

EVENING SITTING

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS

*Amendments to Rules and Procedures of the Legislative
Assembly (continued)*

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Andrew.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I'll just do a quick recap of the information. Number one, of course, we're debating the role regarding the ringing of the bell which will be limited for a period of one hour.

I introduced my comments earlier on this afternoon by stating very clearly that there was a connection between the procedure and the context of the procedure. And in that sense, I made a connection between the concern of the people's issues on selling of public utilities and the very importance of the people's involvement in participatory democracy, and stating their position through the petition, also stating their position through the meetings, and making it well-known on their opposition to the privatization Bill, more particularly in regards to SaskEnergy.

I guess in regards to the bell-ringing, a lot of the information that I got back from the people was one of standing up strong for Saskatchewan, and standing up strong for the history of Saskatchewan in regards to public corporations, Mr. Speaker.

And as I debate this bell-ringing incident, I also mention the interconnection with the short history that I have had in the legislature from '86, and pin-pointed the direct connection between the bell-ringing and other incidents of the questions of democracy where the government makes, you know, their position known as a right to legislate, and the right to continue government.

And from us on the opposition side we make our case and say we have the right to criticize, and we have the right to oppose so that, you know, we have a technical device of the bell-ringing to denote the points of difference. You know, it's a procedural tactic utilized through the parliamentary democracies to voice a strong concern in votes or of issues, you know, that come up from time to time.

My own overview on it as I go on to make the specific connection to the bell-ringing aspect and the proposals that we had outlined, you know, with the government side in communication with us, I'll outline the different proposals that were brought forth, you know, as I continue this discussion.

As I get into that I also want to say, when I used to talk to the bell-ringing situation with the people as I went out to deal with the petition and to deal with to the issue of the public meetings that the people had, I had a quick review of the Bill 5 which did limit the aspect of government debate and opposition debate in regards to Executive Council being able to make decisions in regards to governmental reorganization, and I made the connection

there on the whole issue of democracy and bell-ringing.

Then I went on into the issue of the problem of *Public Accounts* and the lack of interest. I said, my goodness, we're debating important issues of the legislature such as privatization and its interconnection with bell-ringing. And I did mention the problem with quorum that we had the past couple of weeks, and I said . . . And I thought to myself, as a new member, that when we get into the midst of very key issues such as this and the historical development of Saskatchewan, hopefully that we would have had a quorum, and we saw a little bit of light-heartedness by the government in not being able to come out and even listen to their own one member. I remember, you know, before we went into the debate, it was their own speaker that was up on the floor when they didn't find enough of a quorum, you know, to make the legislature work.

And when it was our turn to do the quorum, they didn't have enough speakers again to have that. So it sort of gave me a message that while in the media it stated that there is great concern to get back to the legislature when we were doing bell-ringing, the fact remains that historical documents show that we didn't even have a quorum after the bell-ringing session came to be. And that was a very key point in my comments just prior to the supper hour break today.

I guess the other thing that I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, I was just starting to make comments on one other final example and I want to . . . I mean the text of the auditor's report is pretty thick and nobody wants to go through the full document. And I want to make a couple of observations on this report that was tabled just yesterday.

And I notice that there was fairly, what I would call scathing commentaries by the press in regards to the whole issue of a government function such as the auditor being able to do their effective job. And with due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I looked at this comment, so I'd just like to read it to the record.

It says that — this was on May 18 of '89 in the *Star-Phoenix* and it says that:

(The) Provincial auditor Willard Lutz says that he can no longer effectively do his job because the government isn't obeying its own laws.

In his 1988 annual report to the legislature, tabled Wednesday, Lutz says he's being denied access to information he has a right to see.

It's a hard-hitting report; Lutz accuses several Crown corporations of interfering with his right to do his job by refusing to release information to him.

I remember when we were talking about, you know, the right of key people who are government, very important government functions, you know, whether it was the legislative law clerk, and also your position, and also now the auditor, and people felt that it's not a good idea to ever

attack these very important positions of our parliamentary democracy.

And that I was outwardly amazed when one of my members read this following document, too, from the *Leader-Post*, again on May 18, 1989, and he said . . . from here it says that:

Justice Minister (Bob Andrew) said Lutz — who most people have a hard time working with, anyway, he added — he's just unhappy because he sees the government's decision to appoint more private auditors as an infringement upon his territory.

And again it appears here that privatization aspect seems to be more important you know, on the private auditor idea rather than on paying respects to the public auditor as a whole. You know, why would it have anything to do with, you know, hiring private auditors?

The other aspect that I saw in here was . . . Justice Minister said, and these are his words:

"He's a hard guy to complain about working together," Andrew told reporters Wednesday. "Jesus Christ, he can't work with anybody."

And for me that's, in regards to language, it's a little bit harsh to be using that type of language to a very important position such as yourself, or the Clerk, or the lawyer, or the legislative lawyer. As I looked at it, it sort of gives a very bad image in regards to a government having to appear to put down one of their key functionaries in our system of democracy.

I would just like to make that point, Mr. Speaker, as I read the paper of just today. It makes it very difficult when we talk about democracy, and when very key statements are made by a public servant such as the auditor, to state very, very . . . It's very, very discouraging. As a person in opposition, I look at it, and I say to myself . . . I looked at it in terms of the earlier point I made. You need knowledge. You need information to make governmental decisions and to debate these points in opposition, but not only that, in terms of the historical development of our province, to be able to deal with these things very effectively.

I would like to say that as a new person in the legislature I was very displeased, on a personal level, very disappointed to see that happening — that we could put ourselves at that level.

I would like to also state that, you know, I was listening to some reports today in the news about the possibilities that we were not co-operating with the government in trying to resolve the matter of the bell-ringing, and also to try and resolve interrelated matters of rules in this House. And one of the key aspects, of course, on rule changes is that it's not only something very important for the Speaker, or for the Clerk of the legislature, it's very important for the government in power, and also for the opposition to the government.

It's very important as we look at the situation to first of all

establish a strong basis of consultation, and not only . . . and I've said quite a bit already in regards to the substantive issue of privatization, but also in regards to the rules. The rules of the House are made on a more or less co-operative basis to try and make sure that we agree upon, you know, what is workable in the House. And I found the initial stages of the process to be, of course, uncertain as I recall, you know, the other day; and I thought, oh, my goodness, we have a chance here to make a little bit of a breakthrough on coming out with very important changes of rules.

And I would like to just read into the record some of these things that we have discussed. We were on the understanding that more meetings were taking place and that, you know, a process of consultation would come forth.

But I must take a step back before that, Mr. Speaker, and say that the introduction of the motion is such that initially it was not a consultative process. The consultative process only became to be in being after the fact in regards to trying, you know, smoothen the situation out. And I thought we were at the stage of getting a little bit open, you know, to try and come out with a point where the government side makes strong points on their arguments on what is useful for procedures, and we'd make our own points in regards to what was useful for procedures. And I looked at the whole bell-ringing incident as something that was already in the past, you know. We were back here sitting down and trying to figure out a strategy on how to handle this, you know, at the best . . . at least try at a consensual level, which is the usual practice of rule changes in the House.

And my own feeling as a member sitting in with the discussions was, you know, coming out with these basic points. And I must recall that we discussed about the possibilities of bell-ringing being limited to two hours, and other details to be worked out on that, you know, was a first point, you know, that was made in our discussions.

The other one that we did talk about was question period to be extended to 45 minutes. And I think part of that, Mr. Speaker, comes to be that when we did go out to the field, we felt that more public input into the issues of the public could be brought about in connection with the bell-ringing, and in connection to providing a greater scope of questions to be brought into the House.

(1915)

And we thought, you know, that's possibly a debatable point on both sides, but it's something to discuss and bring forth, you know, a lot more questions. Because a lot of times I know that as I was watching we were always cut off on debates and so on, and you know that sometimes a few of us got a little bit long-winded in questions and answers and stuff like that, and that indeed . . . but in most cases I saw that the practice was one where the questioning was not bad at all on both sides, and the answers not bad at all on both sides, and the answers not bad at all. But the important interchange of information that was taking place between that was such that you had to lengthen the time to 45 minutes. So that was, you know, talked about and discussed, and I thought we'd

have an open forum where we could discuss this with the Justice minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — The other one that was on the point of agenda in regards to this bell-ringing was that we suggested that there should be an opposition day with a notice for the topic of debate to be given the previous Friday. I know that in certain parliaments and legislators in, I think, within our country, and elsewhere in the world, have this type of feature where you give a little bit of advance notice on a weekly basis on one specific day where, you know, a particular point of debate could be brought into scope. And again, that would be a point of, of course, debate on both sides as to how useful this might be in the long run.

But most definitely it would then begin key issues of people into proper perspective on a weekly basis at the legislature, and there would be a specific point in the week where there would be concentration on major issues of the week. And I thought that was, again, to be a debated point on either side. But it was part of the bell-ringing proposal that was here today, as I listened with our other caucus members.

The other one that was very important and, of course, I looked at the other aspect of regular tabling of documents. I know that as yourself, Mr. Speaker, you do regular tabling of documents on how to perform a business on a daily level, and you know the very importance of keeping on time on stuff. And you also know the very importance of the debates that take place in the legislature, that the information is there, and that the information is tabled at a proper time. And sometimes we were seeing the tabling of documents being two years behind, and that. You know, why not have a more or less regularized schedule where there might be, you know, up to six months after the end of the year we could table these things and debate them on . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I believe recently there was a previous member who was more or less going through the list of rules and elaborating on each one like you are doing. And I understand from your remarks that you have an interest in it; however, I don't think this is the proper forum to have a general discussion of rules, which it certainly sounds like you're doing that. While you might use some for examples, I don't think we want long debates on them, and I'd like you to shorten your remarks and examples. . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Order. Order, order. Order, order, order. Order. I'm going to once more repeat to the hon. member from Cumberland, this is not a forum for a general discussion of rule changes in the House. That is the gist of my argument.

An Hon. Member: — It sure is.

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. Rule 33(1) discusses bell-ringing. It is not . . . Order, order, order, order. It is not an opportunity to discuss all rules in the general sense. The member from Saskatoon South, I'd just like to ask him to refrain from the interruption. We

discussed this, I believe it was yesterday, with hon. members and I'm just repeating what was repeated then.

Mr. Goulet: — I'll respect your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and maybe restrict my comments on the different points that were raised. So I'll make sure that they are not long at all, Mr. Speaker. I'll just make them as a point of reference.

Mr. Speaker, the other aspect that was brought about was the public notice of order of government business on a weekly basis. That's another point that was made. The other point that was made was to have a timely response to orders for returns and oral questions. There was also some committee suggestions to talk about sitting time and Crown corporations, etc., and so on. I will leave that aspect then, Mr. Speaker, and proceed to talk about the — the summation of my talk.

I would say that over all, Mr. Speaker, I saw the bell-ringing, number one, that we are talking about, of course, is not isolated from other historic processes of rules that are made from time to time in the House. There is a set procedure on rules that have been made prior to this new proposed rule change, and there's been agreed upon principles in regards to process.

And one of the things I would say in regards to process is this, Mr. Speaker, is that the process of consultation, which my understanding is, on both sides of the House, where a great degree of consultation is supposed to take place, hasn't really taken place in regards to this particular rule change.

