

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature
16th Day

Friday, April 2, 1976

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS — MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF COMMONS

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could introduce to you and to this House, three Members, and if I may say so, distinguished Members of the House of Commons, who are with us today. Mr. Les Benjamin, the Member for Regina Lake Centre.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Lorne Nystrom, the Member for Yorkton-Melville.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Ed. Broadbent, the Member for Oshawa-Whitby and the Federal Leader of the New Democratic Party.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — No doubt someone else will mention it, but I join with others who are (I am sure) about to stand in welcoming also a former Member of the Legislature, a former Cabinet Member, a Member of the Senate of Canada, our friend, Hammy MacDonald.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. D.G. BANDA: (Redberry) — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure for me to introduce to you and to the Members of this House, a group of 63 high school students from Hafford, Saskatchewan. These students are from Grade Nine to Grade Twelve. They are accompanied by their teachers, Dennis Taylor, Dan Rambly, Margaret Loomer and Emily Zomber, plus the bus drivers, Ron Thompson and Wally Rasiuba. I want to take this opportunity to welcome them to the House and wish them a good stay and an interesting afternoon, and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER: (Weyburn) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to all Members of the Assembly, a group of students in the Speaker's Gallery. These students are the high school students from Goodwater, Saskatchewan. This is where my family and I received our education and it creates a very warm feeling in my heart to have them here.

They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Andrew Medwid

and Mr. Stan Merlin. I am sure all Members join with me in extending a sincere welcome. May their visit be pleasant and educational and that they have a very safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolseley) — Mr. Speaker, may I join with the Premier in welcoming the three Members of Parliament from the New Democratic Party. I might say that it may be on very rare occasions that they may ever return to Saskatchewan and see an NDP Government and therefore, we want to extend a very official welcome.

My task this afternoon is to introduce to Members of the Assembly and to those in the galleries, a very distinguished Member of the Legislature of Saskatchewan, now a Senator in Ottawa, a man that was the official Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan for many years, one of Saskatchewan's most popular sons, Hammy MacDonald.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. THIBAUT: (Kinistino) — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce again from Kinistino High School a group of Grade Twelve students seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They have made these trips here to Regina over many years and I am sure that their trip here this afternoon will be educational. They visited the city this morning. I want to say that they are led here by their principal, Mr. Merlin McFarlane and chaperoned by Miss Gaye Robinson and their bus driver, Mr. Lyle Cox. I also want to wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. VICKAR: (Melfort) — Mr. Speaker, I should also like through you, and to the House, along with my colleague, welcome the students from the Kinistino High School. A good portion of those students are from my riding of Melfort. Along with them, I notice that their chaperone is the Mayor of Kinistino.

Welcome to the House.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity for the fifth year in a row to welcome to this Assembly, through you, and to the Members, 26 Grade Twelve students from the Herbert High School, the high school in which I received my education and from which I graduated.

I am very pleased to see them here and I look forward to meeting with them at 3:30, later on this afternoon. I understand they have had a good day and hope that the day will continue well for them.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN: (Rosthern) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and the House 40 students from the W. W. Brown School in Langham, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Michasieu and Mr. S. Gratton. I hope they have a good day and I will meet with you later.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

UNLEASED LAND BANK LAND

MR. R.L. COLLVER: (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives) — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It is my understanding that three weeks ago an article appeared stating that about 11,000 acres of Land Bank land has as yet not been leased out. Is this still the case today?

HON. E. KAEDING: (Minister of Agriculture) — No, I wouldn't think so. The process of allocation is just going on at this time and I expect the allocations will be made that some of them, of course, will be under appeal and those allocations may not be completed yet. I know the Appeal Board is in the city at the present time.

MR. WIEBE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In another two weeks farmers in the southern part of the province will be seeding, can the Minister tell the House how many acres of land to date have not been allocated?

MR. KAEDING: — Well, the Member would know that I wouldn't have those figures at hand. If you want the figures I could get them for you.

MR. WIEBE: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister say that he would be reporting back at a later date on those figures?

MR. KAEDING: — Yes.

BEEF INDUSTRY IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. COLLVER: — For the last two days, Mr. Speaker, I have been attempting to get an answer to a question that I posed pertaining to the beef industry in Saskatchewan.

At an agriculture meeting last evening it was confirmed by the Minister of Agriculture to the committee, that the article in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, was in fact correct and that the Canadian beef export to the United States will be decreased by 5.5 million pounds to the advantage of Australia and New Zealand. I now ask the Premier, will the Government of Saskatchewan request that the Government of Canada protest strongly this move on the part of the United States Government to the detriment of Saskatchewan beef producers and if not, why not?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I will ask my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture to answer the question.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, in our conversation with the Federal Department of Agriculture they have advised us that they will keep us informed of any move that is made with regard to changes in quota. We have had no information from them and we have no verification of the statement that the Member made.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Premier not agree that that United States Government's unhappiness about the proposed nationalization of the potash industry is directly related to its attitude pertaining to the import of Canadian beef and in the light of the current depressed condition of the beef industry in Saskatchewan, would the Premier not agree that it makes no sense whatsoever to add to the deterioration of an industry in Saskatchewan which is related to agriculture and which supports thousands of Saskatchewan citizens, in order to acquire a few pieces of paper, which will add no new jobs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The Member is putting before the House an interesting debating proposition which I don't think we can entertain at this time.

The next question.

MR. W.C. THATCHER: (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, why the Member for Nipawin would ask him to protest to the United States Government concerning a category of beef which Canada cannot provide, which only Australia and New Zealand can?

MR. KAEDING: — If that is the case I'm sure it won't affect our quotas.

MR. SPEAKER: — Supplementary?

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that the beef that is being prohibited from entering the United States can only be supplied by Australia and New Zealand? If so, what kind of beef is that? Or perhaps the Member for Thunder Creek would answer that.

MR. KAEDING: — I would like to say to the Member that I have no confirmation that the problem that he is indicating is taking place. If he can show me some documentation or something that proves that that is the case, I will be willing to deal with it. Until that time I think it is a matter of conjecture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

LAND BANK LEASES NOT RENEWED

MR. E. ANDERSON: (Shaunavon) — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I have received a report that a number of the farmers have not

renewed their Land Bank leases because of the increase in rates. Could the Minister give me the figures of the rentals that have not been renewed?

