

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Estimates

Clerk Assistant: — Mr. Gardner, chairman of the Standing Committee on Estimates, presents the third report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee considered the estimates of the Legislative Assembly, Legislative Library, Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk and adopted the following resolutions:

1. Main Estimates to March 31, 1990:

Resolved, that there be granted to Her Majesty for the twelve months ending March 31, 1990, the following sum:

For Legislation.....3,920,500

2. Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1990, the sum of \$3,267,100 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

3. Resolved, that there be granted to Her Majesty for the twelve months ending March 31, 1989 the following sums:

For Legislation.....\$174,600

4. Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1989, the sum of \$174,600 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

5. Resolved, that this committee recommend that upon concurrence in the committee's report, the sums as reported and approved shall be included in the Appropriation Bill for consideration by the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I move, and it's seconded by the member from Saskatoon South:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Estimates be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martin: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and to other members of the House, some visitors from

Manitoba. Sitting in your gallery are 64 students, accompanied by Mr. Dyker and Mr. Marshall, a couple of teachers. They are from the Westwood Collegiate in Winnipeg. We often get visitors, Mr. Speaker, as you know, from many parts of the province, but not too often from Manitoba and surrounding provinces. So we're delighted to have them here today.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure why I was the lucky one chosen to introduce these folks from Manitoba, but perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it's because my wife went to Calvin High School. My wife went to Calvin High School in Winnipeg and perhaps that's why I was chosen.

But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, would we please welcome all our visitors from Manitoba. I'll have an opportunity to meet with them a little later.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Legislative Assembly, some 26 students from grades 1 through 4 from Creelman School in Creelman in my riding, Mr. Speaker. They're accompanied today by teachers and chaperons including Patty Reed, Karen Thompson, Colleen Foss, Susan Lind, Wendy Treble, and as well, their bus driver, Don Anslow.

Mr. Speaker, Creelman is one of those very vital and thriving communities across rural Saskatchewan.

I look forward to meeting with the students after question period this afternoon, and I would now ask all members of the Assembly to join me in extending a warm welcome to these students from Creelman, Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — It's my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you, sitting in the gallery opposite, in the west gallery, Mr. Brian Sklar, alias Captain Canada, who is the leader of the band Prairie Fire. And Brian, when he's working in this area, often comes in and visits the legislature, being interested in it. I'd ask you to join me in welcoming him.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the legislature, 13 grade 12 students who are sitting in the west gallery today. They're from Central Butte High School in Central Butte, which is the largest town, believe it or not, in my riding. They've been in for a tour of the legislature, and I hope that they enjoy question period. I'm sure you'll find it informative. It's putting in practice many of the things that you've studied about in your grade 12 history course.

They're accompanied by their teachers, Ron Wostradowski and Brenda Berry, today, and I look forward to meeting them afterwards for pictures and refreshments and, of course, questions on the aspects of

the legislature.

Please help me welcome the Central Butte students.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure and privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, 38 grade 5 students seated in the west gallery, from the town of Clavet, which is just south-east of Saskatoon.

They're accompanied by their teachers, Darryl Merilees and Judy Tamke, and chaperons, Lois Weins, Gail Wilcox, Glennis Koop, Karen Burnett, and Theresa Lindberg.

And I'll be meeting these people from Clavet at 3 o'clock on the outside lawn for drinks and for questions and so on, and I hope that they have a very informative and interesting afternoon. Please help me welcome them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to welcome the students from Clavet, and in particular Gail MacKenzie-Wilcox, who was a former colleague of mine. When I was a teacher at Radius Tutoring project, Gail was the co-ordinator or principal.

So I would like to welcome the students from Clavet, as well as Gail MacKenzie-Wilcox.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Problems with GigaText

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the minister in charge of SEDCO, and I want to go back to what we were talking about yesterday, Madam Minister, and that is in respect to the government's transaction with GigaText, the transaction of high-tech operation with a French-Canadian business man from Quebec. And I want to get down to the facts in which this government has blown primarily \$4 million of taxpayers' money and essentially has nothing to show.

Madam Minister, I refer you to the quotations of the Premier outside the House yesterday. Outside the Assembly the Premier maintained that the project was viable from the beginning and it's still being counted on to provide cheap method of translation of Saskatchewan statutes. He said he had it checked and there was good potential. But he went on to say, "It's exciting and it's fast and it's accurate." Madam Minister, I wonder if you could explain how accurate the Premier's comments were in light of the performance of this technology to date.

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the member, I would again make the offer that I made yesterday so that he understands the technology. If he would care, I will arrange a demonstration for him at GigaText.

With regards to the technology, it is new technology, Mr. Speaker. It deals with artificial intelligence. We have a great degree of confidence that the technology as described by GigaText will in fact work. But I would point out to the member that I would imagine that there were doubting Thomases when Alexander Graham Bell said what he would do with the technology that he developed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Madam Speaker, a new question to the same minister. Madam Minister, your answer flies in the face of the facts. I want to refer you to a article in the *Leader-Post*, "Private translators working on laws."

Unable to depend on GigaText's computer software to translate its laws, the government has already commenced getting the job done the old-fashioned way (and has entered into a contract with the University of New Brunswick).

Madam Minister, why don't you come clean with the people of Saskatchewan? Why don't you indicate that you have squandered — you have made a bad deal — you have squandered 4 million bucks, that your government has shown its incompetence, its mismanagement, and its waste?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker . . . Thank you, gentlemen. Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, again the member speaks about something he knows nothing of. He selectively, selectively quotes from the newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, the translation business across Canada is about a \$200 million business. We believe that the technology that is being developed at GigaText, once all the characters are keyed in, that this technology, artificial intelligence, will have the capability of translating our English statutes to French.

With regards to the translators, I will defer to the Minister of Justice under who that comes.

Mr. Koskie: — A new question to the same minister. Madam Minister, I say to you, come clean. All the evidence, all the documentation indicates that \$4 million have been squandered, \$4 million which essentially has gone into the pockets of the French-Canadian business man from Montreal, directly to his pockets.

I ask you, Madam Minister, if you're convinced that this technology works, I challenge you to table all of your feasibility studies that led you into this transaction. Will you table them? I challenge you to table them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, I would throw out a challenge to the member. Screw up your courage and come with me over to GigaText. They will give you a demonstration on what they are doing, and you will see what they are doing.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order, order. The minister has the right to answer the question. Unfortunately there are several answers taking place at the same time, but the one we want to listen to is the minister.

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will again say to the member that we have a high degree of confidence that the technology, the so-called artificial intelligence, the technology of translating English to French or vice versa will work — will work. And we would hope that by the end of June, mid-June to the end of June, you will have a demonstration. But again I would say, come with me. Screw up your courage and come and see what it is that they do downtown.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Authorization of Payments to Entrepreneurs

Mr. Anguish: — Madam Minister, we don't want to accept any more of your pretending pleas of ignorance on the questions we put to you yesterday. I would like you to tell us who authorized the payment from the taxpayers' money of \$35,000 a month so that Mr. Montpetit could rent a private jet from GigaMos air services, owned 100 per cent by Guy Montpetit? Who authorized the additional \$18,000 a month to Mr. Montpetit for travel expenses? And who signed the agreement between GigaText and Mr. Montpetit for a \$60,000 a year salary in addition to those other perks? Who made those authorizations, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a whole series of questions yesterday. Those questions, as I indicated yesterday, were best directed to the minister from CMB (Crown Management Board). The Deputy Premier is in La Ronge today and will be prepared to answer the questions tomorrow, provided the opposition is willing to give up about 10 or 12 minutes of question period. The Deputy Premier will be more than pleased to answer those questions tomorrow.

Mr. Anguish: — You're the minister in charge, you're the minister in charge of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order.

Mr. Anguish: — New question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. You're the minister in charge of SEDCO. You know what the answers are. You seem to indicate you have some information, and then you indicate you don't know when it's convenient for you not to know.

I'm asking you, who authorized the payments to Guy Montpetit: the \$35,000 per month for the jet that he owned, the \$18,000 additional per-month travel expenses to Guy Montpetit, and the \$60,000-a-year salary — who authorized it? You're the minister. Come clean with this House. Give us those answers today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, SEDCO took over the day-to-day operations of the . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order. Order. I think it's only fair and just that you allow the minister to answer, not to immediately interrupt her.

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated yesterday, Mr. Speaker, SEDCO took over the day-to-day operations of GigaText, I believe some time in March. The set-up of the company and the payments to individuals, the terms of their employment, were established long before SEDCO took over the day-to-day operations of GigaText. And as I indicated yesterday, I took notice on behalf of the Deputy Premier, the minister from the Crown Management Board, who will be prepared to answer the questions tomorrow.

Mr. Anguish: — Well let's try some more. New question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that if you were conscientious about your role, you would know the history of this great scandal that you just blew over \$4 million of the taxpayers' money.

Let's try some more questions about the expenditures. Who authorized the \$75,000 to a business associate of Guy Montpetit for the services rendered even before GigaText was incorporated? That's one. Who authorized the company's purchase of a condominium for Dr. Jean-Pierre Paillet at a cost of \$137,000? That's the second question. A third one would be: who authorized the acquisition of a Mercedes Benz for Dr. Paillet at \$8,573 a year? Could you tell us who authorized those payments, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, those are the very same questions that I took notice of yesterday. Yesterday I did indicate to the hon. member that the purchase of a condominium, the leasing of a vehicle were probably terms of Dr. Paillet's employment and used as means of getting him to Saskatchewan, as indicated in the article that the member from Quill Lake was quoting from.

Translators are in demand across Canada — Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, Regina, Vancouver — and it's very difficult to attract competent translators. So I would say, as I said yesterday, I would assume that those two conditions were conditions of the employment.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Before the hon. member begins his question, I have been listening to his line of questioning, and it seems to me that he's seeking further information on essentially the same question, and therefore, as we all know, the minister has taken notice. And you certainly have the right to ask further information, but not new questions on the same question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Madam Minister, could you tell us whether or not GigaText is today maintaining the payments on the \$137,000 condo, and on the Mercedes

Benz and, if not, when did these payments stop? You're the Minister of SEDCO; this is a current question today. Are public moneys still going into a condominium for Dr. Paillet and the automobile, the Mercedes Benz, that he needs to help him translate, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, they talk about squandering \$4 million, blowing \$4 million of taxpayers' money. These are the very same members, Mr. Speaker, who said that Weyerhaeuser will never build a paper plant in Prince Albert — there's a paper plant in production in Prince Albert. They said Gainers will never package bacon in North Battleford — there is bacon being packaged in North Battleford. They said that there would never be a fertilizer plant in Saskatchewan.

We invest in economic activity. We encourage economic activity in the province, and we maintain that we believe that the technology that is being developed downtown Regina, Saskatchewan, is valid and will work.

With regards to the payment, I'll bring that information back.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the same minister. I can't believe how you flaunt a scandal like this where taxpayers' dollars are being blatantly wasted and you make joke of it in the House.

An Hon. Member: — Shame, shame.

Mr. Anguish: — You should be ashamed of yourself. You're the Minister of SEDCO. I'm asking you now, Madam Minister, do you not know what's going on in your responsibilities? I'm asking you today: is SEDCO, or public moneys being used to pay for a condominium and a Mercedes Benz in the GigaText operation?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, the member chooses such inflammatory words like scandal, scandalous. It doesn't work. Mr. Speaker, the jury is still out on the technology. And we maintain as a government, that the technology is valid technology, that the technology will work.

