

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Deputy Clerk: — I beg to advise the Assembly that Mr. Speaker will not be present to open this sitting.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that on Friday next I would intend to move the following motion:

That the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan recognizing that the Meech Lake accord puts the issue of Senate Reform on the agenda for constitutional change - immediately establish an all-Party committee of the Assembly to examine all proposals for Senate reform in Canada and to produce recommendations for this Assembly to consider, before December 31, 1987, to:

(a) sustain and increase the public momentum towards Senate reform which, after Meech Lake, will require unanimity among all the provincial legislatures and the Parliament of Canada if it is to be accomplished;

(b) respond to the growing body of opinion in western Canada that a reformed Senate could help to alleviate some of the root causes of western alienation; and

(c) develop a broad-based consensus in Saskatchewan and in this Assembly about the exact nature and extent of the reforms to the Senate that are desirable; including specific recommendations to: (i) render the Senate more legitimate in the eyes of all Canadians; (ii) provide more balance in provincial and regional representation in the Senate; and (iii) enhance the Senate's role in protecting, defending, and promoting the legitimate rights and interests of western Canadians;

and further,

That the committee be empowered to hold public hearings; to sit during the intersessional period and during sessions except when the Assembly is sitting; to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses under oath; and to hold meetings away from the Legislative precincts.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Justice Minister's Trip to Calgary

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question, of course, is to the Minister of Justice. It deals with the misleading information that the Minister of Justice has provided to this legislature about your June 20 flight on a government plane to Calgary - a trip made at taxpayers' expense to attend a wedding.

With a great deal of difficulty, you have now given the people of Saskatchewan three different versions of the arrangements for this trip, each version inconsistent with the previous one. I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the taxpayers of this province have a right to know the truth, so I have a number of detailed questions about this particular trip.

First, can the minister please give us the time of his June 20 breakfast meeting with Soviet officials here in Regina, and can he tell us when the meeting ended.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I believe, to the hon. member, I answered that question yesterday. The meeting with the Soviet officials was at 9 or 7:45 a.m. - in the morning - and that I departed to Calgary at 9:30. I believe the meeting lasted about an hour - I can give you to or fro from there, but the meeting was set for 7:45. It's a breakfast meeting, so we had breakfast and the meeting with the Soviet official and delegation.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Minister. Yesterday in the Assembly the minister told us the meeting was at 9:45; he now tells us it was at 7:45. And he tells us the meeting lasted about an hour, the breakfast meeting. Now could the minister clarify whether the meeting began at 7:45 or 9:45, and whether it ended at 8:45 or 10:45?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The meeting started at 7:45. I departed for Calgary at 9:30. In *Hansard* . . . I checked that, it said 9:45. I was under the impression I said 7:45; if I said 9:45, I meant 7:45.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can understand the problem I'm having with the minister's answers.

Now the minister said he departed from Regina at 9:30. I asked him specifically in supplementary; when did the meeting end?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I recall, and I will . . . to be the specific time. I recall I left the meeting which was held at the Hotel Saskatchewan, I drove home, picked up my family, went to the airport, and immediately left for Calgary. And I think the departure time was 9:30, which is pretty close to the time of departure, as I understand it.

Mr. Brockelbank: — The minister is telling us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the meeting lasted approximately one hour, was over at 8:45, and he left Regina - actually left on his flight - at 9:30. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That's . . . I indicated that the breakfast meeting was at 9:45, departure time was 9:30 when I left Regina . . .

An Hon. Member: — I think it was 7:45.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — 7:45 . . . 9:30 when I left Regina, and that the meeting was about an hour in duration. I think went home, picked up my family, went to the airport - that should take approximately 20 minutes - and we left.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Can the minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in supplementary, tell us what time the government aircraft arrived in Calgary on June 20th?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can't give you the precise time. I will undertake to find that information. I assume it takes about an hour and a half to fly to Calgary. I could be wrong on that, but I will find out specifically for you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Further supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You claim that while you were in Calgary you had a meeting with a business man interested in investing in Saskatchewan. when did that meeting take place? Where did that meeting take place? And how long did this business meeting last?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The meeting took place . . . Again, I can't be exactly specific as to the name of the hotel, but it was a hotel in Calgary, at the lobby. I can find out the exact times if you want. The particular individual was a Mr. von Sass.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister has carefully not answered one part of that supplementary I put forward . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm looking for information for the people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — What time did your personal business in Calgary, i.e. the family wedding, begin, and what time did you leave Calgary for Regina?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think again - I will find out this to be specific - I think the wedding was a 2:30 wedding and I returned home at 11 o'clock that evening.

