

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to introduce to you, and through you to the legislature, six students. They are adults and they are from the “English as a Second Language” course from the Regina Plains Community College. They’re with their teacher, Roberta Kullman. They’re going to spend most of the morning with us, and I look forward to meeting with them at about 11:30 for a break for them, and we’ll get some pictures and drinks.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the Assembly to welcome these students.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Conditions of Sale for PAPCO

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, my question is — would have been directed to the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation and PAPCO, but in view of the fact that PAPCO was owned by CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan), or CICIII, I direct my questions to the minister in charge of CIC, and it deals with the documents released last week by the government respecting its various arrangements with the Weyerhaeuser corporation, documents which show just how badly the government opposite botched up its negotiations for the sale of the Prince Albert Pulp Company and its assets.

The documents show that Weyerhaeuser was not required to put up any money down when it acquired the \$248 million of public assets; in fact the acquisition agreement shows that upon closing, far from putting any money down, Weyerhaeuser will — according to my reading of the documents — receive over \$7 million from PAPCO and from the Crown.

Can the minister explain why, in divesting yourself of a pulp mill, you would not ask for any down payment but in fact would give a reverse down payment of over \$7 million?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I don’t profess to know the full details of that. The member from Meadow Lake handled that, I would defer the specifics and the details of that particular question to the Minister of Health, who can respond to it. Suffice it to say though, Mr. Speaker, the following — and I think this has been widely debated in the province; widely debated during the last provincial election campaign.

An Hon. Member: — You lost some seats over it, too.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, the member of Quill Lakes

says we lost some seats. Well we have a member from Shellbrook-Torch River where the pulp mill is located; he is on this side of the House. We have the member from Turtleford where the project is located; he’s on this side of the House. So we’re quite proud of that, Mr. Speaker.

Let me get back to the question and that is this: the member opposite talks about the particular deal. The particular deal was as follows: that corporation, Mr. Speaker, that corporation was losing the people of Saskatchewan \$91,000 a day, \$91,000 a day from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan because, Mr. Speaker, of a bad deal made by the members opposite when they were in government — because of a bad deal.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is he says, and has said for a long time during the debate and the election campaign, that Weyerhaeuser would not in fact build a paper plant. The Minister of Health stood in this institution yesterday, stood in this Assembly yesterday, indicated that Weyerhaeuser were proceeding with the building of that paper plant, creating new jobs, creating new products, diversifying the economy of this province, and that’s what the election was about. We’re proud of that; we’re proud of Weyerhaeuser; we’re proud of the Weyerhaeuser deal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will either of the ministers acknowledge that when PAPCO was sold to Weyerhaeuser, it was not losing \$91,000 a day or anything like it, and that anyone who says it was losing \$91,000 a day when that sale was made is uttering a flat falsehood? Would he agree with that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — The minister says that PAPCO was losing \$91,000 a day at the time of the sale. Is that a fair interpretation of your monosyllabic answer?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as the member well knows, \$91,000 a day during the debate last spring, and it was clearly pointed out in this House by myself and by other members of the House that the \$91,000 a day was over a period of five years, and that was every single day over a period of about five years that PAPCO lost that much for the public of Saskatchewan.

That, Mr. Speaker, that very fact and that hemorrhaging of money, which is exactly what was happening, was one of the motivations for this government in operating in an efficient and a reasonable way, on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, to say we must get out of public ownership of this — okay? — number one. So we did that.

And not only did we get out of public ownership of the public or the government running a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

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

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Thank you very much, Mr.

Speaker. Not only did we move the pulp operation in Saskatchewan out of the public domain and over into the private sector where it can operate more efficiently; not only did we do that, Mr. Speaker, but as a very significant added bonus, we encouraged a paper-mill to come to Saskatchewan, something that is not anywhere else in the prairie provinces.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — The second largest paper-mill in the dominion of Canada will be in Shellbrook-Torch River constituency in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, there is no question in the minds of any thinking people in Saskatchewan that the building of a paper-mill and its contribution to the diversification of the economy of this province is in fact a very good deal for Saskatchewan and all of its citizens.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, and I will refrain from replying to the minister's speech and direct a question to him — a narrow question. Do you agree that in the transfer of the pulp mill Weyerhaeuser paid no money down but in fact the Crown is paying Weyerhaeuser more than \$7 million?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — In the deal, Mr. Speaker . . . Let me submit this to the House and to the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition. Weyerhaeuser will pay \$248 million for the present installation which is there — \$248 million by way of a debenture which is held by the province. That was the mechanism chosen, that was the mechanism negotiated, and I submit to you and to this House those members opposite . . .

And you will remember the debate, Mr. Speaker; many others in this province will remember the debate. Prior to the election, and, I might add, during the election, this was to some extent an issue during the election as I recall, Mr. Speaker. And as I also recall, the people of Saskatchewan spoke on this issue and they spoke fairly loudly and clearly across the forested belt in Saskatchewan where this is most significant. And let me just name the constituencies where forests are: Kelsey-Tisdale, Nipawin, Shellbrook-Torch River, Meadow Lake . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I asked a very simple question, Mr. Minister. You obviously don't want to answer it. But will you, if you don't want to answer it, then hold your seat and not waste the time of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — My question to you is this: is it not true that Weyerhaeuser paid no down payment, but in

fact the Crown paid Weyerhaeuser over \$7 million at the closing of the transfer of the mill to Weyerhaeuser?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, it is true that Weyerhaeuser will pay the Government of Saskatchewan \$248 million for the pulp mill and the chemical plant and the Bodmin sawmill.

Mr. Speaker, that is the fact. That is the fact. That is the . . . The documents will show. And might I add, Mr. Speaker, the documents which the members have been studying for whatever period of time — three weeks, I believe, ago that I put them on the table — and they've looked at them for two or three weeks. The most extensive set of documents ever tabled in this legislature relating to a commercial transaction . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. The minister is attempting to answer the question.

An Hon. Member: — He's not answering it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I might submit to you that you cannot take the documents as you will have all seen, the thick documents that go with something in that order and break them down into a simplified question. And I will not submit to a very simplistic question. So I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, \$248 million is what they're paying for the pulp mill.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious the minister will not answer the question, because he knows that he is giving 7 million to Weyerhaeuser.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Supply of Natural Gas to the Pulp Mill

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Will he answer another question? Why does the agreement allow Weyerhaeuser to bypass the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for its natural gas supply? And what advantage will that give to Weyerhaeuser over other industrial producers in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — What other paper-mills are there in this province, I would ask, Mr. Speaker? I notice in the news release of the member, of the hon. member opposite, and he says: ". . . because the corporation will have to make up the lost revenue."

And I say, which lost revenue could he possibly be referring to? The lost revenue to SPC now, I believe that he is referring to in this news release of the member of the opposition. Make up for lost revenue. And I would say, what lost revenue can there be if, under his administration or under the philosophy which he espouses, there would not be a paper-mill, so there would be no revenue whatever? What can you lose from that?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it from the minister's remarks that there's no natural gases consumed in the pulp mill? Do you . . . Are you asking this House to believe that the pulp mill consumes no natural gas? And are you asking us to believe that natural gas previously supplied by the power corporation to that mill, but now possibly supplied by Weyerhaeuser not by SPC, will not result in a loss to SPC? Are you saying that?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No, I'm not saying that, Mr. Speaker. What I'm saying is that this paper-mill, integrated with the pulp mill which is presently in Saskatchewan, will make money in the long term for the province of Saskatchewan. There is no question in my mind about that. There is no question in the minds of anybody across the forested belt of Saskatchewan. They will make money for Saskatchewan in the long term.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary. We are not discussing whether or not the mill would make money. I asked you: what is the policy of the government with respect to natural gas supply to this industrial customer? And I ask you now, sir, will you extend the same policy to other industrial customers, and will you not concede that that means higher gas rates for consumers and others who will not get the benefit of the profits made from supplying this natural gas customer?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, if you take the Leader of the Opposition's argument to its logical conclusion, he would say that — he says that there are higher . . . there would be higher gas rates for consumers in Saskatchewan if there was not this deal with the paper-mill. That's what he said. And what I say, Mr. Speaker, is that if there was no paper-mill, which there certainly would not be under his administration, how would that affect the gas rates? It does not affect the consumers' gas rates. I will say that to the hon. member, and the Leader of the Opposition, and all members of the House. What this will do is make money for the people of Saskatchewan over a period of time. It will not hemorrhage taxpayers' money to the extent of \$91,000 a day as it did in the other administrations when they were in power.

Interpretation of Commercial Necessity

Mr. Mitchell: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. And I want to deal with the question of a paper-mill and ask the Minister whether he is aware of the fact that the development agreement contains an out, which is available to Weyerhaeuser if they deem that for reasons of commercial necessity they ought not to go ahead with it, and that Weyerhaeuser is the sole judge of whether such commercial necessity exists.

Now, Minister, if this is such a sure thing project, why was this kind of an out necessary?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what the New Democratic Party opposition calls an out, I believe was

answered yesterday when it was announced here and by Weyerhaeuser across Saskatchewan and across Canada, as a matter of fact, that they had signed the first contract for \$40 million to build a paper machine which will be installed in Prince Albert, and the construction of that paper-mill begins in April of this year . . . of next year, I'm sorry — April of 1987.

So, Mr. Speaker the out that the people are hoping for across here . . . You know, they write the obituary of Supercart; they write the obituary of the upgrader. We heard it the other day — they're writing the obituary of the upgrader in Regina, and yet tomorrow the biggest bit of freight that ever hit Saskatchewan is coming to serve that upgrader. But they say it still won't happen . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I think we should have a little order on both sides of the House. Order! Order! I reiterate — I think we should have order on both sides of the House. Hollering raucously so that they can hear you on Albert Street does not add to the dignity of this House. Order! And I'm warning the member for Quill Lakes for the last time.

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, we're not hoping for an out. Our problem is that there is an out, and we can't understand why there is one. Is the minister now telling . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Is the minister now telling the House that this out, this commercial necessity provision in the agreement is no longer operative and that the pulp mill is a guaranteed go, a guaranteed project . . . pardon me, the paper-mill is a guaranteed project?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — What I'm saying to the member from Fairview and to all members opposite is that I invite them to Prince Albert and to the Shellbrook-Torch River constituency where the paper-mill will be built in April to watch the ground breaking of the new paper-mill in that area. I invite all members to be there, the citizens of Saskatchewan, as a matter of fact. Because the citizens of Saskatchewan who live across the forested belt know that that paper-mill is coming, and they're very pleased about it because of what it does to diversify this economy and what it does for the forest industry across Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. All we know is what we read in the agreement, and we certainly hope that the minister is right, and better be right considering the very many serious questions that are raised in this agreement. Now we pointed out some of them in this House. Many of them were pointed out last spring. And in light of these serious questions which the Saskatchewan people have about this deal, will you agree to the creation of a special legislative committee with the power to call witnesses and hold public hearings to review this deal and to recommend any possible improvements?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, two questions here. First of all, I would say to the member — and he says he hopes that I'm right and that he hopes that the paper-mill will be there — well I would say to the hon. member he's the first New Democratic member who has ever expressed a hope that the paper-mill would be a reality in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — So I congratulate him for that. Secondly, I would say to the hon. member from Fairview, and to other members of the House, that this project, when it goes ahead, will the hon. members acknowledge that there is to be a paper-mill when the paper-mill is up and built. I would just ask them that question: when the paper-mill is operating, will you acknowledge that there is one? When the upgrader is operating in Saskatchewan, will the members acknowledge that yes, there is an upgrader in southern Saskatchewan? That's the question.

And as it relates to the committee, to the committee requested by the member from Fairview, as I mentioned before: the documents that I tabled in this House on the first possible opportunity in this session are three very thick volumes, as you know. And as all members know, Mr. Speaker, they are put out there for the scrutiny of the public of Saskatchewan, for the scrutiny of the public of Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, Mr. Speaker, the member is asking for a legislative committee to inquire into the deal. What I'm saying is we put the total deal before the public of Saskatchewan so the public of Saskatchewan, those who are interested, can inquire into the deal by seeing every shred of paper. That's what that deal was about. And I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, potash take-over . . . you can go back over and over and over different deals. When did they ever table that kind of document?

Twinning of Yellowhead Highway

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. member from Melfort, the minister in charge of pot-holes and broken bridges, and I was wondering: as the member would know, Mr. Speaker, during the provincial election campaign the federal government announced \$50 million towards the twinning of the Yellowhead Highway. And my question to the hon. minister is whether or not you've communicated to the federal government that you will in fact be contributing towards the twinning of the Yellowhead in Saskatchewan, and how much are you committed to twinning on the Yellowhead?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the hon. member's question, I think it's a very good question that you have brought up here today, and the whole subject, the whole subject of the commitment by the federal government of a good number of funds — I believe it is \$50 million towards the improvement on the Yellowhead Highway throughout western Canada — is but one example of the co-operation that this government has had with the federal government. And I am extremely pleased with the

announcement that came a few months ago.