MR. KAEDING: — No, I have no figures on that. I have no information that that is the case, nor have I had any letters from anyone protesting the increases in rates. If the Member feels that this is a problem I can attempt to get some figures for him.

MORRIS RODWEEDER COMPANY

MR. E.A. BERNTSON: (Souris-Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the recent announcement of the Morris Rodweeder Company, of its intention to expand its operation into Minot, North Dakota, to the detriment of Saskatchewan and especially of Yorkton, does this Government intend to offer any incentive to Saskatchewan-owned and operated businesses to encourage them to keep their operations in Saskatchewan?

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the company that the Member makes reference to is indeed a successful company as far as business operations in the Province of Saskatchewan are concerned and so extensively so in the farm machinery business that they have significant sales in the United States. It has been conveyed to us that they see some economies in now establishing a branch plant in the United States. This is clearly not in our best interests as a province, nor as a government, but it may well be because of barriers or problems in regard to moving machinery into a significant market place, significantly away from the point of manufacturing in Saskatchewan, that there may be some legitimacy to their announcement. However, I have instructed my officials to undertake to initiate discussions with the principals of Morris Rodweeder to see whether or not they have any other problems that they have not yet alluded to and if so whether we could work them out in order to retain that operation in the Province of Saskatchewan, and in fact to undertake expansion of that business.

MR. BERNTSON: — A supplementary. Is the Minister aware that the announced reason for this move was a lack of skilled welders in Saskatchewan, and would the Minister agree that some assistance in finding these skilled welders would be to the betterment of Saskatchewan?

MR. MESSER: — I am aware of that observation being made in regard to the announcement. There is no conclusive evidence to show that there is a lack of skilled welders in Saskatchewan.

MR. LANE: . . . surtax.

MR. MESSER: — He made no mention in the announcement of the surtax. Does the Member for Qu'Appelle know something that Mr. Morris doesn't know, would he please stand up and convey it to this

Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan, what his real reasons are because he hadn't made them public.

Mr. Speaker, if in fact welders are in short supply we would be more than happy to work out something to accommodate those welders but I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that a province such as Saskatchewan that has tremendous growth we have problems trying to find a number of required employees to fill all the positions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — Would the minister assure this House that there will be some incentive offered to the Morris Rodweeder Company, I mean some incentive other than nationalization?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence that Morris Rodweeder is in any kind of financial trouble which I think the Member infers when he talks about incentives. They have indicated that there may be a shortage of welders and I said that we would undertake to monitor that problem or investigate that problem. And if there is we would undertake an action to correct that problem for them. If there are problems in moving the product to the market place in the United States, and I am more than happy to hear that they have a significant and a growing market in the United States, we will undertake to resolve that. There is no evidence that the problem is one of lack of financial assistance or . . .

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister had any negotiations or discussions with the Morris Rodweeder management of any kind whatsoever up until this moment in time?

MR. MESSER: — Not in regard to this particular situation. To the best of my knowledge the announcement was just conveyed to the general public in the last couple of days. I've said that I instructed my officials to undertake to contact the Morris Rodweeder Company to see whether or not the Government can do anything for them. They haven't said and they haven't alluded that the Government is a part of their problem in any such way so we don't want to interfere unnecessarily.

MR. COLLVER: — Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister has taken that particular — oh, I'm not supposed to use that — that having been said, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister undertake at this time to give a definite day as to when he will contact the Morris Rodweeder management?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I have already said that I have instructed my officials to contact the executive of Morris Rodweeder to see whether we can be of any assistance. I can't say any more.

STC RATE INCREASES

MR. S.J. CAMERON: (Regina South) — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier. Members will recall yesterday I was asking about STC rate increases and their

concealment. I wonder now that the Premier has had 24 hours to carefully prepare a response, whether he would indicate to Members of the House what the STC rate increases are and why they are not being disclosed?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to consider the matter any more fully than I had yesterday and I have nothing further to add at this time.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary, can the Premier give us some indication as to when he will be prepared to tell Members of the Legislature what the STC rate increases are?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would think that as soon as I have an opportunity to consult my Cabinet colleagues who are concerned I will be happy to advise the House and that, hopefully, would be in the next few days.

WIRETAPPING

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder before putting the question, if I might explain in part the urgency. There is federal legislation coming which will take away from people the right to know that they have had a wiretap placed against them and that has only recently been introduced in the Federal House, and I wonder if I might then direct a question to the Hon. the Attorney General. In Crown Corporations we were told that Sask Tel would not give out information either in a wide frame or in a narrow way to indicate whether wiretaps had been placed in this province and Sask Tel informed us that this information was given to the Hon. the Attorney General. I wonder if the Attorney General would be prepared to table the list from time to time and indicate that you would be prepared to table the list of wiretaps that have been placed in this province, perhaps in the last year. I was thinking particularly about wide wiretap that took place in the last year which involved quite a number of very reputable and well known Regina people.

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I believe the question really has two or three parts to it. First of all with respect to the Federal legislation, my position for the time being is that we will await the outcome by Parliament of that federal legislation. As the Member may or may not know, I have expressed my reservations about the removal of that particular section and I am hopeful that the Federal Government will consider it. I know they have introduced a closure motion to cut off debate on this very important topic unfortunately, but nevertheless I am hopeful that they will consider it. Accordingly, any additional information will have to follow, as far as I am concerned, the provisions of the wiretap law as it presently stands and that information is presented from time to time. That information is available to the Members.

MR. MERCHANT: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Of course we would be delighted if the Hon. the Attorney General would table a letter, any letter. We appreciate the tabling of correspondence to the Federal House, but would the Minister indicate — it would appear that that legislation will be passed — would the Minister indicate whether it is your intention then to make available to Saskatchewan people the information which you have indicated you think should be made available by the Canadian Government? You have access to that information, I agree with you that it is wrong. Would you provide that information on a regular basis and make your commitment to the House to do so?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not give any commitment to the Member at this stage. I think we want to see what happens with the federal legislation. I am somewhat worried, I must say, as the first impression about the suggestion, because I do believe that the criminal law and the criminal law powers should be uniform and should be administered as uniformly as possible across the country and this might be a deviation of that, as far as the Provincial Government is concerned, something which would have wider implications. So I will consider that and give it consideration. And if I have correspondence in this area I will be pleased to table it for the Members.

