

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

#### Standing Committee on Communications

**Clerk Assistant:** — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Communications, presents the first report of the said committee, which is as follows:

The committee has adopted the Saskatchewan Legislative Library's annual report for the period ending March 31, 1986.

Your committee agreed to the following resolution:

That this committee requests for next session a report from the Legislative Librarian on the cost of establishing an on-line *Hansard*.

Your committee has considered the reference of the Assembly of June 25, 1986 and has re-referred on September 1, 1987, namely the recommendation of the Public Documents Committee under The Archives Act contained in the retention and disposal schedules comprising sessional paper no. 132 of the fifth session of the 20th Legislature.

Your committee recommends to the Assembly that the recommendations of the Public Documents Committee on schedules numbers 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, and 264 be accepted.

Your committee has also considered the reference of the Assembly of October 30, 1987, namely:

The recommendation of the Public Documents Committee under The Archives Act contained in the retention and disposal schedules comprising sessional paper no. 153 of the first session of the 21st Legislature.

Your committee recommends to the Assembly that the recommendations of the Public Documents Committee on schedules numbers 254, 266, 267, 268, 225, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273 and 274 be accepted.

**Mr. Gerich:** — Moved by myself, and seconded by the member from Prince Albert:

That the first report of the Standing Committee on Communications now be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** — By special order, question period will be

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Berntson that Bill No. 55 — **An Act to provide for the Division of Saskatchewan into Constituencies for the Election of Members of the Legislative Assembly** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, this Bill sets up the conditions for changing the rules of electing the members of this legislature. The Bill could well be labelled as a Bill which sets up for a gerrymander. I want to speak to the fairness aspect of the Bill, and I want to ask the questions of why is this Bill being put by the government.

We want to know, Mr. Speaker, was there any necessity, was there any necessity for this Bill to come forward? Was there any outburst on the part of the public? Was there anybody in any constituency, was there any group that felt slighted according to the way the boundaries were in the past? What is the reason for the switch?

Now in my constituency I didn't have anybody that came and said, look, our constituency boundaries really need to be redefined, or, we need a new way of redefining our boundaries. And I asked members, all from different parts of Saskatchewan, and talked to people in various parts of Saskatchewan, and no place did I see anybody say that we needed to have a different way of defining boundaries than we now do.

So what we have here is a system that has been worked out, that has been accepted, but that this government has decided to change the rules for. The government is changing the rules for how the boundaries are being set, and the worst part of the whole thing is, Mr. Speaker, that when they're changing the rules it sets it up for the possibility of violating a fundamental democratic principle, and that principle being that every person in Saskatchewan should have a vote that's equal in weight to every other person in Saskatchewan, or as close as possible that we can come to it.

When we get away from the principle of one person, one vote then we violate that fundamental democratic principle. so I'm asking the question, Mr. Speaker: if the rules were all right, why change them? If something is working, if it isn't broken, why fix it — why fix it?

We should review, Mr. Speaker, how the rules were set up for changing electoral boundaries. We know that in Saskatchewan there is an occurring population shift from the rural to the urban. We know that it's occurring approximately at the rate of 3 per cent per year. We know that there have to be some adjustments made from time to time, every election, or second or third election, to accommodate for this, because if it wasn't done, the

principle of one person, one vote would be violated.

So certainly we have to have a mechanism to do this. If you're going to have to change the rules once in a while, then you have to have a system put in place that is accepted and is perceived as fair, and is actually fair.

Now the previous rules and the rules that are still in existence prior to the introduction of this Bill 55 had a three-person commission. And that three-person commission was made up first of all of the Clerk of the legislature, the chief Clerk, which is the chief officer of the legislature. That person is, by virtue of being an employee of the legislature, is an employee of members on that side and employee of members on this side of the House, and a place where you have to be impartial — has to be an impartial position.

The second person that was on this committee, who was the chairman of the committee, was a person that was appointed by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan, who was a federal appointee, and the person was to be appointed from the Court of Appeal, a judge from the Court of Appeal, who was also a federal appointee — which takes it away from the provincial political scene once again. So we have two people who were appointed to this commission, two people whose positions are impartial, or as close as you can come to being impartial.

And then the third person, according to the old rules, would be a person appointed by Mr. Speaker, in consultation with the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier. So naturally the Speaker may have to make some judgement if you couldn't get complete agreement, but the precedent had been set that the Speaker would look for a person and appoint a person that the two people would agree would represent the population fairly without any political bias.

Now that is the fundamental condition — a commission which the people, and particularly the politicians on both sides, could rely on for being impartial. And then this commission would go, and they would set the boundaries according to some of the parameters that were in the Act.

Now the new commission doesn't do that. The new commission has the appearance of being impartial, but when you examine it carefully, Mr. Speaker, then it no longer . . . it does not bear up under scrutiny.

There is one position that does bear up, and that is the position of a retired judge who is appointed to this. But what happens is the other two people do not pass the test of political scrutiny. The second person that's appointed to this, under the new Act, is the Chief Electoral Officer. So the Clerk, who is an employee of the legislature, employee of both sides, is replaced by the Chief Electoral Officer, which is a cabinet appointee — a government appointee, one side only.

And the third person, and this is the one that appears to be fair, but when you examine it carefully, Mr. Speaker, when you examine it carefully, the third person who is appointed is a judge of the provincial court named by the chief justice of the provincial court.

Now the judge of the provincial court is a provincial appointee, and the Chief Judge of the provincial court is a provincial appointee, as compared to the previous method where you had a system where you were removing it from the provincial appointee scene to the federal appointee scene. So that's why I say, Mr. Speaker, that the new commission, which will now set the boundaries, when compared to the old commission has the appearances, has all of the appearances of being a politically unbiased commission, but does have the possibility of being made up and having a political bias . . . being made up so that it does have a political bias to it.

Mr. Speaker, what is it that we mean by a gerrymander? And what is the significance of redrawing the boundaries in some way that may not be politically fair? Well what should happen, what should happen, Mr. Speaker, is that in any constituency, if there's an average . . . in Saskatchewan now there's very close to 670 or close to 700,000 eligible voters. And if you divided . . . Let's assume the figure was 660,000 voters, and if the new Act allowed for 66 members, that would approximate 10,000 voters per member. So you can think of an average of having 10,000 votes for every elected member in this legislature.

So if the principle of one person, one vote was to exist and to continue to exist, we should have an Act which makes it . . . or boundaries, we should have boundaries adjusted so that the 10,000 voters per member should be followed as closely as possible.

Under the old rules we allowed a variance of 15 per cent. That would allow for growth in some areas, and it would allow for a little bit of discrimination in favour of the rural areas because it was felt in the past that we should have, should discriminate slightly in favour of the rural areas because of the distances of travelling; it makes it a little more difficult to service the area.

(1015)

Now when this variance gets bigger than 15 per cent or 20 per cent or 25 per cent, to 25 or 30 or 40 per cent, eventually at some stage that tolerance of discrimination becomes a problem — becomes a problem because you start to wonder why in one constituency, if we have up to 25 per cent variance, as this particular Bill 55 allows it to do, if you have up to a 25 per cent variance, that means that in one constituency you could go up from 10,000 votes up to 12,500, whereas in another constituency the vote might go down by 25 per cent from 10,000 votes down to 7,500.

So you get that tremendous variance in the number of people that elect one member, and that's when it becomes unfair. And when you add to that the provision that allows for a constituency to grow beyond that, due to new growth, we may get a situation where . . . and if the boundaries are drawn in a specific way we may get the situation where you might get as many as 15,000 voters or maybe 18,000 voters in one part of the province electing a member, and maybe 7,000 voters electing a member in another part of the province, where one person's vote is worth twice as much as another person's vote, and that's a situation we want avoided because it violates the

fundamental principle of one vote, one person — one vote, one person.