As far as the specifics, you were asking me here today to make commitments regarding specific areas that we will be improving on the Yellowhead, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to do that today. I can tell you that the matter is under review. I can tell you that we have received representations from a large number of communities all across the Yellowhead, and of course in today's economy all communities are trying to get as much of the share of the pie as possible, and we're listening to those representations from a large number of communities. And after I have listened to all the representations we will, in a fair, an above-board manner, make our best sound judgements on where the money shall be best spent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I was asking how much money the government has committed to twinning the Yellowhead. And obviously you're not willing to make that commitment here today in this House. And I submit to you, Mr. Minister, that one of the reasons you can't make a commitment to twinning the Yellowhead and doing adequate work on Saskatchewan highways is because of the fact you have to contribute a substantial portion of your budget to build roads for the Weyerhaeuser corporation in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just maybe review the commitment made by the federal government and the program that is in effect for the Yellowhead. And it is a \$100 million program that stretches across the four western provinces.

And I find it very, very strange, and I'm very, very saddened, and I'm disappointed that the members of the opposition, after a considerable amount of hard work by this Progressive Conservative administration to attempt to negotiate with the federal government, and after months of negotiations by myself and by my predecessor and by other provinces in western Canada — after all those negotiations are through and we get the federal government committed to a program for the betterment of the Yellowhead highway, at long last we have recognition by the federal government for cost-sharing on the Yellowhead highway — the members of the opposition have to whine and complain about when are you going to spend the money and where are you going to spend the money?

My friends, it is a prime example of the NDP's attitude of "nothing is ever good enough." I don't know what — for the life of me I don't know what would satisfy you people. Here is an excellent example of co-operation between our government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Financing of School Construction Costs

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. My question is directed to the Minister of Education and it relates with the issue raised yesterday by my colleague from Prince Albert.

I was rather amazed that the minister knew nothing of meetings held this month by his deputy minister and associate deputy in regards to capital financing and the proposals which your department is putting forward in changing the capital funding for schools' construction.

Mr. Minister, would you, now that you've had some time to consult and confer with your department, would you please inform this Assembly what the effects of your proposal are going to have on local school boards; and why, at this particular time when school boards are really pressed for money, you are trying to shift the burden from your government to local school boards.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of that question yesterday. My officials have been advised of it. They are going to meet with me and brief me on the consultations that they have had.

And the reason, Mr. Speaker, I was unaware of the consultations that the member referred to was the perspective he put on the consultations in his question was so entirely different and absolutely different than the consultations that I was aware of that the question, in fact, was caught totally by surprise by the question.

And I have yet to have a chance to meet with my officials to discuss what the consultations have been, except to say that I am of the view that they are to the betterment of education, quite simply, to the betterment of education. And when I have had a chance to be fully briefed by my officials, I will report to the House.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here signed by Mr. Drozda who is the regional director of education, wherein he outlines that meetings shall take place and they will be chaired by your associate deputy, Mr. Penner, and spoken through by your deputy, Mr. Wickstrom. And one of the purpose of the meeting, Mr. Speaker, just to enlighten the minister, is to solicit input on potential changes to the financing of school construction programs; secondly, to discuss the role of the property management corporation in the financing of school construction.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: I think these things are very closely related, and why is he, at this particular time, trying to change the financing formula for school construction when school boards are finding themselves in financial difficulties and property taxes are increasing because this government is denying the finances necessary for quality education? Why are you shifting the responsibility to the local school boards?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I have already said I

will take notice of this question and give the full answer. And I'm not going to take debate on specific points that the hon. member might raise, except to say that my understanding is that anything that was discussed was relative to preferred financing, not deterrent kinds of financing for school boards.

And the other point that this question raises, Mr. Speaker, is this: our government, quite frankly, believes in consultation. We are not a government that sits in Regina and designs some kind of policy in the dark of night, hidden away somewhere. Our style is to go out and talk with the people. I suspect that's what's being going on here, and I suspect it's been for the better of education, not for the worse of education.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Shillington: — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, has two aspects, if you like . . . I seek a ruling on two different questions. One . . . the first has to do with some questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition, some tightly-focused questions to the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health then responds . . . talked about everything but the question that was asked. At one point in time, he went on and referred to a press release which the Leader of the Opposition had issued this morning which was only in the most indirect sense related to the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the Assembly do not require the Minister of Health to answer a question. I think public opinion is going to be less generous, but the rules to the question Mr. Deputy Speaker don't require him to answer it.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the rules of this Assembly do prohibit the Minister from responding by launching into attack on an unrelated issue, which is what I suggest the Minister of Health did this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I asked you to rule on that question, as well as the Minister of Highways, who took notice and took a minute and fifteen seconds, because I timed him — a minute and fifteen seconds — to take notice.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of my point of order is: I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to tell us what you think the responsibility of the Chair is in keeping order during question period? Mr. Speaker, we cannot call points of order. We depend upon you to keep order in the question period. And I'd ask you, Mr. Speaker, as well, to rule on what you think your responsibility is when you see blatant abuses such as we got from the Minister of Health this morning. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to define your responsibility in question period.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the point of order by the member from Regina Centre. First of all, I believe in his point of order he's suggesting that I did not answer questions that were asked today. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, in going through the record and reviewing this in order to make a ruling on the point of

order, that you take into consideration the following: that the traditions of the House and the way in which question period is conducted in a sense that it's a very . . . that you get on to a topic, whatever that topic may be. Question period has not been a place for very specific sort of detailed questions, and I would say that it is not that. But I would say as well, Mr. Speaker, that it is certainly a place to discuss the broad issues which are pertinent to the day, and I'd just like to ask to check into that.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, the other point that I would make is, as it relates to the member's suggestion about the Minister of Highways, he said in his statement, I believe, that the Minister of Highways took notice of a question. I don't believe that that's the case. The Minister of Highways did not take notice of a question. And so I would just say to you, Mr. Speaker, please take into consideration the traditions of question period and the way in which question period is conducted in a broad discussion of broad issues.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, may I just make one clarification. I referred to the Minister of Highways; I did indeed intend to refer to the Minister of Education. It took a minute and 15 seconds to take notice of a question.

Mr. Speaker: — I have heard the point of order and the views of the opposition, and I will defer my ruling on that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Special Committee

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move and seconded by my seat mate, the member from Kindersley:

That a special committee, composed of Mr. Speaker as Chairman and members Andrew, Brockelbank, Gerich, Muller, Koskie, Kowalsky, McLaren, McLeod, Shillington and Taylor be appointed to examine such matters as it deems advisable with respect to the rules, procedures, practices and powers of the Legislative Assembly, its operation and organization, and the facilities and services provided to the Assembly, its committees and members;

That this special committee be instructed to include in its report, drafts of proposed rules to give effect, if adopted by the Assembly, to any change or changes that may be proposed by the committee;

That the committee have the power to sit during the intersessional period and during sessions except when the Assembly is sitting; and that the committee have the power to send for persons, papers, and records, and to examine witnesses under oath, to receive representations from interested parties and individuals, and to hold meetings away from the seat of government in order that provisions in other legislatures can be studied;

That this committee be instructed to submit its report to the Assembly at such time as the Assembly resumes regular sitting in 1987.

I so move, seconded by the member from Kindersley.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this motion. First of all, the opposition welcomes the opportunity to take a look at the rules. We expect that this is a practice which is very much worth while and in keeping with the tradition of the Assembly.

One aspect of this motion, however, does raise a small degree of concern on our part, and I think it should be accommodated by the government, and that is the last sentence of the proposed motion which says:

That this committee be instructed to submit its report to the Assembly at such time as the Assembly resumes regular sittings in 1987.

I'm sure that what the government intends, and what the hon. government House Leader intends by this, is that that phrase is to be interpreted to mean that there will be a report, but not necessarily *the* report, because it would be confining the House to a very strict timetable, and may be an unreasonable timetable by which the committee will complete its job and review of the various procedures involved.

I'm sure that this is what the hon. House Leader intended. I don't think you, sir, as a chairman of the committee would want to be put on such a strict and narrow timetable. I know that we wouldn't want to be, and I'm sure that the members opposite would want a full and frank discussion about the rules, because what we effect by way of change will obviously have a great deal of impact on the way we operate for quite some time to come.

So in order just to clarify this situation totally, I'll be proposing an amendment to this motion which in effect will clarify the reporting time. We'd like to have this committee act in all due dispatch and reasonable speed, but obviously to be free to report as its deliberations permit it to report.

And so accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that with respect to motion no. 1, amendment be made:

That in the second last line we delete the word "its" and insert the word "a".

It would read:

That this committee be instructed to submit a report to the Assembly at such time as the Assembly resumes regular sitting in 1987.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the government side has no problem whatever with the amendment that's put forward by the member, and we agree that it would probably be an interim report, or a report at least.

Motion as amended agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Berntson that Bill No. 5 — **An Act respecting the Organization of the Executive Government of Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's with somewhat saddened heart that I have to rise in this debate to speak on a Bill such as Bill No. 5, particularly after the kind of sentiments which were expressed by the members of the government opposite in the throne speech, talking about co-operation, in which they talked about consultation, in which they talked about all the good things which were going to come from this Legislative Assembly in this term.

Unfortunately, for the second time in this session we've had to rise in order to defend some fundamental principles regarding the functioning of the parliamentary democracy and the functioning and the ordering of the business of the Legislative Assembly. And that, sir, does not bode well for the future, I believe, of the operations of this House, of co-operation between ourselves and the side of the government; does not bode well for the nature and the process and the development of a consultative process between the government, between those who govern and those who are governed.

In saying that, I'd like to refer a bit to a statement made by the hon. member from Quill Lakes yesterday, in which he made reference to the fact that the Big 8 or the Big 9, as they came to be known in November of 1985, took it upon themselves to bring this government, issue by issue, into account and into an account of its actions. And they were able to do that. They were able to do that by nature of some of the fundamental principles of parliamentary democracy which have been established in this House.

And we, sir, view Bill 5, Mr. Speaker, we in the opposition view Bill 5 as an attempt to attack some of the underpinnings of the edifice of democracy which has been built not only in this House but throughout the Commonwealth over the last several or hundreds of years.

And that's why I basically am rising to oppose this Bill 5. Because I view it, as a member, as an attack on my rights — on my rights as a member of this Legislative Assembly to inquire and to find out and to scrutinize the activities of the government, and as a method of them impinging on my right as a member, and impinging on the right of the public to know — the right of the public to know the conduct of the government business.

And that is how I see that Bill — that it's an impingement on some basic rights and some basic freedoms which people have fought for and which have died for. And to

remind members opposite of some of those objections that we're raising, I'd like to review some of the legal ramifications of this Bill.

The one particular legal ramification which we've seen . . . The member from Regina North West is so taken away with this speech, I see him not able to control himself.

There are some legal ramifications in this Bill, the primary objection to which we see outlawed and probably . . . (inaudible) . . . The member from Regina . . . pardon me, Saskatoon Fairview, excuse me, Mr. Speaker.

The member from Saskatoon Fairview and the member from Regina Lakeview have outlined the primary essence of our objection to the legal portion of the Bill, and that objection is based on its *ultra vires* nature.

Now I'm not a lawyer and I'm not going to pretend to go into the legal if's, and's and but's and some of the legal niceties of the Bill, if you like. But when I see such prominent members of the legal profession as the member from Saskatoon Riversdale, as the member from Saskatoon Fairview, and as the member from Regina Lakeview, as well as the member from Regina Elphinstone who, I would submit, have been involved in some fairly significant legal operations in this province and in this country and who have got some knowledge of constitutional law and who have some knowledge of how, in fact, the British parliamentary tradition operates; and myself, as a new member, when I see people like that coming out in such strong opposition to this Bill, then there is something twiggling in the back of my mind that says there is something wrong legally with this Bill, and that the members opposite, particularly those in the back bench, had better open their ears and had better start beginning to take notice of precisely what is wrong with what is happening.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1045)

Mr. Lyons: — When we have people of such a stature, people involved in the drawing up of the constitution of Canada, one of the fundamental legal documents which governs the nature of our democracy, standing up and saying, this is *ultra vires* the British parliamentary tradition, then gentlemen and ladies opposite, I suggest to you that you had better pay attention, that you had better pay attention, because there is something wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member from Souris-Cannington referred to some sinister and cunning reasons in regards to this Bill. And playing the "ah shucks! And gee, gosh, golly" act that he affects so well — tries to down-play the significance of this Bill; tries to say that it has no political ramifications for the people of this province; that it has no political underpinnings and no political motives behind it, and there's absolutely nothing political, we just want some good old-fashioned, down-home common sense efficiency, and that's the only reason why we're trying to put this Bill forward at this time.