OPERATION RECYCLE

MR. D.M. HAM: (Swift Current) — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of the Environment.

In view of the Government's so-called restraint program and in light of the Government's Operation Recycle, would this Government allow tenders on the last contract expiry of the recycle program?

HON. N.E. BYERS: (Minister of the Environment) — Mr. Speaker, I think that it is only fair that the Minister who administers the Operation Recycle Program reply to that question. Operation Recycle is under the Minister of Industry.

MR. MESSER: — I will take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker.

VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION

MR. J.G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Sask Tel.

A press release of March 31, 1976 indicated that the cable television dispute between Ottawa and the Saskatchewan Government has been at least partly resolved, wherein the Government of Canada is giving up at least partial control of cable television to the province. In light of that decision and in light of public statements by officials within the Department of Education with regard to violence on television, what regulations has the Government proposed or drafted or what is the Government's policy with regard to limiting the degree of violence on

any public cable television, which will be under Government control?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I shall undertake to answer on behalf of the Government.

I am aware of no law that could conceivably give the Government of Saskatchewan any control over the programming of television stations, whether they are through air, on cable or any other way. And, accordingly, I cannot I think help the Member in any way in advising him of what steps will be taken to decrease the violence which is shown on television, be it cable or otherwise.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary of the Premier. Would the Premier not admit that after the long public dispute between yourself and Ottawa of your attempt to get control, that a responsible provincial government would have a stand on this and would you mind tabling the policy of what indications you have given to the Federal Government as to the social policies which you put on the cable television.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we undoubtedly have views, but we are dealing with the Federal Government and in our judgment it does not enhance our relationships with the Federal Government to offer them gratuitous advice on television programming which is entirely within their jurisdiction. We feel that they are sensitive in that area and we feel that although we might offer them some comments, any attempt by us to even indicate that we wished indirectly to attempt to control programming, would undoubtedly be detrimental to our desire to have a voice in how the hardware is put into place.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary of the Premier. In light of the rider that you have put on your discussion, do you say you obviously have some views and you are making some comments. Have you made your views known and have you made comments to the federal officials with regard to the control of programming to limit which, you know, is becoming an educational or social problem. And have you made those views known?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think any views which may have been made known to the Federal Government, in discussions between the Minister (Mr. Shillington) and the appropriate Federal Minister, would be of a purely unofficial nature and I think it would be detrimental to our relations with Madame Sauvé and with her Department to discuss, in this House, the views which may have been expressed to her on a quite informal basis.

RAT POPULATION IN SASKATCHEWAN

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to whom to address this question, so I will let the Minister respond accordingly.

Is this Government aware of the damage to public health, the agriculture industry and many other areas of Saskatchewan life, caused by the rat population in our province and if so,

and taking into account the fact that this present Government and the rat population and the PCs are synonymous, why won't this Government conduct an all-out war to make Saskatchewan a rat free province, much like Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I am not impressed with the urgency of the matter from the way the Member phrased the question. Next question.

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON GRAIN ELEVATOR TICKETS

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I took notice of a question from, I believe, the Member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson), with respect to grain elevator tickets and the substance of the question was: is it the policy of the Highway Traffic Board to routinely go into elevators, country elevators and check grain tickets for the purpose of prosecutions?

I am advised that the answer to that is, no. It is not the policy.

GRAIN TO CARGILL ELEVATOR

MR. R.H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Transport. Is the Minister aware that a number of farmers in the Rosetown area, because of his recently announced weight restrictions, are now being practically forced to haul their grain to the Cargill elevator there?

HON. G. MacMURCHY: (Minister of Transport) — No.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister, I have copies of letters which have been directed to you and copies have been sent to me. Have you not read the correspondence and the press of these people?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Yes, I have and I have replied to those letters.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister not agree that with the recently announced weight limits which are admittedly proposed weight limits, that these people need some answers to their questions as to what the Minister means by weight limits in the near future?

MR. MacMURCHY: — I indicated earlier in this House in responding to questions that we are proceeding with making an official announcement with respect to these weight limits. I announced to the House, through a question from the lion. Member, that I have my first meeting with SARM on the 14th of April.

AGREEMENT TO PURCHASE ANY POTASH MINE

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolseley) — Mr. Speaker, it is widely known that the Saskatchewan Government is busy negotiating with the potash industry, so may I direct this question to the Premier, seeing that the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation has, once again, fled the House. Could the Premier indicate to me whether or not agreement in principle has been reached with any potash company or mine in the Province of Saskatchewan, in relation to an agreement to purchase by the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No.

MR. MacDONALD: — Might I further direct, I kind of anticipated that answer.

I further ask, as a supplementary: could the Premier indicate whether negotiations are still being carried on with Duval? And whether or not they are anticipating an announcement in the near future?

MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the first part of that question, whether negotiations are being carried on, the answer is yes. And whether or not an announcement is anticipated in the near future, I think the answer is: I don't look into the future very well and I can't tell you.

MR. MacDONALD: — A further supplementary. That is rather interesting, Mr. Premier.

Indications are that perhaps Duval has come to some kind of an agreement with the Province of Saskatchewan or the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation and from what I understand and the Premier has appeared to indicate or endorse, that position, that negotiations are proceeding with Duval. It is rather interesting that this would appear to be one of the potash mines that has now decided to break the stance and force the Government to expropriate them.

Could the Minister indicate to the Members of the House and, I think, of general interest to the Province of Saskatchewan, just exactly what is the stage of negotiations with Duval; have concrete offers been made; are you in fact near a conclusive agreement with the Duval Corporation to purchase that mine for the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that negotiations are continuing. I think it is not possible for me, nor would I think it would be in the public interest, for me to attempt to advise the House of precisely what state negotiations are at.

