

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

July 12, 1982

EVENING SESSION

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Interpretation Act (continued)

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned at 5 o'clock, I was just nicely getting started on a few words I had to say on the amendment proposed to Bill 16. Mr. Speaker, just in case some of the members weren't here or have forgotten some of the things I was saying, the amendment is being introduced to Bill 16, basically because we see the bill as taking away rights from a number of people — 30, 40 or 50 in number. We believe that if you are going to break that agreement or trust which a former government had with that group of individuals, then it is important and absolutely necessary that the new government compensate, and fairly compensate, those people with whom an agreement had been made.

There have been comparisons made with a deal that was broken when our government was elected in 1971 and came into power — a deal which was between a company in New York, the president of which was Karl Landegger and the company being Parsons and Whittemore. The members opposite, the government, have said that this analogy somehow gives them the right to break an agreement with individuals at this time. I think the comparison is not a very accurate or a very good one, because even at that time in dealing with a large multinational company we did lay on the table a compensation package when the agreement was terminated — a compensation package which fairly and adequately compensated that large company for the breaking of an agreement.

On the other hand, the situation we find ourselves in today with the introduction of Bill 16 and the subsequent amendment which was moved here in the Assembly last Friday is one in which we are standing up for the rights of that small group of people who are said to be, in one way or another, political people of the former government and should be removed. The proposal is that they not be removed with a fair compensation package but with a very wide broom to knocked aside without compensation. The members call them political hacks.

I think it has been pointed out a large number of times, Mr. Speaker, loudly and clearly, that many of the people definitely were not political hacks. I went through the list. I know that Mr. Speaker himself was on one of those boards and did an excellent job. The amendment to Bill 16 that will allow for cancellation of an agreement with compensation will protect people in that group who were appointed by the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association. There are other members of this Assembly who have, as well, served on boards. The member for Regina Lakeview, I know is on a board; at least he was at the time of the election. Whether he is now or not I am not too sure. With the milk control board, for example, where the chairman is appointed for a 10-year term and where I am sure that person is protected by the public service commission, I think there are questions to be asked as to whether or not The Interpretation Act, with or without its amendments, will supersede The Public Service Commission Act.

July 12, 1982

So we find the difficult position that we find this Assembly in at the present time, where we believe the rights of a large number of individuals are at stake, and where the government is insistent on removing a group of people who, we feel, do not fit into the mould that they talk about when they talk about political hacks. They are people who have been appointed after many years of building a trust, many years of continuity, whether it is with the teachers of the province or the trustees of the province, just to mention a couple of groups.

The member for Swift Current will be well aware that there is a trust that builds up between the government and between the School Trustees' Association, and it's one which is at stake at the present time because of Bill 16, and because of the fact that the amendment that we are proposing is suggested not to be part of the package.

I think that there are a number of ways in which the amendment to Bill 16, offering a compensation package, would make the bill better. It wouldn't be a great bill, but it would make it better for those individuals who would be involved. It would compensate them for the discontinuation of pension plans, discontinuation of income in some cases, and discontinuation of holidays, in others.

I think, as well, we have to look at the trust that has been placed in our government, the government of the day, and look at what will be happening, if in fact that kind of agreement and the trust that results from that kind of agreement being signed between individuals or companies, is lost. And I say that in Saskatchewan we have a great record. The previous governments, whether they were Liberal, NDP, or CCF, had a great record of signing agreements with people. And when government changes, those agreements stand, and they stand the duration of the contract or the agreement.

But for the first time, we find that here in this legislature we are asked to be party to the discontinuation of a large number of agreements with individuals.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's fairly obvious that in breaking an agreement, you're setting a very, very dangerous precedent here in the province of Saskatchewan.

I talked last Friday about what that will mean to a large number of other contracts, whether they are with highway contractors or whether they are with farmers or resort owners — what that will mean to them if they now live in the fear, on a day-to-day basis, of worrying about whether or not their agreement will be cancelled.

And I think when the government talks about making this province and the civil service and the people who work for it non-political, the very opposite is true. If we allow this to pass unamended, with every person appointed to the board, whether he is the suggestion of the school trustees' association or the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, what you will find is that the cabinet will then have the weight to dictate to what is supposed to be an impartial appointment what it wants done and what it would like to see take place in the province. And that may be a fair point. Maybe the principle of this is to get rid of boards and commissions in the province of Saskatchewan. But if that's the case, then let's get it out on top of the table and say so.

For example, take the labour relations board. If the government is saying they don't want a labour relations board and the cabinet would like the authority to make decisions on each and every one of those, then simply get rid of the board. Don't bother bringing in this Bill 16 or the amendment. Simply get rid of the board, and each week the cabinet

can take a list of those names and tick them off. But, I think what is attempted to be done here is, under the table, somehow to gain control of these boards, set them up as puppets of the cabinet, and yet maintain that they are somehow at arm's length, or that they serve some type of a judicial procedure. Bill 16 unamended would completely and totally rip apart the concept of many of these boards.

Now, we're not saying that everyone who is on a board or commission should be offered some type of a compensation package. It's fairly obvious that many of them are at the will of the government. Probably 75 per cent of them are not in a position to be affected by this amendment. However, for that group of people who came into the agreement — they weren't told at the time, they weren't taken on the mat and told that they would be subject to removal if a Conservative government came to power. That's not the agreement that we, the government of the day, made with those people. There are large numbers of them, probably 75 per cent, who did know that if the government changed they would be displaced and removed, and someone else would be appointed. I don't see why this process cannot be allowed to continue where, on the majority of boards, the government has a wide broom — as the members opposite talk about — to clean out those whom they see to be in sensitive positions and maybe have political leanings. For many of the people who do not fit into this group, those appointed are community leaders in every sense of the word. They cross party boundaries, and they should at least be offered a compensation package when they are dismissed. The whole principle of looking at Bill 16 and its amendments is to consider the rights of this group of people and to consider whether or not we should be looking at this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious that I will be supporting this amendment, as I am sure that all members on this side of the House will. I would encourage the members in government, at least those in the back benches who have some sensitivity to these proposals being created and proposed by the government, and who have the backbone to stand up and vote against the party line, to have the backbone to vote in favor of this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate on the amendment to Bill 16, and because there seems to be some question as to what the amendment contains, I precede my remarks by pointing out that the amendment states that all the words after the word "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

this bill not now be read a second time, because it would authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to abrogate agreements unilaterally, and to do this on a retroactive basis, and fails to make any provision for fair and reasonable compensation to parties to any agreement so abrogated.