Many of our members have stated, and I would like to state that it appears to be, you know, ramming down a particular rule simply because the government sat as a majority. The fact that they don't enter into a debate on the particular motion shows that they are not really that interested in debating the point, but basically just passing it and hoping that very little debate has happened on it. And so I see a contradiction in regards to the call for a democratic process, but at the same time it does not appear to occur in this case on the bell-ringing rule.

The other thing that I mentioned quite well in regards to the connections of the rule changes to substantive issues of which the privatization debate was part of this. And I would say in conjunction with the process there, Mr. Speaker, that the participatory democracy aspect where we involve the people . . . and I made a point, I said that the government side of the House must have learned from us in regards to — during the bell-ringing session — when we went out to see the people, because they seem to be following our example. Mind you, I think our example is tough to beat in regards to the great degree . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, we had a great degree of involvement of people; we had people involved in the process of petitions, and we had people involved in the process of meetings, and it was a Saskatchewan people's approach to dealing with Saskatchewan issues.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And because the tradition of a mixed economy approach is a very important aspect to the people's democracy in Saskatchewan, a lot of people

voiced us to . . . made a strong position to us as we went around to the community level. They said, make a strong stand; don't give up too easy. And I think a lot of us would have come back a lot earlier than we did, but I think a lot of the people wanted us to make an important point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And we met that important point, and the important point was that the practice of getting democracy at the people's level, combining it with our legislative strategy, and that's the checks and balances that we always like to talk about.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And I really feel that as we debate, at least on this side of the House we're debating it, Mr. Speaker, these are the major points I would like to make.

In a concluding remark, Mr. Speaker, I tried to get a sense . . . I always in debates, I always want to get a feeling of rationale. You know the rationale for role change and the rationale for the government. I must state, Mr. Speaker, that the rationale, as it sort of reflected to me on the media, was very disappointing. I thought that the government would be at least a little bit better in responding to the people's actions.

I thought that they were trying to ignore the people's message, the people's message on saving our public utilities. I thought that they were trying to ignore that. Another member said it was like a knee-jerk reaction because the people made such a big gain and a big impression to the history of this province when they made such strong stands, and the interconnection of it to the bell-ringing, that many people really felt that it was time to make this stand.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And as I looked at the other points we wanted to deal with many of the issues, Mr. Speaker. As we go along, we want to deal with many of the issues that are outstanding. Some people, for example, they said we've got such a heavy taxation load, we want to deal with the taxation question; many people say that, whether in gas, whether in liquor tax, smoke, and so on. So everybody wants to get back into the issue.

People want to get back to unemployment, the deficit, you know, the family issues, the family farm issues, and so on. People want to get back to these things. And a lot of people are saying, maybe this government is out of touch.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Maybe this government doesn't have a good feel in regards to what people are saying out there. Maybe this government is losing touch with the issues of the people. And that's a central message that I get. And I will leave that as a central comment in my general, you know, closing statement, that I think that in the past two weeks during the bell-ringing session it showed me that when the people are confronted with an issue, people will stand up. People will stand up and say, enough is

enough.

People are saying that it cannot happen this way; you've got to make a strong stand. So we made a strong stand, and now we're back in the legislature debating a limiting rule that would possibly limit us to make strong stands in the future. And who knows, if the government changed, Mr. Speaker, then it would be them that would be the opposition next time. And I believe that they would want the bell-ringing rule, you know, brought back when I'm pretty sure that they're the opposition next time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say a few words in my own language. And before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this: you know, from time to time in the legislature I make my comments in Cree. I think for the benefit of the listeners out there, Mr. Speaker, I do that in due respect to all the languages of the province of Saskatchewan, and also to mine.

I would like to add, too, that sometimes some people wonder what I am talking about when I am speaking in Cree. I would like to state very clearly that I treat the content of the English language in the same way as I treat the content of the Cree language. I try and pay the respect that the House is due, in both English and also in Cree.

So I'd like to make that point, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes I think people wonder, in regards to my talk, because I do know that there are some Cree speakers that are listening out there in the audience. I want to make sure that I do not disappoint them in regards to the issue at hand, in regards to the debates that are taking place, because for me it's very important, as a person being involved in education, that the information that is required to deal with the debates of the House are brought forth, straightforward, and brought out as clearly as possible in the Cree language.

(1930)

I would like to state that, Mr. Speaker, because I know sometimes some people have wondered in the past of what I am saying, but I do know that the language will be in the historic record. It'll be there for people to do research in Cree language and dealing with substantive issues in the Cree language. So I am very careful in regards to what I do say in my own language because, as I said, I am as respectful to my language as I am to English.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.)

Mr. Goulet: — I guess, Mr. Speaker, I guess in final comment, I made a sort of a short summary of the talk that I did do in regards to Cree in a differentiated-type order, but very much the same type of comments that I made, you know, when I was speaking in English. So I would like to state that I strongly oppose that motion then, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, the item that we have before the House at this time, of course, is the government

motion dealing with the changing rules of the Legislative Assembly. This change in the rules, Mr. Speaker, comes about because this government does not want to deal with this matter in committee, but wants to bring forward their own interpretation of how the rules should be changed without any discussion in a committee, aside from this Chamber, as has always been done in the past.

It is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of sadness that I rise to take part in this debate. I have been associated with this Legislative Chamber now for many years, and it gives me a heavy heart to take part in this debate. I remember as a teenager watching the debates in this Legislative Chamber, and I was impressed by what I saw. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think what I saw at that time influenced me later in my life that I should partake in the political process and see if I could do some of the things that I felt the people on the floor of this Chamber were doing for Saskatchewan people.

(1945)

In all the time I've thought about this Legislative Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I have never, never thought that I would see happening what this government is doing today. Never, in any thoughts that I had about this Legislative Chamber, had I thought a government would attempt to do what this government is doing today.

I want to review briefly my experience with rules committees in this Chamber. I want to go back to 1969. I was a new member of the Legislative Assembly, and you might say a side-line participant at the beginning, but in 1969 a rule change was made.

There was a committee set up; this is their report I have in my hand. It's the *Report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures of the Assembly, December, 1969*. And the Speaker of the Assembly at that time was Mr. J.E. Snedker, the member for Saltcoats. And Mr. Snedker chaired this all-party committee of the Assembly to look into the rules of the Assembly.

It was not done in 1964 or '65 or '66 or '67, but in 1969, after the members had been sitting in the Assembly for some period of time, had become experienced with the rules, and then they drew off a committee of members of this Assembly. It was made up of Mr. Snedker, as the chairman, the Speaker; Mr. Blakeney, the member for Regina Centre as the vice-chairman; Mr. Dewhurst from Wadena, Mr. Forsyth from Saskatoon Nutana South, Mr. J. B. Hooker from Notukeu-Willow Bunch, Mr. W.S. Howes from Kindersley, Kerrobert-Kindersley, the Deputy Speaker; and Mr. Lloyd, Mr. W.S. Lloyd, Leader of the Opposition, the member for Biggar.

Mr. Loken from Rosetown was another member; Mr. Weatherald from Cannington was another member. And the staff to that committee was Mr. C.B. Bev Koester, who was the secretary; Mr. G.L. Gordon Barnhart, who was the secretary as well; Mrs. Small and Mrs. Doan were stenographers.

I might say about the staff to this committee, Mr. Speaker, these are recognized experts in their field, and they both, Mr. Koester and Mr. Barnhart both served this Chamber

well in the years that they were here. Mr. Koester was ... attesting to that fact that he served us well, he later became the Clerk in the House of Commons at Ottawa, and of course we all know the Mr. Barnhart has recently become the Clerk in the Senate at Ottawa.

So we have established here a committee from all sides of the House to consider the rules of this Assembly. And that's the way it had been done for many years prior to that. And I make only reference to the committees where I was a participant, either in the House or in the committees.

It's interesting to note in the presentation of the report, Hon. J. E. Snedker, chairman, MLA, Saltcoats, who was the Speaker, made this report to the House in presenting the report of the committee.

Honourable members: I have the pleasure to present herewith the Report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly appointed by a Resolution of the Assembly dated February 17, 1969, to consider and report upon the advisability of making changes in the Standing Orders and procedures of this Assembly.

And this other paragraph is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, and I know you'll be interested in this one.

It has been a personal satisfaction for me to have had the privilege of occupying the Chair of a Committee whose members laboured diligently and harmoniously in their study of the various problems relating to procedures of the Assembly, and whose deliberations have resulted in the recommendations embodied in this Report.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee, (and it's signed by the Speaker).

In 1969 I was a relatively new member in this Legislative Chamber, and I appreciated that report that that committee, that all-party committee, set aside from the heat of the moment on any particular issue, had time to deliberate and consider what should be adaptations for the rules to run this Assembly. There was no rash move to change the rules in the Assembly or to change the rules arbitrarily. There was co-operation, and as the Speaker said, a harmonious relationship among the members of the committee.

In 1976, Mr. Speaker, I have here a report, it's the *Third Report of the Special Committee on the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly, November 22, 1976*. And I must admit that I was more intimately involved with this committee than I had been with the previous one, and as a matter of fact, I served as chairperson of that particular committee. And it concludes by saying:

The first two reports of the Committee may now be supplemented by the recommendations in this report. As before, the Members of the Committee contributed their valuable time and consideration, aided by excellent staff support to prepare this

presentation.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, consideration of the rules down the road a bit from the first committee, which is in 1969, now 1976, considered by an all-party committee outside of this Chamber, deciding what amendments, if any, should be made to the rules of the Assembly. It worked well. Members were satisfied with the procedure. There was no rush, no pushing, no shoving. There was respect for the parliamentary system, and the rules reflected that.

Later, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to chair a further committee of this Legislative Assembly. And their report was tabled on April 21, 1981, and in this particular report I want to read the letter of transmittal which was from myself to the Assembly. And it's addressed as follows:

HONOURABLE MEMBERS:

I have the pleasure to present herewith the Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly appointed by a Resolution of the Assembly dated May 3, 1979 to consider and report upon the advisability of making changes to the rules and procedures of this Assembly.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the members of this Assembly, in their wisdom, drew off a committee from all sides of the House, where the committee met together, and I have the names of the committee members here. And I'll just review them briefly for you. The members of the committee were: myself; the member from Kindersley; Mr. Banda; Mr. Allen; the member for Souris-Cannington; Mr. Engel; Mr. Hammersmith; the member for Qu'Appelle; the member for Meadow Lake; Mr. Mostoway; Mr. Pepper; the leader of the opposition, the present Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Skoberg, and the member for Maple Creek.

Now I notice that some other members are interested in getting into the debate from across the way, especially the member for Melville, who has addressed us with some of his rulings earlier today. The member from Melville had an opportunity — I know he wants to read his newspaper, which he has before him now, and is thumbing through it — you should read the headlines, Mr. Member from Melville, it would be of interest to you. You should also read the auditor's report that relates to those headlines.

I gave the member from Melville and the member from Weyburn an opportunity to get into this debate just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker. I held my seat waiting for them to rise and take part in this debate. Neither one, neither one — and they're both talking now, Mr. Speaker — they're both talking from their seats right now. With disrespect to the parliamentary system, they're both talking now, attempting to make a contribution which they know won't be on the record, won't be on the record of this Assembly.