Payment to Terry Leier

Mr. Lautermilch: — Madam Minister, I have a question to you as well. But I want to say: you're starting to look like a side-show huckster; but before we're done, we're going to find out which shell you've hidden the pea under — you can count on that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — My question to you is this, Madam Minister. I want to explore a little more fully the payment of \$5,000 to Terry Leier. You said yesterday that it was for legitimate board expenses. Now I want to know today if you still stand by that, and if you do stand by that, I want to

know if today you're going to table the invoices and the documents that would confirm your statement of yesterday. Can you do that today, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I indicated yesterday that there is an RCMP investigation on and that that . . . I indicated also yesterday that Mr. Leier received legitimate reimbursement for legitimate expenses incurred as a board member of GigaText — as a board member of GigaText. But here we have the usual tactics of the NDP under that leader, who calls himself a leader, the member from Riversdale, smearing a person's name, bringing people's names into the legislature with innuendo, false allegations. I indicated yesterday that Mr. Leier was reimbursed for legitimate expenses. The RCMP investigation is ongoing, and all of that is part of the investigation.

Mr. Lautermilch: — New question to the same minister. Madam Minister, it's clear you're not prepared to support your statements of yesterday.

I want to carry on with another question. I'd like to indicate to you, Madam Minister, that there's a court exhibit titled GM-59 prepared by the court-appointed inspectors in Montreal, Thibault Marchand Peat Marwick, and referred to in the inspector's April 28, 1989 examination, under oath, of Mr. Montpetit. And it's a list of some disbursements made by GigaText.

In it, it lists two payments to Mr. Leier, one on September 9 of '88 for \$4,000, and on September 26 of 1988 for \$1,000. In both cases, Madam Minister, the reason for the payment was listed as, and I quote, "represents."

Now can you tell us today, Madam Minister, what the term "represents" means in terms of legitimate board expenses? Why don't you come clean?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — I don't know. I wish you guys would get your minds out of the gutter.

I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that on September 9 Mr. Montpetit had signing authority for the company and would be making payment to employees, to board members. As was indicated yesterday, in late October, when we were made aware of the court case going on in Montreal, we immediately referred the matter of GigaText and our involvement in GigaText to the RCMP for full investigation.

Mr. Lautermilch: — I have another question to the same minister. Madam Minister, I would like to ask you this: surrounding the payments of exactly \$4,000 and exactly \$1,000 . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order, order. I'm having difficulty hearing the member.

Mr. Lautermilch: — I'll start my question again, Mr. Speaker, if it's all right. Madam Minister, I would like to ask you about these two payments to Mr. Leier. What do

you think the odds are that these expenses would come out to exactly \$4,000 and exactly \$1,000 for lodging and for travel? Are they all even figures and do they come all out exactly?

I mean, Madam Minister, I mean even to you, you should understand that this looks a little bit fishy. Wouldn't you agree to that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — No.

Mr. Lautermilch: — New question to the same minister. Madam Minister, the document lists that on August 2, disbursements to the other three directors, Mr. Montpetit, Mr. Waschuk, and Mr. Young, at \$3,600, \$3,604, and \$3,000 respectively. And in each case the reasons for the payment is listed as "miscellaneous director."

Now why do you suppose that the payments to Mr. Leier were listed as "represent" and payments to the other directors were listed as "miscellaneous director?" Can you perhaps explain that to the House, Madam Minister?

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, obviously the member doesn't listen. The matter of the government's \$4 million, the disbursement of the \$4 million, etc., has been referred to the RCMP for investigation, and that is exactly what is going on right now. And the matters that the member brings up, I'm sure, will be looked at as part of the investigation.

Further Payments to GigaText

Mr. Mitchell: — Minister, the fact that the RCMP have been involved in this case doesn't relieve you of your responsibility to answer questions in this House about the expenditure of public money.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — Now I want to ask you some questions that I think you're going to be able to answer — you ought to be able to answer, as the minister responsible for SEDCO. Aside from this \$4 million, the initial investment, could you tell us if your government has put any further money into GigaText or committed any further money, and could you give us the details of that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, as was indicated yesterday, SEDCO has taken over the ongoing day-to-day operations of GigaText, and I believe there is in the area of a half a million dollars from, I believe it was October or December.

Mr. Mitchell: — So if we're talking about half a million dollars, Minister, that, I take it, is an answer to the question I asked you that that's the amount that's either been expended or committed. And if that's the case, Madam Minister, would you care to explain why, on March 16 of this year, SEDCO gave GigaText a loan of 1.25 million — \$1,250,000 — secured by a mortgage against the condominium we've been talking about,

which was purchased by the company for Dr. Paillet. Would you care to explain that, Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that as part of the agreement with CMB to take over the daily operations, that a budget was set up and SEDCO would want to secure it with the mortgage of the condominium.

Mr. Mitchell: — Minister, this is a SEDCO loan we're talking about in March of this year; this is not a CMB loan. You're the minister responsible for SEDCO. Now will you stand in your place and confirm to us that there is in fact a loan of 1.25 million, and would you care to explain what that loan was all about?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Well I believe that the loan was taken out to continue the daily operation of GigaText.

Mr. Mitchell: — Minister, your answer doesn't square with what you said earlier.

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. The member is following a line of questions and he's not indicating whether new or supplementary.

Mr. Mitchell: — So you told us earlier, Minister, that the amount of SEDCO involvement was \$500,000. Now you seem to be agreeing that the amount involved is actually \$1.25 million, and which is secured, as from the best of my information, by a mortgage on the condominium worth \$137,000.

Minister, would you care to explain why SEDCO is loaning \$1.25 million to a company that has, dare I say, no valuable assets, with the only security being an interest in a \$137,000 condominium?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, as indicated, if the member cares to listen, SEDCO is running the daily operations of GigaText. A budget was set up on a monthly basis. All the 1.2 million is not disbursed; it's being disbursed on a monthly basis as needed.

Mr. Mitchell: — Now you know a fair amount about that, Minister. Can I go back to the question that was asked earlier? Is that money being used in part to pay for the condominium and to pay for the Mercedes Benz?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — I would think the vast majority would be paid . . . used to pay the 22 employees that are presently working at GigaText.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, prior to the orders of the day, I request leave of the Assembly to introduce a motion with regard to membership on the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations. I've mentioned it to the government House Leader. I wonder if we could do that

now.

Leave granted.

MOTIONS

Substitution of Names on Committees of the Assembly

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, with leave I would move:

That the name of Ms. Atkinson be substituted for that of Mr. Lyons on the Standing Committee of Crown Corporations.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

The Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I would like to lay on the table the 20th annual report of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS

Amendments to Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly

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

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I begin where I left off yesterday, I want to thank, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite with my deep felt gratitude for giving me the opportunity to delve a little bit into the history of this institution, because in doing so, Mr. Speaker, it has made me appreciate even more our actions as an opposition in standing up in this attempt to muzzle democracy and attempting to stop the privatization of SaskEnergy and SaskPower.

Mr. Speaker, I will go on at some length today in dealing with one of the issues that I began to discuss yesterday in regards to this debate over the attempt by the government to ram this rule change down the throat of the opposition so that they can privatize SaskPower.

The point that I will attempt to go today with some length, Mr. Speaker, is the notion that what the opposition has done in stopping the privatization of SaskPower and the tactics it has utilized, is in fact an action which stands well within the norm of the British parliamentary tradition, and stands well within the norm of the role of an opposition in terms of the formation of parliament and its subsequent evolution. And also, Mr. Speaker, stands well within the norms of the political activities of political parties which have participated since the late 1300s in the parliamentary operations of England and also of the British Commonwealth.

So, Mr. Speaker, in outlining that, I would like to say that, first of all, this: that in leaving this legislature when the opposition did, in bringing to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan in a manner in which the opposition did, we have performed a function which stretches back, as I had indicated earlier on, to 1215 and the "Magnum Carter," as one of my colleagues has outlined it, but stands not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, obviously in the same historical light as the creation of Magna Carta, but stands firmly within the true fundamental political traditions established by that document which many constitutional authorities throughout history have noted, forms the basis of our notion of what constitutes liberty and what constitutes democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to . . . as I say that, to a work done by a noted scholar of British constitutional history, professor George Adams, former professor emeritus, head of the department of history at Yale University. And a text written by him, entitled Adams' *Constitutional History of England*, and the gentleman's name is A-d-a-m-s-, so it's a plural Adams. And the *Constitutional History of England*, written by him, and revised by Dr. Schuyler, another noted historian. Dr. Schuyler is a professor of history at Columbia University in New York.

And in what has become one of the parliamentary authorities in terms of the notions of the development of constitutional processes within the parliamentary tradition, and within the context of developing that opposition, Dr. Adams goes on to make what I consider to be a number of fundamental points as it relates to this debate regarding the government's attempt to ram a rule change down the throats of the opposition in order so that they could privatize SaskPower. That is, Mr. Speaker, that in dealing with Magna Carta, dealing with the fundamental tenets of the democracy upon which our law is based, we find a number of seminal notions within that context.

The first is that governments have the right to govern, but in saying that, that there are limits on that governance. And those limits are proscribed by the activities of the opposition. And it doesn't matter whether the activities of the opposition are members of our party walking out and ringing the bells for 17 days to attempt to stop the privatization of SaskPower, or whether it is the barons at Runnymede forcing a despotic tyrant such as King John, or whether in fact it was the barons who, in the late 1300s, put an end to the reign of Edward II through the revolution which ended in his overthrow and ultimate beheading, or whether in fact it extended up unto the revolution in the 1600s, 1688.

English history is replete with activities of an opposition which have, in determining what constitutes legitimate opposition, ended up defining what they themselves determined to be what was legitimate in developing that opposition.

(1445)

And, Mr. Speaker, I was challenged yesterday by members of the opposition in the line of argument that I am proposing to this House. They — some members'

argument — said to me that I was drawing a long bow, and to try to compare the activities of the present government with the activities of a tyrant such as King John or any of the other feudal rulers of Britain in the medieval point in our history. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we're doing so, because there are certain fundamentals and some fundamental characteristics which stretch from that period of time to today.

You know, we are quite privileged, I think, Mr. Speaker, to be able to stand upon, if you like, the peaks of time, and to look back into history, a history that will stretch before us much as an ocean does, and from a height — those of you who have seen an ocean know very well that you can generally make out the contours of the ocean, the heights and troughs of the wave, and the general direction and the sweep of the tides. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that while you're in the ocean and trying to swim, at that particular point in time you feel that the tides have changed, and the tides of history are erratic and are a maelstrom in which human activities have been cast.

However, from the vantage point of where we stand here in the 20th century and looking back to the days and the development of English parliamentary democracy, we see that that is not necessarily the case. So for the members, for me to say that there is a long bow, maybe from the point of view of today it may have that appearance. Obviously the members of the front benches of the government opposite who have proposed this Bill, which would ultimately result in the privatization of SaskPower, don't see themselves in the role of the monarchy of 13th century England. They don't see themselves in that role, Mr. Speaker.