I think that it is important to repeat the amendment, Mr. Speaker, because it isn't clear on reading Bill 16 just what kinds of agreements it is that the government wishes to abrogate, in the cabinet room, what it would not wish to subject to the full scrutiny of this legislature and the public. They simply say:

Subject to subsection (2), notwithstanding anything in this act, or in any other act, or in any order, regulation or agreement.

Now what kind of agreement do they refer to? We're not told. We are to take this in the context of an omnibus bill which has the result of amending 116 different acts of this legislature. It also has the effect of amending, apparently, any order, regulations or agreements. How many agreements? What kinds of agreements? With whom? Why the reluctance to bring forward that information, Mr. Speaker?

If we look at this in the total context of the bill, and in the context of the boards and commissions that the government has available to it, we recognize that there are a number of act, and under those acts a number of boards and commissions, that state clearly that their appointments should be for a specific term. Does the act refer to agreements associated with such appointments? Does it not refer to such agreements? We're not told. The Attorney General did nothing in his second reading speech, or in his speech on this amendment, to clarify that kind of situation.

It is legitimate to ask, Mr. Speaker, because the appointment is for a term. There may be very good reasons why it is for a term, and it is likely that most of the reasons fall into the category of maintaining or providing continuity. It is possible that the Attorney General is referring to some agreements either providing for such continuity, or providing for such term, or agreements associated with those. We don't know whether that's what he is referring to.

There are also, on most boards and commissions, many appointments which are at pleasure. Now, it's possible that there may be agreements indirectly associated with that pleasure appointment. There may be agreements associated with such things as the right to participate in a pension plan of a crown corporation. There may be agreements associated with those at pleasure appointments which refer to a per diem payment; they may refer to a specific minimum number of per diem payments per year, or they may refer to a maximum number of per diem payments in a year. Are those agreements about which the Attorney and the government are concerned? There is no indication, no willingness to enlighten this legislature or the public of Saskatchewan, as to whether it is agreements of those kinds that they are concerned about, and whether those agreements are tied to appointments of a specific term nature, or to at-pleasure appointments.

Now, if they are agreements tied to at-pleasure appointments, the cabinet now has the power to terminate them. So why would they be seeking a new, blanket, sweeping kind of power?

If they are not agreements associated with at-pleasure appointments, to what agreements do they refer? If they are not those associated with term appointments that they wish to abrogate, what is it that they wish to abrogate, with whom, at what period of time? What's the problem with identifying them?

Now, there are some boards and commissions, Mr. Speaker, where some members of those boards (chairmen, particularly, but there might be others) have statutory security of tenure. That statutory security of tenure may have, associated with it, agreements with regard to pensions, or to participation in a pension plan. It may have associated with it the minimum and maximum payments. There could be a connection to any number of agreements with regard to those appointments. The agreements might contain clauses for those people who have statutory protection of tenure, or who may have access to agreements that provide for paid holidays or other kinds of benefits. Is it those agreements that the Attorney General or the government is concerned about? If it is not those agreements, then that's one more set of agreements that can be eliminated

and, perhaps, it will become easier, as they eliminate them, for the Attorney General to identify just what agreements they refer to.

Why are there appointments, particularly on the quasi-judicial bodies, that carry with them provisions for security of tenure, and that may carry with them provisions for security of tenure, the protection of pension eligibility, per diem payments, per annum payments, or holidays and other benefits such as earned days off? Why are there protections and security of tenure built in to appointments to boards or commissions, and why are there agreements associated with them?

Well, the reason, Mr. Speaker, is that just as we must do in our society, whether at the federal or the provincial levels, with judges, and just as we must take every precaution to ensure that the integrity, independence and security of tenure of the appointees is guaranteed and protected, so must that be done with some of the quasi-judicial bodies which would be affected and effectively amended by this legislation. That kind of independence could be effectively eroded, whether contained in an agreement or not, by this legislation. It could be eroded not so much by dismissing the person, not so much by saying that the person is a political hack — regardless of what exists under your agreement with the government, regardless of what security of tenure and independence and security of integrity your job may have carried with it from the date of passage of Bill 16 (without amendment) — but saying that independence, whether it was contained in an agreement or not, could be threatened if the incumbent in that position refused to carry out the instructions of the government of the day.

So any pension agreement, any payment agreement or any holiday agreement could be threatened by political interference in a quasi-judicial body; this is only marginally different from political interference with a judge. Any government that would pass a bill like Bill 16 without the protection and guarantees called for in the amendment could easily be thought to be not very far away from the same kind of interference in the judicial process. That might be just the next step.

Now, with respect to any individuals appointed to boards and commissions, whether they are term appointments or at-pleasure appointments, they could each have one agreement or several agreements in place at any one time. The kinds of agreements which the Attorney General is after are not identified in Bill 16. Is it the pension or possible pension or potential pension that might exist in an agreement of the chairman of the Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board that he wishes to abrogate? Is it an agreement or agreements that might exist with regard to the payment that individual is after? Does he think there is some agreement around that gives that individual too many holidays or too many earned days off? What agreements does he wish to pursue under the banner of Bill 16 without amendment?