Well the only thing down-home in terms of that kind of reasoning, Mr. Speaker, is the down-home hog-wash that

we see coming across the floor in terms of that kind of reasoning.

But I think, unlike some of the members on this side of the House who have been fairly charitable in terms of trying to impute motives to the opposite side, I am not going to be quite so charitable, despite the fact that we're so close to Christmas. Despite the fact that I've been told not to be a Scrooge, I'm not going to be overly charitable in trying to say that there is nothing political or there are no sinister or there are no cunning political reasons behind the introduction of this Bill ... (inaudible interjection) ...

No, the member from Saskatoon Centre didn't say that. The member from Souris-Cannington did say that — that there was nothing cunning and nothing sinister behind this Bill. But I think, Mr. Speaker, if we look at a little bit of the past history of the activities of this government over the past four and a half, five years, we will see what kind of sinister and cunning plans that the government has laid out for the people of Saskatchewan and how Bill 5 fits into their sinister and cunning plans.

For examples, let's take the whole question of privatization and this Bill's ability to privatize, to take out of the realm of the public domain those businesses, those corporations, and those government departments which the public has entrusted its administration to, in terms of having passed Acts establishing them in the past.

To refer to the Liquor Board store — the local Liquor Board store which can possibly be established in Regina and Saskatoon and throughout the province through the attempt to privatize the Liquor Board operations of the Government of Saskatchewan. The governing party of the government opposite has passed resolutions at their convention urging for this type of privatization, that in fact liquor sales should be a private matter, should be put over to the private sector, should be taken out of the hands of the people of the province and put into the hands of their entrepreneurial friends, big business and small; and that the Liquor Board operations should not be a functioning of the government and should not be responsible to this legislature.

Now that's the kind of logic, Mr. Speaker, which seems to fly in the very face of the activities of the government in the recent past in setting up operations like SADAC and establishing the alcoholism treatment centre, alcoholism and drug treatment centre in Yorkton. On the one hand, they want to turn over the Liquor Board operation to private business in this province to promote liquor sales, to spread liquor around, to make it more accessible. On the other hand, we, the taxpayers have to pour more of our tax money into trying to ... drug abuse programs, liquor abuse programs, and rehab programs such as set up by SADAC.

And Bill 5, Mr. Speaker, Bill 5 and the principle of Bill 5 allows them to do that. And so we're going to oppose Bill 5 for that reason.

Now we ask the question: what does Bill 5 do for example to 600 maintenance workers who are members of Saskatchewan Government Employees Union who work in the government offices and in the businesses, the

legislature here, and in the government buildings in Saskatoon, and the government buildings in Swift Current, and Moose Jaw, North Battleford, Prince Albert, Yorkton, and Melfort — around the province. What happens to those maintenance workers? Are they an impediment, Mr. Speaker? Are they an impediment to the government's aims of being able to privatize and to contract out government work?

Well, Bill 5 allows them to do that, Bill 5 allows them to be able to reorganize the Department of Supply and Services, or whatever government department, that will affect these maintenance workers, and to throw all these people out in to the streets. And that's not fantasy land, Mr. Speaker.

I look back at the record of the government opposite when it came to privatizing highway workers. Highway workers in this province were transferred to the private sector, and some of those highway workers are now on welfare and still haven't been able to find jobs. And part of the reason they haven't been able to find jobs is because of the kind of despicable attitude the government has to working people in this province, and also because of the despicable attitude the government has in terms of fixing the roads, and the pot-holes, and the broken bridges of Saskatchewan, and in giving away one dollars in every 10 to their big corporate buddies at Weyerhaeuser out of the Highways department budget.

Highway workers have felt the benevolence of the members of the government opposite. They have been put out in the private sector, and Bill 5 allows them to, in fact, make highway workers just the advance guard of this transferring into the private sector.

And that's why we are going to oppose this Bill, Mr. Speaker, because we don't want to see government services in this province fall — the level of government services fall. We don't want to see working people throughout Saskatchewan transferred into the private sector, transferred in to the UIC category, and then transferred onto the welfare rolls of this province.

And that, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is one of the sinister and cunning aims of Bill 5, in order to let the government of Saskatchewan privatize — transfer to the private sector — government workers, without the scrutiny of the House, and without allowing us, as members of the Opposition who will stand by those workers, who will stand up for those workers, who will stand up for those workers and not let the government begin this kind of dismantling of the public sector and the public service which they have on their political agenda.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, Bill 5 is the slide — it's like the child's slide that they are putting the public workers on top of, and they are going to grease it up, and they are going to slide them out. They are going to slide them out into the warm, loving embraces of the private sectors, the warm, loving embraces of those employers who took such good care of the highway workers of this province.

That's what will happen to the liquor board employees. I

suggest that that's what this government intends for maintenance employees in the province.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that that's what the government intends for a whole range of government services and a whole range of government contracts. And if one looks at the provisions of Bill 5 . . . And I'm not going to go into them because we're speaking now on the principle of the Bill, and we'll get into this, I'm quite sure, more closely when we do the clause by clause study.

But in terms of the principle of Bill 5 and the way that it can establish the privatization of government services and the privatizing of the jobs of government sector workers, we're not going to allow it. And that's why we're going to be here for a while; and that's why, gentlemen and ladies opposite, we're going to be here for a while.

Because we oppose that kind of privatization. We oppose you people putting people out on the street only so that some of your big business buddies who own contracting firms or maintenance firms, or whatever kind of firms, can bring them back in, pay them at half the present rate of pay so that they can increase their corporate fat cat profits. We oppose that kind of thing. Bill 5 allows you to do that, and that's why we're opposing Bill 5.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 5, when it talks about changing the purposes of departments, when it talks about changing the aims and objects of departments, allows this government to carry out the kind of attack on the rights of working people in this province that we've seen in the last four years. We've seen it not only with the introduction of bill 104, and we've seen it not only with the actual *de facto* change in purpose of the nature of the Labour Relations Board under its Tory hack appointment, Dennis Ball; we've seen the kind of labour laws which are in place, twisted and perverted.

What Bill 5 does, it will now allow the minister for everything, the hon. member from Melville, the fourth most powerful man in the Tory caucus — it not only changes what labour legislation in this province was established to do — it allows that hon. member to define and re-define the nature and the object and the purpose of the Department of Labour away from, for example, as The Trade Union Act, which is an Act to allow and to encourage employees to set up trade unions in this province.

I'm quite sure that that is not the intention, that is not the intent, and that is not the motive of the government in regard to Bill 5. That will not be the purpose of the Department of Labour after they get through putting the Department of Labour through the meat grinder, and after they get through putting the Department of Social Services through the meat grinder, and after they get through putting the secretariat in charge of human rights and the Human Rights Commission, and the secretariat in charge of native and northern affairs, and the secretariat in charge of women put through that meat grinder.

Those purposes and those objectives will be radically different, will be radically different than the intention of the legislation which was passed here in prior legislatures. And that the intent and purpose . . . and I see

the member, I see the member from Melville smiling, but I don't think, I don't think that your attack on trade unions in this province by a minister of Labour is anything to smile about, Mr. Minister. I don't think it's funny; I can tell you right now that the workers on strike at Lanigan don't think it's very funny; I can tell you right now that the workers on strike at the Co-op in Nipawin don't think it's . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please.

Mr. Lyons: — Who were you calling to order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — I'm calling you to order. I assumed that you knew why. You were not on the topic at all, and I would ask you to get back to the topic.

Mr. Lyons: — I would . . . It's an oversight; I'm sorry. I'm trying to relate, in fact, the actions of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Social Services to the history of this government, and the history of this government in the context of Bill 5.

And while it may range somewhat far afield, I understand from your own rulings in the past that the second reading is to discuss the principle of the Bill in the widest possible range in its implications on people in this province. And if I was totally out of order, I will apologize.

However, I believe I was in order in terms of talking to the minister regarding the record of his government, which is a pretty sorrowful record, you'll have to agree, Mr. Speaker. It's a pretty sorrowful record when it comes to defending working people. And one has to look at the statistics in this province and see, for example, that last year Saskatchewan was the only jurisdiction in Canada to see a fall in the actual industrial wage, the average industrial wage in Canada — it was the only jurisdiction. Everywhere else in Canada there was some rise in the average industrial wage except Saskatchewan.

So when I say there's been attack on the living standards of working people, there's statistics from the government's own Bureau of Statistics to back it up. And Bill 5 will enable this government, will enable that government across the way to continue its attacks on the rights of working people, working people who are organized in trade unions, but also working people who are not organized in trade unions.

(1100)

It will, for example, allow the Minister to rearrange the purposes of the Department of Labour in terms of conducting itself when it comes to enforcing The Labour Standards Act. Now for all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, the Labour Standards Act of this province is now not being enforced. It is a piece of legislation which is out there; it is a piece of legislation in which the inspectors have been jerked back by the government departments to whom they are responsible. That the kind of enforcement procedure which was in force between 1971 and 1982, which defended people who weren't members of trade unions, people who were working for the minimum wage or above the minimum wage, people who were part-time

workers, people who were working for the 40 hours a week, people who were protected by that legislation aren't being protected any more — they're not being protected.

In fact, some of the regulations that this government has put in, in terms of changing the purpose of the Labour Standards Act. That's what Bill No. 5 does. It allows the government to change the purposes of the departments, and when you change the purposes of the departments, you change the way in which the legislation is administered, you change the purpose of the legislation.

That is a *de facto* fact of life. That's a fact of life for working people in Saskatchewan. And what Bill No. 5 will do will allow the minister of everything, minister of the oppressed, to change behind closed doors the purposes, for example, of those who carry out labour standards so that they will have some legal justification, if not a moral justification, for the kind of activities that they've carried out in the past four years when it comes to working people.

And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Bill No. 5, when it comes to people in the whole realm of trade union rights and the rights of working people who are not in trade unions, that we're going to see Bill No. 5 used in the manner which is a clear and focused political purpose and which was outlined in the Speech from the Throne when it talks about removing impediments to efficiencies. And let's cut through all the high-faluting bureaucratise and see what that really means.

Impediments to efficiencies means things, for example, at least from the point of view of the government opposite, means things like section 37 of the Trade Union Act. And section 37, if you're not familiar, Mr. Speaker, is that section which allows succession rights and succession duties and places an obligation upon new employers of firms which are unionized to bargain collectively with the employees.

And I suspect that what we're going to see is that it will be deemed an impediment to efficiencies, and it'll be applied particularly in the civil service. And it'll be applied in the civil service in a manner which we've already seen in this province. We've already seen it in the setting up, for example, of the water corporation, in which the government deliberately passed into legislation enabling legislation to set up the water corporation; specifically excluded members of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union, members of SGEU from having been able to bargain collectively on behalf of the employees of the water corporation when its headquarters were established in Moose Jaw.

And they had to pass specific enabling legislation in that regard. Well what Bill No. 5 does will provide an easy out, in my mind, for the government to carry on that kind of contracting out, because that's all it is.

And if members look at section 14 of that Bill, and members look at section 12 of that Bill, and 13, you will find there a very, very, very close symbiotic relationship

between what they did with the water corporation and what the sinister and cunning plans of this government is in regards to contracting out, to privatizing, and to attacking trade union rights such as section 37 of the present Trade Union Act.

And what it will do, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, when I look at it, it will not only affect, for example, section 37, it will also attack the established sections such as section 46, I believe, which deals with technological change and the introduction of technological change.

Now the definition of the technological change I don't necessarily have to go into, other than to say that when there is a major change in the work-force or the major change in the nature of work or when there is a major change in the nature of work or when there is a major change in terms of laying off employees or shutting down an operation or any kind of technological — and it's interpreted in a very broad sense, and that was the interpretation given to that section when it was passed — that the technological change provisions of The Trade Union Act will become totally meaningless, that they will, in fact, be totally disregarded by the government of the members opposite.

What it will do, what Bill 5 will help the government do, will be able to change the nature of work in the public sector and the public service without having to deal with that section of The Trade Union Act which not only deals with technological change, but with that section of The Trade Union Act which forces the government or any employer to negotiate with its employees on any change, and any change in their work.

So we see an attack on section 37, the succession. We'll see an attack on the very principle and the heart of the principle contained within The Trade Union Act, which is an obligation for employers to negotiate collectively with their employees when they change, when there is any change in the manner of work. And also we will see an attack, I suspect, on the question of technological change, and it will be all under the rubric of removing impediments — removing impediments to government efficiency.