But they don't see themselves in that role only because they happen to be swimming in the sea — and it is a turbulent sea at best for those hon. members and a storm-tossed maelstrom for them at worst — so maybe that they aren't able to see the situation they find themselves.

But I'd like to quote, if I may, from Dr. Adams' book regarding the situation of the present government, because I think that we find ourselves with some fairly close parallels. And on page 53 and 54 of the work I had previously quoted, the *Constitutional History of England*, Dr. Adams says:

Meantime, the state was the king, quite as truly as in the France of Louis XIV. The officers of the state, justiciar, and treasurer and sheriff were his personal servants. The machinery of the state, above the merely local, was his machinery. The force which operated it (that is the machinery of the state) was his will. If the king was strong and ruled firmly, the state was in good order. If he was weak and vacillating, it fell to pieces.

More specifically, the area of the state was his lordship and domain. Like the manor of a baron, its revenues were his private income. Justice was his, and he assumed for himself the right to enforce it upon all. An offence against the law was an offence against him personally.

Justices and courts were his instruments. Even the Great Council, the national assembly, existed to do his business, not the nation's. It had no right of initiative, except by petition; its decisions were his decisions, and invalid if he did not make them his, a fact which becomes the sovereign's absolute veto in the modern state.

And I want to stress that, Mr. Speaker, because I'll be returning to that notion some time in the future, and that is the concept of the absolute veto of the sovereign in the modern state.

In a word, the king assumed that the state and all its belongings and all its actions were his.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the present situation, the activities of the government, and whether or not the activities of the government fit within the description of the activities of the king and of the monarchy, the absolutist monarchy in the time of the 1300s in Britain. And I think that, Mr. Speaker, instead of those members saying that there is a long bow in drawing this analogy, that when one looks at the activities of this government in that regard, you will see that in fact rather than being a long bow, what we have is rather a straight arrow.

Meantime, the state was the king quite as truly as in the France of Louis XIV.

Now, Mr. Speaker, legally, if you look at the position of the ministers of the Crown, and particularly of the Premier of this province, you will see that unlike ministers of parliament of the 13 and 1400s; unlike those in which the ministers were directly responsible to parliament, were liable to impeachment, and in fact, were impeached and met with some fairly severe retribution; unlike those ministers in those days, we have the ministers of today, one step removed from that responsibility to the parliament as a whole in this province.

We have a legal situation in which the Premier approaches that of an absolute monarch because in fact, legally, the Premier is not bound to this parliament; the Premier is here at the whim of the sovereign, through the Lieutenant Governor. That is to say, in a very real sense, members of the Executive Council which are appointed, are appointed by the representative of the sovereign and are not appointed by the parliament.

We find, for example, that the state, in other words, Mr. Speaker, the state in fact devolves itself in the personage . . . the state in fact devolves itself into the personage of one person. That is the Premier of this province. Quite literally and quite legally and constitutionally, what we have here is a situation that approaches the days of Absolutism, if you like.

And there is certain reasons why that developed. It did in the 1400s, and we can thank Richard II and some of the other Plantagenet kings for that. But we'll get into that in a little while. But we find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in the role where the Premier of this province is in effect the Louis XIV of Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, in the methods of operation . . . and this rule change is a perfect example of that in which he himself takes it upon himself and the ministers of his government to break with the procedures and precedents of this parliament. The Premier has instituted an action much in the same manner that the despots of the 1300s and the 1400s in medieval England have done; that is, they have taken upon themselves to order that parliament shall do a thing without the consent of parliament, without the consent of parliament as defined by the procedures and precedents of this parliament itself.

So in the first criteria, while those members opposite say, no, you can't compare the Premier of this province to a despot, quite constitutionally, Mr. Speaker, you actually can. Because not being responsible to the parliament, the Premier of this province is responsible to the king, and we find ourselves in that constitutional spot, quite frankly, right now.

Now the machinery of the state . . . excuse me, the officers of the state, judiciary, and treasurer and sheriff were his personal servants — were his personal servants. Do we find in this time in history here in Saskatchewan that the officers of the state, judiciary and treasurer and sheriff are the personal servants of the Executive Council? And, Mr. Speaker, we in this parliament are within the tradition of ministerial responsibility for the activities of the civil servants; that is, of the officers of the state, of the judiciary, of the treasury, and of the sheriff. Now we don't have the sheriff with the star or the Sheriff of Nottingham running around, but we do have law enforcement officers which ultimately are responsible, not to this parliament, Mr. Speaker, they are not to this parliament, but ultimately responsible to the Premier of the province.

And how does that occur, Mr. Speaker? Well very simply, the Premier of the province has the power to appoint ministers. Those ministers are not elected by this parliament. Those ministers are not even given their consent by this parliament. Those ministers are appointed by a single person, in this case the Premier of the province. And, Mr. Speaker, those ministers are responsible for the activities of the civil servants; in other words, the machinery of the state.

Once again, we find some striking parallels between the situation we find ourselves legally and constitutionally here in Saskatchewan and the situation that people like Edward II found themselves in back in the bad old days of the 13th and 14th century England.

Now the force which operated it, and I say, Mr. Speaker, the force which operated it, which is the machinery of the state, was his will. And we have seen, Mr. Speaker, very recently, a whole operation, a political propagandistic operation carried out by Mr. Oscar Hanson and other officers of the state responsible to a minister of the Crown. We've seen an operation where they went, spent taxpayers' money, travelled around the province holding these so-called public information meetings, which were nothing more than attempts to sell a sorry mess of pottage to the people of this province; that is, the sale of SaskPower. We've seen the officers of the state, and the use of the machinery of the state, to carry out the will of whom? Why? Constitutionally, to carry out the will of the

Premier of the province. So here we have the machinery of the state — above the merely local, was his machinery — the force which operated it, was his will.

And in the case of the sell-off of SaskPower here in Saskatchewan, and in the case of the government's attempt to ram a rule change which nobody in this province wants, nobody except a small, small group of Tory hacks — I may say that — what we see is the imposition of the will of the Premier to try to, first of all, privatize SaskPower and then, when that wasn't successful, attempt to put forward a rule change which would lead to that privatization.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you on the face of it, what is different between the activities of the Premier in the instance of trying to privatize SaskPower, than the activities of a Richard II, or an Edward II, or a Henry I in regards to using their will to make the machinery of the state operative? And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest none — none whatsoever.

We had the Premier of the province . . . made a decision to go ahead to try to privatize SaskPower, put in motion machinery to try to get that thing through illegally as it turned out; illegally, because it didn't even follow the laws of the province regarding the putting forward a prospectus to sell off the assets that belong to the people of the province. But be that as it may, we have the Premier going ahead, putting into force the machinery of the state by his will alone.

(1500)

And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier of the province attempted to sell off SaskPower, just as he is now attempting to put this rule change through the House, did he have the consent of the people of the province to do it? Was it through consent? Was it through a political mandate? I guess the answer to that is no. What is was, is through his absolute will, an absolute dictum laid down by the Premier of the province that he was going to go ahead and ram through the sale of SaskPower, just as he's trying to ram through these rule changes despite, and in spite of, the wishes of the people of this province.

So I would say on two counts — first of all, the relationship of the Premier to the parliament is the same type of relationship that the king has to parliament in England, that they are not personally accountable and also in terms of the appointment and the operation of the machinery of state, and, Mr. Speaker, we don't have to look any farther than today's question period to see, in fact, how the operations of the machinery of state can get all mixed up in terms of the Gigagate scandal that we see unfolding before us.

But be that as it may, what we see is that the machinery of the state is used to impose the will of the Premier on the people of this province and not to utilize the machinery of state to carry out the will of the people of Saskatchewan. And I suggest, sir, to you that it is not a long bow to say that that is a form of absolutism, and it is a form of absolutism that is contrary to the British parliamentary tradition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Adams goes on to say: "If the king

was strong and ruled firmly, the state was in good order.” Well what do we find ourselves in, in the situation we find ourselves today, Mr. Speaker? Is the king strong? That is, is the Premier strong?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Mr. Lyons: — And is he ruling firmly? Is the state in good order?

An Hon. Member: — No.

Mr. Lyons: — No, Mr. Speaker. I very often do not disagree . . . Let’s put it this way — I seldom disagree with my friend and colleague from Regina Centre. But when he says that the king is strong, i.e., the Premier is strong, I’m going to have to disagree with him on that score. It’s obvious that, given the activities of this government — given the activities of this government — the king is not strong.

I don’t have to say that. Every journalist and every political commentator in this country knows that since this government embarked on its course to try to ram through the sale of SaskPower, that this government has come apart, blown apart at the seams because it has run up against the fundamental democratic will of the people of this province.

The king is not strong, Mr. Speaker, and I could list a whole host of reasons why I would say that. This rule change, I may say, is a perfect example of that. You know, when despots can’t get the consent of the governed, they then must use coercion. And after all, Mr. Speaker, just as the government tried to ram through the privatization of SaskPower, we find a coercive activity of this king — of the Premier of the province, if you like. He is not strong and hence the government is falling apart. He is not ruling firmly and hence we’ve seen the kind of Gigagate scandals that are springing up all around. The state is not in good order, Mr. Speaker.

So on the criteria laid out by Professor Adams in regards to those . . . that particular criteria, do we find a parallel, do we find a parallel between the operations of the Premier and the operations of England in the 1300s? All I can say is, yes. Based on what we see before us, no other conclusion can be reached because the other side, the other side of the equation — if the king is not strong — Professor Adams says, “If he was weak and vacillating it fell to pieces.” It fell to pieces. “It” referring of course, to the state and the machinery of state.

Has, Mr. Speaker, has the machinery of state in Saskatchewan fallen to pieces? Well when it comes to the use of the machinery of state to try to sell, try to sell to the people of the province the notion that selling off SaskPower is good for them, even at that level, what we see is that the machinery of state is falling to pieces.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention and to the attention of the House, an event which occurred at Empringhams the other night, in which this government, having sent forward the machinery of state, i.e., Mr. Hanson and his minions to try to sell the government line, there were two or three civil servants — and I’m told this

by constituents of mine — that there were two or three civil servants at the front of a room in which there were 40 or 50 people who evidently were all opposed to the privatization of SaskPower.

And one of the first questions that was asked by one of the people at that meeting, Mr. Speaker, was this: is this meeting being taped? Is this meeting being taped? Now the person who was speaking, acting as spokesperson for the machinery of state, tried to brush off the question. Oh, I don’t know; we don’t know; maybe it is; what do you think? What do you think?

This was directed back to the person who was running the sound recording equipment. Clear, clear attempt to deceive the people there, because one of the people at this meeting walked around to where the recording equipment was held, looked down at the recording machine and saw a tape operating in the sound equipment — this with the obvious knowledge of the people who were running the meeting. This with the obvious knowledge of those officials from SaskEnergy — pardon me, SaskPower, natural gas division — who were engaged in an operation of deliberately trying to deceive the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that that is the state machinery falling apart, falling apart because the political will of the Premier, the absolutist ruler of this province, is trying to, against the will of the people of the province, do something which is contrary to the will and the popular opinion.