Mr. Shillington: — Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let me say, by way of background, this isn't an easy supplementary since I was last here on Monday. But given the story as I now understand it . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Does the member have a question?

Mr. Shillington: — If you had gone to Calgary on government business only, Mr. Minister - you said it was a short meeting - you would have been in a position to return to Regina right after that meeting. But you did not because you had a wedding to go to. Where were the flight crew and the aircraft crew during your time in Calgary? Did they return to Regina, or did they wait in Calgary for you, and at what expense?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The flight crew and the airplane remained in Calgary with me. And during the time that they were there, they took that opportunity to get the necessary repairs to the airplane - the balancing of the propeller, as I understand - and they used that time to get the repair . . .

An Hon. Member: On a Saturday, oh yeah.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — They used that time - if the member wants to listen - they used that time to get proper repairs to the airplane, that can only be done in the city of Calgary. That's what they were doing at the given time. So they were able to use that time to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to know how long your meeting with this business man in the hotel took. How long was it? Was it 10 minutes, 15 minutes? How long did it take?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I would . . . I can find out precise. I would guess, and I'm only guessing here, probably an hour to an hour 10 minutes, hour 15 minutes, give or take, give or take 10 minutes off of an hour, one way or the other.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, would the flight crew for this trip have been on overtime? And are you aware of whether or not the taxpayers were paying this crew overtime to sit and wait while your wedding finished in Calgary?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I have no idea whether they were on overtime or not. If you want me to find that out, I would find it out.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the obvious question to you is why you didn't take the commercial aircraft which was freely available. I remind you, Mr. Minister, that the Canadian Airlines flight 341 leaves Regina at 10:20 on a Saturday, gets to Calgary at 1:45, in plenty of time for you to get to your wedding that afternoon. Why didn't you do the obvious and take a commercial airline, or did you just not want to pay the price of a commercial airline ticket?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No, I in fact checked that with my staff. I was advised by my staff that there was flights to Calgary on that Saturday at 7 o'clock in the morning, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, which would not accommodate.

Mr. Shillington: — Well you staff, Mr. Minister, missed the obvious flight you should have taken at 10:20.

Mr. Minister, I ask you again: since the furore arose, have you checked to find out the full cost of this trip by your family to a family wedding? The taxpayers would be interested in knowing, and I want to know whether or not you've considered doing the obvious and honourable thing, and that is at this point in time paying for the cost of this trip yourself?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the .c.c. or Deputy Speaker, as I indicated in the House yesterday, I believe what I did was perfectly within the rules and was perfectly proper, and I do not intend to resign from my seat, and I do not intend to make the payment out of my own pocket.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, would you t least come