Mr. Speaker, there are times when we might want to discriminate, to have that kind of discrimination. There may be occasions when that is desirable, and the one that I mentioned earlier was that we might want to discriminate slightly in favour of the rural areas because of the distances covered. There are arguments as to how far you want to go that way.

Really the job of a member . . . There's two jobs for a member — the job of representation and the job of servicing. You want to represent a certain number of people and represent a certain number of people's views, and you also have to service your constituents.

When it comes to representation, the fairest way, in my mind is everybody should be represented equally. When it comes to servicing, we want everybody to be serviced equally as well. Now we can represent everybody equally by having one person, one vote, but we can service people equally by having good access to our constituents.

And I say that can be accommodated other ways than just changing the . . . other ways than violating the one person, one vote policy. You can do that by adding staff to your constituency . . . or adding staff to your constituency or to your constituency office. So that if I had to service an area which had a tremendous amount of area to cover, a constituency that had a tremendous amount of area to cover, I might need a little more help in my office so that I can get the area serviced. It can be accommodated that way.

It can be accommodated by increasing communications allowances so that the money can be put into making certain that people are contacted by telephones or by mail on a more frequent basis than they would otherwise because of the distances that had to be travelled to see the people.

So I make the distinction, Mr. Speaker, of how to balance these two duties of a member. The first duty of representation should be done as fairly as possible — one person, one vote. And the second one, of servicing, can be done . . . servicing is quite often done, and a lot of it's done, through the constituency office help, and that can be accommodated in the rural areas by just adding a little more help in terms of office assistance.

Now there are some times other ways that we might want to discriminate; some other ways we might want to discriminate consciously in favour of some minority group. And that's all right, I think. I think it's all right if we decide consciously and openly that perhaps we want to discriminate in favour of a minority group. Perhaps we have a community of one ethnic group in a certain pocket of the province which is consistently unrepresented, and we might want to discriminate consciously on the basis of that. But I say it should be done consciously, no other way. We should have a lot of discussion on it.

It should be done so that the people accept it, because I'll tell you, there are other times when it may be set up so we

discriminate on a different basis, like on the basis of income. And I think if we had a discussion on that we would probably come to a conclusion that we don't want to discriminate on the basis of income.

And let me give you an example. If we had a ward system in one of the cities where the boundaries were redrawn so that if the average ward had maybe 2,000 voters in a particular city in Saskatchewan, and the boundaries were redrawn so that there would be a pocket of maybe 500 or 1,000 voters as opposed to the average of 2,000 in one particular part of the city simply because they were a higher income or simply because they were a lower income, for either one of those two reasons I don't think the public would buy it. I don't think the public would buy that that would be a situation under which we want to discriminate. I don't think we would want to do it.

And certainly I don't think we would want to discriminate on the basis of income. And I certainly don't think we'd want to discriminate on the basis of political preference. And the problem with this particular Bill is that it sets up a situation where the commission can discriminate on the basis of a political tradition in the communities.

Let's take my own city for example, Prince Albert. This new boundary . . . the new Act, rather, sets up the rules so there shall be two seats in Prince Albert, two seats. But the commission is allowed to draw the boundaries. Now in Prince Albert there are approximately 20,000 voters. If the boundaries are drawn so that there are 10,000 voters on one side of Prince Albert and 10,000 voters on the other side of the province, I would say that that would be a fair boundary.

Now it's possible for this commission to vary those by 25 per cent. It's possible to have one set up as far as having only 7,500 voters, and the other constituency as having 12,500 voters. And it's possible to take that line and carve the city up so that I would have a very, very safe seat. It's also possible to draw that boundary so that my seat could be impossible for me to win if we use those two figures. It's also possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and that's why I'm saying that this commission must not have any appearance, and must not under scrutiny have any possibility of having a political bias because those boundaries should be drawn without variance and without violating that one person, one vote principle.

So I have one more comment to say about this, Mr. Speaker. Ordinarily, if you're going to change the rules for any kind of a game, you do it by consulting. You do it by consulting with all of the people that are affected.

We had this Bill tossed on us. We had it mentioned earlier, but we never had any consultation. People of Saskatchewan didn't have any consultation. I'm sure the members opposite said yes, we consulted. But who did they consult with? They consulted with their same groups that they traditionally consult with. You consult with somebody that gives you the answer you want to hear. You don't consult with the public openly. You change the rules.

Now when you're changing the rules, the voting rules of Saskatchewan, you're tampering with a fundamental democratic principle. So, Mr. Speaker, I predict that what will happen to this government is that they will . . . They are following the pattern that was done before them by the Liberal government. The last time we had a gerrymander under . . . and you will recall, it was person from Prince Albert, the member from Prince Albert — his name was Davey Steuart — at the time and it was . . . his name was Davey Steuart, and at the time the gerrymander was called a Daveymander that they gave us, that they gave the electorate, the government of Ross Thatcher was turfed. And that's what'll happen here too, Mr. Speaker. That what's going to happen here, because it's just fundamentally unfair.

And I close then, Mr. Speaker, by saying we should vote against this. If you've got a system that's working, don't try to fix it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish the Deputy Premier would stay so he could learn a few things about the democratic principles in our society which, Mr. Speaker, must be cherished and also must be protected.

One of the sad things that I have experienced in this House, Mr. Speaker, since coming back in 1986, is how we have sort of ignored and abused and disregarded the principles, not only the principles of democracy as they exist outside these Chambers but how we've done that same thing within these Chambers. That, Mr. Speaker, I think, just simply flows from the attitude that has taken place on the other side. We saw that happening last December when they brought in their motion on changing the quorums of committees and tried to ram it down our throats. Now only because we had a strong opposition on this side were we able to ward it off for some time, and the government pulled in its horns and said, all right, fine, we'll back away from that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the principles of democracy, as my colleague from Westmount pointed out yesterday, have been fought over and fought for by our parents and our grandparents and have been well established in this country and elsewhere. And it should not be taken very lightly. I wish some of the members opposite who have done some studying in this area would take it to heart and find out exactly what your government is doing. You should not be conned by the members of the Executive Council that just because you may be in jeopardy at the next election, therefore anything is all right as long as we can save our hides.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of representation by population is a principle that is very, very sacred and should not be taken lightly. In this province, Mr. Speaker, I well remember when I first started in politics in 1970 and ran in the constituency of Saskatoon South — Saskatoon Nutana South it was called at that time. I really couldn't believe what was being done at that time by the former administration, the Ross Thatcher government.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the present

Minister of Finance, the present Minister of Finance was working for the attorney general, I believe, at that time and, it is said, had a hand in the fixing of that gerrymander that took place at that time. I remember being nominated in my constituency in June of 1970 and the gerrymander had taken place. I put out a pamphlet to my constituents explaining what the government was doing with the gerrymander. I hadn't intended on speaking on this, so I didn't bring that . . . that I put out . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — But you're not making sense.

(1030)

**Mr. Rolfes:** — The Minister of Education says that I don't make any sense. Well I make more sense standing here than he does chirping from his desk.