And, Mr. Speaker, the word "efficiency" cropped up in the throne speech debate, cropped up in the throne speech itself. And here once again, here once again, we see it cropping up in the mouths — the minister, Deputy Premier, minister for . . . pardon me, the member for Souris-Cannington, the member for sinister and cunning reasons, the introduction of Bill 5.

And what I'll do, Mr. Speaker. . . What this Bill will do — Bill 5 — will affect, I know directly, me in my critic area as opposition critic for the environment. It will allow, I suspect, when it comes to dealing with the change in the purpose and the objective of government departments without scrutiny by this House, it will come to mean more and greater secrecy in dealing with environmental issues in this province.

We've already seen the kind of secrecy from the minister in charge of Environment, the hon. member for Rosetown. We've seen that kind of secrecy when he ordered a gag rule, when he put a gag on his employees

— put a gag on his employees, saying you're not to talk to any of the MLAs — not to talk to any of the MLAs, and that includes the back-bench MLAs across the way; you're not to talk to any MLAs without clearing it through my office first. That's the kind of ministerial directive he gave. That's the kind of secrecy they want when it comes to environmental issues.

That's what Bill 5 does, Mr. Speaker. Bill 5, will allow him to change within the Department of the Environment those provisions which will require openness. And I refer specifically to section 13 of the environmental Act, and the hiring of inspectors and the nature of the duties of those inspectors, and the environmental assessment of people. And those good people who are concerned about the environment, who work for the Department of the Environment, will have their purposes, will have their objectives, will have their functions changed by the back-room boys, by the wheeler-dealers. They'll be told not to raise this environmental issue. And don't you touch that environmental issue because that's not your purpose; that's not your function; and that's not what you're hired to do; and that's not your objective.

And the kind of secrecies that we've seen which, for example, have kept the recent massive spill of sulphuric acid at Key Lake . . . We heard the government talk about that kind of massive sulphuric acid — the member from Weyburn doesn't even know about it; the minister's so good at keeping secrets that the member from Weyburn doesn't even know about it — when which a tanker load of sulphuric acid, a tanker load of sulphuric acid was spilled in the containment building at Key Lake, then somehow — and we're not quite sure how, because it's not supposed to happen — but then somehow escaped the containment building. And as you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, by its very name the word "containment building" means that things are supposed to be contained within its walls — then somehow the sulphuric acid got into the ground water, into the water table, and has in fact totally destroyed one of the reservoirs at Key Lake.

Now did we hear anything about that from the government opposite? No, no. These are people who want to talk about open government and about the democratic process and how they're consulting with people and how they're co-operating with people. Yet at the same time, they put gag orders on their environmental officials, and they keep quiet about a major environmental hazard and accident that's just recently occurred within the last three weeks at the Key Lake mine site.

And not a word. And I bet you they didn't tell their back-bench members, and I bet you they didn't tell most of the members of their cabinet, despite the fact that one of the reservoirs and despite the fact that the security of the containment building at Key Lake has been breached. Secrecy, secrecy, the big secret, and that's what's in Bill 5. The big secret: don't tell, don't tell, don't put our political behinds in hot water. That's what . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Right. Well, that's right.

As the member from North West says, if they were Weyerhaeuser, they would tell; if they were Pioneer Trust, they might tell if it was here. They'll tell Pioneer

Management, but they'll give it away. But they'll tell their big corporate friends, but they won't tell the people of Saskatchewan. And Bill 5 allows them to change the purposes defined by section 13 of the environmental Act so that environmental officers won't be able to do their job in this province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think there's another reason in terms of dealing with that. And we look at the government's project at Alameda, Rafferty, and Shand, and in terms of the environmental impact that those projects have at those three sites. And they'll use that in environmental . . . They'll be able to use Bill 5 to change the purposes of the department in dealing with the environment in order to put a muzzle on some of the environmental hazards and some of the political and environmental issues which have arisen around the Shand, Rafferty, and Alameda projects.

I want to give you just one example on that. As we've been able to discern from people in the state of Montana, environmental activists and people who support the environment and support the notion of clean air and good drinking water and productive soil, one of the reasons why the government made its decision to put Shand power plant where it is instead of building at Coronach — and I'm not carrying a brief for either at this time, Mr. Speaker — but the reason they put it over in Shand was because of the nature of the sulphur emissions coming from the Shand plant.

(1115)

And right now, within the state of Montana, within the state of Montana the level of sulphur emissions is at such a state that not one more particle — and I use that figuratively, not literally — but not one more particle, in a figurative sense, if it crosses the international boundary, will be tolerated by the federal regulatory agencies who deal with emissions, who deal with the emissions problems. And what will happen is that some of the industries, some of the industries in the state of Montana will have to cease operation, cut back its . . . or I should say, cut back its sulphur emissions. And that will involve a ceasing of operation until they apply the appropriate technology to cut that.

And that there was communication between the Government of Montana, the Governor, and the state of Montana and this government, requesting that no more coal-fired power plants be built at Coronach because they did not want the large corporate interests in Montana, particularly in the mining and smelting industry in Montana, to undergo any more pressure on their profit levels; that they didn't want them to have to take money out of their corporate profits and put them into environmental emissions equipment. And so that was one of the factors in determining the whole move of the power plant over to Shand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what Bill 5 does, what Bill 5 does in terms of trying to put the lid on those kind of political information, will allow . . . And that was obtained, I might say, that was obtained because legislation exists as it presently exists, and because the objectives and definitions and the purpose of the Department of the

Environment is defined as it presently exists without the introduction of Bill 5, and we're able to obtain that kind of information. That kind of information, while it may not stop altogether, the government wants to put a stranglehold on it. And that's again just a question of secrecy that this government has when it comes to dealing with environmental issues.

They don't want to tell people . . . They don't want to tell the farmers, for example, at Birsay Lake and at Luck Lake what the environmental results of the spray irrigation systems which they're proposing to put in place through Sask Water Corporation, what effect that will have on the salinity levels. And I'll be going into that question a little during the spring sitting of the House, Mr. Speaker, so I won't bother . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We've got to be open. We're an open party, and we're an open opposition. It's unfortunate we don't have an open government opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — You know, Mr. Speaker, there's another section of the Bill that I object to, and I object to it in the political context. I object to it in the political context we find ourselves in Saskatchewan, and that's the whole question of things that we've seen recently like the appointment of George Hill to head up that . . . that qualified, eminent, electrical engineer who is able to grasp quickly the management problems at Sask Power and grasp them so quickly that he puts long-time civil servants like Don Moroz out on the street.

There's an aspect of this Bill, Bill No. 5, that I object to, and that's the section 14 which it specifically states out, and again I refer to the principle of patronage, which seems to be a watchword of this government — the principle of patronage, not any specific examples — but in which section 14 of the Bill allows them to carry on, and states openly — right? — that they want to hire their advisers, and they want to hire their consultants, and that they will want to hire their friends and their political hacks when it comes to setting up any new reorganized, disestablished, de-purposed, produced, manufactured, and diversified departmental structure, and so forth. But they want to use section 14 of the Bill and be able to fill the pockets of their Conservative friends.

We've seen that again, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the history for the last four and a half to five years of this government — it will be five years in April — over four and a half years of this government, which has nothing but one long, miserable record when it comes to plugging — that's the only word. They just plug them with their political friends so they can all feed fat and happy out of the trough.

You know, when they told me that Mr. Hill was making close to \$200,000 as the head of SPC, I think of the people, Mr. Speaker, the people in Regina who last night attended the Salvation Army turkey supper, who had to attend a supper at the Salvation Army because they didn't have enough money to be able to buy their Christmas turkeys. And I look across the halls and I see, yes,

George's friends, 200,000 bucks. Well I can tell you, he'll be having some nice turkey suppers, and he'll be having them in Saskatchewan, and he'll be having them in Acapulco, and he'll be having them all around the world at the taxpayers' expense. Lots and lots of money for the pigs at the trough, Mr. Speaker. Lots of money for the George Hills in this province. Not very many for people on social services.

But, Mr. Speaker, Bill 5, section 14 of Bill 5 is going to allow them to line up, going to allow them to line up stretching from here to Kuroki, and then saying: come on boys, come on in; stick in the snout; it's public money; it's trough money; come and get it because we've established a new department and we've established a new agency, and it's got this purpose and it's got that purpose. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose that they are going to establish some of those agencies and some of those departments and some of those divisions is so they can line up their friends at the trough, they can stick their snout in, and they'll be just supping mightily. They'll be supping mightily on the sweat and labour of the people of this province.

That's another one of the reason for Bill 5. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, I have seen a record of patronage, of legitimized theft of the treasury of this province, from any government since the time I have moved here. Ross Thatcher, he was a piker when it came to piggery compared to these folks. Let me tell you he was a piker, Mr. Speaker.

It's legitimized theft, and Bill 5 helps them set up a trough which is legitimized theft. And my friends, let me tell you, these people will have no hesitation; they'll have no hesitation whatsoever of getting their friends out there, leading them in, sticking the snout in the trough and saying: drink deep friends, drink deep.

You know, Mr. Speaker, all these things put together are objectionable. They are objectionable politically, they're objectionable morally. They are straight objectionable. They're also unconstitutional, according to my learned friends.

They're wrong. They're plain, plain wrong when it comes to the conduct, the manner in which the conduct of the affairs of the province in which we, as legislators, want to encourage people to act. And I think that one of the essences, the conceptual essence of democracy, is a very, very simple, straightforward proposition that when you have an informed citizenry that knows the issues and that have the confidence in which to act on the issues, that at some point in time our functions as legislators will wither away, because they themselves will be part of the Demos of the people who take part in the democratic process.

And I can't think of a more fitting quote to back me up on this than a person whom the Premier raised time and time again during the legislature as one of his heroes. You know, he raised Tommy Douglas as one of his heroes, as one of his icons, to be, you know, to be followed by people in this province. It's too bad the Premier didn't take to heart any of his writings.

And I refer to the July 1987 page of the Tommy Douglas

commemorative calendar, which are obtained by . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, some hon. members are attempting to cast aspersions or make light of the fact that this is a . . . of this quality product.

But I want to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seeing that the Deputy Speaker has taken the chair, I want to quote now from the July page of this calendar, Mr. Speaker, "Those of us," Tommy Douglas says:

Those of us who believe in genuine democracy are convinced that it is possible to have both freedom and security. We believe that there must be a place in human society for human values and the dignity of the individual. We believe that it's possible to build a society in which man will not have to choose between freedom and bread, but will be able to eat not only the bread which he has earned by the sweat of his brow but will also be able to walk the earth in dignity and in freedom.

The greatest defence in the world today is a satisfied democracy. I hear people talking about defending democracy. You may have to defend it with bayonets and bombs, but in the final analysis democracy is an idea which cannot be defended with guns and bombs alone.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — "The greatest way to defend it is to make it work."

I want the members opposite to hear what Tommy Douglas had to say about that. The greatest way to defend democracy is to make it work.

And you, ladies and gentlemen of the government opposite, are trying to make it not work. And that's your aim. And you're trying to make it not work for your narrow and selfish political aims. It's plain and simple. It's a power grab. "Unless," Mr. Speaker, Tommy Douglas goes on to say:

Unless democracy can give people full stomachs, clothing to wear, decent houses to live in, educational opportunities, security in their old age, health services for themselves and their families when they need it — unless democracy can do that, democracy will have failed.

It's your job and mine to make democracy work.

When I look around this province and I see what they want to do with Bill 5, I see what they want to do with Bill 5, and there is nowhere in Bill 5 any idea of extending democracy out to people, any idea of involving them, any idea of making things work better for people, but only making things work better for their fat-cat corporate friends. When I see that, then I know the hypocrisy of the members opposite when they bring up Tommy Douglas's name. Then I know they're hypocrites because they have no conception, they have no understanding, of the kind of things he said about something so plain, so elemental to our historical traditions as the nature of democracy.

And so, Mr. Speaker, that's another reason that I intend to oppose Bill 5. You know, I earlier said, Mr. Speaker, that when I began this short address that the . . . and these are my opening notes gentlemen, these are my opening notes. I earlier on said that the government regaled us, absolutely enthused and overwhelmed us with words like co-operation, with words like consultation, with all those nice, warm buzz-words that the Conservatives opposite like to use, what they'd like to put in place instead of any kind of substantive action.

And I want to talk about consultation in terms of Bill 5. Well first of all, they didn't consult us as members of the opposition on Bill 5 as to what kind of efficiencies we can effect in government, of what kind of methods there are — and there's a fair bit of experience, you will come to understand, Mr. Speaker, on the front benches of this opposition, when it comes to administrating, when it comes to administrating government in an effective and efficient manner — an effective and efficient manner. You'll find that kind of knowledge rests not just on that side of the House, but on this side of the House.