clean with this Assembly and lay before the Assembly all of the documents which pertain to this flight? Will you give us the document which authorized the flight? Will you give us a copy of the trip sheet which is, as I understand it, a report that the pilots file with the department? Will you give us a copy of the document billing the department for the flight? And will you give us a copy of the document authorizing payment for the flight? And will you give us a copy of the journey log of the aircraft so that we'll know what portion of these documents, if any, are actually accurate?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, and hon. member. What I can advise the hon. member is what took place is exactly as I set out as to what took place. With regards to what a log is or anything else, I don't really know what that is, and you might direct that question to the minister responsible and not to me.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, the minister is not responsible for this, Mr. Minister; you are. It was you who apparently authorized this flight, so the questions are being put to you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to know what time this meeting with the business man, unnamed business man, in the unnamed hotel, for the unnamed purpose has been . . . when was it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — How you indicated the particular question. I can advise the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I left Regina at 9:30. I got into Calgary at whatever time it takes to fly to Calgary. I then went down to this hotel. I had a meeting with this particular member. I will find out the precise times for you and answer that question. If I was to miss it by 10 or 15 minutes, you'd somehow say I was trying to mislead the House. I do not want to do that. I will bring back that information back to you.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, if you came within 15 minutes of anything, you'd be a lot more accurate than you have been to date. That would be a substantial improvement.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to know when the meeting was arranged. When was the arrangements for this meeting finalized?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The meeting was arranged with this particular individual. I believe, about four to five days prior to the 20th . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, but I mean . . . It was arranged by my office, you know, the exact time. As I understand, it was arranged when it was determined . . . The facts as they unfolded were as follows. I was originally going to go to the wedding and drive there; the fact that the Soviet delegation required my attendance there on Friday night and Saturday morning. I arranged for a meeting with a company in Calgary, changed a meeting that I was going to have to do in the future, up to that day, and then the office booked

the flight. The office both booked the meeting and booked the flight in this particular situation.

Mr. Shillington: — The question, Mr. Speaker. May I remind you, Mr. Minister, of your comments of yesterday. This is yesterday's version. We're all having trouble keeping it straight, but I'll give you some assistance by reading it:

Number one, I was required, I was required, and I think, importantly, Mr. Speaker, I was required to attend to, I was required to attend to the Soviet delegation. Very important. So what I proceeded to do was I (proceeded to) set the meeting with Mr. von Sass in Calgary on June 20 to met with him in Calgary on the 20th of June.

Now that isn't what you told us today. Now which is the correct version?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I set the meeting prior to . . . I set the meeting for the 20th of June. The office arranged the meeting for the 20th of June, prior to arranging for, prior to arranging for the government plane. So that's exactly what happened. The meeting was arranged prior to, prior to the 20th. It obviously had to be arranged prior to the 20th; you can't arrange a meeting in half an hour's notice.

Mr. Shillington: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will you admit what is obvious to everybody in this province, and that is that the meeting in Calgary was a fabricated excuse to cover a personal trip to a wedding in Calgary on a government plane?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The meeting . . . The meeting, my friend, was not a fabricated meeting. I had met with Mr. von Sass in Regina on the 8th of June, the 8th of June of 1977 - or 1987. I undertook at that time to a follow-up meeting with him in Calgary. No specific date set. I had to get some information and some ideas as to whether or not we were interested in the type of venture that he was pursuing. We further met, through the Crown Management Board, with this particular individual and other members of his company on July 8, 1987, and are pursuing an investment opportunity in this province of Saskatchewan with this particular company.

Mr. Shillington: — And will you admit something else that is obvious to the people of Saskatchewan: that is that you wouldn't have gone to Calgary that weekend had it not been for the wedding?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I indicated to the House yesterday that number one, had it not been for the Soviet delegation, and all things else not existed, I would have taken my family and my automobile and travelled to Calgary to that wedding. I don't make no bones about that.

However, what happened is that the Soviet delegation

came. I was required as Trade Minister to meet with the Soviet delegation Friday night and Saturday morning. I arranged, then, a meeting in Calgary that I was going to have at some future date - brought that meeting forward so it coincided with the same date. I could go up to Calgary in the government airplane. I could cover all three things in one day, including going to a wedding. I made that very clear as to what the intentions were.

Mr. Shillington: — New question. It's not clear, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, it's not clear whether or not you breached government policy, because it is anything but clear what the government policy is. What is clear is that you have misled this House. We have heard different versions in this Assembly of this trip. I ask you, Mr. Minister, are you going to do the honourable thing and resign, having misled this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — You indicated . . . your last question was: would I pay the thing back? I indicated that I thought I was properly performing my job as Minister of Trade; that I believed what I did was correct and proper. I intend to stay in my seat, and I intend to remain as a member of this legislature and serve the people of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I address a question to the Premier, and it concerns the answers given in the House by the Minister of Justice on the matter of a trip to Calgary, and I want to quote from the *Hansard* of July 20, where the minister said, at page 1269, and referring to this trip:

I had clearance to travel to Calgary. I made that very clear. I'm very above-board with that, and that's how it unfolded.