And I want to say to the Minister of Education if he'd pay more attention to his Department of Education, he would also, also make sure that the principles of democracy are protected. And you have an obligation, sir, as the Minister of Education . . . you have an obligation as the Minister of Education to show some leadership on that side and show the children of this province that you as the Minister of Education won't stand by and let the principles of democracy being flagrantly abused by your government. If you had any gumption at all, any courage at all, you'd stand up in this Assembly and you'd say, I oppose Bill 55 because it abuses the principles of democracy, and I won't stand for it as the Minister of Education.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — If you had any gumption at all that's what you'd do. But oh no, you don't have any courage, you can just chirp from your chair and just let the members on the Executive Council abuse the principles of democracy. And you say, well I am the Minister of Education, I will protect the rights of our children. But oh no, you won't do that. He hasn't got the courage to do it. He is more concerned in saving his hide in the next election, and therefore he says this Bill is all right because it gives us the advantage and maybe, just maybe, we'll be able to slide back in again and remain the government.

I want to say to the Minister of Education, I know well what happened to Ross Thatcher in 1971 — I know well what happened. And I can tell you people, the same thing is going to happen to you. I want to go back, Mr. Speaker, and remind the members opposite what happened.

In 1970 when I was nominated I sent out a letter to my constituents and I called it the gerrymander. And I got a number of calls from then Liberals who said to me, that isn't true, what you're saying isn't true, no government would do that — no government would do that. And I said to those members, you phone your MLA, who at that time happened to be Austin Forsyth, who was called the conscience of the Liberal party. Austin Forsyth happened to be the member of that constituency — he was the conscience of the Liberal party. They phoned Austin Forsyth, and I remember some of those members telling me, if what you're saying is true, you can count on me working for you in the next election. When that election is called you can count on our help. They found out it was

true.

And what did they do to my constituency? What did they do? My constituency happens to be on the east side of the river. It was a relatively small constituency. The member from Riversdale, his constituency happened to be on the west side of the river and was a large constituency. So what did they do? Around the exhibition, those of you who are familiar with Saskatoon know well, around the exhibition it's a relatively poor area — good supporters for the NDP. They took a whole section — they took a whole section of the west side of my constituency and threw it in with Mr. Romanow's, at that time, into Riversdale area. Gave the member from Riversdale, I believe, about 16 or 18,000 voters, and mine was less than nine — less than nine.

And they felt they had a very secure seat. They felt they had a very secure seat in Saskatoon Nutana South. But what did the people do? The people said, no, we won't let that happen. You can't do that in a democracy, and if you do we'll turf you out. And that's exactly what happened, Mr. Speaker, they turfed them out.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Excuse me. Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Martin:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the Assembly to introduce a group of young children.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Martin:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you, perhaps the youngest group of people that we've had in the Speaker's gallery this year.

This is a group from the Creative Corner's Co-operative Childcare, a group in my constituency. and we have, as you can see them there, I believe eight students, six kindergarten students, and one from grade 2 and one from grade five, Mr. Speaker. The teachers with them are Kelly Ann Jackson and Debra Sandgren. It's nice to see you here today, ladies and children; it's nice to have you here. Would the members please join me in welcoming this group to the Assembly today.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 55 (continued)

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the member from ...

**An Hon. Member:** — Saltcoats.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — No, no, the guy that ... Regina South. The member from Regina South, the guy that's hard to see whether he's standing or sitting, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, he made a comment that ... Well this gives the member from Saskatoon South a chance for his brain

catching up with his mouth. I would just say to the member from Regina South that at least there's a brain to catch up in this particular instance, which probably would be absent in his.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the members opposite, you can do whatever you wish to try and save your hides, but that isn't going to work with the people of Saskatchewan. They will see this as an abuse of the democratic system, and they will not accept this. We had established, and I have not heard one member saying opposite, that the independent boundary commission that was set up under the NDP government in 1973 or '74 was not fair — not one member said that it wasn't fair.

And, Mr. Speaker, there certainly had to have ... There should have been some changes made in order to accommodate the growing areas in Saskatoon and Regina, and we all recognize that. But they could have done that under the Act that existed. But no, they found that they needed to make some fundamental changes. They had to abuse the principle of representation by population, and I'm very surprised, Mr. Speaker, because I know some of those members opposite. I know some of those members opposite, and I've talked to some of those members. And when you talk to them individually, they tell you how they want to protect democracy, how they want to protect this particular principle. And yet they sit opposite, say not a word when their government brings in a Bill that, as I say, blatantly abuses that principle, and say nothing, absolutely nothing.

So I can only conclude one thing, that they're hypocrites when they speak to you individually about the principle of democracy that they want to protect, and they put their own selfish interests before the interests and the well-being of the province of Saskatchewan. And I'm surprised at that. I'm surprised that the members opposite, some of them will not speak out against this Bill.

What was wrong — as the members opposite ... as my colleagues have already pointed out, what was wrong with the independent boundary commission that we had? I couldn't help but read some of the comments made by Norman Ward the other day when he was asked his impression of this particular Bill that was in the House. His comment was: never would I sit on such a commission — never would I sit on such a commission.

He said the government should not, should not put the limitations on the commission that it's doing. It should not state how many rural seats there should be, and how many urban seats there should be. That should be left up to the commission. why? Why did the government state that there should only be 29 urban seats? I am told that the city of Saskatoon grows on an average annually by 4 or 5,000 people. That means by the next election we will have an additional 20,000 people in Saskatoon — over 200,000 people, over 200,000 in Saskatoon alone. And we are guaranteed only 11 seats.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we believe in the principle of rep by pop, then we must try and carry it out as much as we can. We know that there is going to be some variances, and there have to be to accommodate peculiarities that may exist throughout the province. And

no one argues with that. My colleague from Prince Albert says, yes, maybe we should have some variance for rural Saskatchewan because of the scarcity of population, the long distance, but he also gave some very positive suggestions as to how they could help those MLAs to deal with that scarcity and the travel that they have to do.

But you don't do it by abusing the very fundamental principle on which democracy is based. There are other ways of doing that. There are other ways of doing it, and those were available to the government. But they did it . . . but they're bringing in this Act, Mr. Speaker, primarily because the polls show that they are in trouble, and if they don't change the constituencies in such a way that they can at least save a half a dozen to a dozen seats to their advantage, they will not be the government. They will not be the government. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is wrong. That is wrong, and I'm ashamed that the members opposite don't recognize that — at least some of the members.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that we've seen this in this House — we've seen it with the Ombudsman — an excellent procedure put in place where the Assembly could agree, and the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition could agree, to a candidate who would be the Ombudsman and brought before this House. That was changed because they wanted to appoint their person without any consultation on this side.

We saw the same thing happen with the auditor when they say that they didn't like what the auditor was doing. So what did they do? They cut his staff. They try and curb his influence. He's an employee of the Legislative Assembly, and his independence should be protected. But again, democracy — no problem, just push it aside. We'll do what is best for us, not what is best for the people of Saskatchewan; what is best for the Progressive Conservative government and not for the people of Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is fundamentally wrong, and we should do everything we can to oppose it.

We saw this same thing happening with PURC (Public Utilities Review Commission). When the chairman of PURC didn't do what the government wanted it to do, what happened to the principle of democracy? Threw it out the window, and arbitrarily, just like we've seen with Bill 55, arbitrarily bring in an Act which scuttles the principles of democracy. We're not doing what is best for Saskatchewan; we're doing what is best for the Progressive Conservative Party.

It ell the members opposite, you're going to rue the day that you brought in this Act because the people won't forget. The principle of democracy and the representation by population is sacred, and the people will not let you forget it, and neither will we on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one further thing about the commission. We had an excellent commission. The procedures that were used in establishing this commission were unquestionably the best in Canada.

And what was wrong in having on that commission the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, an employee of all the

people in this Assembly? He has served well on those commissions. He is now, I believe, serving on the federal commission for the province of Saskatchewan. He is an experienced man in that area. He is impartial.

Why would they replace him with a Chief Electoral Officer who is and was a bag man of the Conservative government, of the Conservative Party? Why — if they aren't doing it so that they can have someone on there that they can convince and persuade and tell and instruct exactly how they want those boundaries done?