I want to get those members on the record of this Assembly, and they'll get an opportunity maybe tomorrow after I finish my comments to get into the debate, along with the member from Regina South who is also now chipping in. It seems to be a disease that cabinet

ministers have over there because there's a line of three of them; they're all in the cabinet, and they're all the ones that are trying to ramrod this through. They're all the ones behind this business about the public accounts and the auditor. They're the ones that are disrespectful of the parliamentary system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can get back to my comments after being rudely interrupted by those members opposite, I want to read the final part of the letter of transmittal. And, Mr. Speaker, if at any time . . . Mr. Speaker, if at any . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order, order, order. Order. I think everybody's had their opportunity, perhaps more so, and let's allow the member from Saskatoon Westmount to continue his remarks.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. The letter of transmittal reads in the second paragraph:

The Committee has laboured diligently in its study of the various matters addressed by this report. It has been a great personal satisfaction for me to have had the privilege of occupying the Chair of a Committee whose Members worked harmoniously while exhibiting qualities of earnestness and perseverance. The deliberations of this Committee have been marked by a spirit of compromise and fellowship and have resulted in the recommendations embodied in this Report.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee, (and signed by the chairman).

So, Mr. Speaker, we have another committee, the third time in my experience in this legislature, where an all-party committee was established to decide if the rules of the Assembly needed amendment, and in fact they did need amendment in all three cases. The amendments were brought forward and accepted in the spirit of parliamentary harmony, as close as we can get to that in this Chamber which has strong feelings about political subjects and which sometimes interfere with their parliamentary views.

And I think it's important that we not let our strong political feelings interfere with the parliamentary process and the best due process for all members of the Assembly.

In 1987 a further attempt was made to establish a rules committee. That was six years later than the last one I referred to here, Mr. Speaker. The attempt was unsuccessful.

And I was interested in reading the remarks of the member for Kindersley just May 11 this year, just a few days ago when he was speaking on this particular resolution that is before the House, this motion that is before the House at this time. And it's interesting to note that the minister from Kindersley suggested that this House should set aside a committee again, and it should be made up of members of both sides of the House and that they should attempt to establish some rules.

One of his paragraphs particularly caught my attention

and it was this. It's on page 1,083, May 11, 1989, where the member from Kindersley says:

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the opposition says, why this way? Why not use a traditional process of the legislative committee to look at the rules? Mr. Speaker, we did that last year.

Well it wasn't last year, Mr. Speaker. The member for Kindersley is incorrect. It was 1987 that that was done.

We attempted to find a common ground with regard to limits on bell-ringing, and the committee broke down . . .

He says:

We attempted to find common ground with regard to the limits on bell-ringing, and the committee broke down . . .

As if to say the fact that we couldn't find agreement on bell-ringing was the reason the committee broke down in 1987.

(2000)

If a member wants to check the record, all they'd have to do is go back and look at the documents with regard to the 1986-87 committee which was unsuccessful in coming to a conclusion.

A number of research items were put before that particular committee for study: the oral question period; the length and the guide-lines; the legislative auditors in Canada; Legislative Assembly television distribution; television in legislative committees; guide-lines governing television coverage of the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly; comparison of sitting hours per week and the number of sitting days per year; parliamentary calendars; motions for return and written questions; time limit on speeches; selection or election of a Speaker; time limits on division bells — there was a research paper on that particular matter, Mr. Speaker, which doesn't surprise anyone — tabling of documents; radio questions; committees, business done; committees, characteristics; estimates processed; opportunities for private members' business.

Disciplinary powers of the Chair; tabling of *Public Accounts*; timing of budget presentation — two issues that were causing some concern among members in 1986-87, for good reason — comparison of practices respecting the requirement for the royal recommendation on money bills and motions; decorum, a subject which is still of current interest, I'm sure, to all members; recognition of third parties; introduction of guests; review of order in council appointments; confidence; legislative . . . or rules respecting oral question period in Canadian legislatures; answers to questions asked re: broadcast.

Item 29 was proposals put in by the New Democratic Party, and paper no. 31 was proposed amendments to the Legislative Assembly respecting committees and hours of sitting.

The committee was unsuccessful in coming to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, not because of the question of division bells ringing, but for a number of reasons. And there were a number of issues before that committee. Even if you go back to 1980, Mr. Speaker, when the previous rules committee sat, the matter of division bells was on the agenda then.

And I'm reading from the minutes, minute no. 7, May 14, 1980. This is some of the minutes that led to the 1981 report which I referred to earlier. Mr. Speaker, on that particular day, May 14, item 4 on the minutes states:

The committee considered the matter of the length of time that division bells are rung in preparation for a recorded division in the Assembly. The committee deliberated and agreed to stay with the present practice.

So it was considered in the committee in 1980, and it was considered in the committee which was unable to successfully complete a report in 1987-88.

These attempts at amending the legislative rules of the Assembly were all done outside of the Legislative Chamber, away from the tension, the political tension of the Legislative Chamber, with all members coming to a consensus, or as near to a consensus as was possible under the circumstances, and bringing back a report to the legislature, which in pretty well all cases was accepted by the legislature. And that's the way rules were amended in the past. But today we're faced with the government's intention to force this resolution through the Assembly.

It's interesting to note in the comments in the Assembly on May 11, 1989. The member for Melfort made a contribution towards the debate a few days ago, and it's interesting to note that he talked about privilege. He talked about privilege in the Assembly and he quoted what privilege was, and I'm assuming that he quoted it accurately, Mr. Speaker, because it's attributed to:

Beauchesne's, in the Fifth Edition, quotes Erskine May, in the 19th Edition stating what privilege is. And I quote, Mr. Speaker: (the member from Melfort said)

. . . Privilege is the sum of . . . the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge (their duties) their functions . . .

The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers." They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without the unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its Members and the vindication of its own authority and its own dignity.

There ends the quotation with regard to privilege. I hope that all members can keep this definition of privilege, not

only for members but to the servants of members who work in this House, who work for the members of this House. Because in days to come, as in days in the past, from time to time we will have to make decisions whether the privileges of the Assembly or its servants have been abridged by occurrences in or outside of this Chamber. And we should all keep that in mind.

The member for Kindersley, in debating the motion . . . There was one other peculiarity of his comments that day, the first one suggesting that the previous committee which aborted, aborted because of the bell-ringing, which is not true. And to leave that inference in the record doesn't add to the facts in the situation. But I read the member from Kindersley's remarks very carefully from beginning to end, and then I went back and I read them again. And the member for Kindersley said, the bells are ringing. Well, referring to the bells rang, and he made reference to that, and that's all he talked about. He never said one word — not one word — about why the bells were ringing.

First of all, I don't believe that we should be making this rule change in this Chamber. I think that is harmful of the parliamentary process. And I'll get to that subject later, about parliamentary process, and the political process, and how it operates. But I don't think that it's in the best interest for us to be amending the rules of this House just by the numbers you've got in the House. It requires perseverance and compromise to change the rules. The member from Kindersley, in all his remarks, never mentioned why the bells are ringing.

If we're going to consider changing the rules about division bells ringing, for a complete understanding of it we must know the context in which this came about. Why did this come about? It's only logical, it's only rational, it's only reasonable that we know the absolute context by which this situation arrived upon us. And the bells rang for a number of days.

In any case, in any case, no matter when the bells . . . The last time they rang for a long time, I believe, was six hours, and the minister from Kindersley mentioned that. And I don't believe there's a straight comparison between the two; they're apples and oranges. One is one situation and this is another situation. There is no comparison between the two.

But leaving that aside, the minister quite honestly said the bells rang when he was a member too, and he was one of the ones that was ringing the bells, and I accept that. At that time it seemed to be a long bell-ring, but times change.

Now why were the bells ringing? The bells were ringing, Mr. Speaker, because this government said it was going to sell off or privatize Sask Power Corporation, gas division, which is known now as SaskEnergy. They said they were going to sell it off. Now what has been happening? Obviously our concern was raised, not by this particular issue but by a number of steps leading up to this particular issue of selling off Sask Power Corporation, SaskEnergy gas division.

The first one occurred a few years back when this

government sold off a drag-line in the coalfields. And they sold this drag-line — and this was a \$45 million drag-line; this is just not an average coal shovel — this is a \$45 million drag-line. They sold that drag-line off to an Alberta corporation called Manalta Coal.

Now in order to make the deal attractive for Manalta Coal — this was their first privatization of any significance in SaskPower, the first privatization — in order to make it attractive for Manalta Coal, they said, we'll sell you the drag-line for \$45 million and we'll guarantee your loan. The Government of Saskatchewan will guarantee your loan so that you can buy it. And furthermore they said to Manalta Coal, this company from Alberta, they said, we'll give you a contract to dig coal; we'll let you dig coal.

A few years later they sold off the Coronach coalfield for over a hundred million dollars to Manalta Coal of Alberta. They lent them \$89 million to help them make the deal of over \$102 million, and the assets were valued at in the neighbourhood of \$129 million. The assets were severely undervalued for the sale. They give them a guarantee; they lent them \$89 million; then they give them a 30-year contract to dig coal for Sask Power Corporation.

Now our members protested this sale of the \$45 million drag-line. They protested the undervalued sale of the coalfield at Coronach for \$100 million and the deal that went with it. But we were then, at that point, faced with the spectacle of an Alberta corporation using our drag-line to mine our coal to sell to us to burn in our power house so that they could make a profit in Alberta.

Now that's . . . in today's context, this is small potatoes, you know, it's \$45 million and \$102 million. But it's getting worse, Mr. Speaker. It's getting worse with this government selling off parts of Sask Power Corporation. And this is what led to the bell-ringing; this is what led to it. People have got to grasp that.

Recently they sold off natural gas deposits — again, grossly undervalued — for \$325 million to Saskoil. Saskoil now is a private corporation. At one time Saskoil was a Crown corporation, but this government privatized it, and within two years of them privatizing it 75 per cent of the preferred shareholders resided outside of Saskatchewan. The preferred shareholders are the ones that get the dividends, Mr. Speaker.

So of the millions of dollars of dividends that are paid by Saskoil, 45 per cent of it goes out of the province of Saskatchewan, where before it stayed in the province of Saskatchewan — it stayed in the province. That again was alarming to the members of this Assembly.

So finally the government says, well, we're going to sell off SaskEnergy, which was the gas division of Sask Power Corporation. Their promise had been that they would never privatize SaskPower or SaskTel because they're public utilities. And the minister in charge of Sask Power Corporation when the Bill was before the House to create SaskEnergy out of Sask Power Corporation, to split it off from Sask Power Corporation, he was asked directly if the purpose of that was to sell it, and he said no. The minister said no.

(2015)

Well they've sold it off; they're attempting to sell it off. They're attempting to sell it off. The legislation is before this House now — and that's Bill 22, Bill No. 22 and associated Bills — when the members of this opposition arrived at this point, the government saying they would not sell off SaskPower, but continuing to sell it off, bigger piece by bigger piece; each few years they're selling off another piece of Sask Power Corporation — we said, it's time to take a stand. And the members of the Assembly rang the bells and they went out to talk to the people.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all the time the government was saying, oh, it's not our intention to ever sell SaskPower off, and all the time they were selling off a \$45 million drag-line; a coalfield worth over a hundred million dollars; gas reserves well over \$325 million, probably several times that amount; and now selling off Sask Power Corporation, all the while saying they're never going to sell Sask Power Corporation.

