.

I can say on behalf of the committee that a full schedule of meetings is established with British members of parliament, clerks, committees, House leaders and administrators. We plan to attend the question period and meet with members of the United Kingdom former rules committee, which was responsible for recommending the new committee system now in effect at Westminster.

The terms of reference for the committee clearly state in part, "to hold meetings at and away from the seat of government in order that the provisions in other legislatures can be studied."

I must say, while I regret the comments of the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake in so far as they may indirectly allude to the activities planned by the rules committee, I do not believe that the said comments will seriously impair the ability of the committee to accomplish its objectives, which are to work toward a final report on the basis of research, observation and discussion, whether done in Saskatchewan or elsewhere.

Therefore, I find no prima facie case for privilege.

## SECOND READINGS

**HON. MR. ROMANOW** moved second reading of Bill No. 21 — **An Act respecting Representation in the Legislative Assembly.**

He said: Mr. Deputy Speaker, before moving second reading of this particular bill which is the representation act, Bill No. 21, I should like to make some very brief comments.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as is required by the practice of the House in the legislation, a resolution was passed adopting the recommendations of the committee dealing with representation. What we have before us now is the statute which would give the force of law to that redrawing of the constituency boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear to the members of the House again that this bill is the direct consequence of recommendations put forward by what I would categorize as a rule independent boundaries commission. It was, as you know, headed by a justice of the Court of Queen's Bench in the province of Saskatchewan. It also included the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly as well as one other nominee, the former president of the University of Regina, Dr. John Archer.

I don't think members would find much sympathy with any suggestion that that truly was not an independent boundaries commission. As you know, members of that

commission, aided by a staff, undertook to examine the relevant population figures and date, considered the existing constituency boundaries, made an interim report which was available to all of the members of this House and to the members of the public at large, listened to representations from some individual members and from some members of the public with respect to that report and then concluded with its final documentation about one and one-half months ago, I believe it was.

The committee was chosen on the following basis: the chairman was Mr. Justice Ray MacDonald of the Court of Queen's Bench who was appointed (if my information is accurate, and I believe it to be so) by the chief justice of the entire province, Mr. Justice E.M. Culliton. The appointment of the president of the university, Dr. John Archer, was done by Mr. Speaker, technically, but I believe the record also shows that it was done only after Mr. Speaker had fully consulted with the members of the opposition and in effect had the opposition agreement for the appointment of Dr. Archer to that committee. I believe that fact is beyond dispute. This included the government as well. The third person is the one whom I believe, by all accounts, by all members on this side of the House, certainly is qualified to serve on that, our Clerk — able and neutral in his fulfilment of functions — Mr. Gordon Barnhart. So the committee was Mr. Justice MacDonald, Dr. John Archer and Mr. Gordon Barnhart.

After having gone through this lengthy process the report has been tabled and the report now has been translated into legislation, which is the subject of this second reading speech and the subject of this bill.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that there are absolutely no changes to the boundaries as prescribed and recommended by that commission. There are two or three relatively minor name changes from the main report, which the members of the committee themselves recommended was acceptable. They would not find any offence if the legislature saw fit to do that. So we have some name changes, primarily in Saskatoon and Regina, where there is confusion with existing federal and provincial ridings. One of the recommendations by the committee was that there be a new provincial riding called Saskatoon West. Members will know that there is a federal constituency called Saskatoon West. In order to avoid the confusion there needed to be a name change. Different reasons are attached to one or two name changes here in Regina. But short of that, with respect to the fundamental factor, namely the constituency itself and the boundaries, the scope of representation, nothing here has been changed from the independent boundaries commission report which has been submitted and tabled and the subject of some discussion publicly by the people of this province.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it came as quite a shock and surprise to me to note that during the course of yesterday's consideration of the resolution on this matter, two members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition voted against the resolution and spoke against the boundaries recommendation as set forth by this group of individuals. The argument which was articulated, as I understood it . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I just want to caution the Attorney General that the discussion which took place yesterday is a different discussion and cannot be entered into in this debate. The Attorney General or any member can make reference to some other debate that took place at some other time but we can't get into the debate of yesterday in this debate.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, as I had heard and seen the debate reported and indeed as it is in *Hansard* minutes, the fact is that two members of

the opposition opposed the boundary commission's . . .

**MR. LANE:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General has been here longer than I have. He knows that he can't bring in another motion and debate it on the motion which he has before him. He just tried to do it again.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think it is quite clear that members cannot reflect on a decision already made by the House. That is understood. I realize this presents a difficult situation for the members because the content of this bill is essentially the same as the content of the motion which was before the House yesterday. There is nothing wrong with members making an argument on this bill which may have been made on the motion yesterday but they can't make a direct reference to the debate which occurred when the motion was discussed. Just to support that, I will cite from Beauchesne's, Fifth Edition, citation 315:

(1) It is a wholesome restraint upon Members that they cannot revive a debate already concluded, and it would be little use in preventing the same question from being offered twice in the same session if, without being offered, its merits might be discussed again and again.

(2) It is irregular to reflect upon, argue against, or in any manner call in question in debate the past acts or proceedings of the House, on the obvious ground that, besides tending to revive discussion upon questions which have already been once decided, such reflections are uncourteous to the House and irregular in principle inasmuch as the Member himself is included in and bound by a vote agreed to by the majority and it seems that reflecting upon or question the acts of the "majority" is equivalent to reflecting upon the House.

Citation 313:

A Member may not speak against or reflect upon any determination of the House unless he intends to conclude with a motion for rescinding it.

Citation 314:

The rule that allusions to debates in the other House of the current session are out of order, prevents fruitless arguments between members of two distinct bodies who are unable to reply to each other, and guards against recrimination and offensive language in the absence of the party assailed, but is mainly founded upon the understanding that the debates of the other House are not known.

This might have a greater reference to a different situation but citations 313 and 315 certainly refer to the situation here. I therefore rule that the Attorney General or any other member cannot relate his arguments by the arguments that were put forward on the motion of a similar nature to the bill.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll accept your ruling, of course. I gather that quotations by members about former speeches and debates which they use in current debates are out of order. It has been done every time I've been here. Almost every other day somebody will get up and say that this is what this guy said in this debate a couple

of years ago, a couple of hours ago. And is that out of order? All I'm attempting to say is that a couple of days ago, a couple of hours ago a member said this on the question of the resolution. I'd be pleased to know what the ruling is.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — A couple of hours ago, no; a couple of years ago, yes. There's a distinction. Debates in this same session cannot be referred to in that manner.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I abide by your ruling and it won't lessen the force of what I was going to say in any event. What I was going to say was that I note by public reports that yesterday, the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Regina South voted against a motion on the representation on the arguments that the work done by the commission was work they did not agree with. I simply state that. And that is the point to which I wish to address my remarks. None of us in this House, if we were looking at any boundaries commission the subject matter of which is this bill, could say that we are satisfied with the recommendations that are being made. If we were to choose how those boundaries were to be drawn, each one of us would draw line or two here or there that we think would best reflect the interests of our community and our constituency and which, presumably, would lend a basis for us to oppose what is being done by this legislation.