But there wasn't any consultation when it came to the introduction of Bill 5 in dealing with the whole question, in dealing with the whole question of government effectiveness and efficiency, despite the fact that it's there.

(1130)

Mr. Speaker, and there wasn't . . . and they talked a great deal in the throne speech debate, they talked a great deal about consulting with those groups outside this House who will be affected by their legislation, who will be part of their economic plan, who will be partners for progress as we march down that glorious, glorious Tory road into the ever-rising sunset of hope and prosperity which the members would like to paint as a picture which faces us all, and which we all know is not true.

They talked about consulting groups. You know, they introduce a Bill which deals with the reorganization of government. And government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is an organism by which people work together to do certain things. And the first, the very first people, the very first people they forgot to consult were the people who work for them. They're so concerned with developing their rhetoric about consultation, and so concerned about painting that picture of co-operation out there, that they just forget a little bit to actually do any consulting.

And I want to read into the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a letter that I received yesterday from Barbara Byers. Barbara Byers, as you well know, is the president of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union. The letter is dated 18th of December, 1986, and it's addressed to the Hon. Grant Devine, Premier of Saskatchewan, Legislative Buildings, Regina, Saskatchewan, and it says:

Dear Mr. Premier: I am writing to you to express concerns about the recent introduction in the legislature of proposed Bill 5 of 1986-87, an Act Respecting the Organization of the Executive Government of Saskatchewan.

The proposed government organization act would, if passed, have the effect of overriding many pieces of existing legislation which guarantees the maintenance of government services to the public. It would allow the cabinet to eliminate or reorganize government departments and agencies without the knowledge or permission of the province's elected representatives in the legislature.

I want to repeat that.

It would allow cabinet to eliminate or reorganize government departments and agencies without the knowledge or permission of the province's elected representatives in the legislature.

We can underline that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Here is an opinion from people, the representative of people, who work day in and day out in the government services, and they're saying that your Bill 5 will do the following:

It would allow the cabinet to eliminate or reorganize government departments and agencies without the knowledge or permission — (without the knowledge or permission) — of the province's elected representatives in the legislature.

There they go again, grabbing power — grabbing power. They take their power from the Conservative Party and put it in the hands of the caucus, from the caucus they put it in the hands of the cabinet, and from the cabinet they do it in their own version of the Politburo — their little inner cabinet — and it ultimately devolves it down into the little tin-pot dictator, the would-be, tin-pot dictator on the other side.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is not my opinion. That is the opinion of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union.

That it would allow the cabinet to eliminate or reorganize government departments and agencies without the knowledge or permission of the province's elected representatives in the legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it says that's what it would do. And it says, here's what the effect is.

If adopted, this Bill would constitute a radical departure from Saskatchewan tradition.

"... a radical departure from the Saskatchewan tradition." And I believe I've mentioned the word "radical" earlier on, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with that question. That's not my word. That's the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union who say:

(that they want to introduce) a radical departure from Saskatchewan tradition in the organization of government services, and the public's right to scrutinize government decisions. As such...

And here's the recommendation. It says this is what they did; this is what the Bill will do; now, here's what they

want done.

As such, it warrants thorough study of its implications, and meaningful consultation with affected groups, before consideration of its passage into law.

The Saskatchewan Government Employees Union, the organization in this province most to be affected by the introduction of Bill 5, wants, Mr. Deputy Speaker, wants consultation.

And my question now to the government is: are you prepared to provide that consultation? Will you meet with the representatives of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union to discuss Bill 5 and how and what it will affect? And will you negotiate, will they instruct their negotiators in fact to deal with the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union on the questions they raise insofar as it affects the reorganization of the government.

What they want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and what they ask for outlined in this letter is:

We strongly urge that the proposed Bill 5 be withdrawn from the current session of the legislature

...

They want Bill 5 withdrawn. Those people most affected by Bill 5, those people who will feel the full brunt of Bill 5 want it withdrawn. They want Bill 5 to go. and that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the reason why I'm going to oppose it, because if those people want it withdrawn, those people with the most knowledge and the most to lose by this Bill, when those people want it withdrawn, I'm standing by them. And that's why we here on this side of the House will stand by them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — They want it withdrawn from the current session of this legislature pending full consultation with employee organization and consumers of government services.

That seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that seems to me not a very radical request to have. They want the legislation withdrawn until the government consults with the groups most strongly affected by this legislation. Are they going to withdraw it? Well, I don't think they will. My own bet would be that they won't. Because between the rhetoric of consultation and the reality of their secrecy live the shadow people, out therein the grey areas, trying to hide from the people; trying to cover themselves in lots of nice rhetoric, lots of nice rhetoric, about consultation, about co-operation. But you know, they will be found out. They will be found out because the shadow people will be brought to account in the full light of public scrutiny either inside this legislature or outside in the legislature of the streets.

Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in Saskatchewan will not allow the continued attack on the democratic rights and traditions which people in this country have fought

for for so long. We will not allow the power grab. We will not allow them to introduce the kind of sinister and cunning measures, sinister and cunning measures which these people intend to.

Their agenda — and Bill 5 is the mechanism by which they intend to do it — their agenda is an agenda of oppression and misery for working people in this province. It's an agenda for patronage for their corporate fat cats. It's an agenda for disaster, economically, in terms of . . . And we only have to look at Weyerhaeuser when they give away \$248 million worth of assets and we have to pay \$7 million for it. We can see the kind of agenda for disaster that Bill 5 is going to allow for this province.

But, gentlemen, step out of the shadows and come into the real world. Step out of the shadows and come into what's really happening out in Saskatchewan. I want to, just in enforcing that comment, I want to remind you of what's happening in other places in the world and what's happening to governments who try to force through legislation. And I'll refer, for example, to the Government of Quebec — a nice Liberal government who wanted to put forward some reforms who, under the rhetoric of consulting and co-operating with people, tried to put through reforms somewhat the same as is happening here in this province in terms of affecting contracting out and cut-backs in the civil service and a cut in the quality of government services.

They were met not only with a hostile legislature in terms of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Quebec, the Chamber of Deputies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were met with the real parliament. They were met with the real parliament, the parliament of the street, the parliament which overthrew "Boo-boo" Bourassa in 1976, and which will be Boo-boo's downfall in 1986 because in 10 years that good Liberal hasn't seemed to have learned anything at all.

And we look at another Conservative government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in which they tried to introduce reforms under the aegis of efficiencies and consultation and co-operation, the government of Jacques Chirac in France. And you know it was very interesting, despite all the hard-line and hard-nosed statements that they would never knuckle under, they would never give in, that these reforms are so important — and they were dealing with the educational institutions — and they were so important to the educational future of France, it took the parliament of the streets, it took the parliament of the streets to immobilize that government.

And when you see what's happening in France, if you look at your television sets and see what's happening in France, I say to the members opposite, what you're doing is you're looking into the mirror of your own future. Spring is not far away. Spring is not far away, and that is why we're opposing it. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we're opposing at this time in this Bill, in this place, is because that government wants to ram it through just before Christmas. They want to sneak it by the people. They want to slide it under the mat of the political agenda. They don't want it out in the open. They don't want consultation. They don't want co-operation in putting this Bill through.

What they want to do, Mr. Speaker, is hide it behind the backs of the people of Saskatchewan, but we're not going to let them. We're not going to let them do it. And if we can't beat them here in the parliament, in the Assembly, the people will get them in the broad light of day out there in the parliament of the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I'm not able to go on much longer, other than to say that I'd like to finish my remarks and talk about some other examples of the Conservative commitment to democracy and why we have Bill 5 before us.

I refer the members opposite to yesterday's paper, yesterday's edition of the *Leader-Post*, December 18, 1986, to a front-page story that says, "Four Tory MPs linked to Contras." The Tory MPs, Mr. Speaker — Mr. Don Blenkarn of Mississauga and Andrew Witer of Toronto. And they said that they met several times with retired U.S. Army General John Singlaub, the chief American fund raiser for the Contra rebels.

Now what we have here, Mr. Speaker, what we have here . . . I'm going to read it. What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a party which claims to be committed to democracy, committed to territorial sovereignty and integrity, committed to all those good things, committed to all those good things. Right? What do we have? And yet what do we have? We have two Tory MPs — two Tory MPs — meeting with the chief fund raiser for the Contras in the United States.

There they are, in the back rooms, meeting with the Contras, trying to subvert a legally elected government — a government that was elected legally and free in democratic elections. That's what they're trying to do — subvert. Bill 5 is the same nature, is of the same nature. They have no interest in democracy.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the story goes on and on and talks about the relationships between Patrick Boyer, a Toronto Tory MP, and Alex Kindy of Calgary, Alberta MP, and that they attended a meeting last month organized by the anti-bolshevik league — you know, that mass organization we see all around us, and it's a member of the World Anti-Communist League.

Now for the point of information, Mr. Speaker, the head of the North American World Anti-Communist League is none other than leadership aspirant for the Tory federal leadership, than a former Tory member from Toronto named John Gamble.

Now John Gamble ran for the Tory leadership. Right? Ran for the Tory leadership, ran for the Tory leadership, headed this North American Anti-Communist League or anti-bolshevik league or whatever it's called, who are involved in shipping arms, who are involved in shipping arms and, as the story says, blowing up kids — blowing up kids in Nicaragua.

You know, that's the kind of attitude that we're finding more and more as the strong status, as these people who try to grab power and put it closer, closer into their little clutches, as they try to bring it closer and closer to the seat

of executive government and ultimately to the seat of the member opposite.

This is the kind of commitment to democracy that we find from Conservatives. If you don't like it, kill it. If you don't like it, squash it out. You know, all in the name of the good old Conservative ideology, all in the name of that good old Conservative ideology.

And I can see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the reaction of the members opposite, that they've wakened up, that they're taking attention and that, in fact, some of their skin colours are turning a little redder because, in fact, they themselves have met with people like Don Blenkarn, they themselves have met with people like John Gamble, and that ultimately, ultimately, that they will support the kind of work that these gentlemen are doing to support the Contras.

(1145)

Because if you asked them, if you asked them, each and every one of them here, ask them about their commitment to democracy, ask them whether or not they favour Ronald Reagan's policy. Ask them whether or not they favour the Contra policy in Latin American, in Nicaragua, in terms of trying to overthrow a legally constituted government. And you ask them about it, and you'll get one answer, and they won't say it here. And they won't say it openly, but they'll say it in private. They'll say it behind closed doors. Yeah, yeah, they agree with that. They agree with that kind of subversion of democracy.

So despite all the rhetoric, despite all the fancy words of co-operation and consultation, despite all of their undying commitment to democracy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill 5 is the same kind of subversion of democracy that we see their Tory MP friends doing in terms of trying to overthrow the government of Nicaragua.

And I see the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden chortling rather heartily at this fact. I see the member there saying — kind of denigrating those kind of statements. Well let me tell you, -Mr. Speaker, about this member's . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would just like to ask the hon. member if his remarks have anything to do whatsoever with the Bill before the Assembly. I don't know what Nicaragua has to do with the Bill before the Assembly. The hon. member hasn't been anywhere near the Bill since he put it down. And I suggest that the rules are such that the matter before the House is the particular Bill. And I think that the hon. member should follow the rules and speak about the matter before the Assembly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The point of order is well taken. I've been listening to the debate quite closely. I have allowed it to go quite far-ranging, but I would ask the member to return to the Bill and discuss the Bill that is before the House. And I think we'll have to tighten up on the comments.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will offer my profuse apologies for ranging far afield and outside of the bounds of the debate. I would like, however, to defend myself very shortly by saying that the nature of the subversion of democracy that we find here in the Legislative Assembly, and the kind of power grab that we see undergoing that we're witnessing here before our very eyes, is the same kind of subversion of democracy that we see in . . . (inaudible) . . . to the Contras. But I won't raise that any more. I'll put that aside.

In doing so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to say that it's a very simple solution to the problems if in fact our charges that we make to the members opposite in terms of the principle of the Bill; if in fact our charges are incorrect; if in fact they're not a subversion of democracy; if in fact they're not *ultra vires*; if in fact they're not and have not and will not have any sinister and cunning reasons, to quote the member from Souris-Cannington; if in fact that is not true, then why don't the members hold the Bill? Why don't they just withdraw it for now so that it can be studied by a committee of the House — that they consult their legal people; that they can go and consult the people from the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union, who it most directly affects, so that those people can get their questions answered and they can get their concerns addressed. If, in fact, what we're saying isn't correct, why don't you do it? Why don't you live up to your rhetoric for once in your life? For once in your life why don't you live up with the kind of ideals that you profess to have? For once in your life why don't you do what's right for the people of Saskatchewan?

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in this debate and make a couple of points primarily as they relate to some of the legal arguments being advanced by the members opposite over the last day or so.