(1045)

Mr. Speaker, that is what is wrong with this Bill. And I ask all members, not only on this side but on the other side, to oppose this Bill.

I can't see how some of the back-benchers don't go back to their constituents and honestly face them and say . . . I see some of them shaking their heads. If you can honestly say to your children . . . Well all right, if you can falsify things and be honest, then you are a better man than most people.

But some day you're going to have to look in the mirror too, boy, and you're going to have to say to yourself, yes, I was the one; I was the one that agreed with the demolishing, the destruction of the principle of representation by population; I was the one that was there; I did not stand up; I did not stand up and speak out for democracy; I supported Bill 55 because I knew it was in the best interests of the Progressive Conservative Party and not within the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to simply say, I went through one gerrymander in 1971. I was hoping that I wouldn't have to go through another one, but obviously we did. Obviously we're going to go through another one. But I'll tell the members opposite one thing: the people know what you're up to. You've lost your credibility, and now you're trying to blackmail them into voting for you again. It isn't going to work — it isn't going to work. Save at least your honesty. Save what integrity you have left — save what integrity you have left and withdraw Bill 55.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the conclusion of my remarks, I intend to move a motion to amend the main motion and will, in effect, read:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Be not now read a second time because:

(a) it severely undermines the fundamental democratic principles of one person, one vote; and

(b) it fails to provide for a truly independent commission.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to Bill 55, The Electoral Boundaries Commission Act that the members opposite have designed to replace the existing Act. And I speak here this morning in sorrow rather than anger at this Act, because this Act and your actions opposite tell us something about the nature of man and the nature of politics.

In the past 200 years, man has made more scientific and social progress than he has made in all the previous years of history. but the question that still has to be proven is whether man, who has grown up scientifically and intellectually, has also grown up morally and socially.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that man's greatest triumph has been the development of the principle of democracy — the ideal that each and every individual has an intrinsic worth and has, through the franchise or the vote, that opportunity to choose who they wish to govern them and why.

Woodrow Wilson stated in April 1917, "The world must be safe for democracy." And earlier, Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address gave us his own definition of democracy. "Government of the people," he said, "by the people, and for the people."

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that these are noble sentiments. And history tells us that the development of democracy has been one of the greatest moral and intellectual achievements of humankind. But democracy, of which we are so proud, are so proud, was not achieved, Mr. Speaker, without a great struggle.

And even within the democratic system, the ideal of one man and one vote has sometimes been perverted by politicians.

Governor Gerry, who lived during the period of 1744 to 1814, won the dubious immortality in history when he redistributed the boundaries in the Essex County in Massachusetts for partisan political reasons. The local editor said that the new constituency looked like a salamander, and some wit dubbed it "gerrymander," and that phrase has stuck, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, even with the democratic ideal there have been those who would seek to distort the democratic political process for partisan advantage. There are those who seek to perpetuate themselves in government by attacking the very touchstone of the democratic ideal — the principle of one man, one vote.

Mr. Speaker, what does one say about those who seek to cling to power by such means? Perhaps the members opposite might think again of the words of Lincoln when he said, in the Lincoln and Douglas debate:

No man is good enough to govern another man

without that other's consent.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite should remember that public office is a public trust, and that he who serves his party best serves the people best.

And when you, the members opposite, use your majority to put Bill 55, the gerrymander Bill, into statute books, you will violate the public trust, you will disgrace your parties, and you will earn the disgust of the people of this province in doing it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — I say, Mr. Speaker, they should keep in mind the words of William Moody:

Oh ye who lead, take heed; blindness we will forgive, but baseness we will smite.

And I'll tell you, the people of Saskatchewan demonstrated that in the last great gerrymander of this province, under the late Premier Ross Thatcher. And I say history will repeat itself with people in political life cowardly trying to cling to power that will go to any means in an unfair gerrymander.

So, Mr. Speaker, as the members opposite consider their actions, they might reflect upon the recent history of this province. And prior to the election of 1971, Saskatchewan history has been replete with attempts to make the province safe — not for democracy, but for the incumbent government. All parties had sought to use the electoral system for their own advantage. But I say, Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1970, the incumbent government went too far. In that Bill, any pretence of support for the principle of one man, one vote was stripped away completely. That Bill was seen by the people of Saskatchewan as the last-ditch attempt by a discredited government to keep itself in power by effectively disenfranchising both urban and rural residents alike.

And let us look back at the history that is being repeated here today. let us examine the handiwork that went on in 1971. I want to demonstrate how tremendously in 1971 that the gerrymander affected the right of one man, one vote. And I want to give a few examples, Mr. Speaker, of what can happen when a political party interferes with the democratic process. In 1971 there were 5,759 voters in the constituency of Gravelbourg who elected a Liberal with a majority of 44 votes. In the nearby constituency of Swift Current they had 13,288 voters elected a New Democrat with a majority of over 2,000. In the same election — I want people to listen to this — in the same election in Regina, Regina Park had 4,573 voters . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Albert Park.

**Mr. Koskie:** — . . . Albert Park, in Regina Albert Park had 4,573 voters, and they elected a Liberal with a majority of 971 votes.

And in Regina Centre, Mr. Speaker, 17,599 voters elected a New Democrat with a majority of 5,552 votes. The majority in Regina Centre was larger than the constituency of Albert Park. That's the game that these

members opposite are playing. And people . . . and I say to you all across the province the pattern was the same — enormous majorities in enormous seats, tiny majorities in postage stamp-size seats. It was most blatant attempt in Saskatchewan history to thwart the will of Saskatchewan people.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, it failed, as the actions contemplated here by the members opposite will also fail. You will think that these people opposite would learn from history. But in their unseemly lust for power, with all pretence of morality stripped away, we see them for what they are, Mr. Speaker, a second generation of vipers. We see the premier for what he really is, a carbon copy of the ghost of politicians of the past.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, Tommy Douglas, I think said it well when he said this:

Let me remind you (Tommy Douglas said) let me remind you what Fascism is. It need not wear a brown shirt or a green shirt; it may even wear a dress-shirt. Fascism begins the moment a ruling class, fearing the people may use their political democracy to gain political power, begin to destroy political democracy in order to retain their power of exploitation and special privilege, and that is what is carrying on.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, those of you who shared a common philosophy in 1971 and attempted to pervert democracy in 1971, will, I say, in 1987 fail once more. The tragedy is that you are even attempting such an action.

Mr. speaker, following that same election in 1971, even after the most vicious gerrymander in the history of this province, indeed in Canada, I want to say that what happened in 1971, a New Democratic Party government, led by the Leader of the Opposition, came to office, won overwhelmingly in spite of the gerrymander, and he came to office, and the people had asked him to represent them fairly.

And the Leader of the Opposition said that never again in Saskatchewan would an incumbent government have the opportunity to impose tyranny of the elected minority on the wishes of the majority. Never again, said the leader, the former premier, would an incumbent government be allowed to manipulate electoral boundaries to serve itself. Never again, he said, would an incumbent government have the opportunity to create an electoral system in which one person's vote was worth four times that of his fellow citizen. But "never again" in politics, Mr. Speaker, it would appear is not a very long time.

Those who would seek to pervert and twist the democratic process to serve their own discredited advantage have crawled out of the graveyard of history and seek once more to turn back the clock to a disgusting, discredited past. So much for the public trust. So much for political integrity. So much for political courage. Once

more the draftsman's pen will be used for political advantage.