What's being done by this legislation in principle is the statutory enactment of a specific recommendation by an independent boundaries commission, the membership for which I've already outlined. Judging by those press reports of yesterday, a member or two doesn't like what the independent commission would have recommended. The next logical step in that regard is to say that if an independent boundaries commission cannot draw the boundaries for the members of this House, who can? If it's not independent, it clearly must be, and legislation of this nature would come forth as recommendations from a nonindependent committee. And we've had experience of that in the past in this legislature.

In 1969 and 1970 we had no independent boundaries commission. We had no third party outside of the opposition in the government drawing the boundaries for us. And in 1969 and 1970, I want to remind the members of this House, the Liberal Party of the day, which was the government of the day, structured a bill in April of 1970, Bill No. 86, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. That bill came forward as a direct result of a committee, which was structured by the then deputy premier of the government of the day, Mr. Steuart, composed of Messrs. Steuart, Guy MacDonald, McPherson and Heggie, all of whom were elected members — all of which were elected members on the government side.

The result was that those of us who ran in the next election in 1971, based on that kind of drawing of the boundaries, faced situations like the one in Saskatoon, where in Saskatoon Riversdale, my constituency, I had 16,000 voters to face, to meet and to answer, but the Liberal candidate of the day, Mr. Charlebois, in Saskatoon City Park, had 6,000 voters to face, meet and answer to. My colleague, the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista, had something in the neighborhood of 4,000, and next door a colleague on our side had to meet, to answer and to face an electorate of 18,000, or roughly that. We had those kinds of wild swings because the boundaries in 1970 were drawn by a nonindependent commission.

One of the pledges that we made, Mr. Speaker, when we went about the province campaigning in 1971, was that we would do away forever with that kind of blatant, political gerrymandering of our constituency boundaries.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — And if you make the commitment that you are going to do away with gerrymandering, and indeed you do away with it, how else can it be done except through an independent committee? And if it is put in the hands of an independent committee, you have to live with the bad, Mr. Speaker. No independent committee, which is doing the job it is trying to do, will be free of some error. It is composed of human beings and they will make errors. But the most important thing is to deny once and for all the principle that politicians can sit down and draw their own boundaries, the basis of which will determine their election, or the election or the defeat of the government or the opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought surely in 1980 that battle had already been won in this province. But I see by press reports that I was wrong. I see now that two members, according to these press reports, from the Legislative Assembly — from the opposition side, the Conservative side — indicate they don't like those boundaries. They voted against the resolution, I don't know what they are going to do on this particular bill, but it is only logical, at least for two of them (if not for all of them), if they opposed the resolution, which they did according to the reports, they would do the same thing with this bill. If they do, Mr. Speaker, they strike at the very heart of an independent boundaries commission which is the basis of this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, we are not just trifling with a little bit of a boundary here or there relating to a particular constituency in Glencairn or Riversdale of whatever. I could come to this House and tell you where I think the boundary line should have been drawn with respect to Saskatoon Riversdale. We're not just trifling about a block or two here or there.

When we raise concerns about this piece of legislation, if we do, we are raising concerns about the very fundamental principle which is the subject matter of this bill. And the very basic principle which is the subject matter of this bill is whether or not the people of this province are going to be represented fairly and equally, numerically, in boundary terms, with those boundaries drawn by people who are removed from the partisan political process in the province of Saskatchewan. That's the issue that is at heart.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — The Conservatives, 10 years later, say no — seem to say no. And 10 years later the member for Qu'Appelle, who 10 years ago, by all acknowledged accounts, was an employee of the government of the day which set up this parliamentary committee of politicians to draw the boundaries; ten years later, Mr. Speaker, he opposed the resolution, according to the press reports, on the basis that he didn't like the way they were drawn.

Mr. Speaker, how would we have drawn them? Would we have drawn them, as members, to suit his interests? Would we have drawn them to suit the interests of the member for Regina South? Would we have drawn them to suit the interests of the member for Kelsey-Tisdale? If you establish that principle, what prohibits a government drawing those resolutions and those boundaries the way the former Liberal

government (to which the member for Qu'Appelle was a party) did in 1970? Absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker.

This is the first time since I have been in this House and sitting on the government side and the first time since we've had an independent boundaries commission (it's not the first time we have introduced legislation of this nature), that I have seen any suggestion that there would be any opposition whatsoever to what is taking place here. I guess it proves, Mr. Speaker, once and for all that old maxim that any battle won is never secure. Any battle won, whether it's for the maintenance of medicare or insurance, or for the maintenance of the principle of a fair drawing of boundaries upon which the very foundation of democracy is based, is never secure so long as you have a Tory or a Liberal around.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — So long as you have a Tory or a Liberal around, who doesn't like the way things are cutting, so long as you have a Tory or a Liberal who may want to draw the political map to give himself as better political advantage, you are faced with this situation.

Mr. Speaker, we know the term the gerrymander. It was first instituted in the United States — in the state of Massachusetts, I believe. They called a salamander because the constituency, as drawn, looked like a salamander. But the guy who drew it was a governor called Gerry, and so they changed it to gerrymander. And now, Mr. Speaker, if we're to have our way in Saskatchewan, judging by the press reports on the member for Qu'Appelle, we're not going to have a gerrymander if the Conservatives ever should come into power, we are going to have a "garymander."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I, for one, would not want to go down in history as being remembered in the province of Saskatchewan in that fashion, as a garymander or whatever.

I say to the hon. members opposite, you still have a chance on this bill to change your attitude and your approach to the boundaries commission and to say that the principle of independent boundaries, being drawn independently, is something to which all of us subscribe, regardless of whether we agree or disagree with the specific proposals. This bill does that. This bill gives all members the chance to reaffirm their commitment to the principles of democracy, to the principles of the Legislative Assembly.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would call on the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Regina South, and I'm going to go one step further — it's more than just those individual members — to call on the Progressive Conservative Party to put the whip on those members to show as a party their commitment to the principle of independent boundaries and to show as a party their commitment to an independent tribunal drawing those lines. Put the party whip on those two dissidents and others who would raise the doubt that really within that PC caucus works this desire to return back to the old system of changing the boundaries.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I could go on at length about the individual description of the boundaries. That would take days to describe; there's no use in doing that. I would not have made a speech (such as it is) if I had not seen this press report dealing with the resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that under the circumstances, we have to act now and act decisively, as members of the House, lest this odious principle find its way back in as it did in 1970.