Negotiations, while they are in progress, really don't bear of comments on what state they are in. If and as, when an agreement is reached, there will be an announcement. Until

that time or until negotiations are conclusively broken off I think all that I can say is that negotiations are continuing.

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier inform the House as to whether or not negotiations are being carried on with any other company other than Duval?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the problem here surrounds the content of the word 'negotiations'. There are certainly discussions with a number of other potash companies. Whether or not one would characterize them as negotiations, I think is a judgment call. Nor, I think, would I wish to indicate the companies with whom there are discussions going on, unless they so wish. In the case of Duval, they made the announcement. There are other discussions going on with other companies, yes.

MR. MALONE: — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Would it be fair then, Mr. Premier, to characterize your discussions with Duval as negotiations as such and that your discussions with other companies as not reaching quite the stage of negotiations?

MR. BLAKENEY: — It would be fair, Mr. Speaker, to characterize our discussions with Duval as negotiations. I think it would not necessarily be fair to say that discussions with other companies do not constitute negotiations. As I say, that is a judgment call, but to meet the thrust of the Member's question, I think it is fair to say that negotiations with Duval are more advanced than are the discussions with other companies.

MR. MacDONALD: — A further supplementary. This is rather interesting. Mr. Speaker, may I ask on behalf of not only the official Opposition, but perhaps the people of Saskatchewan, if these negotiations come to a successful conclusion, is it the Government's intention to further negotiate with other mines in the Province of Saskatchewan to purchase them at the same time?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think that is a hypothetical question and I think I would refrain from answering it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The question period time has run out.

STATEMENTS

GUATEMALA RELIEF FUND

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a brief Ministerial statement. This concerns a sum of money which is very much less than those we have been discussing. It concerns an activity of government which I think is interesting. It is not earth shattering in money terms, but I think it is interesting nonetheless.

I am pleased to announce that contributions made by Saskatchewan residents to the Provincial Guatemala Relief Fund

April 2, 1976

have reached the total of approximately \$20,600. This is over and above the \$25,000 already contributed by the Government of Saskatchewan to aid the victims of the Guatemala earthquake. So far the people of Saskatchewan have therefore contributed just about \$50,000. I understand that the relief fund is still accepting donations.

This morning I presented a cheque to Mr. Frank Gillis, an Information Officer of the Canadian University Services overseas, that is CUSO.

I am told that the money will be used for two purposes.

One, the leasing of an ambulance aircraft.

Two, the reconstruction of the town of Santa Maria Chiqimula located in the interior of Guatemala.

The Board Members of the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation have recommended that the relief funds be channeled through CUSO.

As I indicated some of the money will be used to lease an aircraft for ambulance emergency use and the remaining money will be used for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of a town of 5,000 people. The town of Santa Maria Chiqimula was split apart by the earthquake and one part of the town is now 600 feet below the other. More than 320 homes were destroyed, together with municipal government offices, schools and the health centre. There is no safe drinking water. The funds from Saskatchewan will establish a safe, though admittedly temporary water supply and a health centre. The funds will also help to pay for equipment, tools and advisers.

The problems of Santa Maria Chiqimula are far from over and the disaster is thought likely to be compounded when the rains start in the next couple of weeks. The earthquake has devastated the agricultural system and the aircraft will be used to fly people in where emergency situations arise.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is good to see the strong support Saskatchewan residents are giving to the earthquake victims. I think I speak for all the citizens of Saskatchewan when I express the hope that Santa Maria Chiqimula and the whole of Guatemala will soon recover from this tragedy.

Those wishing to make a contribution can do so by sending a cheque to the Guatemala Relief Fund, Box 5060 at Regina.

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I only want to make a very brief comment, if I might on behalf of the official Opposition and suggest that we, too, are delighted to see the response of the citizens of Saskatchewan to the tragedy that occurred in Guatemala.

I should like to ask if the Premier might be willing to clarify one or two questions for me.

I was wondering just exactly what organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan were involved or was it strictly individuals on a voluntary basis? I think this might perhaps direct other organizations and other citizens of Saskatchewan toward the tragedies that have occurred at international levels. Certainly Canada has never really played its full

part in international contributions to disasters that have occurred around the world.

And the second question that I would like to ask the Premier: could he indicate if the Federal Government is involved? CIDA for example, and do they match or quadruple if my recollection is correct, that the Federal Government then makes an additional contribution in proportion to the contribution of the citizens of Saskatchewan? I think that this might be of value to the people of Saskatchewan if it is a fact, so that this might also encourage them to make contributions in this regard.

Perhaps the Premier wouldn't mind clarifying those two questions for me.

MR. SPEAKER: — It is not customary to allow questions during a statement period. I will put the matter in the House's hands and ask the House if they wish to receive the answers.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, two or three points.

Firstly, there were other donations that came from organizations, many of them as it happens, channeled through the Red Cross. The fund that I refer to — the \$20,600 — all came from individuals. I believe the highest single donation was \$1,000 and others came usually in \$5 and \$10 amounts.

The Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation recommended that we distribute through CUSO. It does not by any means represent the total relief efforts of Saskatchewan organizations for Guatemala.

Ordinarily the Saskatchewan Council of International Co-operation, or organizations which are a part of it can contribute money, as will be known, to projects approved by CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency, and the local agency — let's call it — Lutheran World Relief, as an example. If this organization puts up say \$2,000, the Government of Saskatchewan puts up \$2,000 and CIDA puts up \$4,000 and then this becomes \$8,000 for approved projects.

I do not believe that this is operative with respect to the Guatemala Relief Fund. I believe that CIDA is making its own contribution and these dollars will not quadruple in the way that they do for an ordinary project routed through an International Agency with CIDA approval.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to commend the people of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan for their efforts in this area. I also would like to add one question, if I may, until what date, if any, are people still able to make these donations in order that there may not be any rush on it, we can get people to get it rolling in; and if they do make further contributions to the fund from now on, or for that period of time, will the Government of Saskatchewan match dollar for dollar their donations or their grants?

MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the latter, I don't think we have made a decision on matching. We have put in our \$25,000 at the start for openers.