And so what happens? We have a weak and vacillating ruler who, using the state machinery, is embarked on the course against the will of the people. It’s falling to pieces. I use that as one example because civil servants in Saskatchewan, people who used to be employed and some of who still are employed by SaskPower and the other Crown corporations, had a reputation for honesty and integrity despite their political affiliations. And now we have sunk to the level in this province of civil servants being forced to lie to the people of this province to carry out the will of a weak and vacillating leader — weak and vacillating leader, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Professor Adams, in dealing with the constitutionality of where we find ourselves in parliament, talks about more specifically the area of the state was his lordship and domain. Like the manor of a baron, its revenues were his private income.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, with what we have seen in the past little while; with what we have seen with the attempt of this government to muzzle the opposition; with what we have seen with this government’s attempt to force a rule change which would deny the right of this opposition to act in a manner more consistent with the democratic will of the people of this province; with what we have seen particularly by the activities of the Minister of Justice, who has gone out of his way to do a political hatchet job on the auditor of this province — an office I may say established back in 1337, I believe . . . pardon me, 1377 when the first auditor was appointed. In fact, at that point in time there were two, and we’ll get to that a little later.

But with this government's attempt to ram its rule changes down the House of this legislature, we have to ask ourselves: what for? Because it's obvious, given the Gigagate scandal that we're dealing with, that this government is intending to use taxpayers' money in the manner that Professor Adams outlines: like the manner of a baron, its revenues were his private income.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, is that drawing the long bow when this government can turn around and spend \$8,000 on a Mercedes Benz, or \$18,000 for a millionaire business man to travel around the country, or \$137,000 for a condominium? . . . and the list goes on and on and on and on and on. It's obvious that this government, i.e. this Premier, is treating the revenues, which accrue to this parliament like revenues from his own private income.

So I don't think, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this Premier is acting like a despot, or like an absolutist king of England in the 1300s, when it comes to the treatment of public funds, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, on the point of order of relevance, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the member is off the topic. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has a lot of reference material there dating back to Oliver Cromwell and before, maybe back to the caveman, and Mr. Speaker, the public of Saskatchewan don't believe that all of that is relevant to whether or not the NDP wishes to continue to have the obstructionist method of ringing bells for an indefinite period of time available to them. I make the point of order on relevance, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to speak to the point of relevance.

I would suggest to Mr. Speaker that this is relevant. What we are talking about are the rights of this legislature, the manner in which this legislature functions, and the manner in which it has functioned. And the history of this institution and the manner in which it developed is directly relevant to how this institution functions and how it's developed. And that is directly the point with respect to the bell-ringing.

It is our argument that the bell-ringing is a legitimate part and a legitimate outgrowth of the development of the rights of a legislature. And that's what the member's on, and I suggest that he's directly relevant.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I have listened to the member's point of order and considered the member's response, and I have in fact been listening to the member's comments yesterday and today. And of course relevancy is sometimes difficult to define, as all members will appreciate. However, I would just like to say that we are discussing a rule change, and while it may have a historical perspective, I do believe that the member

should tie this historical perspective directly to the rule change and on a rather more direct and frequent basis than perhaps he has been.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1515)

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly appreciate your ruling. I will make on every attempt I can to directly relate this rule change to the kind of unprecedented activities of the government, unprecedented in the history of this province, and as I will prove beyond any doubt whatsoever that the activities of this government are without precedent in regards to this rule change.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, more importantly, the point I am making to develop before I reached that particular point in time, the argument I'm making is this: is that the activities of the opposition which led to the rule change — that is the bell-ringing for the 17 days — was firmly within the tradition of this House, and the manner in which the government is opposite, is totally outside the history of this legislature in this province. It is totally without precedent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, not once, not once in the history of the legislature of Saskatchewan has there been a unilateral rule change — not once. We find now this despotic and absolutist type of government, led by a weak and vacillating king-like figure, the king who would be man, attempting to ram down the throats of this legislature an unprecedented activity.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Regina Centre is absolutely right. I intend to put this within the historical context because the activities of the opposition stand firmly in a line of opposition to tyranny stretching back to 1215 and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, in direct regards to this government's attempt to drive this rule change down the throats of this parliament, the whole question of notion and justice arises. The whole question of justice arises.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the concept of justice as carried out by the absolutists. And if there's any doubt on that there was an absolute rule back then, let me provide another little quote from Professor Adams:

On what material and constitutional advantages the royal Absolutism was based will be pointed out hereafter, but it must be emphasized at once that it was Absolutism.

In this context, Mr. Speaker, I intend to point out that not only was it Absolutism, that this rule change, this rule change in order so that SaskPower can be privatized after they get it through, is nothing more than a modern form of Absolutism, well-known to Conservative right-wing, hard-line ideologue governments from time stretching well back, not to the days of the caveman, Mr. Deputy House Leader, not to the days of the caveman, but to your political antecedents, to your political ancestors.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we said, justice — is this rule change justice in the sense that we have come to know it? Well let's look at the justice, the concept of justice, as embodied in the absolute monarch.

Justice was his (says Professor Adams).

And once again I'm quoting from Adams' *Constitutional History of England*. And I would defy any member opposite to stand up and oppose themselves to the interpretation of constitutional history, put forward an interpretation which differed any way significantly than that from Professor Adams. And at some future point in this debate, I want to hear somebody from the other side go up and argue and try to say that what Professor Adams is interpreting is wrong.

Justice (Mr. Speaker, in regards to this rule change) was his. And he assumed for himself . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, once again we get the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden who likes to blabber away from his seat. He asked the question, he asked me, what university did he . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. I believe I heard the hon. member from Regina Rosemont indicate in reference to the member opposite that he likes to "blabber away." I don't think we wish to use those kinds of provocative words in this House, and I would just like to remind the member that that will only elicit a further provocative response.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I will say he's making noise and speaking nonsense from his seat, and I will do that.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, he asked me the question as to the authority from which I am quoting and which I am using as an authority. It's Professor George Adams, George Burton Adams, late Professor of History emeritus, Yale University, former head of the department of history in that distinguished university; and the revised edition by Robert L. Schuyler, professor of history at Columbia University. And for that member opposite, he is now the head of the history department at Columbia University and an expert in constitutional law, not only in Britain but also in the United States.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, justice in regards to this rule change and how the Premier sees himself . . . let's go back to what Professor Adams was saying. The notion of the absolute ruler in unilaterally imposing things on parliament was this:

Justice was his, and he assumed for himself the right to enforce it upon all. An offence against the law was an offence against him personally. Justices and courts were his instruments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the legal and constitutional position that the Premier of the province finds himself in, what is the difference? I ask every member opposite, particularly the Minister for Justice, the minister, in this case, injustice: what is the difference of that notion of justice and the notion of justice that this

government has carried out, both in regards to this rule change, but into other activities, whether it's attacks on officers of this legislature and, in particular, the newest attack on the auditor, where the Minister of Justice, pretending he's in the Court of Star Chamber, puts forward charges which are . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I believe I mentioned relatively recently that members should not bring up in debate issues that have been dealt with by the House, and we have dealt with that issue just relatively recently, within a matter of days, as a matter of fact, I remind the hon. member.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize that ruling. The comments in that sense were off the topic. But basically, in regards to the rule change, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, what is the notion that this government has in regards to this parliament. Is it an absolutist notion? Does it say to itself: we take upon ourselves to know what is right and what is wrong in this parliament, and the opposition be damned? Or to quote from history: the opposition be damned? Is, Mr. Speaker, that the temper of the government opposite? Is that their notion of justice that they are going to be the guardians of what is correct and proper in this parliamentary forum?

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is, that their notion of justice isn't a two-sided notion, that when it comes to this rule change, just as it came to the sell-off of SaskPower — the attempted sell-off of SaskPower — that their notion of justice is: might is right. Their notion of justice is: might is right. They say to this parliament, Mr. Speaker, we have the majority and we're going to ram this rule change down the throats of the opposition and down the throats of the people of the province of Saskatchewan the same way that we're going to ram the sale of SaskPower down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan despite their will. And that, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, is a concept of justice which is foreign to this parliament, is foreign to the notions of democracy, but is not foreign to the concepts of Absolutism.

And as I've been saying from the very start, the line of questioning, the line of reason I shall follow is this. This government is a government which sees itself above the law and above the people and above this parliament. It sees itself in the same way that the monarchy of the 1300s and the 1400s saw itself. And that is why it is trying to ram this rule change down without the consent of the opposition. That's the line of argument.

And the historical references I'm referring to prove that. That's why I am, yes, taking some time, and I shall take some time, because I feel quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that this a precedent which this legislature . . . that this precedent is something that this legislature does not want to have on the record books, that is to say, does not want to be recorded in *Hansard*.

Now as I was talking, Mr. Speaker, the concept of justice in regards to what an absolutist monarch thinks, I would suggest to you, sir, with all due respect, is the concept that the leader of the government, the Premier of this province has, that his justice is a one-sided justice based on what his notions of right and wrong are in regards to the

operation of this parliament.

Professor Adams goes on to say:

Even the Great Council, the national assembly, existed to do his business, not the nation's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about the national assembly here, but we're talking about the provincial parliament here. That is the council which has been set up supposedly to represent all the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now Professor Adams argues, Mr. Speaker, that the mind of an absolutist ruler says that parliament or the national council or the Great Council exists to do his business, not the nation's.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, have the events of the past several months not shown that the definition in regards to how the absolutist ruler or those who would be absolutist see the functions of this Assembly, or are the notions of the government not absolutist but are democratic.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the activities of this government and the mind-set of the Premier of the province as exhibited by this rule change and by its attempt to privatize SaskPower shows the kind of great deal of what can be nothing else but contempt — can be interpreted as nothing else but contempt for the institution.

Even the Great Council existed to do his business, not the nation's. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, in a province in which thousands of farm families are losing their farm. Here we are in which there are 50 or 60,000 people on welfare — tens and tens of thousands of our citizens without the adequate means to fend for themselves. We have tens of thousands of people who do not have a job. We have literally hundreds of thousands of people who are feeling financial distress of one sort or another, urban and rural.

(1530)

We have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people in this province who want the government to get on to the nation's business. And what do we have? What do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have an absolutist government intent on ramming through a rule change, intent on ramming through a rule change, spending hour after hour after hour of the Legislative Assembly's time, spending hour after hour by putting it on the order paper. Because, Mr. Speaker, day after day we tell this government that they are not going to put through a rule change which will allow for the privatization of SaskPower. And as long as they keep coming at us with that kind of stupidity, they are going to get this kind of speech in return.

Because, Mr. Speaker, it is, as you know and I know and as the people of Saskatchewan are learning, the government determines the order of business. The government determines the order of business, Mr. Speaker, not the opposition.

So each and every day when all members of the Legislative Assembly come in to pick up the *Votes and Proceedings* book, goes forth — and today being the Thursday, June 1, we have a series of things in the agenda: presenting petitions; reading and receiving petitions; presenting reports by standing, select and special committees; notices of motions and questions; introduction of guests; oral questions; ministerial statements; introduction of Bills; orders of the day.