I say to the members for Regina, and particularly to the members of the Progressive Conservative caucus, laughing or otherwise, as sincerely as I can that the most important aspect of this thing is the commitment to the fair drawing of boundaries. That's what is at issue in this bill and I urge all members, Mr. Speaker, to give it their unanimous support. I move second reading of Bill No. 21.

**MR. THATCHER:** — It is with a great deal of pleasure that I join two other colleagues in the position they took yesterday. I am sorry that pressing matters took me out of this Assembly and I was not able to express it in a more formal way.

I would also like to take a moment, before I go any further, Mr. Speaker, to welcome the Attorney General back from what I understand has been a French immersion course for some venture that he is considering in the near future. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that. I suggest that the Attorney General take his French book home tonight and bone up because the French network may have an interview with him tomorrow.

It's interesting to hear the Attorney General's rhetoric on the subject of sanctimony, and the neutral provisions which have gone into the redistribution of these boundaries. Certainly no one would ever, ever suggest that whatever changes were taking place were strictly for the benefit of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Attorney General, the reason I would choose to oppose this bill is very basic and very simple. We don't need 64 MLAs in this province; we simply don't need them. We've heard so much rhetoric from your side of the House about how our population has increased. I'm going off the top of my head and some of my numbers may be out a trifle, but if you go back to about 1937, I think you will find our population was about 950,000 — 943,000 sticks in my mind — but about 950,000. If memory serves me correctly, there were 46 MLAs at that time.

I suggest that if you take an accurate figure of the population in Saskatchewan today, you will find that it is not vastly different from that figure of 950,000. You can nitpick for a few thousand, but you know that I'm pretty close. I will never understand why, if 46 MLAs were adequate in 1937, we need 64 MLAs today.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the entire process of increasing the number of MLAs over the years has worked to the detriment of rural Saskatchewan. More and more, we have seen rural Saskatchewan lose its power to the cities.

We choose, in the British parliamentary system, to abide by the very basic principle that representation by population is the only way that we can go. It's sacrosanct and we absolutely cannot deviate from it. And, based on that theory, we justify patting the bulk of the population into the cities. Now it is by no small coincidence that many of these city seats are favourably inclined toward the New Democratic Party.

I'd certainly never suggest that these seats would be deliberately jockeyed. Certainly I would never suggest that of the last redistribution. It had some funny curls and twists.

down in the southwest. I recall you had to alter one there because the former member for Gravelbourg and, if I recall, the present member for Assiniboia-Bengough were a little bit twisted up. But, somehow you fixed it so they were in different constituencies; you put enough of a zig and a zag in it to put them into separate seats.

The point of the exercise is that we don't need 64 MLAs. We simply do not need them. We don't need them any more than we need two ministers of municipal affairs. We didn't need to split the Department of Municipal Affairs. We didn't need to split the Department of Education. It is needless duplication, and a needless cost to our taxpayers.

I'm not on my feet to tell you what the correct number is, because I don't know and I don't have that information. But 64 is not the right number. As I recall (and again I am subject to correction), in 1964, when my father won the election, there were 57 seats. Again there are those who will recall more accurately than I. Therefore, I take a great deal of pleasure in joining my two colleagues who chose to vote against this bill. I will vote against the bill (and any other bill), saying that we do not need 64 MLAs. We do not need to see this process accelerated of rural Saskatchewan losing what is left of its political power to the city, because you people can get carried away with expropriating potash mines and building uranium refineries and all that. But the backbone of this province is still the 67,000 farm operations that are out there.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:** — They are still the backbone and they have lost far too much of their clout over the past 30 to 40 years. I suggest to you that this bill, the bill which is in front of us right now, just further erodes the power of rural Saskatchewan and virtually puts the bulk of the power to elect a government in the cities. As someone who makes his living out of rural Saskatchewan I take an exception to that. And every rural member over there should take exception to that, every single one of you who is from rural Saskatchewan should take exception to this philosophy of turning over absolute control of what is still a rurally-oriented province to urban Saskatchewan. I think it is wrong and I take a great deal of pleasure in opposing it. I will always oppose a bill like that. I say to those of you who are from rural Saskatchewan who support this erosion, this total transfer of power to urban Saskatchewan — shame on you. I hope you can justify it to your constituents.

Once again, it is nice to see the Attorney General back. I hope in the coming days of the session, since this is probably the last time I will be on my feet before the session terminates, that the Attorney General will be back. I hope he will be back for the spring session and I sincerely hope he will not be going to Ottawa, as I have a great many questions for him in the spring session. I sincerely hope that what is becoming increasingly more obvious is not going to happen. Mr. Premier, with the loss of talent which you have suffered of late, I sincerely hope you can hang onto him. I look around at potential replacements and it saddens me. Mr. Attorney General, I am afraid we need you here.

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the comments of the member for Thunder Creek about the potential future of the Deputy Premier. I hope he does talk to me before he makes a decision as to perhaps taking some appointment from the Parti Libérale Federale du Canada, for which he is, I understand, taking his French lessons. I am sure I could give him some practical advice which would be of great assistance to him, from many years of experience. I am sure he would take the advice and put it to good use.



It is interesting to note, though, that he is well on the way. Not only is he learning the language, but he feels that anyone who opposes his position is morally wrong and is the sinner of the earth, lowest of the low. That's an attitude I think he has picked up which will serve him well should he join the Liberal Party of Canada and an attitude that will probably allow him to get to the top very rapidly if he can fine tune it a little better and work at it. Perhaps he can get a little more used to that approach, that approach which doesn't suffer opposition, that approach that anybody who has a contrary viewpoint . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I am at a bit of a loss to understand what the discussion we are going through here has to do with the bill which is before the House — Bill 21 which is An Act respecting Representation in the Legislative Assembly.

I had some trouble with the previous member about whether his comments were in order. Unless the member is prepared to relate them immediately to the bill, I have to pass on to the next speaker.

**MR. LANE:** — That's the easy part, Mr. Speaker. In his remarks the Deputy Premier referred to the actions of the Liberal government of Saskatchewan, how he so opposes them and his great resentment to the actions taken by the Liberal government, I think we all remember those remarks. I was just updating him to the Liberal governments and how they handle matters to make sure that his remarks are concurrent and his understanding of the political climate in Canada is kept current.

I would just like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that it was the Attorney General's reference to the Liberal party that caused me to bring a little currency into the matter. I know the Attorney General and members opposite will take my remarks with the appropriate understanding and will deliberate and take them to heart.

It is interesting that the Attorney General feels that on the one hand the electoral boundaries commission is perfect and that every member must support that boundaries commission right down the line.