With respect to the former question, I don't think there has been a deadline. Mr. Robbins, the Minister who is handling this, is not in the House but I was talking with his Deputy this morning, Mr. Derrick, who, with Mr. Robbins is handling this program.

The CUSO people indicated that they would welcome funds. Their representative was on a hotline show this afternoon. I don't think they have established a cutoff date, but they would welcome the funds.

They are doing a job of reconstructing. I don't want to take the time of the House to give full details. They are putting up temporary housing. They have some very ingenious ideas formulated by a man from Scotland who has been working with them for a number of years, a man by the name of Hibbits. They have some ingenious ideas of building temporary shelters which will be able to be used as roofs for permanent housing when they get going and they are in rather desperate need of money. I believe, therefore, the sooner the better, but there is no cutoff date.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, two days ago I was going to rise on a Point of Order during Question Period as a result of one of your decisions. And because of the lateness of the last two days, with radio, I haven't bothered rising until now.

On two questions that were asked two days ago, one I believe by the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) and I think the other by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron), you ruled them out of order and if my recollection is correct, both questions were prefaced by the Speaker saying that they were questioning the Government on policy, that is, what was the Government's policy on certain things. As I say it was two days ago and perhaps you could check Hansard's record on it and refresh your memory on it and perhaps give me an answer at a later date. It seems to me that any question on policy is in order. Now whether it is of urgent public importance or not may be another question. But certainly it should not be ruled out of order because it is a question of policy.

MR. SPEAKER: — Would the Member tell me on what day that occurred? Wednesday. All right, I shall look into the matter.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MELFORT JUNIOR B WINS PROVINCIAL CHAMPIONSHIP

MR. N. VICKAR: (Melfort) — Mr. Speaker, I have a rather important announcement to make at this time and I should like through you to make this

announcement to the House.

Last night in Melfort, with a crowd of about 1,300 spectators, the Melfort Junior B hockey team known as Team Melfort, won the provincial championship title defeating the Regina Pat Canadians. I think maybe that is why his Worship is not in his seat this afternoon. I was hoping that he would be.

I would, on behalf of the House, Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate Team Melfort and wish them well in their journey to the play-offs with the Manitoba team and then on to the Canadian championship.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

POINT OF PRIVILEGE — ANNOUNCEMENTS IN THE HOUSE

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition) — I was wishing the Premier would remain here longer than his usual two and one half minutes before he runs out, but I will direct the question to the House Leader, it isn't a question, it is a point of privilege.

I have a press release put out by Mr. Bowerman, announcing two new DNS branches created April 1st. I think this is really a question of House etiquette, when the House is in Session and the Minister was here, he was here yesterday and he was in the House for at least a little while, that surely it is the etiquette of proper procedure for Ministers, and there is a time for Ministerial announcements, to announce this sort of thing in the House, to give Members of the Opposition an opportunity if they wish to rise and comment on it, so that they have the information rather than a phone call from some diligent reporter who picks up the phone and asks if the critic, in our case, of DNS, knows anything about this. our critic hasn't heard anything about it. He might go home and have this question asked on the phone to him. It is hard for people to believe that while the House is in Session that a major announcement of two new branches being created, that MLAs would not have this information first.

I would hope — I know there is no rule covering this — but I think it is just a matter of common courtesy and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you could bring it to the attention of the Premier and he would in turn bring it to the attention of the Ministers, that when the House is in Session, whenever possible — maybe circumstances make it impossible or impractical that announcements be made first in this Assembly and then later to the press.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might address one or two brief comments to the question raised by the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart).

MR. SPEAKER: —I don't think so, because I don't view it as a valid objection to be raised in the House. As a matter of fact this point was raised in the previous session by the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant). I believe it was in November, I made a statement in the House with regard to the matter. I haven't

had time to review the ruling I made at that time, however, I believe the Member for Wascana at that time raised a matter of bills being announced somewhere other than in the House or that someone had access to bills before the Members of the House had access to the bills. I think he was referring to the press gallery at that time.

I think the statement I made covering that situation would apply to the situation as raised by the Leader of the Opposition, namely, that the Minister is not obligated to make announcements in the House. However, in a lot of cases Ministers do make announcements in the House. I would, if the Member wishes, bring in a ruling on that as if it were a Point of Order requiring a ruling. I think the reference to that ruling I made before would solve the problem.

MR. CAMERON: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't address myself to the Point of Order so, therefore, I raise another one of a similar kind.

It is true, as the Speaker has indicated or as the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake has indicated, that there is no specific rule covering this situation. But the rules do make the point that we are to observe the customs of the House of Commons. It is clearly a custom there for Ministers who are making statements of government policy and government programs, to bring those statements and make them in the Commons so that Members opposite can respond and that is done virtually invariably.

It is taken by the Members of the House of Commons to be contemptuous of the Members if Ministers don't follow that practice. Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, a Minister will do otherwise, but they always risk the censure of the Commons for being contemptuous of it, if they don't make those ministerial statements to the members first, rather than to the public.

I would like to request, Mr. Speaker, to consider that, which I think is a different question to the one raised by the Member for Wascana and to bring back to the House a ruling in that connection. It is a practice that we most certainly should want to get into.

MR. SPEAKER: — Before going on to the next subject on the Order Paper, I would just say that I think a "custom" of the House implies that there is some discrimination to be used by someone in deciding whether he will do it one way or the other, whereas the "rule" is something that is supposed to be inviolate. I am not aware that a rule has been broken in this case, however, I shall look into the situation and report back to the House at a later time.

MR. MERCHANT: — I should like to address myself to you very briefly in that regard.

I think that you will find that the ruling that you make in the case which I raised, which was similar, said that, and in your ruling you came very close to pronouncing a ruling for this House which would have been similar to the rule

enunciated by my colleague for Regina South (Mr. Cameron).

You said that you thought that ordinarily the practice would be followed that the statement would be made here, but that there were no rules. I am going from memory and I don't want to oversell the case of what you said, but I certainly got the impression from what you said, when I read it, that you were saying there was no rule but that you almost thought it somewhat bad taste if bringing the matter before the House first was not the practice followed.