Mr. Speaker, if it is the intention of the Attorney General and the government to abrogate agreements, then they should be able — indeed they must be able — to satisfy this legislature, the public, and the people of Saskatchewan that they are justified in doing this, and that they can state publicly the justification for the abrogation of the agreement. They must subject to public scrutiny the terms and conditions upon which they are abrogating the agreement.

There need be no fear of that unless there is something to hide, and I believe that the Attorney General is an honorable man. I believe that he would not wish to hide anything from the people of Saskatchewan or from the public of Saskatchewan. I believe that he would not lend the authority and prestige of his office to abrogating in secret

agreements duly entered into and duly committed to by two parties.

I believe that he is an honorable man, and that he would wish that both parties to the agreement would have their say and would negotiate the conditions under which the agreement would be abrogated. Having done that, then what's wrong with coming into this legislature, under full public scrutiny, and explaining and justifying why changes to agreements should be made, which changes should be made, and under what terms and conditions they should be made? What is wrong with identifying the quarry? Why does that need to be done in secret? If it is the desire to abrogate agreements, particularly agreements associated with, or tied to, or upon which quasi-judicial bodies are dependent, then I think that it is incumbent upon the government to satisfy this legislature and the public that there is no intention to impair the integrity, the independence, or the security of tenure of those boards and commissions where, under one or several agreements, there are provisions for such security of tenure and for the protection of the integrity and independence of the boards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, government members, and particularly the Attorney General, continue to insist that they only wish to replace our political hacks with their political hacks. Fair enough, with the proviso that if there are agreements with some people who cannot be categorized as political hacks, if there are agreements covering all or certain aspects of the service by those Saskatchewan citizens on boards and commissions then can the Attorney General or the government identify which boards and commission and which agreements and confront them with the impossibility of making the changes they wish to make? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that they can already do . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The rules of the Chamber do not permit members to continually repeat the same things that they have said in the same debate I would caution the member that you are moving in that direction. You are going around and around on the same topic time after time. You'll have to be ruled out of order unless you get back to the subject.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am in full agreement with your ruling. Let me say that I don't recall whether you were in the Chair or the Deputy Speaker was in the Chair when the Attorney General . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! You don't have the right to dispute the rulings of the Chair. I would caution the member to proceed with his speech.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I'm not disputing the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I said that I agreed whole-heartedly with your ruling. I was explaining what may have appeared to be my wandering. In way of explanation, I was offering the observation that when the Attorney General was speaking on the amendment, he (I may be mistaken) appeared to me to wander over quite a number of subjects that were difficult for me to relate to the amendment. However, I did make note of those subjects, Mr. Speaker. I'm referring to those notes and I'm operating under the assumption (maybe it's the wrong assumption) that if the Attorney General, in speaking to this amendment, raised certain subjects that were not ruled out of order then it should follow that it is in order to respond to those subjects raised by the Attorney General. I was not disputing your ruling. I was trying to explain what appeared to be a wandering on my part.

The Attorney General, in speaking to the amendment to Bill No. 16, introduced as a defense of Bill No. 16 and as an argument against the amendment the entire matter of Bill No. 45 and the ordering of hospital workers back to work. He drew the conclusion that somehow Bill No. 45 was identical with the provisions of Bill No. 16 and that it was a demonstration that the government was doing the right thing in opposing the amendment and that Bill No. 45 somehow defeated our argument in support of the amendment.

I want to point out to the Attorney General that even in his example of Bill No. 45, in addition to the error of his arguments, one of the things he left out was the fact that that is an example of what we are saying. That is an example of bringing the matter before this legislature and of subjecting it to public scrutiny and to the scrutiny of this legislature and to the scrutiny of the press. And that is fundamentally different from what is proposed in Bill No. 16. That is a fundamental argument in support of the amendment, although the Attorney General put it as an argument in opposition to the amendment.

When he was talking about the hypocrisy of this amendment, one of the other things that the Attorney General of Saskatchewan left out was that when Bill No. 45 was before the legislature he stood on this side of the House in support of it in second reading and in third reading, Mr. Speaker.

He uses Bill No. 45 as an argument against the amendment and an argument about hypocrisy and he somehow casts himself as someone who, in defense of the rights of the working people, voted against Bill No. 45. He somehow feels that the amendment isn't really defending anybody who might be covered by agreement and that it is hypocritical to talk about the rights of these people. Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General has again today shown the shallowness of his arguments against the amendment and the shallowness of his arguments in favour of Bill No. 16 by interjecting into this debate on the amendment the whole question of Bill No. 45 and the rights of the working people.

And because he used that in his arguments today against the amendment, because he used Bill No. 45 as somehow the hub on which his arguments turn and upon which his arguments should be accepted and he used it as the hub of why the arguments put forward by the opposition today on the amendment should be defeated, I want to spend some time talking about the difference between Bill No. 45 and the amendment to Bill No. 16 and what Bill No. 16 would do without amendment.

What Bill No. 45 did for a specified period of time was not take away anybody's rights; it suspended them. That's true; it did that for a period of time.

This Bill 16, without amendment, proposes to retroactively take away the rights of Saskatchewan citizens. It doesn't say which rights; it doesn't say which citizens. Bill 45 identified which rights were suspended, for which citizens over which period of time. So I say the comparison made by the Attorney General is a facetious and fallacious kind of comparison.

I point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that if the Attorney General was being consistent this afternoon, and if he was expressing a true and sincere and honest concern about what he called the abrogation of certain rights under Bill 45, then I would expect that before this session is over we will see a piece of legislation introduced by the Attorney General

to repeal Bill 45, a bill to which he is so adamantly opposed.

Moving on from his example to another point made in his argument this afternoon (and it was an essential point of his entire argument — he made it several times), he said several times this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, "We have terminated no appointments; we have terminated none, so why is the opposition concerned about the retroactivity?" Well, to turn that argument around, if none have been terminated, why is the retroactivity necessary? Why is it needed? Because he said he has terminated none, he doesn't require the retroactivity. And he made a particular point of emphasizing that he didn't require the retroactivity. So why not remove it, and why not exempt, specifically, agreements from that kind of retroactivity?