Mr. Premier, yesterday you indicated to us that the clearance that the minister had, came from the minister himself, which surely is a different impression than he gave the House. He indicated to the House that he had clearance. You tell us he had clearance from himself, and himself only. Does this meet the level of candour and frankness that you think is appropriate for a minister of the Crown to display in this House?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the authorization to use executive air service is at the discretion of those in Executive Council, and they make those decisions.

The request to have the minister stay here was as the result of the Deputy Premier saying, did we have this Soviet delegation and you should stay here, because we need you here Friday and Saturday. Now when you decide to use . . . If the hon. member is interested in the answer, then they could be quiet long enough to listen to it. All right?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order! Allow the Premier to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm sure the

children that are in the audience would appreciate the decorum on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I will respond when I have the co-operation of the members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition has asked a question. At least his members could respect him long enough to listen to the answer.

Mr. Speaker, the members of Executive Council have the authority to make the decisions with respect to executive air service, and they do that. The Deputy Premier can certainly request people to go to meetings, and he does that. So if the hon. member has to stay here, because the Deputy Premier says you have to stay here, then he's likely going to listen to the Deputy Premier.

From that point on, if he has to make an executive decision, he has the authority to make the executive decision to travel to Calgary to a business meeting. I mean, he has that authority and he exercised it. It's not too complicated. He has to respond to the Deputy premier, and he has to make the decision, and he has the authorization to do both.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Premier, the minister said this in the House:

I had clearance to travel to Calgary. I made that very clear. I'm very above-board about that.

Do you think any single person who was listening to that would have taken the meaning that the minister had clearance from himself; or do you not think that the fair and reasonable interpretation of that was that somebody had checked it against the rules, the Deputy Premier or somebody else, and that he was acting in accordance with a set of rules that someone else had passed upon, rather than his own decision to take the executive aircraft to Calgary for that wedding?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the response is the same. The members of the executive make the decision with respect to the executive aircraft, and he has to check with the Deputy Premier whether he is responsible . . . has to stay here and be responsible for those meetings. And yes, he had to be. Subsequent to that, he has to make the decision to use the executive air service to go to a second meeting in Calgary, and we've already been through that.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer is: he responds to the Deputy Premier; he has clearance to go to meetings; he's checked. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he's advised the airport that he's going to make the executive air service decision, and he certainly has that responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Premier, you advised us yesterday that the regulations regarding the use of government aircraft were all set down, and you held up a pamphlet or folder which I noted you held up again today. The Deputy Premier outside the House indicated that he had no knowledge of what these regulations were, and that he was quite amazed . . . he simply didn't know that there were any regulations.

Now, Mr. Premier, can you offer any explanation as to why, if in fact you have rules governing the use of government aircraft, that those rules wouldn't have come to the attention of the Deputy Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm sure that there isn't anybody in the legislature that can quote this verbatim without going back and reading. So he's asked, do you know the rules. Well the rules are laid out and the rules are essentially the same as they've been for probably a decade in the province. And we have said that the discretion with respect to these rules should be watched as carefully as possible. And that's precisely the rules that we apply now, so that the executive committee, members of Executive Council, have the decision and the right to use the executive aircraft, as does the Lieutenant Governor. And it's laid down very clearly.

Now if you want the Deputy Premier or anybody else to quote the rules, I mean we can send across the publication and everybody can memorize them, if that's the intent.

Legal Aid Commission Fees

Mr. Mitchell: — I have a question to the Minister of Human Resources and Labour and whatever else he's called. And it deals with the Legal Aid Commission and the incredible decision of the commission to begin forcing those who qualify for legal aid to pay fees up front before any legal services are provided.