I will leave the question of the streamlining of a government, which is the prime purpose of this Bill and I think everybody understands that we have to streamline government. I'll leave that to the Deputy Premier when he closes the debate, hopefully late today.

I would particularly like to address some of my comments to the member from The Battlefords. The member from The Battlefords, who I have watched as some of the new members in the Assembly, some of the new members in the Assembly, and I isolated him out as one that I would see as more of a street politician and perhaps less of the Bryant oratory contest type members from opposite.

Look at the situation as to what is happening. And I say to the members opposite, take some time to look exactly at what is happening because what you're doing here is following the direction of your new leader, the member from Riversdale, who is taking you guys down on a constitutional track once again. And that's exactly where you're going.

He would have us believe, Mr. Speaker, he would have us believe that somehow this bill is the most dastardly thing

ever done to the democratic process in the history of the province and in the history of parliament itself. That's what he would have us to believe — coming from a guy, a person, the leader, the member from Riversdale — coming from a person who says that they are destroying, and this will destroy the parliamentary system.

Now I want to take you back, and I want to take the member from The Battlefords back five or six years ago. Five or six years ago, and let's remember five and six years ago when the country decided it would take off onto the debate on the constitution. Okay. That was the decision we took at that point in time. Some of us disagreed with that. Some of us said: no, the bigger issue is the fact that interest rates are at 22 per cent in our country at that time. Others said: no, it's the issue that inflation was at 15 per cent at that period of time. And others argued: no, the big issue of the day is the fact that Ottawa was trying to rape the resources of the provinces like Saskatchewan and Alberta.

But no, in their wisdom, and in the wisdom of Trudeau, and in the wisdom of the member from Riversdale, the constitution was far more important than those issues. And to the member opposite I would say this: go back to that period of time and remember, because there were some were saying you are taking us off, I'm sure some within your caucus would say: hey, the member from Riversdale is taking us off our agenda. Because the people out there were not concerned about the constitution; they were concerned about those other issues.

But let me go back and deal with the constitution — a person who was very instrumental, to his credit, who did a lot of work, gained national profile of bringing us a constitution, a charter of rights. Now let's go back and remember, and we debated that in this House in the first session, the first legislature I was here, the 19th Legislature; we debated that question often. And you, member from Battlefords, was a member of parliament, and you obviously experienced debate even more than we did.

Now with that constitution came the charter of rights and the debate was, and I suppose still is, the debate is finished; we have a charter of rights in this country. But I think it's fair to say, and most would agree, that there has been nothing in the past 50 years in this country that has taken more away from the power of parliament and from the power of the legislature than did the charter of rights, because it took away far more than this Bill here is even trying to deal with. It took away permanently, for ever, the rights of parliaments and the rights of legislatures to deal with fundamental questions.

Yesterday, for example, we saw a decision by the Supreme Court. What the Supreme Court ruled with regard to the Sunday hours question was not as important as the fact that because of the member from Riversdale and because of Trudeau, we in this legislature, us as elected officials, no longer have the right to decide whether or not stores should be open on Sunday or not, if the court so decides it's not in our bailiwick to do it.

Now you can go through hundreds and hundreds of examples. Will this legislature have the power to say that

a member can belong or does not have to belong to the trade union movement? That is in the power now of the courts, not in the power of this legislature. That process, my friends and Deputy Speaker, was what the charter of rights did, and nothing has eroded power more from the legislatures or the parliaments than the charter of rights.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me a rather hollow and hypocritical argument for the member from Riversdale to make. The very person who championed the charter of rights that took the power away from parliament, that took the power away from this institution, to say some small Bill is now destroying parliament and destroying democracy; how hypocritical can he be, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — And the member from The Battlefords, to his credit — the member from The Battlefords, to his credit, when he sat in the House of parliament back in those days five and six years ago, said, I don't agree with it either. And that's to his credit. And that's a tough decision for anybody to take. And you pay the price for making those tough decisions, which I'm sure you can advise us better than I can advise you. But you pay the price for that. You stood there for that principle. Now if you were making that argument rather than the member from Riversdale, you have some credibility. The member from Riversdale does not have credibility— talking about what powers legislature should have; what powers parliament should have.

Let me then go finally, Mr. Speaker, to the points raised by the member from Saskatoon Fairview. A member that is not caught up, as the member from The Battlefords is not caught up in this concept of Bryant oratory wing of the party.

Now he raises some points that he takes in all seriousness, and I took them to be made in all seriousness, his argument being that this violated the constitution — violated the charter of rights. That was the argument he advanced. He advanced it. I think in fairness to the member, saying that I don't profess to be an expert on the constitution or charter things. And that's to his credit, and he said that in the House.

I had some of the law officers go over the comments being advanced by the member from Saskatoon Fairview, as he had requested that I do. And I have from them a brief two-page comment with regard to the allegations raised by the member from Fairview. He pointed out the initiatives and referendum argument case that was in Manitoba in 1916.

I think it's important for the Assembly to understand what that particular issue was at that particular time — what the issue was at that particular time, which was not uncommon to legislatures and to politicians of that time and into the '30s, where you had some of the revolt movements within the politics. What that legislation sought to do in Manitoba back in 1916 was to delegate power to referendum. What the parliament or the

legislature of Manitoba was basically saying in that particular case is that we will delegate power to referendum. And when you took a referendum on a particular issue, you bound the legislature of Manitoba to the decision of whatever the referendum was taken.

Now that was the case that the hon. member referred to, and that was the case that was challenged. The Privy Council ultimately decided that the Act was unconstitutional because it altered the position of the Lieutenant Governor in a fashion not contemplated by section 98(1) of the BNA Act, the province's authority to amend the constitution.

(1200)

This line of reasoning, according to the officials, is not applicable to Bill No. 5. The Bill does not deal with initiatives and referendums; it does not amend the constitution of the province; and it does not affect the office of the Lieutenant Governor; it does not concern primary law-making authority. And that's the important point — it does not affect the primary law-making authority.

It is clear and has been established beyond any reasonable doubt that the legislature can competently delegate authority to subordinate bodies or to other bodies. The legislature does that every day and it delegates substantial and broad authority every day. Even a sweeping delegation of power is valid under our system. That principle was established in England in 1700 and it was established over 100 years ago by the Privy Council with respect to the Canadian provinces and their legislatures.

The member from Saskatoon Fairview errs when he attempts to inflate the rather peculiar legal circumstances of the initiatives and referendum case into a general principle. Indeed the very passage from Professor Hogg's text at page 292, 293, that the hon. member relies on actually points out the error of his argument. Professor Hogg notes that a delegated power is substantially different from a primary lawmaking power. Bill No. 5 involves delegation of authority. It does not involve the creation of a primary lawmaking authority as in the Manitoba case.

The hon. member also refers and tries to rely on section 3, 4, and 5 of the charter of rights. Those provisions deal with the right to vote, the maximum duration of the Legislative Assembly, and the requirement of an annual sitting of the legislature. His argument is completely wrong on this point. There is no possible basis for the provision that the charter can be engaged by section 5. The Bill self-evidently does not touch either upon the right to vote, the duration of the Assembly, or the sittings of the Assembly.

Now that in my view, Mr. Deputy Speaker — Mr. Speaker, as you're there now — clearly are of the position that the legislation, in the fine, small point made by the member from Fairview, is that the legislation was unconstitutional, was *ultra vires* and could not be passed by this legislature, we find to be not correct. Of course we in this Assembly can't decide that. I suppose ultimately

anybody can challenge anything they want in the courts.

The point I make in closing, Mr. Speaker, is this Saskatchewan And it's to the member from Riversdale, the person who spirited, and to his credit, some would say, brought in a charter of rights that took for ever powers from legislatures and powers from parliaments; who championed that across this country; who must, I think, agree that that charter takes away power from legislatures and parliaments like no other Act has, because it take away for ever and a day and a day and a day. He was the person that championed that. You broke lines and went against him on that. Now he is trying to lead you boys — he is trying to lead you boys back on to the constitutional trail. He wants to talk about he constitution, I suspect, because that's one of the things that he understands. He doesn't want to lead you into the job creation or economics; he wants to go back to the constitution.

We cautioned you prior to '82, you're on the wrong agenda, boys. You wouldn't listen. You're on the wrong agenda, and that wrong agenda took power away from the NDP in 1982. Keep it up and we'll be here for a long time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to start off my remarks today by wishing a Merry Christmas to the members of the Assembly, and to you, Mr. Speaker, since this is likely the last opportunity that I'll have before the Christmas to do that. And I'd like to wish my constituents as well, and others that . . . I wish them a very Merry Christmas, and peace and happiness throughout 1987.

And I want to make some remarks in this second reading on the principle of the Bill entitled the government organization Act. And I appreciated some of the comments that were made by the hon. member from Kindersley. However, I would want to point out that the charter of rights and the constitution do not have a whole lot to do with this Bill in particular that we have before us today, however accurate he may have been in his analysis of some of the things that happened earlier in the 1980s concerning the constitutional Act that came before parliament, and there was much debate within this legislature.

And I would agree with the hon. member that some rights of legislators and parliamentarians within the country have been lost in that things that could be done in parliaments and legislatures prior to the constitutional Act, which included a charter of rights, cannot be done now, because the decision are made by the judicial system within Canada to make sure that things fall within the charter of rights within this country.

The member is also right in his analysis that I spoke and voted against that in parliament — one of a few members from my party — and may or may not have done me some harm. I am sure that by this point in time I've recovered from any harm which may have been inflicted upon my person, and I hope to continue some career in this legislature.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, about the charter of rights in

Canada, is that those that wanted a charter of rights wanted some consistency as to how politicians dealt with people they represent fairly and equally across the country, and I can appreciate that from those that would argue that viewpoint.

But we also have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that politicians and the forums in which they operate, like this legislature, this House, or the Parliament of Canada, have responsibilities. And they have to act in concert with a charter of rights, because there are many countries throughout the world that have noble-sounding constitutions, but if the political will of the politicians and the legislatures and the parliaments are not there to carry out the intent of that charter of rights, then it's not worth the paper it's written on. Because if you look at the Soviet Union, if you look at some of the Central American countries where human rights are violated every single day of the week, the paper means nothing. So it in fact has to operate with some degree of regularity and fairness with politicians, their forms, and with the charter.

I think, Mr. Speaker, what myself and my colleagues and our House Leader are asking for is not to have this issue taken into the constitutional argument of the charter of rights. What we're looking for is that this Bill, Bill 5, the organizational Act, does not take away from the scrutiny of this House. What we want to do, or at least what I would like to see happen, Mr. Speaker, is that the government draw this Bill from the House and change it so that it is in fact then in line with the federal statute.

We've heard from some of the members on the government side that this is similar to the federal Act; it's similar to the province of Manitoba. But there are some very distinct differences in this piece of legislation. And so maybe because I'm not a lawyer, as some members are in this House, maybe I don't understand all the technicalities of the Bill. And maybe, Mr. Speaker, there are some things implied in that Bill that this government opposite would honour throughout their entire term. But I would prefer that if the Bill would be withdrawn, make it very explicit so we can understand it and future governments can understand it as well.

I don't wish to question the integrity of the government opposite. I hope that they do have integrity to honour their word. But if a government comes along 50 years from now or 60 years from now or 10 years from now, the Bill should be explicit enough that the new government can understand and carry out the intent of the proposed legislation that's before us here today, Mr. Speaker.

And so that's what I think would satisfy this side of the House. It would certainly satisfy me that you would at least bring it into line with the federal statute that would be the counterpart at our federal level of government. I would personally find that very acceptable and would try and convince some of my colleagues that this is something that we could dispose of rather quickly and carry on home for Christmas instead of trying to preserve the rights of people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Because the Bill causes some very serious problems and I want to turn to addressing those . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Even though, Mr. Speaker, this Bill, the government organization Act, the proposed legislation may imply some of the things that the members opposite are saying, it certainly is not explicit in those areas.

The section 5(1) of the Bill talks about:

Assign to any minister any power, duty or function conferred or imposed by law on a minister.

Well it seems to me that that gives an awful lot of power to the Executive Council or to cabinet. So many things that have formerly come before this House can be done in the confines of the Executive Council, by the cabinet, with very little, if any, scrutiny from this legislature.

Section 12(1) states out that the purpose may be:

(a) establish, continue or vary any department and determine the objectives and purposes of the department;

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a very onerous responsibility that the cabinet takes upon themselves, and that means that entire departments could be wiped out, could be privatized for the services that were provided there before by the scrutiny of this legislature, which will no longer exist. It's fairly awesome the power that the Executive Council will receive if this legislation comes into being.

(b) (it can) disestablish any department;

c) determine or change the name of any department.