Each and every day that this Assembly sits, it is the government which determines the business of this House. Today, as it did yesterday, as it did the day before, and as it did the day before that, and as it did the day before that, this government determined that the business of the nation was not dealing with the question of farm debt; not dealing with the question of farm foreclosures; not dealing with the question of the developing crisis in education as we see in Regina in the Regina separate school board; not dealing with the question of unemployment; not dealing with the question of welfare and of poverty; not dealing with the question of child care; not dealing with the question of the hundreds and hundreds of people who are leaving this province weekly, going to search some place else where they get away from the kind of absolutist mentality which leads a government not to deal with the nation's business, but the business of a weak and vacillating despot, the king who would be man, the Premier of this province.

That, Mr. Speaker, fits absolutely, 100 per cent to the T, Professor Adams' description of what constitutes an absolutist — of someone who thinks they're an absolute ruler; of someone who thinks that they're above this institution; of someone who thinks that they're above the will of the people for whom he should be ultimately responsible. What did Professor Adams say?

Even the Great Council, (and in Saskatchewan, that is the legislature of Saskatchewan) the national assembly existed to do his business, not the nation's.

The fact that we are here in this time of crisis in this country, at this time, debating this issue, as opposed to dealing with the business of the people, shows to what extent that the man who would be king and the king who would be man that occupies the Premier's chair has totally lost touch with any kind of reality.

You know, it's not a question of him ignoring the polls, because this government is famous for its polling and its polling tracking, and it's spending hundreds of thousands of dollars every year of taxpayers' money to find out what the taxpayers of the province think.

You know, that's not the question. He knows, he knows what the taxpayers of the province think. He knows that unemployment is a major issue in the minds of the people of this province. He knows that out-migration is a major issue. He knows that the agricultural crisis is a major issue. He knows that health care is a major issue. He knows that privatization and the need to stop privatization, particularly of SaskPower, is a major issue of the people of this province.

They know all that. The government, the Premier knows all that. He knows that that is the nation's business. He knows that that is the business of Saskatchewan. He knows that that's what the people want this government to do.

But what does he do? Does he deal with those issues? No, like the despots of old, he makes this legislature, the Great Council, exist to do his business, his business and not the nation's. And I say, Mr. Speaker, I say, Mr. Speaker, that that analogy is not a long bow to draw in this province in this day; that the analogy that we have set up, that the Premier is acting like an absolutist and a despot, fits the definition of an absolutist and a despot to a T. You don't have to ask me; ask Professor Adams and the other constitutional experts who have defined what constitutes Absolutism, particularly when it comes to the British parliamentary tradition. The Premier is acting like a despot; the people of the province know it.

I would rather, Mr. Speaker, I would rather, I tell you, be on my feet addressing questions of farm debt, addressing questions of health care, addressing questions of child care than debating this issue. But I want to say, I will be on my feet as long as I possibly can, saying the things that I am, to say that what we in the opposition are doing is right, and what the government is doing is wrong. I will be on my feet for a fair, fair length of time. And so will, Mr. Speaker, the other members of the opposition, because we stand opposed to the kind of absolutist mentality which says that the nation's business is not the business of the people of this province, but that the nation's business is the business of a weak and vacillating king who would be man.

I say that to you, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, because that is what is at stake here. We're perfectly within our rights, politically, constitutionally, historically, to oppose this type of ramming motion, a motion which is without precedent in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, you know, during the days of Absolutism of the type of King John, as opposed to the type of the king from Estevan, Professor Adams noted that what the leaders of the opposition seemed really to have been doing was to try and find some basis in the past on which the arbitrary action of the king could be legally limited.

Now he was referring, of course, to the barons at Runnymede and also the baronial attempt to impose upon the king the confirmation of charters of 1297, I believe it was.

We, Mr. Speaker, here today in the opposition, we here today in the opposition are doing the same thing — finding in the history of our . . . parliamentary evolution of our parliamentary system, precisely the same thing. We are bringing to the attention of this House those things from the past which would legally limit the power of this absolutist to impose things upon this House which we in this House don't want, and which the people of Saskatchewan don't want.

And in doing so . . . and the barons of King John's time, as they looked back, and they looked back to a document called "*laga Edwardae*," and *laga Edwardae* was a

document produced during the days of Edward the Confessor which established certain fundamental rights, or presumed to have established certain fundamental rights — fundamental rights which exist to this day in this legislature. As those barons looked back into the past, they looked back at what the historical significance was of that particular document. And so we too are doing it — going back to the days of Magna Carta, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to, if I may, quote from pages 129 and 130 of the work to which I had earlier referred, and that is the Magna Carta, and a chapter called "The Historical Importance of the Great Charter." And I will read three paragraphs, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

The historical importance of the Great Charter is to be found, not in the specific provisions which it embodied, but in the principle upon which it was based. In 1215 this meant no more than an application of the fundamental contract relationship between lord and vassal to the special problem of the time . . .

Much the same way, Mr. Speaker, much the same way that the debate taking place today, on the surface of it, would appear to have no other special relationship than the attempt to stop the Bill which would lead to the privatization of SaskPower, but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, has a much deeper and longer-term effect in regards to the future operations of this legislature, particularly after the government opposite has fallen and a new government committed to an open and democratic legislature takes place.

In 1215 this meant no more than an application of the fundamental contract relationship between lord and vassal to the special problem of the time — how to make sure that the king would be faithful in the future to his side of the contract.

That's the nature of what we're talking about here, is how we have accountability in this legislature.

Fortunately, this fundamental principle was not stated in explicit form in the charter; it was taken for granted and left to be inferred, though plainly implied. It was consequently left in shape to be easily expanded into a general principle applicable to all the changing phases of national development.

There is a body of law in the state of rights belonging to the subject or to the community which the king is bound to regard.

Which the king is bound to regard in the community. There once, in this province, was a community in which things were done through co-operation. There once was, in this legislature, rule changes, for example, such as the one we're debating today which would lead to the privatization of SaskPower. There once was the ability to operate in a manner of co-operation in defining those rules.

However, with this there went another principle, drawn directly from the feudal law and put into

specific form in chapter 61 of the charter (that is, the Magna Carta), though with reference only to special case of 1215; that is, if the king will not regard these rights, he may be compelled by force, by insurrection to do so. It is upon these principles . . .

Mr. Wolfe: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member is continuing to read. I believe that the Speaker ruled the other day that they should be short quotations and not continuing reading from a book.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the member's quotations have been relatively short, no more than a paragraph or two, and then they're related — and they are related. He has pointed out that bell-ringing and the behaviour of the government in changing the rules unilaterally is out of keeping with the traditions of parliament. He is talking about traditions of parliament and the way it's developed. I'd suggest it's directly relevant, and it is not a violation of the reading rule. He's only read a paragraph or two and then related it. I submit, if you check the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you'll find that he's well within the rules.

(1545)

The Deputy Speaker: — As the member from . . . the point of order has been well taken and the response by . . .

An Hon. Member: — My comments were well taken.

The Deputy Speaker: — The member from Rosemont has been asked before to keep his comments short when he's reading from the text. It's been ruled on once, and we just ask the member from Rosemont to keep his comments short.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, I will keep my quotations short. My comments will be of somewhat more length and lengthier nature. I will then read, Mr. Speaker, to proceed on to the next point, just two sentences — just two sentences.

With this there went another principle drawn directly from the feudal law and put into specific form in chapter 61 of the charter, though with reference only to the special case of 1215 that . . .

And this is the important part, Mr. Speaker. What I am about to read is the gist of our debate in opposition to the comments of the members that what we did by ringing the bells to stop the privatization of SaskPower was somehow anti-democratic. Because that's the accusation they have made. They have stood in this legislature and said, by us going out for 17 days and ringing the bells this was somehow anti-democratic.

Well let's see what the professors of constitutional law, dealing with Magna Carta, the fundamental document which prescribes the rights of parliament at least as a nucleus, let's see what it says about the right to rebel. It says, Mr. Speaker, that:

If the king will not regard these rights, he may be compelled by force, by insurrection against him to do so. It is upon these two principles, henceforth inseparable, though standing necessarily in quite different relations to the formal, avowed constitution, that the building of the constitution rested.

Mr. Speaker, the building of the constitution referred to is the constitution under which this parliament operates and the constitution which determines the rules. Here we have a professor of constitutional law, a noted authority on British constitutional law, former head of the history department at Yale University, and says this: that the fundamental document which determines the notions of English democracy and freedom rest on two fundamental principles.

One is that there shall be codification of law, and in this case the codification consists in the rules of the legislature. But secondly, that if the king, in other words, that weak and vacillating leader who calls himself the Premier of this province, that if he does not do what the people of his kingdom, i.e., in this case, Saskatchewan — if he does not do what the people of Saskatchewan want him to do, of his kingdom want him to do, if he does not do or if he does those things which they do not want him to do, they can go as far as insurrection.

That's what this professor, this noted professor of English constitutional law says, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously our ringing the bells to stop the privatization of SaskPower was not by any means at all — only in the wildest fantasies of the most paranoid right-winger sitting on the other side — an insurrection.

But this, Mr. Speaker, this interpretation of Magna Carta which is supported, I suggest, by many other interpretations of Magna Carta, by many other scholars who have looked at this document —and when we proceed century by century up until the present day you will see how the pieces begin to fit together, that our bell-ringing to stop the privatization of SaskPower was certainly not outside the very prescriptions under which British parliamentary democracy was formed. Because the very prescriptions under which British parliamentary democracy forms, allows for insurrection, allows for insurrection. And, Mr. Speaker, there has been time after time after time in the development of British history in which Magna Carta was used for precisely that purpose — for precisely that purpose.

So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, on the face of it, and looking from the viewpoint of history, a 17-day bell-ringing to stop the privatization of SaskPower, doesn't quite measure up to what constitutional authorities say Magna Carta and the British parliamentary system, or the principles upon which the British parliamentary system, and the parliamentary system and the democratic system of other democratic countries including the United States, allow.

Because, Mr. Speaker, when I get to the point in which the opposition allowed for by law in the United States constitution in which it explicitly gives the citizen not only the right but the duty to rise up against a government

that they find tyrannical, you will see that the 17-day bell-ringing incident pales, I would suggest, in comparison to other activities which are constitutional in their very essence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the debate proceeds, I'm sure that the other members opposite will want to try to in some way refute that particular argument, and I would welcome, Mr. Speaker, their attempt to do so.

But we have heard, for example, from the member from Regina South say in this House that somehow, try to imply and say directly that what we did was anti-democratic. That what he said, and he repeats it from his seat that the bell-ringing was anti-democratic.

Well how, Mr. Speaker, is it anti-democratic? How is it anti-democratic? How was it anti-democratic? Was Henry Bolingbroke anti-democratic when he overthrew Edward II? Was he anti-democratic when he established the 60 years of the supremacy of parliament? Not only did he hijack parliament, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker, I will return to this theme and the statements of the member of Regina South in a minute. I understand the Minister of Parks, Recreation and Culture would like to introduce some guests.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I thank the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask leave to introduce some guests at this time.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the hon. member for his courtesy in allowing me to interrupt his speech. And of course you'll be welcome to continue just as soon as we've finished with the introductions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of 22 grade 8 students from Turtleford School in Turtleford, and they're seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. They're accompanied by Henry Czarnota, who is the principal of the school, and chaperons Ken Chambers, Marilyn Roney and Tom Richardson.

We welcome you to the Chamber. We hope you're having an enjoyable visit in Regina, and a very safe trip home.