Now that gives new meaning to the saying, if you can't be good, be tricky — if you can't be good, be tricky. Because that's what this government has done. This government, all the while it was doing this, was masking their moves with advertising. They had a massive advertising campaign, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They had advertising in SaskEnergy, they had advertising in Sask Power Corporation, they had advertising in the privatization department, in the millions of dollars — in the millions of dollars.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was home last weekend and I got my power bill, and I'll be darned if in my SaskPower bill there wasn't a little something about privatizing SaskEnergy. They've included their little bit of propaganda with the power bill which goes to all the people of Saskatchewan. They've got advertising dealing with SaskEnergy, our share in the future. Well we own it all now.

Then they've got another one. You send in for information from SaskEnergy. Then they've got announcements about public information meetings. All kinds of advertising — radio, television, newspaper, billboards, literature, you name it.

Even, Mr. Deputy Speaker, calendars. Would you believe it? SaskEnergy designed a calendar. I think it must have been one of the cabinet ministers that designed this calendar, because it leaves a lot to be desired. They've redesigned the calendar so that it's exactly reversed from the regular calendar you would expect to use and which people have become accustomed to use.

This was sent to all the customers of Sask Power Corporation. The printing was done by Mercury Graphics, of course, which is a very good friend of this government. Mercury Graphics got the contract to do the printing, and it's estimated that this calendar cost in excess of \$300,000. This is what's going on in SaskPower and SaskEnergy. This is why we're ringing the bells, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we think this has gone on far too long. Someone has to take a stand, and that's what we did.

I suspect, if we're ever successful in getting the information on this calendar, we'll find out that it cost a lot more than \$300,000, because there's other costs have to be taken into consideration.

What did the public think of this bit of advertising by SaskEnergy? Well here's a citizen in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* on January '89, and it reads as follows:

A large envelope from our newly-formed Crown corporation, SaskEnergy, was delivered to our home recently. It contained a big glossy calendar. Nice, but I couldn't recall ordering one. I appreciate the gesture, but this is a subliminal way of advertising, a business expense in hope of generating sales. It doesn't concern me when independent businesses wish to advertise this way, but it does concern me with recession and fast-approaching depression in this province, a Crown corporation which I interpret as owned by the people, the taxpayers, feels it must advertise by sending a calendar to every customer. SaskEnergy is a monopoly.

And here I digress for a brief moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because when these members were on this side of the House, they say you shouldn't have monopolies advertising. It's unnecessary for monopolies to advertise. Now I don't know any other gas utility that's in operation in the province other than SaskEnergy.

To get back to the letter, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

We can't get natural gas service from anyone else, so why bother to advertise? It's our tax dollars they are squandering. If they have so much excess money to spend without . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I believe the rule under discussion is rule 33, a rule on the bell-ringing, and I have . . . I'm having a little difficulty understanding how a debate on SaskEnergy relates to the bell-ringing. I ask the member to . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — I appreciate your comment, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to relate it quite closely. You will note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I said there were some reasons why we rang the bells on this corporation — why we rang the bells. And you will recall, although you weren't in the chair at the time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I remarked that we're having a motion thrust through this Chamber by the government arbitrarily, which says they're going to change the method by which the division bells are rung. Now I said it's improbable and unlikely and unreasonable to ask members to discuss a change in the rules without discussing why are we changing the rules; what caused the changes in the rules.

Now I've gone through, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I realize the member for Weyburn can use this as well — I've gone through some of the reasons. I said there was a drag-line sold for \$45 million to an Alberta company, to Manalta Coal of Alberta. There was another sale of over \$100 million of coalfield to the same company in Alberta, Manalta Coal, so they can make a profit. So those

companies . . . and the member for Weyburn should listen to this, because he's quite vocal when he's on his seat.

I don't know, there's some misconnection. He should see his horse doctor about that, because he's got some misconnection. Every time he sits down he starts talking, and I can't understand what it is. You should see a vet about that; he should see a vet about that.

Now here we have this spectacle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of a coal company from Alberta, using our shovel to dig our coal to sell to us to make a profit on us for Alberta. It doesn't make much sense to me. It doesn't make a lot of sense to me. And after that you get to natural gas which was another sell-off.

These are the reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we're ringing the bells, because each excess of this government, each excess of this government gets worse than the previous one. It's like the member for Weyburn; every time he speaks it gets worse. Each excess gets worse. When they said, we're selling SaskEnergy, we said, we're ringing the bells. That's why we're ringing the bells.

That's why they brought in this motion of theirs to ramrod through this Chamber, contrary to the historic background of this House, at least in my lifetime, of having rules committee meet outside of this House, aside from the heat of the moment. They're trying to ram something through here, and this is antidemocratic, it's antiparliamentary, and the people should know the reasons why this government is ramming that legislation through.

I don't intend to let this government motion go by without telling the people exactly why the government's doing this, because in a year or two, whenever this government calls an election, the people are going to have to make a judgement. The more information they have — and I want to talk about freedom of information later, because some of the members over there have talked about freedom of information — but for the time being I want to talk about this citizen, this citizen of Saskatoon who is very upset because this government was advertising, in effect, the privatization — this was the run-up to privatizing SaskEnergy. And this is exactly what they're doing, exactly what they're doing.

This lady goes on:

If they had so much excess money to spend without consulting us, why not just give us a credit on our next bill. SaskPower or SaskEnergy, it doesn't matter to me (she says).

An Hon. Member: — It makes too much common sense.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Right. Well this lady is probably common sense. She lives in Saskatoon. There's a lot of people like that up there. As a matter of fact, most of the electorate in Saskatoon have a lot of common sense, and they showed that in the last provincial election. They showed that in the Eastview by-election, and they showed that in the federal election. They've got a lot of common sense in Saskatoon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This lady goes on. She says:

In fact, I already have four calendars from private firms.

And I want to say, I got one of these too, Mr. Speaker, and I already had mine from the Minister of Urban Affairs, which I look forward to each year, to get.

An Hon. Member: — I get one from the minister of crop insurance.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes. Yes, I get one from the minister of crop insurance too. But I got one from the minister of crop insurance; I got one from the Minister of Urban Affairs, and I get so little from him that I like to get his calendar; and then I get one from SaskEnergy.

But this lady, she was a little upset because she already had four from private firms, and she gets SaskEnergy's on top of that. It's part of the expense here.

Okay. Can I return this one to SaskEnergy? Send me a credit. Besides, it's one of those silly calendars. Oh here's how she describes it:

It's one of those silly calendars with the days of the week running down the left side. You have to tilt it sideways to understand it, and the days are not boxed, which makes keeping track of daily appointments totally confusing.

So I think it was the minister in charge of Sask Power that designed the calendar because you have tip him on edge recently to understand what he's talking about, to get an understanding out of the guy.

So this is the same with the calendar. You got to tilt it on edge. And I'm sure you got one too, Mr. Deputy Speaker; you got one of those calendars, too.

One other interesting tidbit (the lady goes on), I couldn't find the name of the company that won the contract to print the calendar. I asked a friend who is in the advertising business, and it seems that his firm was not on the list of businesses for this lucrative contract. This must have been an oversight.

No, no. I'll tell that lady right now, it's one of the facts of life. Mercury Graphics has got it in the corral; Mercury Graphics has got it in the corral because they know the government, and they get those contracts.

At least the calendar he gave me had scenes of Saskatchewan on it, unlike the one from SaskEnergy. Perhaps the government feels it was not in the interest to remind us of the poor farming economy, or the fact that we can't afford to spend weeks at our favourite resort, and that some of us are seriously considering leaving this province due to the unemployment or sheer disillusionment with the government.

Well this is in January 1989, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and there have been over 9,000 people leave this province — most of them since this lady wrote this letter. So it shows you how the diversification and privatization program of this government is working. It's driving the people out of this province, just like their calendar. It's irritating people; it's irritating people.

The lady goes on:

In conclusion, does this letter have a cynical or disgruntled overtones? You bet. And I want the government to know how I feel.

(2030)

Well, there's another letter from Saskatoon dealing with this same issue, another irate taxpayer. And this person goes on, and I'll give you the names if you want them:

Like many households, ours has been deluged this season with all sorts of calendars coming from various sources representing a variety of causes. Most were free and now occupy the haphazard confines of the untold junk drawers situated throughout our home.

At one time calendars were doled out sparingly and selectively by earnest but always serious and sincere business people. They give calendars to cherished friends and customers who were appreciative of the gesture, more often than not actually hung the things despite their sometimes glaringly commercial appearance.

But today, as is the case in so many areas of our lives, the practice of moderation has been abandoned and now even calendars are delivered in bulk. A good, cheap tradition has been cheapened to death, first by the present day excesses and now by the government.

SaskEnergy, apparently aiming to convey its name, phone number and *modus operandi* to a captive audience, chose to do it this way by designing this calendar.

Mine arrived recently, and in a weak moment I felt duly impressed. Unfortunately, I was fresh out of rooms suited for hanging calendars. Since everyone I knew had one just like it, I couldn't give it away. It was only through sheer luck that I found a place for it.

Flipping through the calendar, I stopped to admire the Crown corporation's expensive, high-tech logo with the small print underneath revealing a startling fact: Saskatchewan Energy is Saskatchewan's natural gas supplier.

These are the guys who keep my house warm in winter. Naturally I headed straight for the furnace room. Chuckling to myself, I wondered how I hadn't thought of this in the first place. Sure enough, folded once, the calendar was just perfect to shim up a wobbly corner of an old cabinet

which housed my growing collection of calendars. Though I was successful in finding a use for my calendar given me by SaskEnergy, I doubt many of its 270,000 other customers were so fortunate. That's why, however, the original intent, the good intent, I consider this calendar program to be pure and utter tripe.

And that's quite parliamentary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What an abhorrent, shameful waste of taxpayers' money.

And I happen to agree with Mr. Kardash. The previous person that wrote was Miss Wood. So this is what the government is doing — massive advertising. The calendar is only a small pittance of the advertising they're doing.

This government, in a four-year period, has spent \$46.6 million on advertising. From '84 to '88 it spent \$46.6 million on advertising. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, much of that was spent on Sask Power Corporation, Sask Government Insurance, SaskTel — SaskTel, \$6.1 million in four years. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the date that this return ended was March 17, '88. You will be aware of the fact that Sask TeleBonds advertising came out after that, came out after that. So you have to add another 2 to \$3 million of advertising costs on top of the Sask TeleBonds.

The Sask Power Corporation energy ads which were flooding the paper have occurred by and large since this time, since this time. As a consequence, the figure for Sask Power Corporation would have to be raised by probably a couple of million dollars. And the advertising goes on.

This government has no shame, no shame when it comes to advertising. They are shovelling the advertising money out to Dome Advertising and Roberts & Poole, their friends in the advertising business.

Wouldn't you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, love to get 4 per cent on \$46 million? Wouldn't you love to get 4 per cent on 46 million? Maybe even if you only got 1 per cent, maybe if you just got 1 per cent on \$46 million you'd be set, you'd be set for life. Now I'm sure some of that money finds its way back to its benefactors. I'm sure that that happens.

The advertising goes on; the advertising goes on even in the face of this government sending the SaskEnergy legislation to a special committee they set up. The headlines, May 5th: "SaskEnergy media campaign promised." May 5th: "Sask Tories rev up utility privatization campaign." May 6th: "SaskEnergy media blitz going ahead." Well they promised it on the 5th, and it's going ahead on the 6th. Yes, and those are both articles in the *Star-Phoenix*, and the other one was from *The Financial Post*. So the advertising goes on, on and on and on.