Certainly I suggest not so much to you, but to the Treasury Benches, that that would be the better practice for this House and that that is the practice that they should be adopting.

WELCOME TO FORMER MEMBERS

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to call to the attention of the House that we have a couple of former Members in the back. The old left-winger, Dave Boldt and Mr. T. M. Weatherald.

MR. ROMANOW: — They need you Dave!

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 1

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg), to move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 1 showing:

(1) The amounts of money, if any, that have been paid to Mr. A. John Beke either by Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited or Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation for and in respect of his duties as a director of Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited, and the dates of each of such payments. (2) The number of directors' meetings of the said company Mr. Beke attended and the dates. (3) Whether Mr. Beke, in his capacity as a director of the company, reported to any of the officers or employees of Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation with respect to the business affairs at Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited and the nature and content of each of such reports.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before moving these next several returns I would want to just say a few words. These Resolutions are for information, they're for information that MLAs should be entitled to. There have been insinuations in this House that there is a war on business, and I want to assure the Members opposite that there is no war on business on this side of the House. I also want to make it abundantly clear there is no war on SEDCO either. We, in the Opposition, have a responsibility to perform and that is to criticize and to scrutinize the Government. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we are doing. We were also criticized rather harshly by the Premier because we were critical, though constructive. I want to assure him I've been constructive from the beginning with SEDCO.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

April 2, 1976

MR. NELSON: — I have continually suggested better business management, better business policies and I will continue to follow the bankruptcies and the works of SEDCO and hope the Minister will someday try to clean up the actions of that corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON: — And I move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 1 showing: and it was seconded by Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South).

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few words to Order for Return No. 1 and respond to the brief words that were made by the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Mr. Speaker, he may say to this Legislative Assembly that they don't have a war on business. But I tell him to go to the communities in Saskatchewan and answer for his actions and for other Members in the Liberal Party and the Members who sit to your left as to whether there is a war on business. And I ask him to direct his comments to the business communities of Saskatchewan and they'll tell him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — They'll tell him, Mr. Speaker, whether there is a war on business. That Member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has the audacity to say that he has no war on SEDCO. Yet, he has taken every opportunity to misinterpret the actions of SEDCO. He has taken every opportunity that he could find towards embarrassing the clients of SEDCO and some of the Orders that he asked for in this House today are in regard to businesses that are operating with no evidence of having any economic problems, have no evidence of being in arrears in loans, have no evidence at not meeting all obligations and commitments to the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. Yet, that Member, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and his colleagues are asking this Government to convey to them information about those legitimate businessmen in order to discredit them in the general public's mind when they have no right to do so Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't argue that an MLA should not have information about the government's activities and the agencies of the government. But I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that MLA should be using that information in a legitimate manner and fashion. And the Liberals, to this point in time, haven't shown that they have any intentions to undertake to do so.

Now, the Member is a new Member, so he needs a little educating. Let me remind him what the government position was a few short years ago, between 1964 and 1971 when we asked for information, information about the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. Mr. Speaker, almost without exception . . .

MR. STEUART: — We gave it to them.

MR. MESSER: — . . . and the Leader of the Opposition says “we gave it to them”. I don’t know what he is talking about, but it certainly wasn’t information that the Opposition during that period of time asked for. The constant answer was that it’s not in the public’s interest, almost always, Mr. Speaker, almost always they refused to give us that information.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . never!

MR. MESSER: — One of the Hon. Members says ‘never’. All he has to do is look at the Journals and he’ll know what kind of information we got to the Orders and to the questions that were asked between 1964 and 1971.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when and if they can show that they are conscientious and there is legitimate reason in seeking out information this Government will be open in providing it to them. And I might also say, Mr. Speaker, we’re prepared to answer a lot of these Motions for Return which is more than they were prepared to do when they were the government between 1964 and 1971. And this first Motion for Return is one of them. This first Motion is one of them.

MR. STEUART: — Have you got a guilty conscience?

MR. MESSER: — Now, the Leader of the Opposition says we have a guilty conscience. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if anyone in this Legislature has a guilty conscience it has to be the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — They are now attempting at every turn to embarrass the Government and embarrass SEDCO for that dismal performance that they performed in 1964 and 1971 with that agency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said that we’re going to answer a number of these Orders for Return. That’s more than they were prepared to do when they were the government. But I also want to say it has been conveyed . . .

MR. THATCHER: — . . . convey . . .

MR. MESSER: — . . . the Member for Thunder Creek wants to speak. Just give me a moment or two and I’m sure that you’ll take part in the debate. Mr. Speaker . . . not a chance; wait ‘til you work your way down these twelve Motions for Return. I’ve been waiting for a little while to get into this debate of your war on businesses, as the Attorney General said. Mr. Speaker, let me say, that SEDCO has for a number of years conveyed to the Members, Government and Opposition, that where they felt it was legitimate to seek out information that that information would

be provided to them privately and Mr. Speaker, that has been conveyed to the Opposition Members of the Legislative Assembly this year. But they are not asking for that information because they don't want to really know what the circumstances of some of those businesses are, they simply want that information to undertake cheap political gains in order to embarrass not only the Government but SEDCO and the businesses that are involved. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member should keep that in mind, I think the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg should keep that in mind when he asks for this information.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I think we could do with just a little less crossfire. Order! I think that it would certainly make the decorum of the House much more civil for all of us and it would certainly expedite our whole business.

MR. MESSER: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a number of other things I want to say in regard to some of the other Motions for Returns and I knew as the afternoon wore on if they weren't brought to order on the other side I probably wouldn't be able to debate all of the Returns that I should like to.