Let me tell you about the voters in Glencairn in Regina. Again, it is a matter I raised before the boundaries commission. In 1975 that significant subdivision, which has artificial boundaries (i.e. the Ring Road, Highway No. 1 and the mainline CP tracks running to the north of it) is an isolated subdivision; it's cut off by artificial boundaries. That particular subdivision was put in with a rural riding, the riding of Qu'Appelle.

I remind the Attorney General that I supported the boundaries commission at that time and I supported the bill. It was a mistake on my part because it became a matter of great concern to the voters in Glencairn subdivision that they had nothing in common with the rural voters. It was a new subdivision; it had the usual tensions; it had the usual demands for different facilities and here they were tied in with a rural riding . . .

As the member representing that riding (and I'm sure the member for Kinistino can verify), it is difficult when on the one hand the city has to encroach upon farmlands for extension of that subdivision and others, and on the other hand the rural people are resisting it, I'll tell you quite frankly that I was wrong, as a member, not to oppose it at that time. It was unfair to the voters in Glencairn and I suggest that this bill is just as unfair.

I would be doing a disservice (and I think members opposite are doing a disservice) to oppose this bill because we should be taking it at face value and there is no better way. We must endorse 100 per cent what the boundaries commission . . . I say you are doing a disservice.

I don't doubt for a minute that the boundaries commission did the best job it could. Do I have to agree with it? That's not democracy. That's not the attitude the House Leader opposite should be taking.

I tendered at the boundaries commission and I made suggestions no different than those which I am giving today. My opposition was very carefully tailored to the city of Regina and the concerns I felt. To say that member should not raise those concerns in this Assembly, I think, indicates a lack of understanding of the operation of this Assembly, a lack of understanding which surprises me coming from the Attorney General.

The Attorney General, on the other hand, says they are not perfect. Then, if the boundaries commission is not perfect, what's the error of members in opposing what they are doing? I think it's a very good question. If the boundaries commission is not perfect, as the Attorney General said, then surely it is obvious that members have an obligation and a duty to bring these matters before this Assembly, because, make no mistake you are the government which just brought in changes to the electoral boundaries report not suggested to the electoral boundaries commission. You changed names and made other minor changes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The member is reflecting on a decision which has already been made by the House.

**MR. LANE:** — I simply say that the bill before this Assembly is not exactly the same as the one proposed by the electoral boundaries commission . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, I'm saying the changes are minor . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Ah, suggested by (if I can answer, because the question is raised) the clerk to the boundaries commission and by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, because the maps used by the boundaries commission were different than the maps used by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. When I say that, Mr. Premier, don't get yourself worked up because the changes (we went back through them) were fair changes and innocuous changes and did not change the substance of the boundaries commission report. I am not suggesting that, but you did make changes. Because you made changes this Assembly, no matter how we slice it, is the final decision maker on the boundaries commission, and the boundaries commission accepts that.

We do, as a matter of practice, tend to accept what the boundary commission recommends . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I gather it has been tried before. I simply say to the Attorney General that no, the boundaries commission is not perfect. The boundaries commission can make errors, to use your phrase. I suggest, because that can happen, we have, as members, a duty to raise what we believe to be errors. We have to keep in mind, not only our duties as members, but also what the effect will be on the public of Saskatchewan. Frankly, when I see an area that I believe is not going to have a boundary which reflects a commonality of interest or community of interest, when I see great tracts of the city separating one subdivision from another, I am concerned. I think every member should be concerned.

I suggest to the Attorney General that the opposition is going to ask for leave to adjourn

debate for a reason. We learned a lesson, as the Attorney General well knows, on Meewasin Valley and its effects, and all we simply want to do.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You haven't learned the lesson but you're going to learn it at election time.

**MR. LANE:** — Oh, I'm not allowed to talk about the vote on Meewasin and how some 80 per cent in a particular area were against that, am I, Mr. Speaker? — and on a record turnout! And when they see Wes Bolstad seeking a nomination, as he will be required to do to keep his job, it will blow the whole thing out of the water.

But anyway, we simply ask for leave to adjourn so that we can go through and do the word-for-word confirmation. I give the assurance to the Attorney General that if it is exactly correct the opposition will give him the opportunity to pass the bill on the day he brings it in, in the spring session. I think we're not being unfair in asking for that time to make sure that there are no errors. An error, in fact, can't happen through typesetting or anything else. We're not attributing any motives but we have an obligation to go through and confirm the wording and, for that reason, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW** moved second reading of Bill No. 2 — **An Act to amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.**

He said: The main part of this bill is section 4 which will add a new subclause, section 5(a)(i). Section 5 of this act is the section presently dealing with the transmission of maintenance orders made in the province. Clause 5(a)(i) refers to orders made by a court in the province. Clause 5(a)(ii) refers to order made by an authority in the province other than a court. A court is defined in the act as being the Court of Queen's Bench or a local master of the district court or the unified family court. For some time now, the provincial court has been making maintenance orders which, when filed in the district court, can then be transmitted to a reciprocating jurisdiction. The opinion of my officials and me is that the act must be amended to take into account maintenance orders made by the provincial court. This amendment is made effective October 1, 1978, the day The Provincial Court Act came into force.

The other amendments in sections 3, 5, 6 and 7 are necessary to take into account the 1978 revision of the statutes. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.

**MR. LANE:** — We have no objection to the amendments but I wonder if the Attorney General, in his closing of debate, is prepared to comment on any uniform act across Canada which will have some effect, and whether or not the provincial governments across Canada have been able to resolve the problems of enforcing maintenance orders in another jurisdiction. I'm sure the Attorney General gets constant complaints of the inability of litigants, for want of a better phrase, to enforce judgments in other provinces.

The act is to try to do that but frankly it hasn't been successful. I think the Attorney General will admit that. It's a problem, obviously, that I know the attorneys general of Canada have directed their minds to. I would hope that the Attorney General, in closing debate, would give a report as to whether or not we're finally coming to grips with this problem, and in fact, solving what I think is a significant, serious social problem.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle does make a good point and one that all of us are concerned about: that is, the imperfection of enforcing orders made in another province, when the person who is the subject to the maintenance order moves to that other jurisdiction. In each case we are looking at a different set of statutes and the reciprocating order is not easily obtained. We have been working at it as attorneys general primarily through the uniformity of law commissioners, which, as the hon. member for Qu'Appelle knows, is a federal-provincial organization of people from governments designed to have uniform bills doing the same thing on similar subjects in all provinces. but I must tell the member we have not made as much progress as I would like to see partly because, quite frankly, of the constitutional debates.