And we have a good example of that already, Mr. Speaker. There are many employees within departments that come under the authority of the hon. member from Melville that are already referring to themselves as being the department of human resources. Now, have in fact the government opposite actually brought into reality the functions of this proposed legislation? Are they already making those decisions in the Executive Council? It seems to me that they feel that they are. Otherwise, why would they be referring to themselves as working for the department of human resources? In fact, during earlier debate in this House the member from Melville referred to himself as the minister of human resources in the province.

Well, we would like to be able to debate the pros and the cons, the pluses and the minuses of major alterations to departments where they are disestablished. Some of them may be put under another department. I don't know, as one individual member, Mr. Speaker, what part of his far-ranging portfolio actually comes under human resources. Is some of it under human resources? Is some of it gone to other departments? Has some of it gone to the private sector? We don't know that, and I think that points out, Mr. Speaker, the importance of having to come back before this legislature when there are major reorganizations within the Government of Saskatchewan.

(1215)

Granted, there's a section in the Bill, Bill No. 5, that requires an annual report which I would assume would be tabled in this legislature, but it's already a *fait accompli*. We would have to be referring to things that have already been done with little chance of having some impact on it. And if there's one thing I think we should be able to do, Mr. Speaker, in a Legislative Assembly that is relatively as small as it is, we should be able to have some influence with each other.

Just because an idea comes from the opposition side of this legislature should not necessarily mean that it's a bad idea. We hope that members from time to time on the government side will take our advice under advisement, at least, and look very carefully at what we are advising, because we are politicians, Mr. Speaker, but we also have a legislative role to perform. We have to ensure that legislation that's passed through this Assembly serves the interests of all people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — And as politicians we get very partisan. But as legislators, I think that we have to look very carefully at our role, Mr. Speaker. And what we're doing as legislators from this side is trying to convince the Government of Saskatchewan to please withdraw this Bill and bring it in line, make it more explicit, make it fall in line with the federal statutes, where they have to come back before the legislature when they're doing major reorganizations as is being proposed through this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Even if it was for a limited amount of time, I believe, the federal House — the hon. member from Lakeview, I think, has refreshed my mind — it at least has to come back for, I believe it's seven hours of debate before the House of Commons before it can actually be passed into law and become a statute.

And what happens, Mr. Speaker, is that democracy is at stake, and I don't want to be accused of using a lot of rhetoric. Democracy is important. I took the opportunity the other day to look in the dictionary for the dictionary definition of democracy. It said, and I quote: "A government that is run by the people who live under it."

Well it seems to me that people are being run over by pieces of legislation that are proposed such as this, because they have less and less of an ability to intervene and to make their feelings known, because feelings that are contrary to the government opinion need to be expressed by opposition members of the legislature. And if we can't express our opinions on reorganizations and major activities that are undertaken by the government, then people lose their voice. They don't have the ability then to run the government as they who live under it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we're experiencing something that is dangerous to democracy, and that is that we have a government that's being democratically elected and now are trying to overstep their authority. If you're not willing to withdraw this Bill and make the changes to it, that's what you're trying to do. And I'd ask the back-bench

members of the government side to think about this very carefully as to what kind of authority do you want your Executive Council, the Premier, and the cabinet ministers, what kind of power do you want them to have over everything? It seems to me that what's happening is that the voices are getting fewer and fewer and fewer as to who has influence on how government is organized. It's likely better to have many voices involved in that, not a few.

Now Bill 5 that we have before us moves a long, long way towards a dictatorial system, and I don't want to dramatize, but it does in fact do that. Because any time, Mr. Speaker, that you have one person or two people or at least a very few people making all the major decisions without this Assembly having any input into it, that is a movement away from democracy towards a more dictatorial system. And we don't want that in this country. We don't want that in this province. And I think that if this Bill 5 passes, we are in fact confining power to a very small and very select group of people.

The philosopher Voltaire once said on the principles of democracy that . . . He said, "I may disagree with what you have to say, but I'll defend to the death your right to say it". And I think that is a basic principle of democracy.

Like you have a basic principle, Mr. Speaker, a basic role to fulfil that democracy is preserved in this House, whether it be question period so that there is fairness and equity, or whether it's in the debates of this House, to assure that we're debating the issues at hand.

And this Assembly has a similar responsibility to people within the province of Saskatchewan so that they can be assured that our voices are being heard on their behalf. And certainly some of the voices have been longer heard than some of the members opposite would like. But we have to make a point. We feel we need to make a point on this proposed legislation that's before us.

Now regarding the organization of government, they're completely taking away any voice from this forum that we're in here today. And one of the major tasks of a legislature is to form a government that's fair, that has some equity, that serves the needs of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now no longer does the government want that authority to come before the legislature. They want that authority to be kept by the Premier and by the cabinet ministers that he has some confidence in. And does that mean that in the future, maybe he'll be developing a committee of himself and maybe the political tactician, the Minister of Justice, to make that decision on their own. Does it get fewer from there? Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that it's better to have those things come back before this legislature, at least for ratification and some scrutiny, and to listen to the input that we would like to make in terms of reorganizing government.

And we're not saying that government never needs to be reorganized. All of us, I'm sure, have our opinions on how government could better serve the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Members on this side of the House, I

know, have some ideas, and I know that there must be people in the back-benches of the government that have some firm ideas on how government can be reorganized. I'm sure your constituents come to you on a regular basis with some bouquet or some experience they've had with government that has been not very meaningful to them, and you sort of summarize all those and you develop ideas on how government could better serve people and how it should be organized.

Now I'm not saying that something like the department of human resources is good or whether it's bad, but the point that we want to make is that we'd like to have some input into the organization of the department of human resources. We want to have this forum have some input into the formation of that and other departments and, in fact, in some cases, Mr. Speaker, agencies that carry out the role of the Government of Saskatchewan. And I think that we need to keep that role here in this legislature.

The introduction of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, to me means one of two things. It's either a blatant power grab, which I would hope that it's not. We don't need people grabbing more and more power. When you have more people making decisions, or at least giving input to decisions, you likely have a better opportunity of making good decisions, even though, when it comes down to the final decision, you can't have everybody in the province or everybody in the country in on the final decision. That doesn't make sense. But at least you should be listening to what other people have on as broad a base as possible.

When you talk about co-operation and consultation in the throne speech, throughout your last term of government in the 20th Legislature, throughout the election campaign, I hope you mean that. I hope there is not a double standard by what you say and what you actually do.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, which I had hoped was the reality of what's happening, was that it was an extremely poor job of drafting the Bill — Bill 5, the Bill to organize . . . the organization Act, the proposed legislation. And if it was a poor job of drafting, or if your new legal language is taking on new definitions that maybe members opposite — on the opposition side — don't understand, then again I say, make it explicit to us so we can understand it, future legislators can understand it within the province of Saskatchewan, whether it be new members in your government or, more preferable to us, our government, or, heaven forbid, a Liberal government some time in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if it is that extremely poor job of drafting the Bill that is the issue here, that could rectify the situation that we have, and the members on the government side are not willing to withdraw the Bill and make the changes to it, I think the Peter principle must apply. And the Peter principle is that they have reached their maximum level of incompetence.

If that's the case here, Mr. Speaker, and that's what's happening, the only way that the Peter principle could be extended by the maximum level of incompetence is doing something at the federal level — like is being suggested here — and that is to, by order in council,

appoint these people opposite to be the Privy Councillors, to be the cabinet of Brian Mulroney in Ottawa. Then they would have reached an even higher maximum level of incompetence, Mr. Speaker.

But as I say, I hope that that's not what's happening here. And I hope that the government will withdraw the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, because the principle of the Bill — the government reorganization . . . I want to turn for a while to the actual government departments that we speculate at least may be affected by this legislation. And some of the implications could be quite alarming and could have a detrimental effect on many, many people who have worked and paid long and dedicated service to the province of Saskatchewan. In fact, it could be interpreted as a lead-up to an attack on the public service and the public employees of this province, Mr. Speaker.

Now for example, the Department of Social Services. I mentioned earlier that I would like to know more about this department of human resources. Is the Department of Social Services going to fall under that department, Mr. Speaker? Or even more detrimental, what we have heard — by rumour, mind you; I cannot substantiate it — but we would like to know from the minister of many portfolios whether or not this government intends by their reorganization to transfer the administration for income support programs that are currently under the Department of Social Services to municipal levels of government. Is each rural municipal government, is each town council, each village hamlet, each city council, going to have to prepare to administer income support programs within this province?

It was mentioned in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a look at the delivery of income support programs. Is that what's going to happen? Is that what the minister has in mind as the minister of human resources? Because if it is, the municipal levels of government which are a delegation of authority from this level of government, Mr. Speaker, had better start getting prepared for a horrendous nightmare. There will be inconsistencies; there'll be people moving around in the province. It just, to me, doesn't make any sense.

If that's the avenue the government wants to go down in terms of reorganizing that particular department, it doesn't make any sense to change that and put it in the hands of municipal governments. And I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that municipal governments want that on their platter of the many things they already have to do. I think that it would be an abdication of responsibility by this government if the government has that on their agenda. Incidentally, a hidden agenda, because if this Bill passes we'll never find out about it; won't have any input until after it actually happens.

I'd like to turn for a minute to the importance of the Department of Social Services as something that is general over the whole province of Saskatchewan. The entire province has a consistent way. And I'm happy to see the member from Rosetown-Elrose in the Assembly here because some of my remarks would concern him.

(1230)

I can remember on the evening of December 10, Mr. Speaker, I was attending a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association dinner, and the hon. member at that time happened to be giving an address as the former president of the Saskatchewan chapter of that organization. And during the presentation, Mr. Speaker, he spoke of how he had gone on a trip to India on a delegation. And I would say that our organization, the Commonwealth parliamentary Association, does some very good work; and it's a prestigious organization that has given tremendous help to many countries throughout the Commonwealth.

And, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member from Rosetown-Elrose happened to be at that dinner explaining his trip he mentioned in passing that he had a wonderful time there. The Indian government had treated him royally and that he had been provided with a chauffeur-driven limousine and two bodyguards. The Indian government would allow him to go anywhere he wanted to see anything he wanted to see and to stay for as long as he wanted at the hospitality of the government — whether it be one week or two weeks or three weeks or for however long that he wanted to stay and see the country of India — have some idea of how the country operated.

And one of the major points that the member from Rosetown-Elrose made was that there's no welfare system in India — no welfare system in India. If everyone wanted something they had to work for it, and everybody worked in India. Well, I'd point out, Mr. Speaker, that if that's an example of what we'll get in government reorganization, I don't want it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — There's thousands of people that die in India every day from starvation because they have no income support program in that country. Ask Mother Teresa how good the welfare system is and how good the system is for taking care of people who starve in Indian countries like that. We don't want that in the province of Saskatchewan under reorganization, Mr. Speaker, that we have no input into. And, Mr. Speaker, the member from Saltcoats also made some comments that evening, and I won't even address those.

Another department, Mr. Speaker, that I am very concerned about is the Department of Supply and Services. Already, without any debate in this House, without any debate in this Assembly, we now have the property management corporation in the province of Saskatchewan. The property management corporation is a new Crown corporation by an outfit who is against families of Crown corporations, that believe in privatization . . . They create another Crown corporation. And I would have to go on record today, Mr. Speaker, that if I ever got into the position in the province of Saskatchewan where I could abolish a Crown corporation, it would be abolition of the property management corporation, Mr. Speaker. It's very dangerous. It has a couple of aspects to it, because of reorganization.

One of the aspects of it, Mr. Speaker, is that the assets that

belong to the people of Saskatchewan can now be mortgaged. The government departments can't take on mortgages. Crown corporations can. So the plan as we understand it from the sketchy comments that have been made and from information we pick up through the media, is that all the physical assets of the government will be put under the property management corporation, therefore they can be mortgaged.

For example the Saskatchewan Hospital, the only long-term mental health care facility in the province of Saskatchewan in the constituency I represent, Mr. Speaker, can now be mortgaged. If the economic and finance record of this government continues at the rate it's going — downhill — and there's a mortgage placed against that building, some financial institution can ultimately end up with that building because they could seize it. Because that's the collateral that we've put against a loan. They're now mortgaging — wanting to mortgage all of our assets in the province so they can raise money to keep the Government of Saskatchewan operating because we're in a terrible debt situation, Mr. Speaker.

The other aspect about the property management corporation and how it ties into the Department of Supply and Service through reorganization — an example we're already seeing — is the fact that employees who work in that department also now go to the property management corporation at least temporarily, Mr. Speaker. At least temporarily they go there.

Because what happens if the government carries through on their wish to bid things out, tender things out to the private sector? Does that mean that those people who work as janitorial service personnel for the Department of Supply and Service will be having to compete, all of a sudden putting in bids, on jobs that they've held in some cases for many many years, when they know about some of the patronage that's happened from this government, Mr. Speaker?