He went on to say that any government should be held accountable for terminations, for the abrogation of agreements, and if they are going to be held accountable for abrogation of agreements, Mr. Speaker, what better place, what more fitting place than this legislature? Why does there appear to be a fear of being accountable in this legislature? It's all very well to be accountable in the cabinet room, as the bill without amendment would provide, and then to say, "Well, I'm sorry that we can't discuss that because of cabinet confidentiality." He wants to be accountable, but he wants to be accountable only to himself and to the cabinet.

He went on to say, in making his arguments (and here was an area where I thought that the Attorney General strayed a long way from the amendment, but I did make note of it and I want to respond to his straying), that the legislature should apply to all boards and commissions because they are carrying out government policy.

All boards and commission, under Bill No. 16, would include the Board of Governors of the University of Regina. Is it the view of the Attorney General that the Board of Governors of the University of Regina is carrying out government policy? Because if it is, then it is important that any amendments to that act, any amendments to any agreements under that act, be brought into this legislature, Mr. Speaker, because there are a good many people at the university who do not see the university as an instrument of government policies.

There are a good many people at the university who still consider that there exists something called academic freedom. And they consider that to be important in our society just as I consider it to be important, just as many people in this society consider it to be important. They don't consider the Board of Governors of the University of Regina to be an instrument of government policy regardless of the political stripe of that government.

The Attorney General also this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, in speaking against the amendment and in defending actions under Bill No. 16, referred to Mr. Collver and the bill which was brought before this legislature with regard to the Unionest Party. He said that somehow the denial of rights to the Unionest Party — rights equivalent to those of any other political party in Saskatchewan or in this legislature — made an hypocrisy out of the defense of rights under this amendment.

First, I think that fundamentally the situations are different. I fail to see the comparisons. But give him his argument and say that they are comparable. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you will recall, as many other members of this Assembly will recall, that the Attorney General stood in his place in this House and voted with the government of the day in favour of that bill to remove the rights of the Unionest Party. Now he says that having

voted for that bill is an example of hypocrisy in defending the rights of the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan or the rights of the members of the workers' compensation board or the rights of the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan or the rights of the labour relations board. Somehow that defense is made not credible because people took the position that the Unionest Party did not have the same rights in this legislature as the Progressive Conservative Party.

Has the Attorney General changed his view on the rights of the Unionest Party? I don't know, but he introduced the matter, Mr. Speaker, and I think it deserves and requires reply.

He also went to great lengths to refer to the Alberta Interpretation Act. And he used that as an example and a defense of Bill No. 16 and as an argument in opposition to this amendment. I think that argument put by the Attorney General with regard to the Interpretation Act in Alberta is very revealing, and it's revealing in many ways.

I wish to refer to the Interpretation Act in Alberta, and I refer to the case of *Melsness v. Minister of Social Services and Community Health*, Alberta Court of Appeal, Judgment February 15, 1982:

A civil servant who holds a position as a public officer at the pleasure of the crown but who may not be removed from the civil service at large except pursuant to the provisions of the Public Service Act, is not entitled to a hearing after being removed from his position as a public officer.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that the Attorney General referred to the Alberta Interpretation Act in making his arguments against the amendment this afternoon is that the Attorney General has studied the Alberta act very carefully. He has studied the cases and the precedents, and he knows full well that if using that precedent, he or any officers of the Department of the Attorney General were able to establish in court that a civil servant could be found to be a public officer — a public officer who could not be removed from the civil service at large except pursuant to the provisions of The Public Service Act, then he would be free to abrogate any provisions under the pension agreement that civil servants might have, even if they weren't order in council appointments. He would be free to abrogate any holiday pay provisions. He would be free to abrogate entitlements to earned days off, or any other benefits to which civil servants who have been fired might have been entitled, and which would have to be included in a compensation package — a compensation package that the government continues to refuse to announce and to finalize.

That compensation package will have a lot to do with agreements that could, under the Alberta precedent, be found to be agreements that the government could abrogate retroactively to May 8, 1982.

The Attorney General has said that he doesn't want the retroactivity to deal with members of any boards and commissions, because he hasn't terminated any, and he doesn't need the retroactivity. He has not said what he needs the retroactivity for, but he has introduced into this debate on this amendment the question of the Alberta Interpretation Act, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason that the retroactivity is in there. The retroactivity is in there because he does not intend to pay compensation under any kind of agreement to any public servants, employees of crown corporations, or members of boards and commissions that he may terminate in the future.

July 12, 1982

If that's not the case, if he's not afraid of having to pay compensation to any public officers, under any agreement, who are removed without cause, then what is it that he's after in this act? Why does he resist the amendment so loudly? If there are some boards and commissions and some people who are exempt from Bill 16, and if, as the Attorney General says, the amendment is unnecessary, then why can he not name the boards and commissions that are included and for which the amendment is unnecessary? Why can he not name the boards and commissions that are excluded and for which the amendment may be necessary?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there must be a very good reason for the Attorney General to refuse to do that. There must be a very good reason why this afternoon he chose to wander totally away from the amendment and spoke only in defense of Bill 16 in general terms (and cast that defense under the guise of Bill 45), with the argument that other agreements by other governments had been abrogated, even though they were brought into this legislature when it was done, and at that time justified and explained to this legislature. Why would he go to such lengths to avoid speaking to the amendment, to the details of the bill, and to avoid responding to the criticism of the bill? Why would he cut such a wide swath, and paint with such a wide brush in defense of Bill 16, if there were not something that he wished not to have disclosed to this legislature and to the public?