That's why the people are ringing the bells, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they're fed up with this government and how it directs the economy; how it directs SaskEnergy and SaskPower; how it directs SaskTel. But for the benefit of this particular discussion here, they're upset about Sask Power Corporation. That's what ticked them off, Sask Power Corporation. And the advertising goes on.

The minister of privatization awhile back went on a personal road show around Saskatchewan. And I'm sure he took officials with him, and people to answer the questions for him. And he was all around on his road show around Saskatchewan. He came back. Yes, he came back and he said, now the people are informed. They know all about SaskEnergy.

And they went ahead, they went ahead with their scheme to privatize SaskEnergy, which is Bill 22. And that's why we rang the bells, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Because this government is spending excessive amounts on advertising. They're reversing themselves. They said one thing; they do another thing. That's why we're ringing the bells. That's why we rang the bells.

And the advertising goes on. The advertising goes on. I have SaskEnergy officials . . . Now the next one, Mr. Chairman, you'll be quite aware of this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I see the member's got his crop in and he's back here now, and he wants to get in to the debate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you just wait your turn. Maybe tomorrow you can get into the debate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it could be. You just keep it up. You just keep it up; it could be. Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you see the arrogance, you see the arrogance of those members over there. You see it every day, and it was never worse than it was today, never worse than it was today, and the people are our witnesses. They will attest to that. The arrogance of this government has reached new heights.

And it's reached new heights in their advertising. They have now set up . . . they decided they didn't get the message across with the minister's travelling road show around the province about SaskEnergy. Apparently he didn't answer the questions, so now they've set up the SaskEnergy officials. These are the bureaucrats, and I call this the bureaucrats' travelling road show which is going around Saskatchewan.

And I attach no blame on the bureaucrats. I don't attach any blame on the bureaucrats. Their master told them, you get out there and you attend those 80 meetings in rural Saskatchewan and you tell them how it is. And so far the people are giving them a resounding answer to their bureaucrats' travelling road show.

Some attendances ran up as high as 50 at meetings, but the norm is 12 or 15 or 11 or 6 — some of them very low attendance. And the newspapers are having a field day about this. I don't want to embarrass the officials any more, but I think this government should be embarrassed about it; it should definitely be embarrassed about it.

Here's some of the advertising they've done. Here's some more of the advertising they've done. SaskEnergy has sent out a letter, and I got this one from a citizen in Battleford, Saskatchewan. And I was there. I walked in and he came home; he came home and he opened his mail. And he had two identical letters. And he opened them, and they were from SaskEnergy, and the identical letter was in both of them — the identical address, the identical postal code, the identical name.

And it's a letter from O. W. Hanson, president and chief executive officer of SaskEnergy. And he is also . . . This person I'm becoming suspicious about. I don't attack the bureaucrats at a lower level, but this person I'm becoming a bit suspicious about because what he says here in his second paragraph:

It is to be distinctly understood that SaskPower is not for sale.

Now what makes me suspicious? Well I have a letter here from the Premier to the PC Party membership, and his second paragraph reads:

Let me make one thing very clear. SaskPower is not for sale.

So here we have a citizen in Battleford, Saskatchewan, gets two of these. And the second paragraph says, same in both letters:

It is to be distinctly understood that SaskPower is not for sale.

This is from Mr. Hanson, the president and chief operating officer.

This one is from the Premier to the PC membership in Saskatchewan. The second paragraph reads:

Let me make one thing very clear. SaskPower is not for sale.

And it's signed by none other than the Premier.

And you'll notice something else, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you got one of these, and I certainly hope you did. You might be on the outs with the Premier, but I'm sure he sent them to everybody, no matter who you were. It says:

Return to (and I'm quoting) Hon. Grant Devine, Premier of Saskatchewan, c/o of Government Caucus Office, Legislative Buildings, Regina, Saskatchewan, S4S 9Z9.

And what is on the corner? There's a postal slug on the corner and it's 3-1-4-1. And I bet if you were to check this out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you'd find that 3-1-4-1 means that the taxpayers of the province were paying for this letter to be returned to the Premier. Yes, you send them a letter.

And he's still following that ridiculous theme that he tried to establish a while ago that SaskPower is not for sale. He's attempting to establish that theme: it's not for sale. He repeats it in his letter to the membership, which the taxpayers are paying for the return postage on — and they probably paid for the outgoing mail too — but they're paying for the return postage.

And the president and chief executive officer of SaskEnergy has the same paragraph in it. It's distinctly understood that SaskPower is not for sale. They're not in precisely the same wording, not precisely the same wording . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Acting Speaker, the point of order I raise, to state it clearly, is that the member opposite is off the topic, is not on rule 33, the question whether the bells should be allowed to ring indefinitely at the whim of the members opposite. That is the question here. The member is off the topic. Not only is he off the topic, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but he is showing, for a former Speaker of this Assembly, no respect for this Assembly, for any rules, or for the people of Saskatchewan. And at some stage even the members opposite must have respect for the rules of democracy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — On the point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to make it clear that the reason we're dealing with this rule change motion has nothing to do with the opposition members. I want to make it clear that the government brought the motion, as they have for a number of days now, rather than deal with farm Bills and farm issues, rather than dealing with the plight of the unemployed in this province and out-migration, rather than dealing with welfare recipients that that minister is treating ill-ly in this province. We come here day after day and deal with an issue that you choose, namely bell-ringing as it relates to SaskEnergy — that's why the bells were ringing. Because SaskEnergy, which is part of SaskPower, was put on the auction block by your government, the people were very upset. They told us, they told . . .

(2045)

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I believe that the member from Regina Elphinstone is getting into debate. If he'd just like to state his point, I'm willing to listen and then make a ruling on it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I appreciate that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'll get to my point, but there was a lot of yelling and hollering, and I had to make the point over and over again. But the reason that we're dealing — the reason my colleague is talking about SaskEnergy as it related to the bell-ringing is the reason we rang the bells for 17 days was because of the sell-off of SaskPower, SaskEnergy. So how can you possibly disconnect bell-ringing and SaskEnergy. I think it's perfectly in order. That is what the whole debate in the province has been about for the last month. Now if the members opposite are saying they don't want to talk about SaskEnergy and bell-ringing, then take this stupid motion out of here and we'll deal with the issues that people voted us to come here . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Order. I've listened to the point of order, listened to the member from Regina Elphinstone. I've been listening to the debate and I find that we have allowed the debate at times to far exceed the reaches of rule 33, the bell issue, and I would ask the member from Saskatoon Westmount to relate his debate directly to rule 33. We've been on to advertising. I

realize that SaskPower and SaskEnergy are part of the issue, but let's relate it to rule 33.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your guidance and I certainly want to relate this to the subject under debate. The letter I was reading from has on it SaskEnergy, and that's the reason we're ringing the bells.

The Premier, in his letter, which he sent out probably at taxpayers' expense and which the postal slug on the corner indicates that people will send it back at taxpayers' expense, it mentions SaskEnergy in it. It mentions us, not in glowing terms mind you, but it does mention us. And the Premier's stop-the-bells campaign is on here as well. I don't know how successful that's been, Mr. Speaker, but I haven't heard much about the stop-the-bells campaign. Maybe it was late getting untracked and going . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Could be.

Now I wanted to say one other thing with regard to this SaskEnergy letter, and this is the reason we're ringing the bells, the member for Melville. The member from Melville is so anxious to get into this debate that he's leaping to his feet on points of order. He should try to organize his thoughts so that when I do sit down eventually, he will be ready to go.

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, anyone who understands the language of this country, by listening to the member opposite, would know that he is off the topic. Again he is showing no respect. Again he is off the topic. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have already pointed out to him that he should be on the topic; that there are rules in this Assembly. There are members on the government's side who are prepared to stay on the topic, and I submit that if the member opposite does not stay on the topic, he will have to take his seat and cease and desist.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Just on the point of order being raised by the member, once items are raised for debate it seems to me that it's a fair subject for debate. And I want to point out that the Minister of Justice, in making his comments and moving the motion, dealt or made reference to issues such as an unpopular budget, bilingualism, capital punishment, immigration policy, nationalization or privatization policies, interest rates or monetary policy, and that the Minister of Highways, in seconding the motion, dealt extensively with the 1975 potash debate.

And it seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if those subjects are proper subjects for debate in the context of this motion, then surely the question of SaskEnergy, that prompted this motion, is surely an appropriate subject for discourse. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — I've listened to the point of order, and as I mentioned before, the debate has been far ranging at times, and I've asked the member from Saskatoon Westmount . . . and I will allow the member from Saskatoon Westmount to continue to speak and relate his comments to . . . (inaudible) . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — My problem, Mr. Speaker — and I admit that I succumb to the temptation — when the member from Melville baits me, I sometimes respond, and I apologize to the House for that. I'll try and direct my remarks to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where they should be directed, and if you catch the member from Melville baiting me, I would appreciate it if you'd try and stop him.

I was talking about the letter from SaskEnergy which this person in Battleford, Saskatchewan gave to me. He was able to keep a copy because he got two of them. So out of curiosity, I phoned my wife the other night in Saskatoon, and I said, did you get the SaskEnergy letter from the president and chief executive officer? And I said, because we're down here and we're in a little trouble with the government because we've been ringing the bells, did you get that letter? And she said, oh yes. She said, not only that, I got two of them. I got two.

Now I don't know whether SaskEnergy sent me one, and SaskPower sent me one just to make sure, or whether they sent one to me and one to my wife. I'm not sure how to figure this out. And perhaps if members like the member from Melville get a chance to speak in this debate, they can explain why some people got two or three calendars, why I got two of these SaskEnergy letters, and why my friend in Battleford got two of the same letters — the identical letters. I've heard of other people getting more than one.

This is the kind of advertising that's going on at taxpayers' expense. The Premier's advertising at taxpayers' expense and now we have this . . . The president of the university is the sort of the hand-picked travelling show of the Premier's. It's a hand-picked commission by the Premier of this province.

The question that arises . . . Oh, there's one other thing I wanted to say about the bureaucratic travelling show that's going around. I don't want to forget this, because I believe the government was saying in its press releases related to this bureaucratic travelling show which is going around explaining something that the Minister of Privatization was incapable of explaining to the public, the bureaucratic show is going around now attempting to explain it in about 70 meetings around the province which will be very costly, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

There'll be rental fees, and I imagine they'll put on coffee for the folks. They've got the slide presentation as well, and they'll probably have two or three officials at each of the meetings. So this will be quite costly.

And one other thing that the Premier, through his designate — well, I guess I can't call it the Premier's designate — but it's the Progressive Conservative Party, and I think he is the Progressive Conservative Party in this province, recently sent out a memo. This one is on the Progressive Conservative Party letter-head, and it goes to all riding executives, dated May 11, '89. And it's from the executive director of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan.

And just to keep on the topic here I want to say it's: Re: SaskEnergy Public Meetings. This is the topic that caused the bell-ringing. This is why the bells are ringing. It says: Re: SaskEnergy Public Meetings. The executive director of the Conservative Party says to the riding executives as follows:

As you are no doubt aware, SaskEnergy will be conducting public information meetings in your area in the next few days. Your association has been contacted to (and get this, Mr. Deputy Speaker) get our members out there to these meetings. (Get our members out to these meetings, and that's a direct quotation).