In the constitutional debates, one of the issues under discussion was family law, and whether or not there should be a transference of the divorce granting and other related powers from the federal government to the provincial. We have almost, in a sense bogged won in our task of making uniformity of maintenance orders now. It's not as bleak as that. There is some very good work and good progress being made, but unfortunately I cannot advise the hon. member that we, in my judgment, will see such a resolution in the next several months or perhaps even within a couple of weeks.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY** moved second reading of Bill No. 7 — **An Act to amend The Farm Security Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill. An Act to amend The Farm Security Act. It's traditional since the act was originally passed in 1944, to extend the act for a period of three years. The purpose to this, Mr. Speaker, is to review the act every three years to ensure it continues to serve the purpose for which it was originally intended. Moreover, the amendment before the legislature today has the effect of extending the provisions of the act to years 1982, 1983 and 1984.

The principal purpose of the act is to protect the farm operator who is farming rented land, land being purchased under an agreement for sale or land which is mortgaged by specifying the portion of the crop which may be retained by him for purposes of paying his taxes, costs of production, and family living expenses in years that there is a crop failure. The provisions of the act become applicable when the average value of production for acres sown is less than the value of 10 bushels per acre of no. 1 red spring wheat.

Mr. Speaker, members of the legislature should remember 1944, the year Bill 50 — The Farm Security Act — was first introduced. It was the first occasion in the history of Saskatchewan, and in fact of Canada, when a social democratic party government was in power. It was the day of the first session of the tenth legislature.

The CCF government has been elected on June 15 of that year. It was a time, Mr. Speaker, when Saskatchewan had been and was experiencing hard times. The 1930s brought poverty to too many families. In 1944, many members of those same families were involved in World War II. So it was a struggle: a struggle for freedom, a struggle for peace, and a struggle for security. The government of that day recognized this period in the history of Saskatchewan as a time of building, rebuilding and looking forward. The

newly elected CCF government called upon the province to be prepared to make efforts and sacrifices greater than ever before. Chief Justice W.M. Martin, Saskatchewan Administrator, read the Speech from the Throne that first day, October 19, 1944. He pointed out that this legislature had a great responsibility as it would aid in determining that the sacrifices made in time of war were not in vain. He stated our position.

The legislature must recognize the responsibility of the people of this province towards members of the armed services as they will return to civilian life, and it must utilize fully the machinery of the government in extending a helping hand to those who have served their country.

The CCF government at that time realized that aid and rehabilitation was the responsibility of the federal government, despite these arranged debt-free grants for the purchase of stock, of equipment, of improvements for returned men settling on Crown lands. They went another step by introducing The Farm Security Act. The introduction of this act was in keeping with one of the objectives put forth in the Speech from the Throne. If I may again quote Chief Justice Martin:

The tenth legislature must implement legislation that will guarantee at least a minimum degree of economic security for the rural people and the urban working people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, everyone will know that a farmer's problems are never really over. Everyone will know that the events of the 1980 crop year confirm this and emphasize the importance of the amendments now before us. The drought was serious. It could have been a lot more serious. The Farm Security Act, along with program such as land bank, FarmStart, is another commitment made by our government to add to the security of our farmers, and to the stability of rural life in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this bill to amend The Farm Security Act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LANE:** — I'd just like to make a comment or two. Quite frankly your second reading speech on this bill is no better or no worse than the several that came up every two years, every time the bill is amended. Every two to three years this bill comes in extending the time. Why not simply bring in the amendment that the bill is in effect until repealed by the Assembly? Mr. Minister, you would save the time of the House, and your officials and everybody else. It's been renewed approximately every two years since 1940, which makes it roughly 20 times that the same amendment has been brought in. I suggest that if you would ask your officials to simply draw up an amendment that the bill stand until repealed (as any other bill) it would save the time of the House and your own officials. We will be supporting it.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS** moved second reading of Bill No. 8 — **An Act to amend the Provincial Mediation Board Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill I'd like to briefly review the history of the provincial mediation board, which has been in existence for a very long time. In fact it has been in existence some 51 years, for the board was formed in the year 1929. At that time it was called the debt adjustment board. This board was a real assistance to the pioneers of this province during the depression years. At that time, as all members

are aware, many people in this province faced financial ruin, and I am certain that many of those residents can recall how they were able to retain their farms and their homes through the efforts of the debt adjustment board.

In 1943, the debt adjustment board became the provincial mediation board. At that time the board was responsible for several acts. The provincial mediation board had power under their act to mediate between persons having debt problems, and this mediation process applied both to debtor and creditor. The attempt was made, of course, to find solutions and guide the debtor through the arrangements of the financial commitments.

The provincial mediation board also had, and continues to have, responsibility for the administration of The Landlord and Tenant Act and the provisions of The Tax Enforcement Act for those persons finding themselves with tax arrears. Relief from the pressure of paying those taxes and systematic methods for paying them can be secured through the provincial mediation board's efforts.

In 1973, The Residential Tenancies Act was passed by the legislature with this province, and the responsibility for its administration was given to the provincial mediation board. The board administered that act until 1976, when the office of the rentalsman was opened, at which time the responsibility for the act was transferred over to it.

In 1977, amendments to The Residential Tenancies Act created the rent review program, and the responsibility for this program was passed on to the provincial mediation board, where it currently is administered.

On January 1, 1980, the chairman of the provincial mediation board was also appointed as the rentalsman for the province of Saskatchewan. The combining of these two offices has made for better public service and efficiency in the administration of The Residential Tenancies Act.

The staffs of both the provincial mediation board and the office of the rentalsman have performed commendably in the developing of methods and the resolving of problems in a very difficult area. We are quite proud of the work being carried out by both the provincial mediation board and the rentalsman. In the amalgamation of both their offices, the staff of the office of the rentalsman now becomes the staff of the provincial mediation board. The board, under their act, have had to be appointed by order in council and we feel that the provisions of The Public Service Act and The Public Service Superannuation Act should be available to these people, all of whom have done a very commendable job in the administration of a very difficult and sensitive area of public responsibility. In reality, all this act is doing is making applicable, to the employees of the provincial mediation board, the Public Service Act and The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing this bill for second reading.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I heard most of the comments by the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services. I would like time to review some of the comments made through reading *Hansard* and therefore I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI** moves second reading of Bill No. 17 — **An Act to amend The**

**Department of Finance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few remarks of explanation this amendment to The Department of Finance Act. The bill before us will amend The Department of Finance Act to bring the accounting arrangements for the revenue cutoff for any fiscal year for the consolidated fund in line with the accounting arrangements for expenditures. An amendment with an identical objective is included in the bill to amend The Heritage Fund Act.

The consolidated fund is operated on the basis of what is called a modified cash accounting system. Essentially, the legislature, in its review of the estimates, approves the cash expenditures which are to be made during any fiscal year. In general, the accounting methodology utilized for the consolidated fund is a cash method that includes the moneys actually paid out or received in the fiscal year, as opposed to an accrual accounting approach which would include the amounts payable or receivable after the end of the fiscal year. Expenditures that are not actually paid for, or revenues not received until some period after the end of the fiscal year, are not retroactively included in the fiscal year in which the commitment was made or the revenue was owing.