And following 1971 the New Democratic Party established, as I indicated, an independent boundaries commission, Mr. Speaker, an independent boundaries commission that would be truly independent, based on democratic principles, and that would involve the public of Saskatchewan directly for the first time. For the first time in Saskatchewan we had a commitment from an incumbent government that the sole purpose of the boundaries commission was to serve the people of Saskatchewan and not the political needs of the government of the day.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

(1100)

**Mr. Koskie:** — For the first time in Saskatchewan we declared in statute that each and every citizen of Saskatchewan could rest assured that regardless of where he lived, or how much he owned, or what political party he supported, his vote would be worth approximately the same as each other resident in Saskatchewan. And this Act, Mr. Speaker, was the final realization of what democracy is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, they looked at last year's election results, they looked at the latest polls. They looked at their future and knew that there was no political future. Mr. Speaker, they had no future if fairness was applied. So somewhere over there in the dark closeted room, behind closed doors, out of light of day, they met, and the only order of business was very simple, Mr. Speaker: how can we avoid political disaster? How can we prevent the people from venting their electoral spleen on our candidates? How can we save the people from themselves, they said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they thought about banning elections, but they had to discard that idea. Even some of their own members said they couldn't go that far. So finally, Mr. Speaker, after reviewing all of the options there was only one avenue left to the members on the government side, one last resort to cling to power. If you couldn't avoid an election — although they are trying to do that in Saskatoon Eastview, the largest constituency in Saskatchewan, where over 18,000 electors have been without a member of the legislature since last spring — yes, if you couldn't avoid an election, then try and turn the electoral system to your own advantage.

So that was the result, Mr. Speaker. Out of the back room they came, secure in their thought that if they were to avoid the Divine retribution that they would need a divine redistribution.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — So out of their machinations came Bill 55. Now I know the members opposite will stand up — not many of them. I doubt if they'll join the debate and defend this Bill, but anyone that will stand up — and there's only been one of them — that they will say that this Act does not even draw up political boundaries. And they'll say,



how can we make such accusations. They say, trust us. They say, we care about democracy. And they will say, believe us. They will say that, but the people will not believe.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I ask: what was wrong with the existing Act? Why did they have to dismantle that which was introduced by the former premier of this province that gave fairness throughout this province, until this government decided that apparently it was objectionable. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why did it have to be dismantled? What was it in that was so objectionable to the members opposite?

So I looked at the existing Act and I quickly saw why the members opposite were so concerned about the mechanism that was in place before. And you know why it bothered them? That Act was fair. Secondly, it was equitable. Third, it was democratic. Fourth, it was truly independent. And five, it allowed for public involvement.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Speaker, I say, can you imagine their horror, Mr. Speaker, when they found out that the existing Act respected democracy, respected the individual worth of each and every citizen in this province, was in fact, horrors of horrors, Mr. Speaker — it was truly independent. They would not be told what to do, Mr. Speaker, in fact it would have to be listened to by them. It was obvious that the Act had to go. Such legislation had no place in the Tory Saskatchewan.

It was obvious that under the previous Act that they would have little or no control over the fairness of the application of that Act. And when you realize, Mr. Speaker, how fragile democracy is — or do the members opposite? They knew that it needed all the help it could possibly get. So I say, Mr. Speaker, what they did is scrap the Act and today we are debating this new Act.

And what, Mr. Speaker, are some of the features of this Tory Bill. Is it independent I ask? Not any more, Mr. Speaker. It's not independent. Is it democratic? Not any more, Mr. Speaker. Does it allow for public input? Certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

No, Mr. Speaker, Bill 55 should be renamed not the electoral boundaries commission; rather, Mr. Speaker, this is an Act establishing the Devine right to rule.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it should be called an Act preventing the tyranny of the majority. Or an Act for the preservation of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, because that's what it's designed for. Whatever you call it, Mr. Speaker, it is an unseemly and ill-advised piece of legislation that violates all the moral precepts of politics.

What does this Act do, Mr. Speaker, that is so bad, some members opposite will say. It is fairly independent they will claim. True, the Leader of the Opposition will no longer be consulted as to the members on the commission, but after this Act becomes law he will be

Leader of the Opposition for life. He will not need to be involved. Certainly the fact that the members of the commission will include the Chief Electoral Officer, a political appointment by the members opposite, as opposed to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, may seem to some to be partisan. But not by us, say the members opposite. It's all a tempest in a teapot, they say. They will claim: you can trust us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty and so does the people of Saskatchewan trusting this government any longer.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that they say one thing and they do the opposite. Can the dental workers in the province trust the members opposite?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Can the highway workers in this province trust the members opposite?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No way!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Can the people who are paying huge drug bills trust the members over there?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No, never again!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Can students trust the members over there?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Seniors?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Teachers?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Farmers?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Workers?

**Some Hon. Members:** — No!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Can these people trust the members opposite? And the answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is a licence to electoral theft. And if that is not their purpose, then why did they change the Act?

Mr. Speaker, they have stripped their commission of its independence. They have removed public input and involvement, but they have done more. They have also attacked the very basis on which our democratic system is founded. They have legislated an end to the principle of one man, one vote. They have legislated a class system of voters.

They have created two classes of voters: those who would vote Tory and who, because of their particular acumen, are rewarded as the privileged class; and there are those who have the good sense to vote NDP, who shall be classed second class.

This Act, Mr. Speaker, is the Titanic of the electoral Acts. But we know what happened to the Titanic. The unthinkable happened; the unsinkable sank — just like this government will sink, Mr. Speaker, out of sight when they dare to call the next election.

And why will this happen, Mr. Speaker? It will occur because if there is one quality that is found in every resident in Saskatchewan, that is fairness. The people of Saskatchewan value fairness. They value equality. They believe that each and every person in Saskatchewan should be treated fairly, and this new Act violates that fundamental concept of fairness.

The new commission is bound by statute to create two northern seats, 35 rural seats, and 29 urban seats. And as my colleague from Saskatoon South indicated, that Dr. Norman Ward, the head of the political science department, University of Saskatchewan, so contemptuously looked at this Act and said, I wouldn't even sit on that Act . . . I wouldn't even sit on that commission because of the outline and the drafting of that legislation.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — And I want to say, in dividing the province up into two northern seats, 35 rural seats, 29 urban seats, that this is a significant change from the format of the Act which it replaces.

The net result of this change is that the commission no longer has the option to combine urban and rural areas. It must now operate within the three parameters; the north, the rural regions of the province, and the urban regions. It is further restricted because the decision by the government to establish a fixed number of seats for each of the three regions, two for the North, 35 for rural, 29 for urban. This number remains constant according to the new Act. For the next two elections, that means that eight to ten years from now, in 1997, regardless of any population shift that occurs in the province during that time, there will be two seats in the North, 35 seats in the rural, and 29 seats in the urban.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the 29 urban seats contained 316,817 voters, an average of 10,924 voters per seat. The 35 rural seats contained 333,122 voters, an average of 9,517 voters per seat, that was in the last election. Two years ago there were 14,007 more voters in each of the urban seats, on average, than there were in each of the rural seats. As I indicated, this amounts to about a 13 per cent overall differential that was within the tolerance of 15 per cent specified under the Act that this government is abolishing, because under the old Act there was a 15 per cent plus or minus tolerance.

This differential reflected that the so-called quality of representation argument put forward by the proponents of some differential between urban and rural seats, as

such it would fit the criteria of equality and fairness held by most people of Saskatchewan. But now, under this Act, we have fixed the number of seats: two northern, 35 rural, 29 urban seats. This government has arbitrarily declared that regardless of what happens in the next eight to ten years to the population of Saskatchewan there shall be those set amount, two northern, 35 rural seats, and 29 urban.