I cannot stress enough the importance of using these public meetings to get our message across.

The rest of it is not too complimentary to the New Democratic Party, so I won't indulge in it. But I think the operational part of this, directed to the riding executives, to 64 riding executives around the province from the executive director, this is right at the top of the PC Party, telling them to get their members out to those meetings and use the public meetings to get our message across.

Now the success . . . This was sent out on the 12th. When did the Elbow meeting occur?

An Hon. Member: — Four days later.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Four days later. So that it obviously had its effect, because there was six people out, I think, for that meeting. So obviously the whole Tory executive got out to that meeting at Elbow. Maybe it was the whole membership. It says, riding executives.

So they obviously . . . and then there probably were some innocent bystanders at the meeting too. So you could calculate maybe there were three of the riding executive from Outlook at the meeting, and maybe three public people that were interested in trying to find out something that they couldn't find out from the minister of privatization a while before that.

It is important that some people get to these meetings because I think there's some questions that have to be asked of this travelling bureaucratic road show.

Some of the questions that have to be asked are such as these. How much is your corporation paying to advertise the fact it is being sold? Well I suspect the answer to that would be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Now I don't know whether the bureaucrats will have that information at their fingertips, but it's a question the public should ask and should be able to get answers for.

And I think maybe they should ask the bureaucrats if they shouldn't maybe be back in Regina, or wherever their home base is, doing the job that they were supposed to be doing, rather than out there pulling the government's chestnuts out of the fire. I think they should maybe be back in their own areas working for SaskEnergy rather than working for this government.

But then again the government put them on the line. They

said, get out there and do that job; we're your boss. And they're doing it with taxpayer's dollars.

There's many other questions that I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan will be asking this bureaucratic travelling road show, and I am sure that members of the Conservative Party, those that still have the stamina and are not totally disillusioned by the actions of this government . . . Because I know some are disillusioned because I got some disillusioned Conservatives signing that petition.

So there's a lot of them that won't be on the executives. They won't want to get out there and ask questions and make use of these committee meetings and get their message across. It doesn't say what the message is, by the way, it just says get out there and get our message across.

So we have the Premier's hand-picked commission to study SaskEnergy. So the Premier's hand-picked commission . . . and why did this hand-picked commission occur? Well I'll tell you how it occurred, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We got fed up with this government selling off Sask Power Corporation; we dug in our heels; we rang the bells when they attempted to sell SaskEnergy. The bells rang; the government finally backed away from it. They said well, we'll pull the legislation back temporarily and we'll set up this commission. We'll set up this hand-picked commission of the Premier's to look into these Bills and receive public hearings. So we have the special panel which is looking into the SaskEnergy sale. It's interesting to note who's on that special panel. I don't think that all the people in Saskatchewan know at this time who's on this particular panel.

(2100)

Obviously, somebody has to be the chairperson of the panel, and that is Regina university president, Lloyd Barber. Lloyd Barber is the chairperson of this three-member, special panel. It's interesting when the government has got this special panel out there listening to people, and it occurred because we rang the bells in this legislature which this government wants to change so that we can't do that in the future. They want to change that. So they have President Lloyd Barber. And what is Mr. Barber's philosophy about privatization?

I wonder about the desirability of appointing . . . putting Mr. Barber in this position. I don't suppose he could have put him in that position just by forcing him. I imagine Mr. Barber must have agreed to go along to be the chairperson of this committee, but Mr. Barber is a charter member of a new group in Regina which . . . or in Saskatchewan which is the Institute on Public Enterprise, I believe it's called. And the chief aim of the Institute on Public Enterprise is privatization. That is their aim.

Privatize, privatize, privatize. It's like the Fraser Institute in B.C. Its aim is privatize, privatize, privatize. And since Mr. Barber is a charter member of this Institute on Public Enterprise, it's difficult for me to believe that he can divest himself of his strong philosophical views about privatization in order to be the chairperson of this three-member special panel, which has been hand-picked by the Premier of this province to hear

representations on the privatization of SaskPower, the gas division, SaskEnergy. I find that difficult to believe that Mr. Barber can do that. But I suppose we'll have to wait and see because the government is ramroding this through. Regardless of what we say, they're ramroding this through.

The second person on this commission is Kathryn Ford, a Saskatoon lawyer. She works for the law firm of Robertson Stromberg, and I think we all know where the sympathies of Robertson Stromberg law firm lie. And Kathryn Ford herself is of a similar political persuasion as the principals in the firm.

An Hon. Member: — Who will that be? Who will that be?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, they say money talks. And it says that Kathryn Ford, the second member on this three-person panel, hand-picked by the Premier, in 1987 donated \$1,150 to the Conservative Party. I know Kathryn Ford; she's a very nice person, but I find it difficult to believe, as much as I may stretch my imagination, I find it difficult to believe that Kathryn Ford can separate herself from her strong allegiance to the Conservative Party. Now she may be able to do that, but I kind of doubt it.

And this three-person panel which we're talking about, of course, occurred because this government brought in legislation which rang the bells. And that's the reason this three-party-committee was set up. And the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster might not have made that connection yet. I know he's busy counting and learning how to count, and once he's mastered that he may be able to master the reason why this three-party panel was set up. It was set up because this government attempted to ramrod the legislation through this Chamber, which would privatize Sask Power Corporation.

Now you see, Mr. Speaker, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster is putting me in the position where I'm going to have to respond to him if you don't sit him down. Now I don't mind if he walks around and counts the members on that side, because he's not too good at it. He's fouled up twice recently on counting the correct number of members on that side, but as long as he walks around and keeps quiet, I don't mind. It's another indication of the arrogance of members on that side of the House. That bothers me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And it should bother the people that are interested in the parliamentary system in our province, in preserving it. And I for one, and I think I've laid out my history . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, I enjoin you to join me in controlling the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I know he may be uncontrollable, but we'll do our best.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see you back, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, while you were out briefly, I was reviewing some of the reasons with the members about why this three-person panel is being set up. And needless to say, some, but not all the members, understand the reasons why this panel was set up. It has to do with the sale of Sask Power Corporation gas division, SaskEnergy.

This government has made up its mind that it's going to have another sale in Sask Power Corporation. It's had several already. It sold the drag-line for \$45 million in a sweetheart deal to an Alberta company. They followed that up by selling the coalfield for over \$100 million to the same Alberta company, and it sold off the gas reserves for over \$300 million.

Now this government is insisting that Sask Power Corporation sell off the gas division at probably many millions of dollars more than any previous sale, and we're not interested in seeing this utility pass — probably within a couple of years — pass into hands of people outside of Saskatchewan. That's why we're ringing the bells, and that's why this Premier finally got the message when we were ringing the bells, and he backed away from his legislation a little bit.

He hasn't disowned it, because he says it's coming back. And the minister in charge of SaskPower says it's coming back. And what he's done, and I think to assure a favourable report, is to select a hand-picked committee which will tour the province. And I've questioned, and I think it's right for me to question, as a member of this legislature who's charged with the responsibility of looking after the resources of the people of Saskatchewan, to question whether these members, the first two of which I've mentioned, can separate themselves from their strong and demonstrated allegiance to first, privatization, and secondly, the Conservative Party.

I think that the majority on the panel, two out of three, are going to be unable to separate themselves from those strong allegiances. Keep in mind that president Barber was a founding member of the Saskatoon . . . or the Saskatchewan institute on private enterprise, and that Kathryn Ford was a contributor, well over \$1,000 to the PC Party, and her law firm is a beneficiary of an awful lot of Government of Saskatchewan work — potash corporation, and others — so that the law firm gets a lot of work from the people of Saskatchewan, a lot of money from the people of Saskatchewan through this government and through their Crown corporations. I question whether they can separate themselves from those allegiances to give us a balanced report.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The third member of this three-member special panel, hand-picked by the Premier to bring in a report, which is supposed to be balanced, and to hear representations from Saskatchewan people, is a man by the name of Ken Sarsons.

I know that he used to be in the province of Saskatchewan. I don't believe he lives in the province of

Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, now. I am not sure, but I could be wrong on that, but I don't think he lives in the province of Saskatchewan now. And that concerns me because of the people that I'd like to see on this panel are Saskatchewan people who don't have a demonstrated bias. If we must have a panel, Saskatchewan people who are representative of the people of Saskatchewan who don't have a demonstrated bias.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Otherwise, reason would lead me to believe that we're not going to get an unbiased report from this three-person committee.

And what will be the consequence of that, Mr. Speaker? Well I am not sure what the consequences will be because I don't have a crystal ball; I can't look into the future. But I think I could make some reasonably accurate guesses at what might happen. And I've been around political life enough in Saskatchewan to be able to come reasonably close on a political guess.

If that committee brings in a bias report which says, sell SaskEnergy — and that's the reason the bells are ringing, because of this government's attitude about selling SaskEnergy, which is part of Sask Power Corporation — if they bring in a report that says, yes, Mr. Premier, you were right; aye, aye, sir; we salute; you should sell SaskEnergy; and they'll give some reasoning which they say supports the case — I predict that when that report comes in, the Premier will come back and he will be hoping, by that time, that he will have stopped the opportunity for people to protest in the manner in which we did — and I think we did it justifiably. I think he will, having rammed this motion through the House, then he will be free, when the committee brings back its report which may be biased — may be biased — he will then ram that legislation through this Assembly.

He will ram through that legislation to sell SaskPower, which is the fourth big sale in Sask Power Corporation since he became the government in '82. This is the fourth sell-off, all the time maintaining that fiction by himself and his people who do his bidding that this is really not SaskPower that's being sold, like he says in his letter to the PC membership in Saskatchewan: "Let me make one thing very clear; SaskPower is not for sale." And then his president and chief executive officer of SaskEnergy says, in the second paragraph, precisely the same paragraph: "It is to be distinctly understood that SaskPower is not for sale." Two letters from two different people saying SaskPower is not for sale.

If they are the type of people that can attempt to maintain that kind of a public fiction when all the time they're making sales — one, two, three, four multimillion dollar sales — they will have no hesitation in ramming that legislation through this Assembly, no hesitation whatsoever. That's why we rang the bells.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2115)

Mr. Brockelbank: — This kind of unauthorized sale of

Sask Power Corporation has got to stop, and the people out there say it's got to stop. The people have told us. They said, the Premier has no mandate to sell this off.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well I must move on because I know that some other members across the way will want to get into this debate when I sit down.

I want to talk about democracy. I want to talk about democracy a bit. And I've had a long experience with democracy in this province, and I find that I get along fairly well with it. I've accepted its judgements at one time, which I didn't find altogether palatable, but I accepted it. And we all have got to suffer a defeat sometime, and that's part of the democratic system.

An Hon. Member: — Sometimes we all suffer it.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes. And the Premier may have to suffer defeat, and some of his legislation may have to suffer defeat sometime, as happens to our government when we were the government — some of our legislation suffered defeat. We may have showed less aggressiveness about it than the present government. This present government is loath to back away from a bad piece of legislation.

We actually had the understanding and the feeling of Saskatchewan, so that when we did have some legislation before the House which was not in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan — that was very seldom — that legislation was dropped. It was dropped.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And I recommend that course to the members opposite, otherwise they'll go to their political graves with their legislation in their hands. That's fine with me. That's fine with me if they wish to do it.