I'll be pleased to meet with you later this afternoon. I believe we're scheduled for 4:30 — possibly it will be a wee bit quicker than that now because you're in early — for photographs, refreshments and some discussion.

I trust the weather hasn't dampened your spirits any since you arrived and you're enjoying yourself thoroughly. Have a nice trip and a good trip home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS

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

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to welcome the students to this Assembly. I hope you find the debate instructive and informative. And it's going to sound like a history lesson in school, but sometimes those things happen. We have a little bit of history being played out before your eyes over this next couple of months, and I hope your stay here will help you understand about that.

What we're debating today, Mr. Speaker — and to familiarize the students with just a minute with what we're talking about — is the attempt by the government to introduce a rule change into the legislature, a rule change which would stop the bells from ringing. It's a change that the government wants to put forward unilaterally without any kind of dissent . . . or discussion with the opposition.

We on the other hand take the position that the bell-ringing — and you all know about the bell-ringing that occurred for 17 days was done in order to stop the privatization of SaskPower — that we on the other hand take the position on this side of the House that there is a long tradition in the House that rules are changed by consensus, that they're done by co-operation with each other, that they're not unilaterally imposed on this parliament.

It's one of the things that's been the tradition of the legislature in Saskatchewan, is that any time there has been a rule change, that those rule changes are done through co-operation and are agreed upon mutually and are not unilaterally imposed one upon the other. So what we're basically dealing with is the question of parliamentary tradition and the tradition of the rights and duties of an opposition in regards to the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the hon. members opposite, particularly the member from Regina South and also the member from Rosthern, made the allegations that by leaving the legislature for 17 days that somehow this was an anti _democratic act, right? — that it was anti-democratic, that it was outside the bounds of British parliamentary tradition. And I just have gone to some great length to convince the members opposite that far from being outside the tradition, British parliamentary tradition and British common law going back to the days of Magna Carta and the battle of Runnymede in 1215, and the signing of that, that that particular fundamental document of democracy, as we've come to know it, allows for two things, one of which allows for insurrection.

So that in the context of the history of the development of British parliamentary democracy . . . and I see the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster shaking his head at that. I'm looking forward to the day that the member stands up and refutes that because that's the implication of what they're saying, is that somehow that our ringing the bells to stop the privatization of SaskPower was anti-democratic. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in history, that in

the tradition of British parliamentary democracy, that that is not so.

I want to . . . not only, Mr. Speaker, the quotation I'd earlier read, but there's another. Many other authorities have dealt with this question because this basically is a fundamental question of what constitutes democratic rights, and that's what we're dealing with here. We're not dealing with some abstract idea, some abstract notions of democracy who the members opposite think exist, devoid of content, abstracted from the realities of the everyday world, who somehow, like angels at a party or a ceilidh, are out dancing around above and beyond us. Democracy is a practical form of governance which exists in the real world and which exists between opposing forces, as it always has. It exists as it always has. And it has allowed for, when there are acts of despotism, it has allowed for what those in power seem to be extreme acts.

Well I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that not only does Magna Carta provide the basis for doing things which those in power may not like, there are many other laws which have helped shape our current, common day practice doing the same thing.

For example, the feudal law of western Europe, and that was the law that existed on the continent of Europe and France, of Aragon, for example, and Aquitaine, and all of those small principalities and baronies, they had a law in place which recognized the right of the vassal, i.e., of the person that worked the land and lived in the little towns, the little hamlets and villages of medieval Europe, to renounce his allegiance to the lord, i.e., to the baron or the duke, the king or the queen, it was codified in law that upon written notice to the feudal lord, that upon receiving written notice, that vassal then had the right to make war on his lord, as it says here, to protect himself.

(1600)

That wasn't, Mr. Speaker, to protect himself from injustice. We're not talking here about bell-ringing, Mr. Speaker. We're not talking about bell-ringing and bringing attention, we're talking about the right, and that's codified again in the constitutional law of this country and of the United States and other countries, to protect themselves from injustice. In other words, Mr. Speaker, as part of the basis of British common law, there is contained within it a streak which says it is right to rebel against injustice and against tyranny and against absolutism.

So when we find ourselves, in Saskatchewan, finding the government trying to ram a motion like the . . . ram an action like the privatization of SaskPower, our walking out for 17 days and ringing the bells and allowing the people of this province the right to be heard — it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that pales in significant or what to be determined democratic acts up to and including the right to wage war on the sovereign. Because that, Mr. Speaker, that is part of the constitutional history of this country and of the British Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, what is more interesting, that under that law, in no such case could he, that is the vassal, be charged

with treason. In no such case could that person be charged with treason. In other words, it was not an act against the state. To wage war on your liege lord, as they called it back then, was not treasonable. In other words, it was not outside the constitutional requirements of existing in that state, that that person retained their rights as a citizen, up to and including waging war.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of just that law, never mind Magna Carta, but that law alone, that our bell-ringing certainly fits within the definition of what constitutes democratic practice. If British common law gives you the right to overthrow your liege lord, it gives you the right to rebel against injustice. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if that is democratic, then by heck, so was ringing the bells for 17 days. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it was.

Has there been a greater democratic exercise in this province in many a year than the one we have just gone through? Has there been, Mr. Speaker? I would ask the member from Cut Knife-Lloyd to, if he doesn't agree with that, to bring forward a case in which there has been.

Now obviously we had a election a little while ago and that was an expression of the popular will. And in that expression of the popular will, the members of this side of the Assembly received more votes than the members of that side of the Assembly. But because of gerrymandering and because of little quirks of fate here and there, they ended up with more seats — they ended up with more seats. And now, Mr. Speaker, now we find ourselves in a situation faced with a boundary change which will even make it even less democratic than we find today — and even less democratic than we find today. Right, Mr. Speaker?

But as I said, 17 days, Mr. Speaker, those bells rang and allowed in here the sounds of the bells to ring, but out there in Saskatchewan, allowed the popular will to be heard, allowed farmers and workers and small-business people and young people and old people clear across this province to make their voices heard in opposition to the absolutist moves of a weak and vacillating Premier, the king who would be man.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is a profoundly democratic exercise. That exercise stands well within the tradition of Magna Carta; stands well within the tradition of — the name of the law is *de felica*, that allowed for that vassal to wage war on his lord, all of which were seen as perfectly constitutionally correct, and in fact democratic in their time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that on the face of it that that bell-ringing episode that we've just gone through is democratic; is not anti-democratic as that members would allege, but in fact represents the finest kind of historical tradition established by the barons at Runnymede and extending on until to day, to going out to allowing the people to have their grievances expressed in the form that they want those grievances expressed; in this case, as we've just gone through, the expression of opposition to the privatization of SaskPower.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are just two examples of the right to rebel, as established constitutionally. But I want to bring it up a little closer in time to the members opposite. The member from Rosthern talked about the jackboots, talked about jackboots and his intervention, right? — the jackboots of law and order to which he seems to subscribe.

I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, that member in Rosthern, if you were in occupied France in 1939 and 1940 and 1941 up until 1945, whose side would you be on? Would you have been on the side of that supposed constitutional government of Vichy. It had, Mr. Speaker, all the trappings of constitutionality, all of the trappings of some kind of democracy which imposed its rules on the people of France and on the sham parliamentary institutions — at that time they weren't parliamentary institutions, they were another type . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. I think the hon. member, while he can claim it as being an example, I suppose there are a myriad of examples that one may claim, but the essential point is that we're discussing this rule of the bells, and I'd like to ask him to speak more directly to the rule.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much. Thank you very much. I say to the members opposite, your attempt to ram this rule change through, your attempt is the same type of absolutist manoeuvre that the government of Vichy carried out, the same type — there is no difference. Without the consent of the opposition, and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, without the consent of the opposition, because the opposition weren't in there polishing the jackboots, they weren't there polishing jackboots, they were out there fighting that kind of tyranny; they were fighting that kind of tyranny.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, any move to limit the democratic rights of the opposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member from Regina Wascana wants to act in that way, pacing back and forth and yelling from his feet in front of all these students, I guess that's his business. But the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is this: that in regards to this Assembly, the unilateral moves of this government and its relationship to other forms of tyranny is one, not of substance but of degree.

Where does it stop? Where do you draw the line? In this Assembly from day one it has been the history of this province that if you're going to change rules of the legislature that you do it in co-operation, you do it through an established form and procedure. You do it, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order. The member from Canora, why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the legislature, 28 grade 8 students from the Preeceville School in Preeceville, Saskatchewan. They are accompanied by teachers Lorne Plaxin and John Mills, and chaperons Pat Kozloski, Marilyn Bzdell, Anita Meberg, and bus driver, Dale Goodsman.

Preeceville is a progressive community in my constituency, and also these students come from an excellent school environment. So it is my pleasure to introduce them to the legislature. They are located in your gallery. I would ask the members to join with me in making them welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join with my colleague, the member from Canora, in welcoming the group from Preeceville today. As they would gather from my accent, I wasn't born in this country. I arrived here 23 years ago from Scotland, and the first school I taught in was the Preeceville School. And John Mills, who's the current principal there, also arrived at the very same time I did 23 years. Lorne Plaxin was already on staff then and was a former colleague of mine.

So I would just like to join with my colleague in welcoming the students from Preeceville and hope you're having an enjoyable day. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS

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

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to join all the other members in welcoming these students here from Preeceville and hope they enjoy their time in the Legislative Assembly.

The debate today is over the question of changing the rules of the legislature. We're having a debate as to the reason for that debate. We're saying that it's for the purposes of privatizing SaskPower; the government tries to say other things. But it will give you some idea of the . . . it will give you some ideas of the operation of the legislature. And I know very well the students, that if you acted that way, yelling from your seats in your class-room, your teachers would be throwing you out of your seat.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Point of order. There is no legislation before this House on the privatization of SaskPower. For a member to deliberately mislead students, that that, I think, is improper and he should withdraw his remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Order. The Minister of Finance knows that the rules of the House do not allow for accusing of another member of deliberately misleading, and I ask him to withdraw that statement.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I reiterate, I withdraw my remarks, I withdraw my remarks, Mr. Speaker. But on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — What's your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Let me state that I believe there is no legislation before this Assembly, as the hon. member has referred to, regarding the privatization of SaskPower. There never has been, Mr. Speaker; there never will be. And I ask the hon. member to not follow the practice of the college where they try and mislead young children, where they give statements that were highly inaccurate to young students, where they gave NDP propaganda to young students, and perhaps learn the traditions of this House that you don't abuse the privileges of this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1615)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — On the point of order, the member from Rosemont was clearly explaining why the bell issue was before the House. He explained it in terms of the Bill on which the bells rang. The Bill that the bells rang on was Bill 21, An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act — the power corporation Act, Bill 21. I say the Minister of Finance is misleading the Assembly when he says that it wasn't on SaskPower. That's the issue that the bells rang on, Mr. Minister. You may have been on holidays when it occurred, but the issue that the bells rang on, that we are now debating, was Bill 21, An Act to amend The Power Corporation (Act.)

That is Sask Power Corporation, Mr. Minister. That's very clear. The students will know more about what the bells rang for, that we were protecting Sask Power, than you apparently do. But the Bill that's being referred to is Bill 21, an amendment to The Power Corporation Act.