And let us look now at what has happened in the past 10 years in Saskatchewan. Has our population remained basically constant? Relatively, it has. It has declined a bit since the Premier made the export of young people one of his major priorities, but basically our population has remained relatively stable. But has the population remained stable within the provincial boundaries? No, Mr. Speaker, it has not. There has been a continuing shift from rural Saskatchewan into our cities, and therein lies the significance of boxing the number of seats by statute.

(1115)

What this government is doing is establishing a permanent system of disproportional representation on escalating disenfranchisement of urban voters. Every day, every week, every year, the urban vote will be worth less and less as the population shifts to the urban. Every day, every week, every year, as the number of rural voters decline, the votes will be worth more and more. This Act is truly an Act of morbid genius.

And let us assume, Mr. Speaker, some assumption in respect to this Act. Let us assume, Mr. Speaker, that there is a population shift of 3 per cent per year from the rural to the urban based on the previous movements. This is a conservative estimate. What will happen in 1991 is as follows: in rural Saskatchewan, 283,153 voters will reside in 35 seats — an average of 8,090 voters per seat. In urban Saskatchewan, 351,817 will reside in 29 seats — an average of 12,131 voters per seat. So what they have in rural seats by 1991, 8,000 voters, and the average seat in the urban would be over 12,000.

By 1995, two elections from now — and remember, Mr. Speaker, this is as specified in the Act — in rural Saskatchewan, using the same principle of the 3 per cent shift, 240,680 voters will reside in 35 seats, rural — an average of 6,800 voters per seat. In urban Saskatchewan, as decreed by your legislation, 394,317 voters will reside in 29 seats, an average of 13,597 voters per seat. So you have the discretion of 2:1 ratio that is proposed, which is blueprinted in this Bill. One rural vote will be worth two urban votes — and they talk so much for equity, so much for fairness, and so much for democracy. There can be no justification under any system of representation for such an enormous discrepancy: 394,000-plus voters will reside in 29 seats, 240 . . . in 35 seats in the rural — 153,637 more voters, six less seats. What do you call it, Mr. Speaker? You call it a gerrymander.

But, Mr. Speaker, it gets worse; within those limits the Tories have built in the 25 per cent differential, so that the rural seats would be 25 per cent above the 6,876 and 25 per cent below the 6,876, so we could have rural constituencies with as few as 5,300 voters, and we could have urban constituencies with as many as 18,300 voters.

That's what the Act does — 5,300 is what they could have in a rural seat, and 18,300 in a city — an electoral system that weighs a rural vote three times more than its urban counterpart.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the most flagrant abuse of democracy perpetrated by the members opposite since they arrived in this House. Mr. Speaker, the ideal of one man, one vote, the ideal of democratic representation, has been abolished in this Bill. Mr. Speaker, the supreme Court of United States decided in 1964 that the fundamental principle of representative government was equal representation for an equal number of people in electoral districts, since legislators represented people. And the Supreme court in the United States prevented a gross gerrymander in the United States. People, Mr. Speaker, not farms, cities, or economic interests, is what we represent. And that appeared to be a sensible decision, Mr. Speaker, and under the present Act I say that that fundamental principle that the legislators represented is gone.

But under this new Act, Mr. Speaker, political scientist Norman Ward stated in an interview, "If a commission is to be independent, it should be really independent. It shouldn't be directed to do this and to do that." Professor Ward stated that when he worked on the federal boundaries commission in Saskatchewan, "We could arrange the boundaries any way we liked, provided we stayed within the guide-lines for population." He went on further to state, "I don't know what government's motives are, but I wouldn't myself want to sit on a commission given that kind of a directive." And that's a man that has sat, head of the political science department, sat on the federal boundaries, a man who is respected throughout Saskatchewan who says this Act is so bad that he wouldn't even sit on it. That's how bad it is, Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any person of integrity would agree with Dr. Ward. The guide-line that motivates this Act is the political survival of this government. The fact that they are prepared to sacrifice very principle of democratic representation in this vain attempt to retain hold of their political power is a measure of how much they realize they are despised by the vast majority of the people of this province. The Act confirms that the polls are already told us, that this government has a serious problem with the people of the province. It has always had a credibility problem. Now it has added to than an integrity problem.

When the question is called, I ask, will any of the members opposite have the political courage and the integrity to stand in his place and say that this Act is morally and politically wrong, that it erodes the basic foundations of the democratic principle. Or will they dance like the monkey to the organ-grinder's tune? And I suspect that's what they will be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for a number of years, over 12 years, and I say that I respect the democratic process, and this is a sad day when you see the very basis of democracy being eroded.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Speaker, I have disagreed with the members opposite when they have brought in their legislation, but I have never felt what they did was not within their right. But with this legislation, Mr. Speaker, they are prepared to take away rights of the majority of the Saskatchewan people to pass judgement on their actions.

With this Act, I believe they are violating the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which stress that every individual has the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law.

And I can say, Mr. Speaker, that in fact the gerrymander that was perpetrated by the Social Credit and other right-wing government in British Columbia is being challenged today. And the courts have decided that they have a right to look at unfair legislation similar to this.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry day when the party of John Diefenbaker stooped so low that it violates everything that John Diefenbaker stood for. As early as 1952, John Diefenbaker stated: a Bill of rights would do more; it would make parliament freedom conscious; it would make parliament realize that rights are to be preserved; it would make parliament more cautious in passing laws that would have the effect of interfering with freedom; it would give to Canadians the realization that parliament would be jealous of his rights and would not infringe upon those rights which are dear to us all.

John Diefenbaker would see this Act as a violation of all that he stood for. he would see this Act for what it truly is, the march of a government towards arbitrary power, the arrogance of men clad in a little brief authority. I say, Mr. Speaker, in 1960 he said, "I am a free Canadian, free to choose those who shall govern my country." Twenty-eight years later, in the province he loved and which he represented so long, members of his own party, in this Act, are violating everything that John Diefenbaker held dear.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, nothing illustrates more clearly the hypocrisy of the members opposite, that at the same time as they are found funding to keep the John Diefenbaker centre open, that they would introduce this Act. I say this is a tragedy for the memories of John Diefenbaker and his most cherished ideals. This is a tragedy for the Progressive Conservative Party in that it would stoop to such low levels of morality.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — And I say, Mr. Speaker, this is a tragedy for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I'll be voting against this Bill, and I want to move a motion:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

Be not now read a second time because:

(a) it severely undermines the fundamental democratic principles of one person, one vote; and

(b) it fails to provide for a truly independent commission.

I so move.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I never thought, when I came into this legislature . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — He never does, I know.

**Mr. Upshall:** — . . . that I would ever have to stand here and listen to a government opposite cackle over a serious matter, but that I would ever have to stand here and defend the people against the government they elected . . .

Mr. Speaker, we have a Bill here that is tearing apart democracy. and I ask, what is the need for this Bill? Whenever something comes up for legislation, there's always a need. And the government, I think, establishes those needs a number of ways. It establishes the needs by listening to the people — direct contact — people phoning in or talking on the street. It establishes needs for legislation by polling to see how popular their programs are, and this government has seen how popular its programs are in recent polls. We see special interest groups — doctors, nurses, educators, farmers — all coming on the government, telling them no, their programs are wrong. We see people, a hundred thousand strong, presenting petitions to the government, saying no, your program's wrong.

So there are needs for legislation. But does the government listen to the people and the needs, the response that is necessary? I believe that a response should be to make things better for the people. I believe legislation should be put in place to make sure that the people do not suffer and do not have hardships, and so that the economy continues to work.