He referred to the omnibus nature of the bill this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and he said: "Don't be concerned about the omnibus nature of the bill; don't be concerned about the 116 acts that might be amended by the bill. We really don't want to change the acts, we don't want to change the legislation, we just want to change the people."

Well, which people? A good one-third or more are at-pleasure appointments and can be changed tomorrow, could have been changed on May 10. There are term appointments — all right. Which of those gives him a problem? He says he doesn't want to change the legislation, he just wants to change the people. Which ones give him a problem? He named a few this afternoon, but surely, to change those half-dozen members of some boards and commission, you don't need to amend 116 acts and give the cabinet the power to do that in secret.

Surely, those half-dozen people he can get rid of. This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, he named some of the people. I think it is important that he name the rest. Who is he after? Who is the quarry? Now, he says that all we are interested in is defending political appointments. But as long as he refuses to name those, he paints the entire 2,800 or more people with the same brush. He paints all of them with that wide brush and suggests that they are all political hacks. Will he name those boards and commission and the members of those boards and commissions?

Now, I don't know whether any agreements exist with the members of the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan. Is there an agreement that affects Dr. Saul Cohen on pension agreement, per diem payments, per annum payments, holidays? Is there an agreement that affects him? I don't know. Is there an agreement that affects Sister Bernarda Gallinger? Are there agreements that affect her? Is she to be cast by the Attorney General as a political hack? Is it agreements with her that they are concerned about? They don't say, Mr. Speaker. So all these members of boards and commissions have to assume that, unless he says otherwise, they are the ones the Attorney General is after. Do any agreements exist that are subject to Bill 16 and affect the members of the big-game advisory committee? The bill doesn't say. The Attorney General doesn't say.

Is Dennis Pattinson affected by any of the agreements? If he isn't, what is wrong with saying so? Regarding Andy Michael on the big game advisory committee, are there any agreements that involve pensions, vacations or per diem payments that affect Andy Michael? It doesn't say. On the Board of Governors of The Battlefords Regional Care Centre, who is the target? Judge J. M. Policha? Are there any agreements under that act and under the terms of reference of the Board of Governors of The Battlefords Regional Care Centre that affect Judge Policha? Are there not? There aren't? Why be afraid to say so in this legislature? Why be afraid to say so to the public?

Who is it in the cancer foundation who might be affected by a per diem payment agreement or a per annum payment agreement or some association with some pension scheme, or some holiday scheme that's covered in an agreement? Dr. Baltzan? Dr. Blackburn? Who are the political hacks there? Who is the quarry there? If there is none, and there may very well be none, then why not lay it out before the people? What is there to hide? There are no agreements of any kind affecting any of those people. If there are no agreements that need to be abrogated in the dark of night, then bring them in here and clear the air.

Take the Saskatchewan Labor Relations Board. Do any agreements exist with, or affect, directly or indirectly, Brian J. Keple? Is that the quarry? They are all painted with the same brush. According to the government members, they are all political hacks. Who is it on the Saskatchewan Minimum Wage Board that might be affected by some agreements? Why the anxiety to get this amendment defeated and this Interpretation Act passed? Does it have something to do with the Saskatchewan Minimum Wage Board? Are there some people over there who are resisting instructions and resisting political interference? Can some agreements that they are party to be used as a hammer, Mr. Speaker? I don't know.

The Natonum Community College Board — who is the target there? And who might be affected by an agreement there? A per diem payment, per annum payment, pension? Is it Eugene St. Amand? Or is it Gladys Johnston, retired senior citizen, treaty Indian, retired civil servant? Is she the political hack? Is she the target? Well, there is someone named Murdine Thorpe. Now, is she affected by any agreements? They won't say. Why won't they say?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's legitimate to continue to insist that the agreements be identified and that the targets be identified. Is it the Saskatchewan Arts Board? Who on the Saskatchewan Arts Board? What agreements might be affected by Bill No. 16 and protected by the amendments? What agreements are in place that the Attorney General wants to be able to abrogate? . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I have the list, but I don't wish to belabor that point, Mr. Speaker.

Now, it's true; we confess that there might have been some political appointments on some of these boards and commissions that are covered by agreements. There might be; it is just possible, but what about the rest of the people? What about those dedicated citizens of Saskatchewan who wish only to be of service to the province and to their community? I don't know, Mr. Speaker, when you served on one or more of the boards that are identified here whether or not you were the beneficiary of, or were subject to, directly or indirectly, any agreements. I think that even before taking up your non-partisan mantle, people would have been hard-pressed to say that you were a political hack appointed by our government. There might have been some who would have wished to say that, but I think they would have been hard-pressed to defend that.

July 12, 1982

What agreements exist between the government and the Prince Albert Housing Authority? What agreements exist involving not only the housing authority but also individual members of that authority? Who are the political hacks on the Prince Albert Housing Authority? Is it Larry Zatlyn, the chairman? Is he the political hack?

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is a body involved with alcohol rehabilitation and particularly the treatment of impaired drivers, a board which I know has an agreement with the Department of Health. That's the board of the St. Louis Alcohol Rehab Centre. Is it the agreement with that institution that he is after and doesn't want protected by this amendment? Well, that may be the target. Fair enough. I don't think anyone would disagree with your wishing to implant your stamp on certain boards and commissions and to give your direction to those boards and commissions. But I think people do wonder why you would want to give the cabinet authority to unilaterally abrogate agreements that might exist with those boards and commissions, why you would want to give them the authority to unilaterally abrogate agreements that might exist with individuals. Why wouldn't you bring that matter in here? Why are you embarrassed about it? You keep getting up and saying to us, "The reason that we don't have to bring those agreements before the legislature, the reason that we don't have to give any guarantee of protection of people under those agreements, is that we won the election."

Look, we know you won the election. We may not be able to count to 54, but we can count to 9. We know that that leaves a whole bunch. So you don't need, day after day, to prove to us that you won the election. Surely by now, you yourselves believe it. The people of Saskatchewan believe it. The people of Saskatchewan believe the things you said to them about open government. They gave you an overwhelming mandate on that basis. So why the embarrassment?