Somebody that's worked at a rate . . . Say they're getting \$1,000 a month as a janitor with the Department of Supply and Services and one of the Tory members opposite knows somebody that's a friend of theirs in the private sector can bid that job for \$990. They'll guarantee them the job because they outbid the person that's been in that job for some cases 10, 15, 20 years. It's open to all kinds of manipulation, Mr. Speaker, and I think that we have to be careful of that because . . . And it all ties in to the reorganization of government.

What we want to do is point out some of the negative aspects of that that I think if you go ahead, the members on the opposite side will come back to haunt them in a very short period of time.

Under the property management corporation, Mr. Speaker, I go back to the Saskatchewan hospital as an example. In the Saskatchewan hospital there's janitorial personnel there; there's people that are tradespeople, electrical, mechanical; there's people who do maintenance work. And every single one of their jobs is now in danger because of what the government is doing. Over from Supply and Service to the property

management corporation and then tendering out things that have been traditionally done by public employees to the private sector. And I think we've got to be very careful of doing that.

For savings of what would be, in some cases, a minuscule amount, we're affecting the lives of families, Mr. Speaker; we're affecting the livelihood of people who have planned, in some cases, for many, many years on working, doing a good job for the province of Saskatchewan in whatever department they've been in, planning on the retirement income that they've been able to budget and contribute towards through the pension plan of the provincial government. And those things are in danger, Mr. Speaker, and we should be very careful about how we tread on that. We don't want to take responsibility for those things happening, and that's why we're keeping you here to get you to at least change your mind on the method of how you do government reorganization,. Mr. Speaker, that's the point of what we're taking these people on the government side through.

Mr. Speaker, another department that I'm seriously concerned about, because it falls within my critic area . . . The Leader of the Opposition appointed me as Highways critic. And in the Department of Highways the former member from Wilkie had very heavy lay-offs in the Department of Highways; affected a good many families and the incomes for some of those people. And his line, if I recall correctly, at that time, Mr. Speaker, was that he was giving those people the opportunity to work in the private sector.

An Hon. Member: — He's now in the private sector himself.

Mr. Anguish: — Well, one of the members said he's now in the private sector himself.

But the Department of Highways currently continues on and the hon. member from Melfort is the new Minister of Highways. And we want to know from him: is his department going to disappear so that then all of the Department of Highways employees have the same opportunity to work in the private sector?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the private sector is all right in some cases but we don't want to see, at least on this side of the House, the entire government put into the private sector. It seems to me that that's what we're moving towards, Mr. Speaker. And if we're moving towards that, it just exemplifies to me that a government that doesn't believe in government cannot run government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, look at some of the departments like . . . What are the counterparts? Does it mean Finance is going to be The Royal Bank of Canada, after we reorganize and then privatize? Is Justice going to be Tony Merchant's law firm? Is Agriculture going to be the . . .

An Hon. Member: — I give you the assurance right now, it is not.

Mr. Anguish: — I didn't quite catch what happened there, Mr. Speaker, but I was wondering if Tony Merchant is the Department of Justice.

In Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is it going to be the 10 largest landholders? Will Hudson's Bay Company and CPR, or Marathon Realty that holds the land for the CPR, going to be controlling the Department of Agriculture as the private sector counterpart?

What about Rural Development, Mr. Speaker? Rural Development maybe should go to the new venture capital corporation called Agri-business Incorporated. That would likely make a good trust for the Department of Rural Development — a new avenue to take in the private sector.

Or the Department of Health, Mr. Speaker. If that goes through reorganization and then to privatization, maybe the American Pharmaceutical Association could run the Department of Health at a great efficiency and economy and savings to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. I think not.

An Hon. Member: — That's Blue Cross.

Mr. Anguish: — Oh, is that Blue Cross? Blue Cross could be the one., Mr. Speaker, to take over the Department of Health. They seem to really be running MCIC down.

Parks and Renewable Resources. I had to think for a while on that one. But ever since the documents were tabled, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that would be best privatized under this government's plan by the Weyerhaeuser corporation. It's sort of almost getting like a last will and testament, Mr. Speaker, of where the government wishes these current government departments to go to.

The Department of Science and Technology. I thought that after yesterday's question period that Fleet Aerospace would be a good one for the Science and Technology. Fleet Aerospace seem to be very well equipped to handle that, in the impression of the government.

Energy and Mines. No problem there, Mr. Speaker. When that goes privatized, we will give it to Exxon. Exxon's the one that seems to be appropriate there. Because they have such a large bureaucracy themselves, they should be able to take over actually the entire government with no problem.

And Environment — Environment was a tough one, but we thought that likely where you have to watch that going is to Inco, because Inco has such a good record on creating acid rain and killing thousands of lakes in Ontario.

Tourism and Small Business. Well, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't difficult at all. That's to the Federation of Independent Business in Canada here. It's going to be kept locally owned because Tourism and Small Business are the backbone of our society, and we thought that the government would likely be wanting that to remain Canadian.

Education. I don't know where they would put education,

but they might have schools that have special new curriculum development.

An Hon. Member: — Compucollege.

Mr. Anguish: — Compucollege. Compucollege, but I hope that the minister honours his commitment to the reading, writing, and arithmetic to the very basic principles of education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my last few minutes I would think the members on the opposite side would agree it's a bit absurd. I would hope that that would never happen. But we have to be very careful on reorganization. We can't just reorganize with no input from this side of the House. And when the reorganization takes place, that's when privatization kicks in. And I have nothing against the private sector, Mr. Speaker, but some things do not operate well under the private sector.

Under the private sector there's always got to be the profit motive there, because who would want to be involved in the private sector and not make any money, even though there are several businesses today in Saskatchewan that aren't making any money. But it certainly wasn't their intention when they first went into business, Mr. Speaker, or chose to be an entrepreneur in the private sector.

(1245)

And in the private sector they have to make a profit or else they don't exist. But the idea of government is not always to make profit. Hopefully some of our Crown corporations don't cause a drain on the public purse. But private sector cannot run all of government. And if that's what you're looking at on the opposite side of the House, you're sadly mistaken if we think that we're going to let you disorganize, change, obliterate, disestablish, and privatize all of government. It's taken many, many years to build, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time I do acknowledge some reorganization is not all bad. But we want to have some say into that reorganization.

You know, Mr. Speaker, things are deceiving where the thrust of government goes sometimes. I know that I was talking to a shopper the other day, Mr. Speaker, and she said she was down at the store and bought some PC pork and paper. And I said, well you must be wrong; you must have been down and bought pork and beans. And she said, no, no, I bought pork and paper. She said, it's very good for your diet; it's very, very expensive, and when you open it up there's very few calories, it's just hot air comes out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, people in Saskatchewan are not liking what they see going on, and when it gets removed more and more into the back rooms, they're going to like it less and less. At least in this, many people do agree with what the government opposite's doing or else they wouldn't have got re-elected. But many people, in fact a few more — because the popular vote was heavier in our direction — agree with what we're saying too, Mr. Speaker. And so if you take all of that criticism and take it out of this forum, keep it all in the back rooms and run with an iron hand, people of Saskatchewan will give you even fewer votes next time when you come before the public at the general

election.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look back at the throne speech for just a minute because it does tie into this. And that is the commitment through the throne speech to the people of Saskatchewan that there'll be a rules committee to look at the rules by which this legislature operates. And I believe that the motion has been introduced and that committee has, in fact, been agreed to in this House. The day after the throne speech, on the Thursday, the government comes in and arbitrarily tries to change the rules by which the legislature's members operate — that iron hand there again, that power grab, Mr. Speaker.

Now Bill 5 even takes more away. It doesn't give us the voice that we require to operate in this legislature. And I remember, Mr. Speaker, in the earlier days of this legislature, in this 21st Legislature, that the member of Kinistino was up and speaking in his seat, and he told us how proud he was of Saskatchewan, how proud he was of Canada, that we have such a great province — and we do — because he was comparing it to his time when he grew up, in his words, under Hitler in Germany.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happens is that when fewer and fewer people grab all the power, the same thing can happen. It's only because of the good kindness of the hearts of the people who are here now that it doesn't come to the same thing that it had come to in Germany leading up to, and during, the Second World War. There's a very thin line between democracy and a dictatorship. And as we allow the erosion of this, the greater and greater grab for power, it does come closer to that. And I would ask the member from Kinistino to reflect a little, to think about what actually is happening in terms of rules, what's happening in terms of the centralization and the consolidation of power by this government. And you back-benchers should be concerned about that.

And the member of Rosthern who I mentioned in my throne speech, Mr. Speaker, when his family left the area of what is now the Soviet Union; when the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks were fighting with each other, driving people out of that country — those countries all had great-sounding constitutions. Some of them even had charters of rights but people were driven out. People were killed because the ruling party of the day didn't like the rules that were there. They killed people because of that.

Here we're at the stage, Mr. Speaker, where we don't kill people, and I don't ever imagine that would happen. Even the members opposite wouldn't go to that extreme, but when they don't like the rules here they just arbitrarily want to change them. They don't want any dissension, Mr. Speaker.

And you have a role in making sure that doesn't happen, because of the virtue of your position and the high prestige that that position holds. And I would hope that all members on all sides of the House respect the role that you have to play in this legislature by providing the fairness and equity on both sides of the House. Because for you, I'm sure, it's not a matter of both sides of the House, it's the matter that we are here as representatives from a very diverse and large province and have very many interests.

That same principle has to apply in terms of how the government acts. They don't just represent Progressive Conservative votes. They represent all people in the province. And it's not a long distance; it's not much different from changing rules and stifling dissent to what happened many, many years ago in countries that many of our ancestors came from, to come to a new land where there would be more freedom and a land of hope.

The other thing that I don't understand is that many of the back-benchers on that side of the House tell us that they're born again Christians. And to me, any born again Christian I've ever known, such as my brother-in-law or some of you on that side of the House, the supremacy, the main driving force in their life, Mr. Speaker, is the supremacy of God. Just like in our constitution, the start of the charter of rights speaks of the supremacy of God. I can't for the life of me understand that anybody that has that as the major driving force in their life could sit back in silence and not saying anything about what's going on. Even if you want to criticize us, do it, but say something.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — I prefer that you say something that would convince your cabinet members, the Executive Council of this government, to withdraw this piece of legislation and make the changes that need to be made to it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few more brief comments. As politicians, Mr. Speaker, this isn't a great grabby issue for us. When we talked amongst some of our members, and as I'm sure the government side talks about, is that when you want to deal with something, you always wonder what implications it's going to have through the media. And I know that in terms of this Bill many people must wonder why we're staying here to debate this piece of legislation.

I notice the members of the press gallery are listening very intently to what I have to say, and they now have the advantage, Mr. Speaker, of going and watching it on tape so they can get second and third and fourth runs so they don't miss a word that any of us have said here in this legislature. But to my surprise the press did, in fact, pick up some of this debate and I'll just quote from the *Leader-Post* article that came out this morning. The first paragraph says:

A bill giving the provincial cabinet the right to terminate or create departments is legally, constitutional, and morally wrong, the NDP Opposition charged Thursday.

And I'm no lawyer, Mr. Speaker, but I have great confidence in the member from Regina Lakeview and the member from Saskatoon Mayfair. I don't want to list all the lawyers in our caucus, but I have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Well, okay. And the member from Regina Centre and the member from Quill Lakes and the member from Riversdale and the member from Regina Elphinstone. I think I've listed all the great legal minds in

our caucus. I have confidence in them when they say to me that this is, if not unconstitutional, it is on the verge of being unconstitutional, at least. And there are legal opinions that this Bill is unconstitutional.

We're trying to save the government of a great deal of embarrassment, of putting through . . . the members opposite just make me laugh, Mr. Speaker.

It's hard to take them serious when you look at the weight and importance of this Bill 5 that they are trying to put through the legislature, very close to the Christmas break when they thought we'd give up, and we don't want to let it go like that. We're trying to save the government the embarrassment of pushing this legislation through. Because at the end of the day you have the weight of government to push through this piece of legislation, but we want to save you the embarrassment of being challenged in the constitutional validity of this, that it's not *ultra vires* — because we think it may be — and someone will be taking the Government of Saskatchewan to court if this Bill goes through. As the member from Kindersley has already acknowledged, the charter of rights will allow this to be challenged in the Supreme Court of Canada, and we don't want to embarrass you.

Mr. Speaker, I see it's moving very close to the time of getting out of this place. I would ask that you recognize that it's 1 o'clock. And if the members want me to continue, I'd like to be able to continue my comments on Monday. I don't have any great need, but I'd ask that you . . . do you want me to adjourn debate?

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate. I wish you a very Merry Christmas and a prosperous 1987.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:57 p.m.