This cash-flow accounting approach is, I am sure, well understood by the members of the legislature, since it involves the amounts of cash that are appropriate by the Assembly for expenditures during a specified fiscal year. Any amounts receivable after the end of the fiscal year must be appropriated by the Assembly in the new fiscal year. The system is a modified cash accounting system, however, to account for the fact that our bill-paying and revenue collection system functions with a one month lag in many circumstances and that, in effect, many of the payments for services, or goods purchased and received in March of any fiscal year, are not actually paid for until April. As well, revenues from fees or taxes imposed for March may not be received until April. In both circumstances, the cash transaction occurs in the next fiscal year. The cash accounting system has been modified, therefore, to facilitate the situation at the end of that fiscal year.

On the expenditure side, this modification is authorized by section 63 of The Department of Finance Act and I will just quote it. It says:

The balance of appropriation that has been granted for a fiscal year and that remains unexpended at the end of that fiscal year, shall lapse except that during the 30 days immediately following the end of the fiscal year, a payment may be made under the appropriation, for the purpose of discharging a debt payable for work performed, goods received or services rendered to the end of the fiscal year. Such payment may be charged in the accounts for the fiscal year.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the expenditure cutoff for accounting purposes for any given fiscal year is effectively 30 days after the end of that fiscal year. It should be clearly noted, of course, that the only expenditures incurred in April which are included in the previous fiscal year are those related to work performed, goods received, or services rendered in that previous fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, such a provision as it relates to revenue received by the consolidated fund is currently contained in The Department of Finance Act. Section 38 of the act currently reads as follows.

The revenue of any fiscal years may be received at the office of the treasurer and placed to the credit of the account of such fiscal year up to and inclusive of April 15 in the following year.

The inconsistency between the revenue provision and the expenditure provision is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker. The revenue cutoff is April 15, while the expenditure cutoff is April 30, for each fiscal year. This discrepancy arose in 1977, when the expenditure cutoff was advanced from April 15 to April 30 and no change was made to the date for the revenue cutoff. The impact of the amendment to section 38 of The Department of Finance Act is to bring consistency to the treatment of revenues and expenditures to the modifications to the cash accounting system. Section 38 of the act, in the proposed amendment, will provide the same accounting period for revenue for any fiscal year as in the case for the expenditures.

In recent months, Mr. Speaker, I might add, in our discussion with the bond-rating agencies from New York and other places, we have been asked why our cutoff dates for revenues and expenditures are not the same. This amendment will eliminate the lack of symmetry in our accounting practices.

With those words of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this bill.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Minister of Finance with his explanation of why this bill is being introduced. In his remarks he refers to section 38 and section 63 which are, I agree, contradictory. However, had he brought in an amendment to the act indicating that we change section 63 instead of section 38, I might have agreed with him.

I think the request which he is making of the Assembly today, that we change section 38 to allow 30 days for the revenue to be received at the office of the treasurer is (at last I think he is) indicating to us that he, or his department, is not competent in doing their job in the time allotted under the act as it stands. I can't believe the minister is really saying that. I believe the people he has are really competent enough to be able to handle those transaction in the time allowed for under section 38 of the act.

With the new technology which we have today, the computer does most of the work necessary to bring the books up to date. Mr. Minister, I would suggest to you that rather than the bill which you give us an amendment changing section 63 to read April 15 instead of April 30. That, in my opinion, would make a lot more sense.

I don't know why the government always has to delay and wants to make things more difficult for the operation and business of government. In fact, I think that's all you are doing. There are a lot of businesses in the world today which are operating on exactly the time frame. Mr. Minister.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, we cannot support the amendment to this act. I would hope the minister would take into consideration my suggestion that instead of changing section 38, the change should be made to section 63.

Mr. Speaker, we will not be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to on division and bill read a second time.



## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Snyder that Bill No. 19 — **An Act to amend The Trade Union Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on this bill before I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Let me suggest that Bill 19, which is an amendment to The Trade Union Act, came about because of the SGEA strike and a decision by the courts of the land. I would like to state that democracy in the trade union movement is really the issue we are talking about with the amendment and the history of this particular issue.

The concerns of parliamentarians and legislators should be that those within the union have the same rights as the citizens of the land when it comes to voting. First of all, they should know what they are voting for, what the question is, what a vote of yes or no will mean, what the results will be whichever way they vote, or if they are absent from the meeting how their voice will be considered.

Mr. Speaker, let me first go to a *Leader-Post* article, Thursday, December 20, 1979. I guess the comments I will be quoting in this particular case come from the Premier's press conference when he indicated that the only reason the government wasn't taking action against the SGEA was that it would make negotiations more difficult. That is what the Premier is quoted as saying in a news article Thursday, December 20, 1979.

It is interesting to note in other press articles (which I will be quoting from), it is indicated that the government would not take a stand even though they were shirking their duties in the Department of Labor.

It is indicated in the press statements referred to that the Minister of Labor and the Premier (who spoke quite frequently during that strike) didn't get involved because they were scared of being accused of interfering and having an action brought against them, which can be brought against an employer for unfair actions. They were caught in a dilemma of what was the right thing to do. They would not have been caught in that dilemma had the issue been a union which the government was not bargaining with itself.

It is interesting to note on the December 20 article, once again the Premier:

Blakeney said that the government was not considering amending The Trade Union Act because of the court ruling.

That seems strange because during the minister's statement yesterday, when he moved second reading, he constantly referred to the court case. It just doesn't jive with what we saw yesterday.

The Premier says, December 20, 1979:

Legislation requiring 50 per cent of the vote of the entire membership to

approve a strike has been in effect for 10 years and has caused no difficulty until now.

He suggested that he would not take any action. We seem to see an action coming. Let me comment here, of course, that since the statement was made the case was tried in a higher court and once again supported by the higher court. Therefore, I can understand the dilemma the Minister of Labour is in.

The question which comes to my mind though is, who really asked for the legislation? I once again have to look at the news clips for confirmation. Let me go to a couple here. The comments are made about a Saskatchewan Federation of Labor meeting, where Mr. Brown and his group went asking for the support of that group to have the changes brought in that we are seeing. Political pressure is what it really is. Once again we see why Mr. Brown and his group have that ability to cause political pressure on a December 17, 1979 article: Labor supports the NDP despite SGEA strike.

Even though they are striking against the government, even though the decision was just to come down that same day, Larry Brown and his people knew that the only way they could control this minister . . . Some people would suggest that the word control is a little gentle, some suggest the word blackmail might be proper. I would not suggest that; my suggestion would be that if they put all those funds into the NDP coffers through the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, they would have some clout for some strange reason. I don't know if you would call that clout; some refer to it as blackmail; some refer to it as something else.