If the member for Kinistino wants the agreement with the Board of Governors of the Saint Louis Alcohol Rehabilitation Centre broken, changed, modified, or amended, and if he wants some of his political friends on the board, and somebody else's political friends off of the board, and if he wants the agreement to provide for that, he does not need to be embarrassed about bringing that to this legislature. You don't need to give that power to the cabinet. You can do it. You were elected to represent your constituents, so represent them.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General spent a great deal of time expressing his concern about the cost of keeping this legislature going in order to deal with the amendments to Bill No. 16. Well, if they're really concerned about cost, we can offer them a solution that will only cost one-tenth as much to the people of Saskatchewan as Bill No. 9. It will only cost one-tenth of that — a solution based on this amendment. I'll put forward three solutions, Mr. Speaker. If those aren't sufficient, then let them put forward one. I think that's fair, if nine of us put forward three solutions and they put forward one. I can understand how, with an opposition of 9 and a government membership of 54, they feel outnumbered.

If they're concerned about costs, there is a way to solve that, because this is not, Mr. Speaker, a battle over political power. It's not a battle over ideology. We're talking about the process of effecting significant change in the structures of many of the institutions that are important to the people of Saskatchewan. These institutions are important for providing services to the people of Saskatchewan, many of which are covered by agreements. If they are concerned about the cost, Mr. Speaker . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's the concern you should have!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I can understand that from a member who makes all his speeches from his butt. I assure you that the whip will allow you once more before this year is over, during budget speech debate, to get on your feet . . . Well, maybe 10 minutes tomorrow too or 20 minutes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You'll get 30 minutes in this year. You have already had 10 minutes. You'll get 10 more minutes tomorrow and 10 minutes the following day. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am departing from the contents of the amendments. I am simply responding to the hon. member for Humboldt, who, I think, was falling asleep.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I am sorry, Cut Knife-Lloydminster. Please see that his name is in *Hansard* because he did speak, if only from his butt.

I was about to put forward three possible options to deal with this and allow the government to find a solution to this terrible hand-tying of the Attorney General. The first possibility (and I think those members on the government side should support this one because it would give them a piece of the action) is: why not take the situation that the Attorney General has outlined as a problem and place it in the hands of a select committee of this legislature? Such a committee would have obviously a majority of government members, so there would be no fear there. Take that committee out to hold hearings and discussions with, get the input of, and hold consultations with, members of any of the boards and commissions that would be affected, particularly, those, Mr. Speaker, that might be in the position of being concerned about agreements that either they individually, or the board or commission they are on, have which might be abrogated. That's one possibility.

If the government members are too busy to meet with the people, perhaps they could send the legislative secretaries. After all, that was the Attorney General's defense for paying them extra money; so they could talk to the people. Anyway, a select committee of this legislature is one approach.

Another solution could be the establishment of a royal commission. What would be wrong with taking this whole question of Bill No. 16 and the amendment thereto and putting it in the hands of a royal commission?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Let's save the public money.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Oh, I'm telling you how to save some money. What would be wrong with, on the other hand, putting the question in the hands of one or more judges in a judicial inquiry to look at this matter in a very serious way? When one considers the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and Bill 16, what is the rush? They're not in a rush to raise the minimum wage; they have lots of time to study that. They're not in a rush to bring in the farm mortgage program; they have lots of time to study that. So why not study this? Why not give this the appropriate study and consideration by either a partisan body (i.e., a select committee) made up of a majority of government members, or one of two nonpartisan bodies.

If there is another way to end this stalemate and end this impasse, then suggest it, because, at this point, Mr. Speaker, the opposition is obviously caught between a

desire to protect the rights of the people of Saskatchewan (particularly the rights of people under unidentified agreements) from the desire of the Attorney General to abrogate those agreements and the desire not to spend any more public funds or public time than is necessary.

I tell the members of the government that, whether it's under this amendment to Bill 16 or under many other amendments that we will bring, we are prepared to defend those rights. There are solutions to this impasse. The government would not need to apologize for taking six months for a second look. If the people of Prince Albert can wait to hear what is going to happen with regard to the technical institute, if people can wait for announcements on highways, nursing homes, and hospitals, if people can wait for all of the things that under review, then why the panic? Why the panic with regard to Bill 16? Why can't they devote their mania for study to Bill 16 and the amendments thereto?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan wishes to speak . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They call me many things worse than that, particularly members of the government opposite — of course, not the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, the member for Meadow Lake; he is above such things . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, well, certainly a scholar. I'm reviewing that; he may be a gentleman as well, but that's under review.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General was totally misleading with regard to both the intent and the protections under this bill in his arguments against the amendments.

Now, no one expects that a new government won't have some problems in putting its own stamp on boards and commission. We accept that and recognize that there are some problems. But, we argue that this must be done in an orderly fashion. We argue that people must be protected. We argue that signed agreements must be protected. They must not be unilaterally abrogated.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that this exercise of putting their stamp on boards and commissions not be reduced to an exercise of political power simply as an instrument of ideological vengeance. I have heard members opposite name people upon whom they seek vengeance but they name them only from their seats, Mr. Speaker. They should get to their feet and name them. They should bring the bills before the legislature.

We recognize that agreements may cover certain aspects of some boards and commissions which do deal with very sensitive areas of social and economic policy, areas in which the government may have a particular ideological view and stamp which they wish to put on those boards and commissions. Many are political or of a political nature, but not all of them and not all of the people on them.

I think it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, to speak as the Attorney General did today against this amendment. I think it is wrong to use the reasons which he used, and to paint all the boards and commissions with the same brush, to paint all 2,800 or more individuals involved. Are they all ideological enemies of the PC Party? I don't think so. I don't think they are all ideological enemies of the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We don't either.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Well why do you want to sweep out . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're thinking of crossing the floor. Is that what you're saying?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I think it's a good thing that the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan makes that offer from his seat because I think that is defined in the rules as a corrupt practice — both offering, and, I would suggest, crossing the floor in that direction.