But what we have here is something totally opposite. We have a situation where, instead of responding to the needs of the people, because a government who can't manage and who doesn't know how to run the affairs of this province, who do not respond to needs of people, they're governing for themselves. Many of the major Bills in this legislature this sitting have been as the result of a government that can't manage, whether it be taking money from the people and giving money to the government to spread around in patronage and other ways that relate to terrible management.

So what we have, Mr. Speaker, the situation in 1982, the word was out, we need a change, and the people of this province responded to that, and they got a change. At that time they didn't realize the incompetence that they had received, so they got an incompetent government. Incompetent and inexperienced governments tend to not be able to manage. They got that, a government that couldn't manage.

(1130)

A government that was so vindictive they ripped apart the civil service; they ripped apart any position of power that was held by a New Democrat just for no other reason than being vindictive, and through patronage put back people who were incompetent, simply because they were Tories.

And as a result of that, the public started to hurt, they started to feel the results of the mismanagement, the bad programs, the cuts. And so there was the backlash. And so the government would come along with a few cosmetic cures, but it didn't help because the people continued to say no, through petition, through letters, through demonstration and phone calls.

So the government starts to panic. It panicked three years before an election if you can believe it. The Premier says well, when talking about the polls, well we have a honeymoon period after the election and now the honeymoon's over. Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell you the marriage is over because the people of this province won't accept this.

And so then, the government panics and it has to do something — we have to do something to maintain ourselves. So instead of governing for the people, we're going to govern for government, and that's the whole principle behind this Bill: governing for government. It's anti-democratic, Mr. Speaker, and it's terribly unfair.

It also shows that the government has no confidence in itself. Because of their own programs they're scared that they're going to get turfed out of office, and so to remedy that they gerrymander the province in showing direct lack of confidence in themselves. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, when a government's got no confidence in itself, how do they expect the people to have confidence in them ever again?

So what do we have? There ought to be a Bill. We're going to save ourselves; there ought to be a Bill. So they come up with this Bill, and in the whole process they've disregarded democracy in an attempt to stay in power. They're making what I call orchestrated democracy, manipulating democracy, and disregarding the democratic principles that we have built over time, over the centuries.

And that's a common theme of this government — tear things apart simply for power. That's the thing they're concerned about, is power, maintaining power for oneself. How sad! And, Mr. Speaker, let's look at an example. This government now has the opportunity to carve up this province to ensure themselves government. And we have people in a constituency that they have hacked out for themselves who do not believe in the principles put forward by this government. And so in a democracy, if you don't believe in the principles put forward by a government, you know, you have the right to vote for some other party. But that right, Mr. Speaker, has been taken away.

The right to have a government member, for many people in this province, a government member of their philosophy, has been taken away from them. And you talk about your repressive regimes. You talk about communism. You talk about all the countries of this world

who are supposedly, as members opposite say, oppressive regimes, and these people act the same way — by taking away the fundamental right of expressing your ideas through your party, taking away the fundamental right of one person, one vote. The equality — it's gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a very, very sad tale being told in this province, a tale that started as a fairy tale. It started a fairy tale by a party who promised that it was going to improve things, promised that it was going to improve the economy and the social programs and the health programs, and all of a sudden this little fairy tale has turned into a nightmare for many people in this province. And because they know that, they know it's a nightmare for many people, they know that the future of this government is very, very, very doubtful.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — So, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, they're clinging to power, desperately trying to cling to power. and with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at this time, I will be voting in favour of the amendment and against the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

(1145)

#### Yeas — 20

Blakeney	Atkinson
Prebble	Anguish
Brockelbank	Hagel
Shillington	Lyons
Koskie	Calvert
Rolfes	Lautermilch
Mitchell	Smart
Upshall	Van Mulligen
Solomon	Koenker
Kowalsky	Goodale

#### Nays — 27

Muller	Sauder
Duncan	Johnson
Berntson	McLaren
Taylor	Hopfner
Swan	Petersen
Muirhead	Swenson
Maxwell	Baker
Gerich	Gleim
Hepworth	Neudorf
Hardy	Gardner
Klein	Kopelchuk
Meiklejohn	Saxinger
Pickering	Britton
Martin	

(1148)

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 27

Muller	Sauder
Duncan	Johnson
Berntson	McLaren
Taylor	Hopfner
Swan	Petersen
Muirhead	Swenson
Maxwell	Baker
Gerich	Gleim
Hepworth	Neudorf
Hardy	Gardner
Klein	Kopelchuk
Meiklejohn	Saxinger
Pickering	Britton
Martin	

#### Nays — 20

Blakeney	Atkinson
Prebble	Anguish
Brockelbank	Hagel
Shillington	Lyons
Koskie	Calvert
Rolfes	Lautermilch
Mitchell	Smart
Upshall	Van Mulligen
Solomon	Koenker
Kowalsky	Goodale

The Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a Committee of the Whole later this day.

### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

#### Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Provincial Secretary Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 30

#### Item 1

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the minister, with respect to executive administration on page 74 of the budget estimates, a question relating to that. I would ask the minister: could we get the names, the qualifications, as well as the job descriptions for the eight people that are paid the \$325,000 in salaries, please.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I don't have them all. I can get them, and I will forward those names and job descriptions and salaries to the hon. member . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Good Heavens, there's only half a dozen, you should have them memorized.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Yes, I should have them memorized but I don't. There are only, I think, two people in my office that are considered to being Provincial Secretary people and they are not, I believe,

among the names that are set out as a complement there of eight per annum.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Could we also have on that list the related political staff, their qualifications and salaries attached to the department and to you with respect to being Provincial Secretary?

Who is your deputy minister now?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — As of a few, one or two weeks ago, it's Bill Clarke. It was Marj Jermyn for several years, and she retired, I think, in June of this year, perhaps July of this year, and Bill Clarke has been my deputy for the last two or three weeks.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Was this Marj Jermyn the same Marj Jermyn that was the secretary to the former leader of the Conservative Party, Dick Collver?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — This Marj Jermyn is not only one and the same, but has worked very closely with me and my party, our party, for the last, I think, 12 years. Prior to that she was with Agribition, has her roots very deeply into agricultural Saskatchewan, and she was just a very fine deputy.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — I would appreciate as well, Mr. Minister, a listing of her qualifications and salary that was paid to her during the course of the last year, if possible?

**An Hon. Member:** — *Nemo problema.*

**Mr. Solomon:** — Pardon me?

**An Hon. Member:** — Sure.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Sure. Okay. Is any of the money in the Provincial Secretary's budget — has it been spent on any polling or advertising?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — No. I should take . . . I wonder if I could introduce my staff, Mr. Chairman. On my left is Bill Clarke, the deputy provincial secretary; on my right is, Elizabeth Smith from the Department of Finance.

**An Hon. Member:** — Now you could ask the tough questions.

**Mr. Solomon:** — That was the tough one, yes. That was the tough questions. I see in estimated expenditures 1987 to '86, a total of \$1,432,800. That's the payments you were making to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. Could you please explain what that is for?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Okay. Since the property management Crown came into being, the administration for space and operating has changed somewhat, and that 1,424,500 that you're talking about is for the operating expenses of this building, except for space used by the office of Executive Council; for the Legislative Library storage at 3211 Albert Street; for the Legislative Library satellite office in the Walter Scott Building; for the provincial inquiry centre in the T.C. Douglas Building;

and for the office of the Lieutenant Governor in Government House; and for electoral office storage in the Roll-o-Flex Building, electoral office in the school trustees' building, and the office of the Premier in Saskatoon, previously in the Sturdy Stone Building.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Why would we have, under this budgetary item, expenses related to Executive Council and other departments?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — It's simply a decision made in the new scheme of things, administratively. Somebody had to pay the rent, and so it was decided that, to the extent that we could, it would be handled out of one house, as it were, so Provincial Secretary was chosen.