But as I said earlier, it's with a heavy heart that I see this kind of motion before this House. It hurts me. I don't like it. I'm sure it's distasteful, and I'm sure it's even distasteful to some members on the other side of the House, and I'd be prepared to hear them speak on this issue if they wish.

This particular arbitrary government motion is a complete repudiation of the democratic principles which should govern this Assembly. I'm not surprised, Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that it is a complete repudiation of the democratic principles that should govern this Assembly. This motion before the House, by this government, adds to some other things that have already occurred under this government which are of much similar nature — the loss of the independent Electoral Boundaries Commission. It's gone.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — It's gone. It adds this piece of resolution before the House which will deal with the ringing of the bells in a division vote, also adds to the recent disclosures by the Provincial Auditor, who is a top servant of this Assembly, the observations of the

Provincial Auditor which were aired yesterday in the legislature and again today — this adds to the detraction from the democratic system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This action by this government adds to the government's willingness to sacrifice — and I say that seriously — to sacrifice democracy to salvage their narrow, ill-considered plans to sell off SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) gas division. That's what this adds to.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — While this adds, it also subtracts, Mr. Speaker, it also subtracts. I just want to refer to the statement of the minister from Kindersley. And this is a presentation that he made to the rules committee back in 1982 — this one. The member for Kindersley made a presentation to the rules committee and it's itemized as B-14. So if you go to the records of the Assembly, the Clerks will have all the B's right down to 14 and beyond. And this represents the view of the member for Kindersley.

An Hon. Member: — How would the public get a hold of that?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well the public can hold of this if they wanted to. I'm going to read the important parts to them, but if they want to read it all they can get in touch with the Assembly, and if they can't readily do that they can get in touch with me.

And it represents Mr. Andrew's views — pardon me, the member for Kindersley's views, the member who has given us lectures on the rules in this province represents his views. And he made representations in 1981 when this report was put before the Assembly. This was the last rules committee which met successfully outside of this Chamber and brought in a report on the rules which was accepted by this Assembly in 1981.

And I went back and I checked the debate in 1981 of the member for Kindersley and it's revealing what the member for Kindersley and . . . but you have to keep one thing in mind, Mr. Speaker, the member for Kindersley was sitting over here then, not over there. So keep that in mind when I refer to his remarks . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. Yes, he's gathered a few barnacles since 1981. I'm reading directly from the debates of the Assembly on April 21, 1981, under the heading reports of committees, rules and procedures of the legislative committee is the subhead and the Speaker is speaking, that's myself.

I want to lay on the Table the final report of the Special Committee on the Review of Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly, dated April 21, 1981.

And I referred to that, I don't want to go back and repeat it, Mr. Speaker, because I wouldn't want to be accused of repeating myself in this debate, because I have plenty of material to go on for an extended period of time, and it's

new material as you will see from this.

Now the members of the Assembly availed themselves of the opportunity at this time to speak to the tabling of this report and its recommendations contained therein. And of course the first speaker was Mr. Banda, the second speaker was Mr. Pepper, and the third speaker was the member for Kindersley. And he spoke for some length, but I only want to quote certain sections and I'll tell you where they are, Mr. Speaker, so that you can check them yourself. Page 2320, the member for Kindersley had this to say:

My view on the question of parliamentary reform is that our system must look at parliamentary reform in a much more aggressive way than we have in this report.

So the member of Kindersley was much more aggressive, at least he was talking in aggressive line when he was over on this side of the House, when this report was presented in 1981. And he goes on to say on the next page, the following page:

... What I would like to make is a submission I made, (the member for Kindersley said this on page 2321), what I would like to make is a submission I made to the committee which, I think, covers some of the areas I would like to have seen the committee move in.

And he goes on, he says:

Number one, and I think perhaps the most important area of political or parliamentary development that we need, not only in this province but in this entire country, is in the area of freedom of information.

This is the Member for Kindersley. If you'd heard him recently you wouldn't believe it, but here it is the printed word. And who's to question this?

I know the Attorney General ... (and the Attorney General at that time happens to be here) ... I know the Attorney General has expressed his view on that on several occasions. But, without that information flow from government through to the legislature and out to the people, parliamentary reform is very difficult. You need the information first before anything else can take place.

Well the Member for Kindersley had whetted my appetite by this time, so much so that I went and got his submission to the committee. This is the rules committee of which I was the chairperson. And I enjoyed refreshing myself by reading the remarks of the member for Kindersley at that time. What was the gist ... and he deals with his representations as he did in the debate but this is the original piece. The item entitled "B-14 — Submission to the Committee of Rules and Procedures," and it's got his name, MLA, there. And it says: Problem ... that's the way it starts out. I won't read it all, but I'll read the pertinent parts.

The government back-bencher has remained

acquiescent and reluctant to be critical of the administration or the bureaucracy ...

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And he goes on:

... that the fundamental basis of our system of responsible government, i.e. meaning that the legislature will control the public purse exists only in theory, and that meaningful reform cannot proceed unless a more meaningful information system is developed.

He goes on, "Proposals for consideration." He flies to new heights here, soars to new heights in parliamentary suggestions about how our committee should have been more aggressive.

There is a need for meaningful freedom of information legislation. Without this or a similar reform the debate in (and the scrutiny of) parliament will always remain ineffective. I believe this can be accomplished without sacrificing ministerial responsibility and individual privacy.

So the member from Kindersley was a hawk; he was a hawk on freedom of information. Now in retrospect, I look back and I say, here's the fellow that wants to ram this legislation through ... or this motion through the House about the bell-ringing on a division vote, was a hawk on freedom of information, until I thought, he says so much, but he does so little.

So I went back and I said, how did he do with the Conservative Party? Well here is the Conservative Party literature. And it says, "commitment." There's the Premier's picture there. And this particular leaflet, Mr. Speaker — I know you'll be interested in knowing — this says, "Elect Gay Caswell." And I must say something about my former foe, political foe from Westmount.

At the public meeting we held in Saskatoon dealing with SaskEnergy sell-off ... We had four very successful public meetings, Mr. Speaker, drawing over 4,000 people — 4,000 people into meetings in four places in Saskatchewan.

And the Premier must have got in touch with Gay Caswell for the Saskatoon meeting, and he said, like he said to the people, get out there and influence them, you know. That's like the executive secretary said to the executives around the province, get out there and influence that committee of bureaucrats. Make our views known there. The Premier must have called up Gay Caswell and said, get out to that meeting at the Holiday Inn. And knowing that she's on the cutting edge of Conservative thought in Saskatoon, this companion of the Premier's, who is with him through thick and thin, she was there and she brought all the Conservatives in Saskatoon with her. It was frightening. It was frightening; there were all five of them were there.

An Hon. Member: — How many?

Mr. Brockelbank: — All five. Well it could have been six, maybe it was five and a child. They were all there representing the Premier and they had their signs. And the people inside that hall — the 1200 people inside that hall or more — were certainly intimidated by have the Premier's personal representative there with the picket signs. But this is a free country, and I will fight to preserve her right or anyone else's right to protest, because that's exactly what we're doing right now. We're protesting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2130)

Mr. Brockelbank: — And the people of Saskatchewan are protesting. And this government is trying to ram it down their throats. What did this virtuous member from Kindersley say, and what did his party say in 1982? I'll tell you what they said because I've got their literature right here.

This piece of literature says, "PC Policies for Good Government", this is a heading, right here. And it's got, broken into three sections, "Tax-cuts" — I knew you'd get a laugh out of that one; "Government Management", "Concern for People", "Concern for People".

Under tax-cuts it says, roll back the gasoline sales tax. Well, it's . . . they sort of fell short on that one. They fell short on that one. As a matter of fact they said once they got the gasoline tax off, they said there'd never be another gasoline tax under a Tory party, so they actually broke their promise, because they get more revenue now in gasoline tax then we ever got — then we ever got.

Reduce provincial income tax by 10 per cent. Well, they put on the flat tax . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. The hon. member is introducing several topics into the debate, and I'm trying to ascertain how this relates to the present motion under discussion. I trust that the hon. member will be able to do that in a direct way, or cease discussing those issues.

Mr. Brockelbank: — You're right, you're right, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I won't even mention removal of the 5 per cent E&H tax which was another part of this.

I will get directly to the government management section, the government management section. And hear what it says, hear what it says in the government management section, because this relates directly . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. I have heard some unparliamentary remarks and I once more remind members not to use them.

Mr. Brockelbank: — The first one, the first one under government management — this doesn't say mismanagement, it says management, put in the positive form:

Ensure efficient management of Crown corporations and provide service at cost to the people.

Well the Crown corporation debt in this province has climbed from about 3 billion to about 8 billion under this government.

The rates have all gone up. But they say, "good government management." The next thing they say:

Consumers will be protected by a public utilities review commission.

Well as soon as the public review utilities commission stepped on . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I mentioned earlier to the hon. member that he's introducing various topics that he hasn't made evident are related to the issue under discussion. I once more remind him of the rule pertaining to that, and I'm sure he's aware of it.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will try to get to the point that I was making. And the point that I'm making is that there's been a complete breakdown in what the government democratically promised us. And this adds . . . is being added to by what the government's doing now . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Bringing in motions that will ram rule changes through this House . . . Yes?

And I just read the minister's remarks in the debate dealing with rule changes, where the minister said, he's a hawk on freedom of information. And freedom of information is in here, Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me for a brief moment.

The next item is:

Protect taxpayers' money by ensuring independence of the Provincial Auditor.

Now that one leaves me cold. Just what happened in the last two days, let alone the last two or three years, with the Provincial Auditor, shows that this government is undemocratic, not only on the Provincial Auditor but on the legislations they're attempting to ram through on the bell-ringing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Every year, if not every year almost every year, since this government's been in power, the budget of the Provincial Auditor has been reduced and his scope has been narrowed. And this is one of the items, an attack on democracy which is before this Assembly, just like this motion — just like this motion the government's attempting to ram through this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The next one, dealing with the preservation of democracy, and right on line with what the member for Kindersley said, is: open the books on government business. That's what it says here. I can't believe this. I can't believe these people have changed that much, because government business is a closed

book; it's a closed book now.

And finally, on this section which I'm only going to deal with, Mr. Speaker, establish freedom of information legislation. Freedom of information — can you believe that? This is the program of that member and his party in 1982, completely abandoned, completely destroyed in just a few short years. Every promise broken — every promise on that list of government management broken, and now they're adding to it more broken promises.

I'm depressed. I'm depressed, and I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan are depressed as well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, well I'm waiting for their speeches to find out where they stand on this issue. We want to find out where the members opposite stand on this important issue, Mr. Speaker, because this is an attack on the democratic system and the democratic traditions, not only of Saskatchewan but of our parliamentary tradition stemming from Westminster.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — We know, we have the full knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the defence of democracy is sometimes a costly, sometimes a costly thing. We know that. And it can be costly in many different ways, including political ways. We know that. But when the Premier says that he will not sell SaskPower or SaskTel, and then he begins multimillion dollar sell-offs of SaskPower, and their sales in SaskTel as well, all the time saying he will not sell them, you know, when the Premier breaks his promise, when the Premier has no mandate from the people of Saskatchewan, we'll ring the bells.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — When there are important issues at stake, and only, and only when there are important issues at stake such as this will we ring the bells. We will ring the bells whenever that occurs.