Don't say SaskEnergy; it was not SaskEnergy that the bells rang on, but The Power Corporation Act. You should know that, Mr. Minister, and I'm embarrassed for you that you didn't understand what the bells were ringing for.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made specific reference to SaskPower, not the privatization of SaskEnergy. The hon. member knows full well that the legislation dealt with the privatization of SaskEnergy.

I just call to the hon. member's attention, Mr. Speaker, the practice of the New Democratic Party of trying to browbeat students, and we've had evidence of that in the past, of going into grade 4 class-rooms with NDP campaign material, Mr. Speaker. I say that that's improper; I say his statements are improper.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I've listened to the point of order, which in fact after listening to the member's issue, is not in fact a point of order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — It has deteriorated into a debate by both sides of the House, which is essentially what it is, and may I just add, if I may, that perhaps this sort of thing is bound to happen if we draw guests in the Assembly into the debate.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, thank you.

The Speaker: — The member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster indicates he has a point of order. What is your point of order?

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Speaker, I would like you to review *Hansard* as you have done with our minister when he was addressing himself on his point of order and you made him withdraw the remarks of misleading. The member from Rosemont was misleading. When the member from Elphinstone . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . excuse me — he's corrected me on that several times and I apologize to him. But when he had basically made his remarks, he had deliberately attacked the Minister of Finance by indicating that he was misleading. And I would ask him that . . . I ask you to rule and ask him to withdraw those and apologize to the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I've listened to the member's point of order, and the objection that I raised with the Minister of Finance was that he indicated that the member had deliberately misled. I think that the issue is closed and let's continue with the debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I think it's clear to everybody that our argument here today, as it was yesterday, and as it was and will be in the future as long as this government keeps bringing forward this Bill which will unilaterally change the rules of the House, contrary to all traditions of the House, contrary to parliamentary procedure, something that has never been done before in this legislature.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one reason, there's only one reason for that, and that is so that they can end bell-ringing in order to privatize SaskPower. And that's been our contention all the time. The people of this province and the students of this province know that the government are out to privatize SaskPower.

The weasel words of the member from . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. I think that perhaps emotions are rising, which sometimes happens, and when that happens we begin to use provocative words which elicit further provocation. And I'd like to just remind the member that the weasel words is certainly not the type of term we want to introduce to this House, and I

ask him to refrain from it.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the weasel words that . . . (inaudible) . . . I know that weasel has a connotation that's not . . . that probably, probably shouldn't be used in the House, so I'll use rodent words, I guess, used in the generic.

Mr. Speaker, before we were interrupted with the points of order, we were at a point in the proceedings where we had developed an argument that . . . saying that there are certain things which are fundamental, certain things which are fundamental. And in this particular debate, I want to reiterate what I happen to believe are some of the fundamental problems that we are facing here in this legislature in regards to this particular point of our parliamentary history.

First of all, I think that we have proved conclusively, that from my point of view have proved conclusively that just from the viewpoint of history, that it is quite proper for the opposition — and whether it's a baronial opposition or the coming together of a country-gentrified opposition which occurred in the 1300s in Britain — that no matter what the make-up of the opposition is, is that when there is a perceived attack on the rights of the opposition — and the opposition not as a small political party but the opposition as spokespeople for the interests of the people — that when there is attack upon those rights, the opposition certainly has not only the ability, and not only be granted the ability, both constitutionally and also morally, but that they are forced through their duty to carry out, by whatever means is necessary, to bring the concept of redress of grievances to the House.

Now in the case of the bell-ringing episode, it was perceived by the people of this province that they were going to suffer undue duress and that they had a grievance against the government, the executive. In the case of this parliament and the way the parliamentary system is set up, the absolute ruler who, quite frankly, has those absolute powers constitutionally — in this case the Premier, who attempted to ram through the privatization of SaskPower.

Now the people of the province said to the opposition, we are opposed to the privatization of SaskPower. We don't want you to sell off the natural gas side of SaskPower. We don't want you to allow Bill 21, An Act to amend The Power Corporation Act, into this House. We do not want you to let this Bill pass. That was the nature of the grievance to which the people . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order. Just calm down.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate that some tempers are flying here. I mean, let's deal with this in a calm and rational manner. Let's deal with this in a calm and rational manner.

We have a situation in the legislature where our duty as representatives is to bring forward . . . And I might say this, that it's incumbent upon those who are not members of the Executive Council on the government side of the House, to do the same thing much the same way in which

Pat Nowlan, member of parliament, has taken the Prime Minister to task for his — the Prime Minister's — attack on the freedom of the press. But that is basically, Mr. Speaker, that in order to redress grievances, in other words, to stop the privatization of SaskPower, it is our duty as representatives in this legislature, and outside this legislature, I may say so, to bring that grievance to the attention of the government.

Now the government was amply warned, Mr. Speaker, amply warned that a number of things were happening that were abnormal, that were not within the normal bounds of the functioning of a government. The first thing that it was warned about was that it did not have a mandate to privatize any of the assets of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. You know, Mr. Speaker, throughout history, as we stretch back from 1215 to today, one of the primary causes of unrest among Her Majesty or His Majesty's loyal subjects has been taxation without representation or without consent.

Now taxation has taken many forms, Mr. Speaker, and we'll get . . . at some future date in this, we will deal with this question, because basically the privatization is a taxation of a sort. It is taking away the assets of the people of the province, and taking those assets and using them for purposes other than the people of this province want them to be used for.

But we'll leave that and the whole question of taxation and the relationship to the opposition and to the functioning of parliament to another day. I just wanted to make the point, however, that the people of this province saw that as a legitimate part of their grievance that they sought redress for. They did not want this form of their assets being taken from them, and they wanted something to happen to be done by the members of the opposition.

The members of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, in that regard felt it compelled not only by acts of political expediency, although Heaven knows, when you speak up on behalf of the people of the province, you are obviously going to gain in political popularity; that's the very nature of politics. When you speak on their behalf and when you act on their behalf, they are going to see you as their legitimate representatives, as opposed to those who do not speak on their behalf and who do not act on their behalf. So I say that there was certainly political advantage for us to do that. Nobody on this side of the House would deny that.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, it was not a question of political advantage which led to the bell-ringing, but to the activities of a government which did not — and had been warned in the past — did not have the legislative authority, i.e., the mandate expressed in a constitutional manner, to go ahead and do what they're doing, i.e., to sell SaskPower.

Because part of the overall constitutional process of the British parliamentary system has been this: is that when a sovereign or when a ruler, in this case the ruler of Saskatchewan, the Premier of the province, wishes to make his or her program known and abided by, they must seek consent for that activity. That is a fundamental, fundamental proposition proven time after time after time

in the evolution of parliamentary — and any democracy, quite frankly, whether it's parliamentary or republican — that without the consent of the government, that they do not have the moral or . . . because what is the same thing ultimately, the constitutional authority to carry out the activities that they intend to carry out.

In this case, the Government of Saskatchewan did not have the consent of the people of this province to dispose of their assets, assets which by law *de jure* as well as *de facto* belong to them; that this government was attempting to dispose of something that belonged to them and was held only in trust for safe keeping by the executive branch.

(1630)

The Speaker: — Order. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Mr. Wolfe: — Point of order. I fail to recognize how this has any relevance to the bells at all.

Mr. Shillington: — The member's failure to understand is scarcely a point of order. That's all he said, I fail to understand. That's hardly a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Well I've listened to the member's point of order, and while the member is attempting to give the reason for the bell-ringing, I would say this to the hon. member. I have been listening, I have been listening to his arguments, and he has been repeating his arguments, and that is not acceptable. I'd like to bring that to the hon. member's attention, that the repetition of arguments is against rule 25(2) in our standing orders, and I know he has many things to say about the issue, but he must speak more directly to the ruling.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling. I obviously am not making myself clear.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you. I'm going to obviously have to delineate the first argument. The first argument that I have made, Mr. Speaker, is in response to a charge made by the members of the government who said that our bell-ringing was anti-democratic. And I think that I have put forward, just on the basis of two centuries of British tradition, the 1200s and the 1300s, that not only was it not anti-democratic, that it was constitutional. I think I made that point clearly.

My second argument, which I will now unfold — and perhaps I should have prefaced by remarks by this — my second argument that I now will unfold is this — is that not only what the opposition did was constitutional, the opposition, by its very nature is compelled, that this opposition on this side of the House was compelled not only by its political insertion in terms of the social formation, i.e., our role as opposition in Saskatchewan, on that political level, but we are compelled constitutionally, as members of this Legislative Assembly, to speak up on behalf of individuals and of the populace who feel that they have a grievance to redress.

Now maybe the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg can understand that. On the one hand, what I'm saying is that the opposition was not only politically motivated, but was constitutionally correct in ringing the bells, as is presently the case in Ontario, when we see what's happening in Ontario, and as the members of the opposition party have engaged in from time to time throughout the parliaments and legislatures of Canada.

Not only was that a constitutional act and hence not anti-democratic, but in fact it was an act that we all, as members of the opposition, are compelled to do in order to carry out our responsibilities as members of the opposition. That's an entirely different matter. Not only is it legal for what we did, it is something that we had to do, Mr. Speaker. Because the people of Saskatchewan said to us as elected members of this legislature, stop the sale of SaskPower. That's what they said by the hundreds, by the thousands, by the tens of thousands. And Mr. Speaker, you know yourself . . . excuse me, Mr. Speaker, all members of this Assembly know that through the method of petition, by the hundreds of thousands, people in this province were saying, we want you to stop the sale of SaskPower.

Now, Mr. Speaker, does that compulsion as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, have any historical precedence? That, I guess, is the question that needs to be answered now. Do we, as members of the opposition, have historical reasons upon which we base our actions in terms of being members of the Legislative Assembly?

And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you, sir, that in all due respect, that the mandate given to us and the mandate given to all members of the Legislative Assembly at election, that they are compelled constitutionally and by law to bring forward redress of grievances, and that those members who do not bring forward redress of grievances are negligent in their duties as members of the Legislative Assembly to which they belong. That will be my second argument, Mr. Speaker, as this debate unfolds in the days to come.

And I say so, Mr. Speaker, because I happen to believe that when it comes to the privatization of SaskPower, the refusal of those members outside Executive Council to stand up and speak out on behalf of their constituents, is a dereliction of their duty, is a breaking of the mandate that they have received from their constituents. I think that, Mr. Speaker, we can prove with material exhibit, which we have done through the introduction to this Assembly of petitions signed by petitioners from every constituency represented by the members opposite, petitioners who seek redress of a grievance based on the actions of an absolutist government, based on the sale of SaskPower and, Mr. Speaker, that this action of the opposition in opposing this rule change, which will lead to the privatization of SaskPower, is not only constitutional, Mr. Speaker, it is mandated by our constituents. In other words, what we are doing on this side of the legislature is our duty.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. The hon. member has advanced that argument several times, over and over. The rules, the rules do not permit that, even though he

may feel strongly about it and may wish to continue repeating it, but the rules, in fact, do not permit it. And you, sir, have been advancing that argument several times this afternoon, and I'm drawing that to your attention.