Mr. Speaker, democracy in a trade union is something which I can speak about because I have been involved with the trade union. Really, do the trade union members have the same rights, as the minister indicated, as the general public has when it comes to a vote? The answer is no, they don't.

We just came through some by-elections. If I remember correctly, there were four or five days of advance voting for quite a few hours each day, plus 11 hours on voting day to vote. To boot, you had three hours off by legislation of the province to get to the voting polls on election day. So the comparison to the SGEA strike is wrong. Here is one of the reasons: the people who came to the meeting were told they couldn't vote when they got there; they were told they had to sit through the speeches first. That's democracy? I have not seen anybody being told at a provincial election or civic election they have to listen to speeches. You know, I've never heard that said, so it makes me wonder if democracy really is there. What is important is: are the member before the go to the meeting told what the question is going to be that is going to be put to them? When you go to a provincial election, or as the Minister of Labor referred to the burgesses voting in Regina the other day, people know what the issue is before they go there. They knew what they were going to vote on. They knew the costs (supposedly) of what the results of their action would be.

Mr. Minister, I realize you have a dilemma. You have your political buddies that you must pay off . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The minister from his seat says that he's not had any problem. Well, Mr. Minister, then why does the Premier say . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the minister sits in his seat and says that he doesn't know how he is going to vote. I don't think that's what he meant. I think he's accusing me of that. Let me tell you, Mr. Minister, you check what you are tampering with: 11(2)(d), check it out. Talk with some lawyers and see if that ruling can be looked at both ways. You've missed the point and so has your buddy, Larry Brown.

Let me suggest that you are having problems making your decision, because you have the Premier saying one thing, Mr. Minister of Labor, and you are saying the opposite. But you are paying off. The Premier hasn't changed his mind. I haven't heard the Premier stand up and say that the legislation that's in place is bad, and therefore we have to change it. No, he says that it's good and it has worked for 10 years. You say something different. I don't know if it's because your former executive assistant may have something to say to you each day.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy it when the Minister of Labor or the attorney General makes comments from his seat. And the comment that they both say is, "Judge Johnson made the ruling." You know that may be true. He made the decision, but the fellows from that side don't enjoy it when democracy works and the court system makes the decision. The Premier says that it's worked well for 10 years. Now what's the difference with it, Mr. Speaker? I suggest the difference is: Mr. Brown wants his pound of flesh. I notice that Mr. Kramer has gone and Mr. Brown called for his dismissal awhile ago. You notice Mr. Kramer's gone. I'm just not sure if Mr. Brown has the kind of clout in that cabinet to get rid of a 28-year member of this House. You remember he called for it during the strike last year, when Mr. Kramer made some suggestions that were not too indulging to the executive of the union.

Once again, the minister from his chair says, "how are you going to vote?" Let me suggest to you I'll give you some ideas. During the break between this session and the spring session get your lawyers to check some implication you haven't even thought about. There's more to what you are doing than you realize Mr. Minister of Labor. But let me go back as I said to some of these press clippings, and some of the comments that you made yesterday.

The question is, as I said earlier, democracy in the trade union movement. You should be concerned: (a) that every member of the union is guaranteed the right to vote, and that every opportunity should be there to give him his right to vote; (b) that all votes must be over a period of 12 hours, or 11 hours, because a normal work shift is 8 and that means that the man will have 3 hours to go to vote. That's what you should be concerned about, that every member has the right to vote by secret ballot and not have to come and sit through a union meeting and then be allowed to vote. That suggests that obviously some members don't get to cast their ballots, or maybe it suggests that someone wants them to sit there and be brainwashed before they are allowed to vote. Somebody doesn't want to allow them freedom of thought. Maybe that is what the SGEA was doing when they said to members, "You cannot vote until you have heard the speeches." That came out in the court case.

Now, I don't know what the SGEA was trying to do. That is their internal problem. But you, Mr. Minister are responsible for making sure that democracy works in the union and that every member is guaranteed by legislation a right to his vote. That didn't happen in the SGEA strike. People were denied votes because they wouldn't sit through the meeting. People were denied votes because of the time of the meeting if they had already pre-booked something else. Therefore, they weren't given the right.

In a general election in this province or in a federal election, there is always a pre-ballot for four or five days ahead of time with lengthy hours. The voting day of an election is 11 hours long. But that was not what was given to the SGEA employees. They were given 15 minutes or 20 minutes. They were told they had to sit through the speeches. Your government was really not defending the democratic privileges of this country which

we give the trade unions. People have a right to get into the trade union if they want. They voted themselves in. They have the right to vote themselves out. You know what the legislation is.

I think the key here, Mr. Minister, is that you haven't looked after your job in making sure everyone is protected and has their democratic rights. We should be considering that when there is a vote taken in a union, the question should be known to the members before they go to the voting booths — the same as you and I have that right. Or in the calling of a meeting, the members should at least be told what the intent of the meeting is. Sometimes it is not even suggested. They say, "We're going to tell you what negotiations have been bringing forth." They don't say, "We're going to have a vote and you accept them or not." That is wrong. They should say, "We're going to tell you what we have in negotiations, and we are going to have a vote on it." That way the person knows that he must be there to vote if he wants to have his say. That is what your amendment is suggesting. The only way you get your say is to be there.

Well, I am saying to you, Mr. Minister, your amendment needs more things. It needs the guarantee that every member will have his ballot, that every member does not have to be coerced and told he can only vote at certain times. At the time of the vote, it must be made certain that everyone has their right.

Mr. Minister, the SGEA strike probably proved a lot of interesting things. It showed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Once again, the minister who calls people radicals when they don't agree with him is talking from his seat.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No, no, reactionaries. No radicals, reactionaries.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Reactionaries, correction. Mr. Minister, can you say it in French?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Reactionnaires, monsieur. How do you like that?

**MR. KATZMAN:** — You know, it is interesting. On page 365 of *Hansard* yesterday, Mr. Minister, during your speech you made a comment about 60 per cent of the SGEA members voting, and in the court's decision 37 per cent of the total membership voted in favor of a strike and the rest did not. Mr. Judge Johnson's decision suggested that a majority plus one of the total eligible membership did not vote. Therefore, it was not a legal strike. That is really what we are discussing here, Mr. Speaker. The real issue goes further than just Judge Johnson's statement. The real issue is: did the people at that meeting have their democratic rights preserved and guaranteed, and the opportunity to use them? The answer is no, they didn't. When they came to the meeting, they were told, "You can't vote until you've heard all the speeches." I don't hear that at a general election in this province. You go and vote when you want; there is no requirement that you must know every candidate's stand on every issue.

The issue is that you have your rights and that is your job as Minister of Labor. Any changes that you make to this act should guarantee all those who are members have the right to go to a meeting or go to the ballot box, one or the other. They should have that right.