I simply want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to provide the information that the Member asked for in this Order for Return and a number of others, but I would hope that he would use it in a conscientious and in a legitimate manner, rather than attempting to undertake to continue, as the Attorney General says again, the war on business in Saskatchewan, because clearly nobody gains from that, particularly the community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S.J. CAMERON: (Regina South) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have just been treated to a classic demonstration of the old phrase "methinks the Minister doth protest too much". Very clearly that's what we've seen. Look at the questions that have been asked and consider the response it drew. The question is how much money was paid to one Mr. John Beke as a director of Meadow Lake Wood Industries? He was the member placed on the board of directors by SEDCO. Question is: how many meetings did he attend when he was a director? What date did he attend the meetings and what information did he have? The reason for the questions is clearer when one considers the colossal mess that the Meadow Lake Wood Industry Plant is in. It was interesting indeed, to listen to the Minister, as he did the other day, describe first of all when we began to ask questions about these operations, when we first had notice of Meadow Lake Industries, and we began to look at it. we sought information that we didn't get. So we went to some traditional sources of information to get it. Searches in the Land Titles Office and the central registry system in the company's office, in the registration of debentures office and eventually we pieced it together. What we found was a Government that had put in 1.9 million dollars into Meadow Lake Wood Industries, that it had taken a 45 per cent equity position, that it had put John Beke on the board of directors and we want to know how many meetings he attended and what information he had, because thereafter, the record was one of absolute and total mess in that company. Now any time two Members of the

Legislature begin to probe that kind of an operation that has \$2 million of Saskatchewan money in it and are classed as too poor by the Minister, I say that's appalling nonsense. Then what the Minister did, not having answered the questions you understand, not having directed himself to the issue that was raised, instead, calling the two MLAs that have raised it two damn poor MLAs. Then what he did was to attack the media for having carried the story. He said the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and the Leader-Post were too damn poor newspapers for having carried the story. Again, not having directed himself to the issue or the substance of the matter that was raised, having directed himself first to the personalities that were involved, secondly the newspapers that were involved. Then, as I say, we saw another classic performance again just a few minutes ago. Of all that bluster and blunder which is designed again to draw attention away from the real fact here and that was a colossal failure of substantial magnitude in Saskatchewan. Then it was interesting again when the Minister took a swipe at the Star-Phoenix and the Leader-Post for having reported sensibly and responsibly on this question. He said, you know they only pay attention to the failures, they never report on the successes and the great success story that SEDCO is. What was interesting about that was that that very complaint appeared in an article that was headed up "SEDCO Losses — \$2 Million on Annual operation", said they never report on a great success story, only on the failures. Mr. Speaker, the Meadow Lake Wood Industries issue which these questions are directed at, is in every respect a mess of major proportion. And we, in asking these questions about the expenditure of \$2 million of taxpayers' money on that mess, that is not a war on business, that is a war on mismanagement by this Government, that is what that is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — They gave those employees in the Meadow Lake Wood Industries 15 minutes, these humanity-first guys, they gave them 15 minutes notice before they let them go. Do you know that the employees that were paying into a pension program that had been cancelled by that company in October, while their John Beke was on the board of directors, continued to pay throughout November, December and January, into a nonexistent plan.

Now they did a number of other things at the same time. Mr. Speaker, the worst of them all in a sense was, the employees were, and the company was, contributing to a Christmas fund for a Christmas party, an annual event. The company gave the employees' association a cheque for \$200 to cover its portion of the Christmas party. Then they went out and had a party, the management and the employees of the company had the usual traditional Christmas party. Then it wasn't very long after that that the cheque bounced. So the Christmas party which was put on by the company in that respect, the company on which Mr. Beke was on the board of directors, and which had \$2 million of Saskatchewan money in it, they even bounced a \$200 contribution to the Christmas party. Then we saw instances in that plant of 25 per cent of the production which wasn't usable because they were using inferior products and they had no control over it. They had a manager who was never given the financial facts until it was too late. There was no proper cost control, no proper accounting control, a manager who was being misled consistently by officials of the company, all the

while this Government and that Minister were standing by and doing nothing. Now if that isn't a colossal mess I want to ask you what is? We ask questions and we are called "too damned poor MLAs", and newspapers that report it are "two damned poor newspapers." The CBC television carries an extensive report, an excellent one, it's "a damned poor network." But, not once in all of this has the Minister turned his attention and his mind to the issue which has been raised and given us some explanation of how we got drawn into a colossal mess of that kind. Mr. Speaker, not only do we want answers to these questions, we want answers to all the following questions which are indeed, as the Member has indicated, a mere example of two Members of the Legislature doing the very kind of work that they were elected to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.F. A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I only wanted to address a few brief comments to you because this is very directional about Mr. Beke, and ask specifically for information about Mr. Beke and I wouldn't want the press to react in a way that they think that we're improperly narrowing our interests in that one individual, the former partner of the Premier, and the man who now does a great deal of legal work.

MR. ROMANOW: — Good lawyer.

MR. MERCHANT: — He may well be a good lawyer but I'll tell you that I'm very interested in the massive amount of Government work that he does. And I am very interested in — you are not going to suggest to me that that man is holding that position without some suggestion from the Government — and that's my belief and I'm very interested in Mr. Beke, I'm very interested in the relationship and the massive amount of work that is done by that law firm. And you may recall that I put on the Order Paper, in the last session, and will be putting it back on, a question that again hones in in a different area of law regarding that law firm. I remember when that kind of a question arose, that the Hon. Attorney General took great umbrage at the suggestion that lawyers, as with everyone else, should have to be disclosed. And I suggest that lawyers, more than anyone else, should be disclosed; that lawyers, because of their close relationship to the legal process and the work that they do, that's something that the Opposition and the people of the province have every entitlement to know and something about which the people of the province should be very careful.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to very simply say that I am very interested in what I would mildly categorize as a lecture from the Member for Wascana to the Government side, about disclosures of interests of lawyers and the like in the dealings of government. I agree with that position and I note that it is not funneled with any great deal of certitude with respect to the Federal Government and their lawyers and the contracts and the arrangements that are there. But that's neither here nor there. The Minister has indicated that this question can be answered and will be answered as far as we are concerned.

The Member was rebutting and I think legitimately so, the opening remarks from the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg with respect to his position, whether or not this is a war on business.

MR. J.G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) — I am a little disappointed in the very weak justification of the Attorney General and in particular the Minister responsible for SEDCO. It's interesting that we talk about a particular company, we hear talk about the war on business, we hear more talk, I must admit, over the last several years about the humanity of the Government, how concerned they are about people and how they are always trying to help people. We have an obvious situation that a former partner of the Premier was on the board of directors of a particular company. Let's try and look realistically at the so-called tie-in of the humanity or the humane approach that the Government opposite takes in its social programs and how it is always trying to help people. Now we get possibly a direct relationship between the Premier's former practice and the operation of the particular company.