Mr. Minister, you know that the whole idea of legal aid is to guarantee the right to counsel for those who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. You don't qualify for legal aid unless you can prove that you can't afford a lawyer on your own. Yet effective August 3, the Legal Aid Commission proposes to institute a fee schedule that will require people to pay for legal representation in advance and in cash.

Now my question is: has the minister contacted the Legal Aid Commission about this plan; and are you looking for ways to prevent this unfair decision from being implemented?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to the Legal Aid Commission, I believe the member opposite knows that I have no direct control over the Legal Aid Commission and very little influence over what they do. I am merely the minister who sends cheques to the Legal Aid Commission to pay the bills.

And possibly the member opposite knows more of what's going on at the Legal Aid Commission than I do. Maybe he has better sources of information or more influence and control over the Legal Aid Commission. However, they have not as yet communicated that information to me. And I understand from the media, and maybe you have better sources, that they're considering some charges, and I will study them when they send them to me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order.

STATEMENT BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Rules on a Point of Privilege

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I have a statement. On July 21 a point of privilege was raised by the member for Saskatoon Westmount to the effect that the Minister of Economic Development and Trade had deliberately misled the House in certain remarks he made in question period on July 20 with respect to his use of government aircraft in a recent trip to Calgary. This matter was dealt with at length in question period yesterday, and comments were received when the point of privilege was raised.

There still exists substantial confusion and dispute over whether certain things said in the House were contradictory, or things said outside of the House. It's clearly not possible for the Chair to determine which of either of the statements was misleading.

Order. Order. Order.

On page 1293 of July 21, the minister stated the following:

If the statements from *Hansard* yesterday, and if the statements from the media seem to be in conflict, then I apologize for trying to in some way lead different facts to the hon. member.

I believe this statement adequately conveys the member's apology to the House for the confusion and appearance of conflict of statement of cause.

I refer members to citation 322 of . . . Order. Order. Order. I refer members to citation 322 of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, page 114, as follows:

It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a Member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted . . .

I accept the member's explanation and apology and find the matter has been resolved. Therefore, there is no need to consider further the point of privilege raised yesterday.

Order. Order.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would like to raise a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the precision of the language used in this Chamber in question period, both in questions and in answers.

And, Mr. Speaker, today the member for Regina Centre suggested that it would have been possible for the member from Kindersley, or the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, to leave on a Canadian flight at 10:20 to Calgary on June 20, the date in question.

Mr. Speaker, I have had my staff check to see whether in fact that flight was in fact available or not. They tell me, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian Airlines on June 20 of 1987 had no such flight. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you check the record and see if in fact the member for Regina Centre was in fact misleading this Chamber.

includes adjournment motions.

Therefore, this House now stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order! Is there any comments from the opposition? Order.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't believe that the comments from the Deputy Premier merit any reply.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Anyone who suggests that there's any element of privilege there is surely going well beyond any known parliamentary rule, and we all note that the Deputy Premier quoted no *Beauchesne's* and no Bourinot's and no Erskine May's, but just the member for Souris-Cannington, who has visions of being a Speaker, but I don't think is every going to make it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — All I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that it requires no defence from me to make very clear that what the Deputy Premier was talking about was a debating point, and he couldn't find a place to debate it.

Now I hope you will rule that there is no substance to this, and we will have an opportunity to deal with your earlier ruling in which there was a great deal of substance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. Order! On the point of privilege by the House Leader:

A dispute arising between two members as to allegations of fact does not fulfil the conditions of a parliamentary privilege.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I move this House do now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 2:44 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — It being now 5 o'clock p.m., the motion to adjourn the House now lapses. This is pursuant to Rule 3(3) which stipulates the hour of automatic adjournment of the House.

Once the hour is reached that the House is supposed to adjourn, the motion to adjourn lapses and becomes a nullity.

This practice is the same as that which prevailed in the House of Commons, Ottawa, prior to the latest rule change. I refer Members to the Debates of the House of Commons, May 17, 1983, p. 25,530 and on May 24, 1983, p. 25,686 and March 30, 1984, p. 2569. This practice in no way interferes with the indefinite ringing of the bells when substantive motions are before the House. This practice applies only to dilatory motions which