Let me refer to my own involvement in a union. When we had a very strong issue, we opened the ballot boxes at 9 o'clock in the morning at the place of employment of most of the employees. Those same ballot boxes remained until late into the evening so that every employee had a chance to vote. That's democracy. The ballot box was there at all

times . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Don't point your stubby finger at me. When you get on your feet, you point your stubby finger. And I'm on my feet, so you just there and take it!

Let's not deflect the issue, Mr. Minister of Labor. Let's talk about the issue. The issue is democracy — were those union members in SGEA allowed the rights they came for? You are not giving them the right: even this amendment doesn't give them their rights. There is no guarantee that they won't be told the ballot box is only open for 10 minutes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The Minister of Education likes to make shots from his seat. Well, from the way he's been handling his own department, he has learned some lessons from you, Mr. Minister of Labor, about how to force things through. If I remember, a petition last year had signatures of your own family against something you were going to do.

In a press clipping from the *Leader-Post* dated May 22, 1980, once again the Premier asks the employees of SGEA to support him and the decisions that he makes, and once again we see comments about funds. We see in a December 18, 1979, issue, comments about political pressure being put on. I refer to the other clipping of December 17, when the SGEA said that even though they weren't being treated fairly, they were going to support the NDP.

Let's go a step further now, and remember after Judge Johnson's decision came down, Larry Brown and the executive of SGEA decided that they would fine those people (and that was the word first used) who worked during the strike the total amount of money they received. Well, once again, to protect their democratic rights those individuals had to go to court. I always thought it was the government's job to protect the democratic rights of people in a trade union — especially the job of the Minister of Labor. He didn't do it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — He did fire Mr. Duncan.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Oh, he did fire Mr. Duncan? And we still don't know why, do we? We still don't know why he got rid of Mr. Duncan, but that's another issue again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are so many press clippings to which I would like to refer. Let me refer to one from the *Leader-Post*, dated July 12, 1980: Action by SGEA Termed Bordering on Contempt. Once again, this refers to the levy being made against people who, believing the strike was illegal, took action against the union and proved in court that the strike was illegal. And now the union tries to go after these people for the funds they earned when they refused to go out on an illegal strike.

Mr. Minister, where were you on that one? I thought it was your department's duty and job to make sure that the rights of the union worker were protected.

We can go back a little earlier in time and pick up press clippings. December 18, 1979: SGEA Strike Ruled Illegal. We then go to the second hearings: Union Being Investigated in Handling of Strike Vote. It doesn't say that the government is investigating them. If it were any other union, I think the government would have done it. Instead, it has to be a committee of the SGEA employees. I always thought it was your job, as a government to make sure the vote was held correctly — not the employees who are unhappy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see that it took members of the union (who had to hire their own lawyers) to protect their rights, and not the Government of Saskatchewan which normally is supposed to do the job. It took the members to take Mr. Brown and the executive of SGEA to court. What is interesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that Mr. Brown while he was with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, sent out a letter, with his signature below it, suggesting that if anyone were to have a strike vote and didn't have 50 per cent of the total membership plus one voting in favor of a strike, then to strike would be illegal. Yet Mr. Brown, now that he is with the SGEA takes his membership out on strike in circumstances which his letter, while he was the secretary of Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, said would be illegal.

It seems strange that we see Mr. Brown send out such a letter to people within the province and just a few years later, with the same law, he does exactly the opposite to what he advised everyone else. But I didn't hear the government of the Department of Labor saying, "Mr. Brown, that's improper. You cannot do that and you know it. There's a copy of a letter where you said you couldn't do it so now why are you doing it?"

Instead, he took people out on a strike — and people suffered. I refer to the students who were in the institutes around this province trying to get an education so that they could take their rightful place in this province and earn a living. Instead, some of their teachers were out on strike, and therefore the students suffered. In fact, in the case of the nurses, it caused a lot of hardship as they could not write their examinations. They had to have special arrangements made so that they could. but they couldn't write when everyone else was supposed to.

I made a reference earlier to Larry Brown and the former minister of highways, Mr. Kramer. Well just so that the Minister of Labor can find it when he goes looking for it, in *The Star-Phoenix* December 8, 1979, where Mr. Brown asks Mr. Kramer to be muzzled or removed, I noticed he got his wish; Mr. Kramer was removed.

Before I wind up my comments . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . From the backbenches comes a comment from the member who sits upon his you know what, and stands up when told to say yes or no, and has no opinion because he's a backbencher of a government. It's unfortunate that your rights aren't protected too, but that's the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, several of the comments made by the minister, I think should be placed out to the people within the union movement and the memberships of the unions, so they have time to consider them. When we come back in the spring, the letters that we and the minister receive from people, who do not believe that his amendment is going to do the job to protect their democratic rights, might change the situation. For that reason, I am going to ask leave to adjourn debate. We will wait for this legislation to get out to the people of Saskatchewan, so they can let us know their feelings on it.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

### **Bill No. 6 — An Act respecting a Floral Emblem for Saskatchewan.**

Section 1 agreed.

## Section 2

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Minister, is this flower in the position of becoming extinct or what is the reason for the legislation?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of the legislation is along the lines as suggested by the hon. member. We are advised by people who have taken in interest in this, that the flower is indeed a special flower and in danger of extinction; it needs protection. It is widely recognized as the floral emblem of the province of Saskatchewan — the Western Red Lily (or what I used to call the Saskatchewan Tiger Lily) — and we're simply enacting it by legislation.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Just so that I understand what you're saying . . . I understand, Mr. Chairman, that we can talk over this bill on the first issue and then just go through it. Am I correct?

Are you suggesting that if a farmer is breaking land and has Tiger Lilies on his land, that he cannot plow them under?

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, obviously if Tiger Lilies, or Western Red Lilies are the subject of a farmer's action in the course of plowing or something of that nature, unconsciously, then no one would seek any damage or retribution against him. But the idea of consciously proceeding to destroy an extinct plant, which is (if this bill becomes law) the floral emblem of Saskatchewan, would be prohibited. Through a combination of 3, 4 and 5, it's possible for an offence to take place.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I take it that what you are saying is that if a man breaks land that has this emblem on it, he's liable for fine.

**HON. MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Chairman, I said that you need the intent, and furthermore you also have to take a look at section 4 which says that section 3, which is the prohibition, does not relate to the person engaged in the lawful carrying out of any public work, or of his occupation. Presumably, that's the farmer's occupation.

I know how sensitive the hon. member is about the Meewasin Valley Authority, and how wildly misrepresented that bill was, and I'm in fear that he might misrepresent this one, but it is not there.

Section 2 as amended agreed.  
Sections 3 to 7 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

### **Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Police Act.**

Section 1 to 3 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Universities Commission Act.**

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:38 p.m.