Now there are important issues at stake, Mr. Speaker, as you will be aware. And the Premier must think they're important as well, because he's staked so much of his reputation, his political reputation, on them. This is a test of wills. And we want to know, we should know whether whose will is supported in Saskatchewan. Well it's not difficult to figure out whose will is supporting Saskatchewan. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when the bells rang in April and we left this Legislative Chamber, there were no public polls had been taken with regard to these issues — not by us, and not polls of the significance of the polls that were taken after the bells had rung for some period of time.

We left this Legislative Chamber, Mr. Speaker, on a point of principle, on a point of principle. It wasn't because it was politically expedient; it wasn't because we had a poll, because we had no polls. We said that this has got to stop. The Premier has no mandate. He's gone too far.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, what is the public view on this? Well you only have to look at the polls that were

done, and there was more than one poll done. I have the one that was done by the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post*. I have the one that was done, paid for by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, which found that 71 per cent of those surveyed were opposed to the sale of SaskEnergy. And the members opposite scoffed at that, and they said, oh yes, well that's just a labour poll.

Well they can scoff at it all they want to. I hope they continue to scoff at those kind of polls because those will be the kind of polls that'll do them in. This poll for the Saskatchewan federation was done by a professional pollster, and it was backed up very shortly thereafter. The poll for the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour was Wednesday, May 3. The poll in the *Star-Phoenix* was released . . . well, the *Star-Phoenix* one is Wednesday the 3rd and so is the *Star-Phoenix* one, Wednesday, May 3. The one by the Federation of Labour was taken slightly in advance of that but was released on the 3rd; it was reported on the 3rd.

Now what does the poll show? Well, it shows that the Government of Saskatchewan in its plan to privatize, sell off SaskEnergy, was away off base, way off base.

The *Star-Phoenix* privatization poll, first question was: do you support or oppose plans to privatize SaskEnergy? Not SaskPower. Do you support or oppose plans to privatize SaskEnergy? You see, the pollsters saw through this and the public sees through this charade . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . this charade where the government says we'll never privatize SaskPower Corporation, we'll never privatize SaskTel; doesn't mean a thing to these people, it doesn't mean a thing. It's a deception practised on the public. The public can now see through it. The pollsters put it . . . They said, we'll never privatize it, so you're wrong. But the pollsters put it in the language of SaskEnergy. And what was the result of that? Sixty

— seven per cent opposed the privatization of SaskEnergy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And then the second question: do you support or oppose privatization in general? It's a general question about privatization. Opposed, 58 per cent — 58 per cent.

And the next question which really caught my attention was this one, Mr. Speaker. Do you support or oppose the privatization of PCS — that's Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, not power corporation. Potash corporation, entirely different entity, which is a Bill before this House to privatize it right now, Bill 20, where this government's going to sell off a valuable asset of this province to foreigners, by large part.

And the people were asked: do you support or oppose privatization of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan? Fifty per cent opposed it; only 28 per cent supported it. So that should tell this government something. They may even have a little tougher fight on their hands on Bill 20 as a result of this poll, because it's a pretty clear indication

the people of the province think that they're off base.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2145)

Mr. Brockelbank: — You know, it's important. In this poll dealing with SaskEnergy, it's important that they included Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in the poll. The reason the bells were rung was SaskEnergy, but the question was not only SaskEnergy but potash corporation as well.

That corporation, which could be the economic salvation of the people of Saskatchewan, is going to be sold off by this government under Bill 20. This is a corporation that brought in profit in the first few years of operation, from '76 to '81, of \$413 million. The actual investment in plant and updating, or renovations at that point, was only 418 million, and they made \$413 million of profit. What an investment that was, and it was owned by the people of Saskatchewan.

And it was interesting to note when Dr. Barber was picked from that institute on privatization to head up the Premier's hand-picked committee, another person on that same institute for privatizing in Saskatchewan made a statement about the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And he said, there's never been demonstrated to the people of Saskatchewan whether there's been any good to them directly from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Well, Roger Phillips, I have news for you. He's a charter member of that institute, and he's the one that made the statement. And he's the head of Ipsco, but that's another story, Mr. Speaker.

I'd love to tell you the story about Ipsco and its beginnings, and privatization, because that would take up a fair bit of time and you'd find it interesting. But I don't want to get off the subject and talk about that.

But Mr. Roger Phillips said there was no direct benefit to the people of Saskatchewan from the potash corporation. The people of Saskatchewan seem to think that it's a valuable asset because they don't want it sold. It paid, in 1980, \$50 million directly into the treasury of Saskatchewan by dividend; it paid another \$50 million in 1981 — \$100 million of dividends directly into the treasury to pay for things like health care, education, highways. No dividends to the people of Saskatchewan? Don't you believe the people from that institute when they tell you, when they interpret for you, what are the facts of life in Saskatchewan. Don't you believe that.

At the same time, the potash corporation paid \$271 million in taxes and royalties to the province of Saskatchewan, in addition to the \$413 million of profits. This is a magnificent operation, but I know you don't want me talking about that, Mr. Speaker, because I'm slightly off the subject there. And I'll get another chance to talk about that one later on Bill 20, and I'll deal with it more extensively there.

I want to get back to this poll, this poll which reflects the views of the public of Saskatchewan. Done by a

professional organization, this is by Angus Reid Associates, did the poll, and it's on May 3, reported in the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*. They go on:

Do you support or oppose the NDP tactics in the legislature?

And obviously they left that up to the people to decide what our tactics were. And I suppose the one that drew the most attention at the time was the bell-ringing. What did the people say? Supported by 49 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Now here's where that statement I made comes in, Mr. Speaker, that the defence of the democratic system sometimes can be costly. We made the decision to leave this Chamber and ring those bells because we thought that our political survival was superseded by the issue that was before this Assembly, namely the sell-off of that asset.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — That is a principle decision, and in due course we will find out whether it was a right decision or not.

The next question is: should there be an election on SaskEnergy? Well, 52 per cent of the people want an election on this issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, I might be able to convince my colleagues that if the members opposite were to put together an election package, put in it power corporation sell-off, potash corporation sell-off, and this ramrod effort of shoving the rule change through the Assembly, and we'll go to the electorate, I think I can convince them the Premier wants an election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — We'll show up John, we'll show up.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, we won't start the war till you get there.

An Hon. Member: — We will show up.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Right. And then the last question is a rather revealing one, Mr. Speaker. If an election were held tomorrow, which party would you support? Well, 54 per cent said they'd support the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And there's one figure here that I don't intend to report. People are going to have to dig out their old newspapers because it's too embarrassing for the Premier. It's too embarrassing for the Premier.

An Hon. Member: — We'll stop the clock. Come on.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, no, no, I'm not going to do it.

I'm not going to do it because this poll is dealing not with the popularity of leaders, but with the issue. That's what we're dealing with, the issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The issue is this government ramrodding the sale of SaskEnergy, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. When they can't get their way, they're ramrodding a rule change in this Assembly. They have no mandate for any of them. They have no mandate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And it would just be an embarrassment to the Premier to report the figures that show how he stacks up against the Leader of the Opposition.

An Hon. Member: — This is not a personality issue.

Mr. Brockelbank: — That's right. Well an article here, attached to this poll, says that the respondents want an election — NDP government favoured. And it reports in there about the popularity of the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition and talks about the poll. And it says: "The NDP has the backing of 54 per cent of the decided voters."

I don't think that relates directly to the issue at hand, Mr. Speaker, so I won't get into that, but the interesting part on this particular poll is the figures about the sell-off, and 67 per cent of the people said they don't want the government to sell it off.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Many of those same people said that they would like to have an election on this issue. They'd like to have an election. I said it costs to defend the democratic system sometimes. We're prepared to pay that cost. And that's where the cost should be assessed, Mr. Speaker, not here with this government ramming through a rule change — anti-democratic — should be done the democratic way with the electorate. And if the Premier wants to test that he can test that any time he wants.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — If we've made that error in judgement, then of course we'll pay the cost. Now it's not to say, Mr. Speaker, that all people were for us on this poll. I was a bit surprised a while ago, a very short while ago. I got a letter from the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association, and I thought, my heavens!, what can the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association be getting in touch with me about? I opened up the letter and lo and behold!, it said this:

For immediate release. (I felt offended because it wasn't the letter to me; it was just for immediate release. And it says) "Back to business" (in quotation marks) The Saskatchewan Stock Grower's Association urges the provincial opposition to discontinue the bell-ringing process

and get back to business. President Bill Yeast stated that the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association does not support the boycotting of parliament. It is irresponsible and non-productive to boycott the House while in session. The stock growers encourage elected members to get back to business and back to the issues.

And I thought well, you know, I'm a little offended that he issued me a press release rather than sort of writing me a letter and telling me to get back to work. But when he said to get back to business and back to the issues, I thought, well there's a glimmer of hope here. I'll maybe get in communication with Mr. Yeast, the president of the stock growers' association. So I sent Mr. Yeast a letter, and I said:

Dear Mr. Yeast: I have received your news release which states your association urges the provincial opposition to discontinue the bell-ringing process and get back to business. Aside from using a news release to advise me, which I find unusual, could you give me the thoughts of your organization on the business which caused the bell-ringing in the first place?

What are your organization's views on the Premier's stated position that his government would not privatize SaskPower (SaskEnergy) or SaskTel because they were public utilities? What are the views of your organization to Mr. Berntson's (pardon me, the member for ... I'm quoting the letter, I'm quoting the letter) Mr. Berntson's stated position that splitting off the gas division, SaskEnergy, from SaskPower was not for the purpose of selling SaskEnergy (that was on May the 9th, '88) which he is now attempting to do (which he is now attempting to do)?

What are your views on selling SaskEnergy when it made a profit in 10 out of the last 10 years, while the electrical division of SPC lost money the last seven out of the 10 years?

What are your views about the further extension of natural gas to rural Saskatchewan, a relatively very expensive capital and operational cost venture by a private owner of SaskEnergy? Would the program be curtailed and the price of natural gas rise rapidly in rural Saskatchewan?

Can Saskatchewan people trust the government to create a PURC-like regulatory body when they disbanded their own public utilities review commission shortly after creating it? I most sincerely solicit your organization's views about this important business.

He said, get back to business. Well I've got a response back from Mr. Yeast, and I know the member from whatever he's from ... who's got his crop in now and he's back in the Chamber, he's got his crop in. Mr. Yeast has responded to me, and you'll be interested in his response about the bell-ringing, Mr. Speaker. He says:

Re your letter of May 4, 1989 re our news release:

In response to your letter of May 4, 1989, the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association's news release of May 3, '89 regarding the discontinuation of bell-ringing was issued out of a request by our board of directors representing our membership.

Here's the next paragraph:

It is and always has been a belief of our organization that we support free enterprise, and thus the result of our decision to issue the news release to discontinue the bell-ringing. I sincerely hope my explanation of the situation is clarified for you. Yours truly.

Now the member of the stock growers' association, the president, sent me this letter. I sent him a number of questions sincerely soliciting his views. I sincerely wanted to find out what is their position on these important issues of the day.

And he writes back with a knee-jerk reaction, we're a free enterprise organization, period. Now that was one that disturbed me a bit . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

An Hon. Member: — That's the only 100 per cent support.

Mr. Brockelbank: — You can't win them all.

Another one which I want to comment on, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the chamber of commerce. The chamber of commerce recently elected a new president, and the chamber of commerce took up the issue of the bell-ringing in the Legislative Assembly. They voted overwhelmingly . . .

The Speaker: — Order. It being 10 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.