Why do you want to sweep out all of the non-political service-oriented individuals along with the few who are political appointees or ideological enemies of the current government, or whom you think are ideological enemies? I know that you don't believe all 2,800 are. Identify the ones who are. You don't have to identify them by name or identify the people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, is the Minister for Northern Saskatchewan referring to the amendment on Bill 16? I'm not sure that I make the connection between . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this isn't just a debate over political power. It is a process of effecting significant change in many areas which are covered by agreements, and I am sure that the government opposite would not wish to unilaterally abrogate agreements and leave itself open to the kind of criticism that could yield. I am confident that they will wish to support this amendment, Mr. Speaker, because I know that all hon. members opposite believe in citation 1 of Beauchesne's, which says:

The principles that lie at the basis of English parliamentary law have always been kept steadily in view by the Canadian parliament; these are: to protect a minority and restrain the improvidence or tyranny of a majority; to secure the transaction of public business in an orderly manner; to enable every member to express his opinions within limits necessary to preserve decorum and prevent an unnecessary waste of time; to give abundant opportunity for the consideration of every measure; and to prevent any legislative action being taken upon sudden impulse.

And I know that those members opposite for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, and because they are supporters of the parliamentary tradition and parliamentary process, will wish to support this amendment to Bill 16. I know that they will believe, as I do, that to present a bill on such a complex subject in this fashion is gross abuse of the government's power, and I know that they will wish to support the amendment. I urge all hon. members to support the amendment, and I will let my argument stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 8

Thompson
Hammersmith

Koskie
Shillington

Lingenfelter
Yew

Engel

Lusney

NAYS — 31

Devine
Andrew
Muirhead
Garner
Duncan
Hampton
Petersen
Hopfner
Gerich
Embury
Baker

Muller
Lane
Pickering
Katzman
Smith (Swift Current)
Tusa
Schmidt
Klein
Domotor
Dirks

Birkbeck
Rousseau
McLeod
Martens
Boutin
Sauder
Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Rybchuk
Maxwell
Johnson

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a few comments on Bill 16 and after I make my comments, I will be moving an amendment to the motion. Mr. Speaker, I'm quite concerned about this bill and I know the citizens of Saskatchewan are quite concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — Over the weekend, I spent three days out in Saskatchewan (not particularly northern Saskatchewan but I was around the province) and I met a number of people who expressed to me their concerns as to just what this bill really meant.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Name three.

MR. THOMPSON: — Name three. Many, many of them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will get to that. And I think it's quite sad, Mr. Speaker, to see the members opposite and way they take this. They don't take anything seriously over there. I hear all the members who are sitting in their seats making some pretty great speeches, but they are all from their seats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — I ask the private members who are sitting in the back benches not to sit back there and speak from their seats. Get up and speak on this motion. Whether you've been told not to or not, you have the right as private members to get up and say your piece. I know that your constituents back home want you to get up and speak on this.

When I move the amendment to this motion, maybe it will solve some of the problems for the members in the House. It's quite interesting to see a motion, Mr. Speaker, put before this House that with one sweep of a pen cancel or do away with 116 boards and commissions. No questions are asked; you just do away with them. And the Attorney General sits there and makes his big jokes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not a journeyman speaking from the opposition side of the House — especially not the type of journeyman that the Hon. Attorney General is. He

has had a lot of time sitting on this side, and I hope that I don't have to put in the type of apprenticeship to be the journeyman that the Hon. Attorney General is. He has had a lot of time sitting on this side, and I hope that I don't have to put in the type of apprenticeship or the length of apprenticeship that he has put in to get to his position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — I heard the Attorney General today talking about an agreement and referring to the Prince Albert pulp mill and the cancellation of that agreement. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that agreement was cancelled. That agreement was cancelled and we had authority to cancel that agreement. That agreement was signed by the Liberal government of Ross Thatcher — the Liberal government, I might add, Mr. Speaker, that is still dictating and getting the headlines on that side of the House. Yes, on July 7, 1971, that agreement was cancelled. But we campaigned for one full month and we indicated throughout the campaign that we would cancel that agreement. And on June 23, 1971, we received the consent from the people of Saskatchewan to cancel that agreement. We did it and I think that the people of Saskatchewan are proud of that agreement and we are a lot further ahead today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — I find it interesting that the private members sit back in their seats and give their great speeches when they are sitting down. I don't hear them up there trying to protect this bill. I also did not hear them standing up in this legislation trying to protect the minimum wage, when you guys froze it. I thought that the hon. member for Kinistino would be up on his feet. I know that he's going to speak after I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The question before the Assembly is Bill 16, and I don't think it has much to do with some of the things that are being talked about at this point. I would ask the member to get back on the subject.

MR. THOMPSON: — I do want to say that I am very disappointed to see this type of legislation being . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what you have said. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very concerned about the type of legislation that we see being pushed through this House. We don't see any of the members standing up and speaking to the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I will, if you will sit down.

MR. THOMPSON: — Well, that's fine; the hon. member for Regina South has indicated that he will be speaking on it, Mr. Speaker. He will have lots of opportunities to speak.

When I take a look at some of the bills that can be just wiped right out with this type of legislation, I sincerely expect to hear a lot more of the members get up and speak on this bill before it is passed. I am sure that the hon. member for Melville will be up speaking, because I know that he's concerned about the grain car commission from his constituency. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Melville will be standing up and assuring this House that the grain car commission has nothing to worry about. However, there are a lot of boards and a lot of commissions that are going to have a lot to worry about in this province.