**Mr. Solomon:** — But does not the other departments that you referred to also pay funds into the property management corporation for the purposes of rent. And if that's the case, I can't understand why you would roll into your budget the amounts that should be allocated and attributed to Executive Council if that's what it was for.

It seems to me, Minister, that for \$1.4 million, where there was no figure that's corresponding to that in the previous year, it's an expenditure which averages about a \$100,000 per employee of your department for rent, and that seems to be fairly steep rent.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Of course if you interpret it that way I suppose, but the fact is we are paying the operating for this total building, and I expect that that covers the heat and light and so on that lights your caucus room as well. And so it's not a million dollars or a million and a half for the rent for the eight people in the Provincial Secretary's department, it was an administrative decision taken to handle it in this fashion, and it's as simple as that.

**Mr. Solomon:** — And last year the rents came from where for all of these places?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — It was handled in the Department of Supply and Services previously.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Okay. Could you please tell me what the responsibilities and functions of the Department of the Provincial Secretary are?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — In a general sense we are responsible for the provincial inquiry centre, the Saskatoon cabinet office, the Office of the Lieutenant Governor and, of course, the prime purpose for the existence of the Provincial Secretary is that of the custodian of the great seal of the province of Saskatchewan, and recently we were responsible for the budget of the royal visit of Her Majesty, the Queen.

(1200)

**Mr. Solomon:** — How many people are paid out of the Provincial Secretary's budget that work in the cabinet office?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — There are two employees paid by the Provincial Secretary that work in the Premier's office in Saskatoon, and I've already undertaken to provide the

job descriptions and qualifications of those.

**Mr. Solomon:** — I notice that there's no expenditure here for the cabinet office that's defined in the *Estimates*, and I was wondering if you could also explain, when you provide the written material, under which budget they're paid?

And also I'd like to have, Minister, some indication as to whether there's any ministerial expenses that came out of this budget? Is there? And could I have some figures as to what the estimated expenses will be for this fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Okay, the ministerial expenses included in that budget are my salary and my travel. And the salary is pretty easy to project; the travel we estimated, I think, \$5,000, and year-to-date none has been used.

**Mr. Solomon:** — None has been released. Should one assume that none has been claimed then?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — None has been used or claimed as Provincial Secretary.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Just one final item, Minister, and it relates to the Coopers & Lybrand study that's being done for the government. We get conflicting numbers in terms of dollars that's being spent on it. I have a confirmation here from one Norman Riddell, deputy minister to the Premier, that you are the minister that's heading this study up and that any questions related thereto should go directly to you. My question is: is the Department of the Provincial Secretary at all involved with regards to any of the expenses?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — No, the Department of the Provincial Secretary has no responsibility for the Coopers & Lybrand exercise. As minister responsible for Crown Management Board, I have responsibility for that.

**Mr. Solomon:** — So you're managing . . . You're in charge of the Coopers & Lybrand study as a result of your relationship with the Crown Management Board, and they're the ones who'd be paying for the study and related expenses. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I'd be happy to deal with those questions in Crown Corporations Committee. But again, that was a convenient way to do it, and the actual costs, when everything is all in and calculated, will be appropriated to the various departments on a prorated basis. But that has nothing to do with Provincial Secretary.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Final question. The staff that worked under the Provincial Secretary's department, could you also provide, when you provide the background and salaries and expenses, whether or not they qualify for government cars?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Okay, it's getting easier. The eight positions include my deputy and two clerical positions in Saskatoon, and five vacant positions and . . . oh, and one in my office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Five vacancies. Right. So I will give a job description as the earlier

undertaking was, and the cars, etc. My deputy has a car, but I don't think anybody else has one, but I'll confirm that and provide that in writing.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Just a codicil to my final question. Item 3 under vote 30, I note that the other expenses of the Office of the Lieutenant Governor is increased from 42.9 to 55.5. What would be the reason for that large increase?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Yes, the Lieutenant Governor advanced, I think, a pretty compelling argument that he did quite a lot on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan representing the Queen here in the province of Saskatchewan and previously he had no entertainment budget. And so this year, for the first time ever, we have from the province granted him \$1,000 a month entertainment budget.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Would you give us the terms under which that \$1,000 . . . Is that something that he pays himself and submits receipts for expenses for, or is this something he submits bills and the bills are paid. I'm curious as to how the \$1,000 a month expense allowance . . . entertainment allowance, rather, works. How does the payment system work?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — We told him we'd provide him with \$1,000 each month, and then on a quarterly basis he provides a statement, and there's a reconciliation.

**Mr. Shillington:** — So I gather this is an allowance that's available to the Lieutenant Governor to entertain anyone, including the minister himself if you were to have lunch with the Lieutenant Governor. I assume this is an allowance to entertain anyone. I recognize this is a delicate subject, but \$1,000 a month entertainment allowance to be used entirely at the discretion of the office holder is a very rich allowance.

**An Hon. Member:** — What are the restrictions?

**Mr. Shillington:** — My colleague suggested a question which should be asked. What are the restrictions, if any, on the use of the entertainment allowance?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The expenditures are made at the discretion of His Honour, and there is an accounting quarterly. And as it relates to the minister dining with the Lieutenant Governor, the only time I recall that happening, I was sitting at the table next to the Leader of the Opposition, and that was during the recent visit by Her Majesty. And I'm told that there were other people in the room that saw us sitting together there and said that we were both alone so . . .

**Mr. Shillington:** — I want to preface my remarks by saying that I have no concern about the present incumbent misusing that. The present incumbent I know from a different movie when he was chief justice. He was the soul of discretion and integrity. But \$1,000 a month expense allowance to be used at the discretion of the office holder is just way too much in a province of \$1 billion . . .

Mr. Minister, I wonder what . . . as I say, no reflection on the present incumbent whom I would not have any

**Supplementary Estimates 1988  
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure  
Provincial Secretary  
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 30**

concern about, but that as an expense allowance is just way too much. Mr. Minister, what other expenses are available — free flights — what other expenses does this individual get?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Okay, it's up to \$1,000 a month. He's not compelled to spend it. And it will be a long time, I suspect — if these are patronage appointments — before one of your people ever get in there.

So I think that, having taken my cheap shot, the fact is that compared to other jurisdictions and the way that their lieutenant governors are treated in this respect, this \$1,000 a month is very, very modest. And I will give you the undertaking — I don't have it here — to provide you with that comparison when I give all the other information.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well compared with some of the things this budget has seen and the cuts we've seen, \$1,000 a month is a fair sum of money.

Mr. Minister, what other expenses is he allowed to claim? What travel expenses, what other perks is he allowed to claim?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Okay, salary and all out-of-province travel and expenses are paid by Ottawa. The province pays the operating cost of the office, provide him with a car and in-province travel. And he has access to CVA executive air as well, in-province.

**Mr. Shillington:** — If the federal government pays all of his travel expenses and so on out-of-province, do I assume then that since we are intraprovince the expense allowance is used intraprovince and not outside the province?

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — That's absolutely correct.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd sent over a note for the minister with regard to space and consultant studies, and I wonder if the minister could send that over as soon as possible.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Yes, we can give a list of the properties. And understand that some of the things that we're paying for aren't properties at all. Like this building, we're paying for the operating costs of this building. That would include operating for space that you occupy and I occupy, and so on. So it'll get a little . . . Well we'll provide information, is what I'm saying.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I'll be sure to read the minister's footnotes that's on the information that will explain that and make it adequately clear.

Item 2 agreed to.

Items 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 30 agreed to.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Any questions?

I'd like to thank the minister and his officials.

(1215)

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to thank my officials.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.