Mr. Lyons: — Sorry, Mr. Speaker. In regards to advancing the debate that it's our duty, yes, I've said that several times and I believe that. Now what I will do, what I will do . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Order, order. Order. Order. This isn't a debate on that; I'm just drawing it to your attention, drawing it to your attention because I cannot allow you, sir, to continue repeating the same arguments over and over.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for drawing my attention to that matter. I shall now proceed, Mr. Speaker, and it will take some time to outline the historical precedents of why it is that members of the legislature are obliged to do their duty. And I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, to the activities of the member of parliament for the constituency of Reading, Mr. John Kent. Mr. John Kent was appointed by the sheriff of the shire of . . .

An Hon. Member: — J-o-h-n K-e-n-t.

Mr. Lyons: — K-e-n-t. Exactly, that is the spelling. Mr. Kent was the first member of parliament for the shire of Reading. Reading is a constituency in England. It was a little town in Reading, where among other things a monastery was set up. The activities of Mr. Kent, Mr. Speaker, the activities of Mr. Kent, as they were mandated then and as that mandate consists today, forms the basis upon which all our activities in this legislature are carried out. And I want to, Mr. Speaker, draw your attention to that fact of the activities of why it is the duty of members.

Mr. Speaker, in order to understand that the situation in Reading in the middle and late 13th century were not quite akin to that as it is today, let me just outline for you and for the House how borough representatives, as they were called, were picked. They were, first of all, Mr. Speaker, summoned to what was vaguely known as a parliament because the institution itself had not come into its own right, known of its own right.

But Mr. John Kent, of whom recorded history has written this little tome called, *Parliament Through Seven Centuries*, done under the auspices of the Hansard society, deals with parliament. And it deals with . . . Mr. Kent was appointed to parliament because at that time, people were not elected to parliament.

And, Mr. Speaker, borough representatives were appointed in the following manner. The writ of the year addressed to all sheriffs set forth the reasons for the summons, and the year that I'm referring to here is the year 1295 — 1295. And here's what, Mr. Speaker, the reasons for the issuing of that writ, that writ of summons which subsequently became the writ of election — the dangers threatening the kingdom. Mr. Speaker, John Kent, in 1295 was summoned to parliament because of the dangers threatening the kingdom.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in some way . . . Mr. Speaker, in the same way that the people of Saskatchewan mandated the opposition to bring to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan the dangers which threaten the kingdom, so too was Mr. Kent brought to the Reading.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the members opposite have absolutely no appreciation for precedence. It's obvious that the members opposite have no understanding of tradition. And it's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite are engaging in a kind of nervous laugh, a kind of nervous laugh that shows their desperation, that shows their desperation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — And not only their desperation, Mr. Speaker, also shows their total lack of respect for their predecessors in the parliaments of this country and in the British Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker. And while the member from Rosthern can laugh at democracy, while he may enjoy polishing the jackboots of tyranny, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I for one happen to respect the work done by the John Kents of the world, representing the Readings of the world, to act on their mandate which is to speak on behalf of the people of this province the same way, Mr. Speaker, that all members of the opposition spoke on behalf of this province in carrying out the duty established by Mr. John Kent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Because, Mr. Speaker, the nub of the writ of summons in 1295 was the dangers threatening the kingdom. Well let me say, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan in 1989 perceived a dangerous threat to the kingdom, to their kingdom, the province of Saskatchewan, through the privatization of SaskPower.

And we can draw those historical parallels because, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kent, Squire Kent at the time, knew it was his bounden duty to go to this parliament to deal with what was called dangers threatening the kingdom. And he ordered them to:

. . . causes to be elected without delay two nights from the aforesaid shire, and from each city of the aforesaid shire to citizens, and from each borough to burgesses of the more discreet and able sort.

(1645)

Now, Mr. Speaker, why isn't it, Mr. Speaker, why isn't it that that rule is in existence today? Why don't we have that rule in today, Mr. Speaker? — having burgesses of a discreet and able sort. Because, Mr. Speaker, if that rule, if that rule was in existence today, if that rule was in existence today, the benches of that government opposite would be mightily empty; let me tell you, if the requirement was for discreet and able sorts to be elected, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker.

And, as I say, Mr. Speaker, not in the same way that we reached this parliament, but in a different manner, these people were summoned and "make them come to us."

That's the form in which they were addressed. The absolutists said that they had to come to us, with a big "U", because the big "U" means king, "at the aforementioned day and place." In other words, a setting of the time, and that . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order, order. I believe I have brought to the attention of the hon. member a few days ago the fact that speeches should not consist of a series of quotes interspersed with a few original sentences. That's against the rules of the House. I believe it's rule 328 if I'm not mistaken. And I bring that to your attention again. You can make your point, but certainly we don't want you going through a book or an article, reading quotes and interspersing it with some original thoughts.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just finished the quote. As I finished the quotation, the point that that quotation backs up and provides reason for is the following: that in 1295 there were duties assigned to each and every member of those who were summoned to the Legislative Assembly. And in 1295, Mr. Speaker, those duties were laid down and were laid out, some of which I read here, and there were others that were assigned to members of parliament at that time.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I want to say — and I won't read the quotation — but in page after page after page of this book, dealing with Reading and the parliament from 1295 to 1601, and the Stuart and Hanoverian period from 1603 to 1754 and beyond, the last years of the unreformed House of Commons, those duties, Mr. Speaker, remained the same. And the duties that were obliged of each and every member of the House of Commons and of this parliament remained the same — an unbroken line of duty compelling members to carry out certain tasks.

First and foremost of those tasks was to bring to the attention of parliament the redress of grievances.

Does this rule, Mr. Speaker, which this government is introducing in the House today, I ask you, sir, does it help in the tasks and duties that are obliged by all members of the Legislative Assembly? Does it help in helping each and every one of us to carry out those things to which we are obliged to do? Or, on the contrary, does it hinder us in carrying out our duties as members of the Legislative Assembly?

Mr. Speaker, that is a question, I think, that deserves consideration by all members of this House when it comes — if it comes — to a vote on this motion. We on this side, Mr. Speaker, say that it is an infringement on our duties as members of the legislature to carry out those things to which we have been mandated to do.

It is the duty of the government members to prove to us and to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that by ramming this rule change through the House, a rule change which we say will lead to the privatization of SaskPower, but a rule change which they intend to ram through this House or want to ram through the House, does it help the members of the Legislative Assembly carry out the duties to which they're obliged?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, the only answer, the only answer to that question can be no. No. Not . . . It does not help us in carrying out the duties to which we are obliged. First and foremost is to bring to the attention of parliament the redress of grievances, Mr. Speaker. It does not help us in that task; in fact, it hinders us in that task, Mr. Speaker. It puts road-blocks in front of us in carrying out that task.

All it does, Mr. Speaker, is allow the little monarch from Estevan to carry out his will. Not the will of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but carry out his will as Premier of the province, his will as leader . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order, order.

Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Speaker, if you're listening to the member from Rosemont in his name-calling of the member from Estevan, I would ask you to retract that particular remark. He's referring to the . . . I'd ask you to go back in *Hansard* and ask him to withdraw and apologize to the House for that particular reason.

The Speaker: — I've heard the member's point of order, and actually he does have a point. I think if we're going to . . .

An Hon. Member: — Does he know what it is?

The Speaker: — I think if we're going to . . . I believe he was referring to the quote, "the little monarch from Estevan." Is that correct? Yes. Well I believe if we begin to, you know, name-call, in a sense, you know, all members begin to use those types of phraseology, we're certainly not going to have a good situation. So I would like to ask the hon. member for Regina Rosemont to withdraw those comments.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Speaker, is the pejorative . . . and I'll ask the question to withdraw the comment, little or monarch?

The Speaker: — We had an issue on here maybe three, four weeks ago about a comment that was ruled as perhaps not acceptable, and perhaps referring to another member as a little monarch from Estevan, or from Regina Rosemont, or whatever constituency you might use, is not really acceptable parliamentary language, and I bring that to your attention. I just to ask you to withdraw that.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll withdraw the remarks about the little monarch from Estevan.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Estevan, the Premier of this province, as I have said earlier on today, is engaged in activities which through the introduction of this Bill, limits our . . . limits, puts shackles on, hinders, confines, ties up the obligations that we as members of this Legislative Assembly are mandated constitutionally and legally to do.

That's what this rule does, Mr. Speaker. And there is centuries and centuries and centuries of historical precedent which would lead one to suppose that those truly interested in democracy would be doing exactly

opposite; that far from limiting the rights and obligations and duties of a member of the Legislative Assembly, what the government of any reasonable person, of any reasonable government intent on allowing the redress of grievances, which after all is the first duty of a member of the opposition and, I submit, all members of the legislature outside the Executive Council; that the whole movement of history has been to empower parliamentarians with those tools which will allow them to broaden their ability to represent their constituents.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — To move forward, Mr. Speaker, not to move back — that's what we're faced with. When you get down, stripped away of all the political rhetoric, does it meet that criteria? Does it meet the criteria of helping members of the Legislative Assembly represent their constituents? And the answer to that is no, it does not. No, it does not.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we had a case very recently in the House of Commons in Ottawa in which there was a bell-ringing episode. And after the bell-ringing episode was finished — and it was carried on by the members of the Conservative party, but that's neither hither nor yon, because, Mr. Speaker, what was relevant was that the bells were used to bring to the attention of the Canadian public what members in that House saw as a grievance that needed to be redressed, and they used that tactic — but the government, Mr. Speaker, the government and, unfortunately, other members of the legislature, including members of my party, went along with that. They went along with that particular ruling.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, when you talk today to those members of parliament in Canada who were there when the bell-ringing was outlawed, you will find that those members wish that had not been done.

When you canvass those members, Mr. Speaker, you will find that as individual members, individual members of the Legislative Assembly, that they . . . pardon me, of the members of the House of Commons, that those members do not want that kind of hindrance put in their path ever again, because they understand, Mr. Speaker, they understand, just as the people of Saskatchewan understand, that this is nothing more than a Bill to privatize SaskPower after this rule change goes through. So too do the members of the House of Commons realize that the clamping down of their rights as members has not been a step forward, but in fact was a step backward. And, Mr. Speaker, we don't have to look very much farther into the past than the inability of members of the House of Commons, who represented a majority of people by popular vote, and their inability to stop the free trade deal from going through.

Mr. Speaker, that inability is precisely linked to their inability now to make their protest known in a manner which brings to the attention, and brings to the attention of the parliament, the particular grievances that the people of Canada want redressed. In the case of the free trade agreement, in which a majority of the people voted for members of parliament who were opposed to free trade, since the bell-ringing has been outlawed, one of

the tools that those members had to bring parliament to a halt so that this thing would have a sober second look, or third look, or be discarded; that tool was taken from the hands of the members of parliament. And when you canvass them today you will find, oh, there will be those who for reasons of political expediency may say it was a good thing, but even privately when they're canvassed you will see, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of unease about having allowed that motion to take place.

Mr. Speaker, I say this here today, that if you go to Ontario and you speak to the members of the provincial parliament in Ontario and ask them whether or not in bringing to the public attention the scandals of a Liberal government by the members of the Conservative opposition in Ontario, whether or not they want bell-ringing done away with, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, you won't find too many Conservative members of the provincial parliament in Ontario saying, we want bell-ringing outlawed, because that's what the PC members of the Ontario legislature are doing today, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order. It being 5 o'clock, the House stands recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.