If we want our boards and commissions to do a good job, Mr. Speaker, we're going to

have to treat them fairly. We can't have a cloud hanging over their heads. The type of legislation that we have before the House today creates a very dark cloud. It is too important a piece of legislation not to have one private member get up and speak on behalf of it.

Mr. Speaker, they are taking this legislation for the gospel truth. They all accept it. We're trying to make a case in this legislature, and we're trying to show the citizens of Saskatchewan that we intend to fight for their rights. We intend to fight for the rights of the citizens who are sitting on these boards and commissions. I think that the members have that right. They have the opportunity to get up and speak, and I'm sure that before this is passed, you're going to see all the backbenchers up there speaking on behalf of the citizens that they represent. I will be looking forward to hearing their speeches.

I am really concerned, Mr. Speaker, about what this bill might do with some very important agreements that we have in Saskatchewan. A couple of agreements that we have in northern Saskatchewan really concern me. I would like to ask the Attorney General if he would spell out to this House whether or not this legislation protects the surface lease that is signed by Amok. I would like him to tell us: is that surface lease safe? Is that agreement safe? Mr. Speaker, is that monitoring committee which is set up in that surface lease at Cluff Lake between Amok and the Government of Saskatchewan — what about that monitoring committee? Will the Attorney General get up in this House and spell out whether that monitoring committee is safe? Will it be there? And will it do the job that Justice Bayda has recommended that it do? I want to hear him say that, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's vitally important that members of that monitoring committee know that they can carry out their functions and that they don't have to worry about their jobs being cancelled. It's a very important committee.

We also have a monitoring committee that's set up on the new surface lease at Key Lake. That is another board that has been appointed by the government. Is that board safe?

Mr. Speaker, we'll probably stop the clock and we'll let the hon. gentleman for Regina South get up and he can speak all night if wants . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! There's so much conversation going back and forth across the House that the member can't hear himself speak, and I can't hear him. I would like the House to resume some order.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I would like the Attorney General to do is make it clear in this legislation that the monitoring committee with the Amok surface lease is safe, that it is protected from this type of legislation. I'm just wondering when I take a look at the type of legislation, and when I hear the members opposite say that they are going to freeze the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, I just wonder about the minimum wage board. That is a very important board, and what have they done? They have frozen the minimum wage.

The minimum wage board, I think, is a very important board and carries out a very important function in this province. Is it safe? I think that the Attorney General has a right to let this House know if it is safe and to spell out who is safe and who is not.

On the day care boards, all these people are very concerned, because they carry out a

very important function in this province, and I have spoken to members who are not too sure just where they are going. They have asked me if this legislation is going to affect them.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, another board that I am concerned about is the North-Sask Electric Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They're not affected either.

MR. THOMPSON: — The Attorney General says they are not affected, and I'm just wondering what he means by that. I think that maybe he should spell that out in the legislation. He says the North-Sask Electric Board is not covered under this. I wonder about the community college boards and in particular I worry about the West Side Community College, and I think the Attorney General has a right to stand up in his seat and tell us just what is taking place. I look forward to his speech.

The fur marketing board is another board I'm really concerned about. They've already changed that board, Mr. Speaker. I see under this legislation they're going to have an opportunity to change it again.

I guess really what concerns me is the freedoms that have been taken away and the cloud that has been cast upon all the boards and commissions that are in Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, you should have had one this afternoon. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the type of legislation that the citizens of Saskatchewan do not appreciate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — They don't want us as an opposition to be sitting on this side of the House and letting you guys pass that type of legislation without a fight, and, believe you me, we intend to fight this legislation; we intend to stay here as long as humanly possible. If that's what you guys want, if you want to put through this type of legislation, we're prepared to fight it. And I think that you guys had better be prepared to fight it, too. And you are going to have to fight it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We are not, I think, Mr. Speaker, . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I ask all the members to take this very seriously. Take this amendment seriously. Go back to your constituencies for six months, find out just what your constituents are saying; listen to your constituents; then come back in October or November and we can go over it again, if that's the way you feel. But I say, support this amendment. Go home for six months. It's not that important.

Ask yourselves, why does the Attorney General want to ram this thing through without letting you as private members have your say? You have a right to get up and speak in this House, not just the Attorney General. Get up and speak and then go on out to your constituents. Support this amendment. Write to your constituency. Listen to what your constituents are saying. That's what they elected you for — to listen, not to sit back in your seats and talk from your seats. You were elected to stand up in this legislature and speak your piece — protect their rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to move this amendment. I want to say

July 12, 1982

once more, and I'm asking all members, including the Minister of Finance, to go back out into the boondocks, play ball a little bit with your friends and find out what they're thinking. I think you'll come back here in November with a different attitude. That's what you need. Just go out there and listen to the folks.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move the following amendment, seconded by my colleague, the member for Pelly, that the question be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following:

Bill 16, An Act to amend The Interpretation Act be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day, six months hence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The debate continues concurrently on the amendment and the main motion.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, was there a seconder to that motion and is the member, in fact, seconding the motion? . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I read it to you.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into debate with regard to Bill 16 and the amendment that my colleague from Athabasca just introduced. I simply want to say that this amendment has a basic need for debate. There are a lot of acts that are going to be affected by this piece of legislation, and no doubt it will have some effect on existing organizations, committees, commissions, boards and what have you in the northern administration district. For that reason, I would like to enter into this debate to support the amendment that was just now introduced by my colleague. I am of the understanding that it will have some drastic effects on the people living in the northern administration district, namely . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're totally wrong.

MR. YEW: — I hope I am totally wrong. I hope so . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Are you calling the people in the northern administration district turkeys?

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's what he said.

MR. YEW: — Are you calling them turkeys? I would like to put that in the record.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who did it?

MR. YEW: — The member for Moosomin?

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's what he said.

MR. YEW: — Haven't you got any respect for the people of this province? There are a lot of people out there in the northern administration district who were here a heck of a long time prior to you people.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it's 10 o'clock.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 p.m.