Let's, when we talk about a war on business, let's see how a supposedly humane government treats the community in which SEDCO set up this particular plant. There is no doubt that from the very sudden demise and dramatic demise of this particular company that it was poorly thought out or SEDCO gave poor advice, or it was mismanaged and for no other reasons. We deplore the Government opposite, through SEDCO, through the Minister with his weak defence, who inserts this company into a particular community, poorly managed, mismanaged, poorly thought out. Employees are brought in from other provinces, according to the news report, to work in this particular company. The town itself was committed to a course of action on community planning and costs and subdivision costs to bring in this plant and the supposedly new families that were coming in. The town itself made certain expenditures, the taxpayers of the particular community made certain expenditures based on the backing of SEDCO. All of a sudden once this is all set up and the expenditures are made and the commitments are made by the community itself, the company goes bankrupt shortly after beginning operations. The very, very commitment made by the Minister of SEDCO, and SEDCO to that community, is something that should have been honored and I am assuming that the Government opposite will reimburse the community to make good the costs that were incurred by the particular community. I am assuming that aside from welfare forced upon these fired employees, or released employees, that the social disruption of individuals caused by the Minister responsible for SEDCO will be reimbursed by the supposedly humane Government. That's what you stand for, that's what you talk about. I am assuming that where there is a direct relationship onto the board of directors that something will be done and a commitment will be made publicly to stop such cheap, certainly immoral practices as rubber cheques for Christmas parties, taking or possibly defrauding pension funds of the employees. That's supposedly a humane government that, you know, embarked on this particular action. It seems to me that when we talk about a war on business that the one who is doing more to discredit business than SEDCO and government involvement in business is the Minister opposite with his cheap, partisan attacks on Members who are doing their jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — His usual attack as a matter of fact when we talk about the Members doing their jobs, the more of these fiascos that we can bring to public attention the sooner we get rid of that Minister and clean up SEDCO, the Members will be doing a great job for the people of this province and will be doing a public service for the people of this province. There is no doubt that the only war on business being carried on is the insidious attempts of the Member opposite to bring SEDCO into disrespect.

MR. ROMANOW: — Why. . .

MR. LANE: — You had your opportunity to speak and you blew it Mr. Attorney General. There is no doubt that the Minister opposite with his fanciful flights into movie making and cheap partisan attacks on Members doing their jobs in this Assembly is doing more to discredit small business in this province than anybody could hope to do if they did it consciously and purposely. For that, among other reasons, you stand to be condemned. We have asked for information, there is no war on business by this party. There is an insidious war on business by the Members opposite and that is the true war on business and that is the true tragedy that is being foisted upon the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. McNEILL: (Meadow Lake) — Mr. Speaker, I am tired of the Opposition over there running down anything that starts in the North and the particular Member for Gravelbourg-Assiniboia has nothing to do but sit here and run down the small business people in the North. He hasn't got the capacity to do anything constructive. I just listened to Mr. Cameron a little while ago talking about what happened to them. We happened for this particular party because of multinational people that come into our country and try to run it with 55 per cent of it, to take those things away from them. At least we took the responsibility and have paid off those workers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — Just for your information all those NSF cheques were covered yesterday by the Government.

MR. NELSON: — Rubber blankets . . .

MR. McNEILL: — Rubber blankets, where? The Opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, come in here in their little offices and make phone calls in there and they don't know what they are doing. They don't know what is happening out there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — And also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is time the Member for Gravelbourg-Assiniboia quits attacking the people in the North and quits trying to make small business people close their books, and quits trying to make the civil servants stop doing the job

they are trying to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — I am not particular what type of paper they have got. I've talked to the people in Meadow Lake this morning and they are quite satisfied that they got their pay and the pay was made up by this particular Government because we are sorry for them. And I just wish once that the Opposition across there would try and do something for the people of Saskatchewan instead of trying to discredit it all the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL: — For the information across there that they do not know, there was a development committee made up in Meadow Lake consisting of the Chamber of Commerce and the business people in Meadow Lake who asked for this type of a business to come in there. It wasn't forced on them by the Government and they are prepared to do this, they are prepared to take a look at this thing. I think the Government is prepared to do what they can for the people of Saskatchewan if the Liberals don't drag them down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY:(Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two very brief comments.

The remarks that I have heard opposite, from Members of the Opposition appear to proceed on a number of assumptions. I heard the Member for Qu'Appelle indicate that business in Meadow Lake is bankrupt. I am not aware of any bankruptcy petition. I think there is none. I think it may be in receivership and that may or may not be permanent. Bankruptcy is permanent, receivership may or may not be. I think we all agree with that. That may be a technical point.

The other point I want to make is this. The discussion I heard seemed to presuppose that Mr. Beke was a director of the corporation. The whole discussion is meaningless unless he was. My information is that the Beke firm incorporated the company and accordingly he was the provisional director momentarily. He and his secretary. My information is . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Did he act for SEDCO?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, do I have the floor or does the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley? My information is as follows . . . a new speaker, the Member for Shaunavon.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, please. I think I brought this to your attention earlier and I certainly would appreciate it from both sides of the House if you would try and control yourselves. I know that there are times when the emotion is great but remember you are here to do business for your province, let's do it in as honorable a way as possible.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I simply want to say this, my information is that Mr. Beke never was an active director of this corporation other than a provisional director, he never was a director. My information may be wrong, that is certainly my information. We are certainly going to look into this and give you the right answer. I hope that all those who have made remarks which reflect on anybody and are based on the assumption that Mr. Beke was the director, if they find out that he was not a director, will withdraw their remarks and indicate that they were in error and they regret their error.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD: (Indian Head-Wolseley) — Mr. Speaker, I only want to add a comment and the comment is really this. The millions of dollars of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money has been squandered by the Minister in charge of SEDCO. Millions. It is the Opposition's responsibility by your own report, by the bankruptcies and the companies that have gone into receivership. And all of a sudden a couple of MLAs who are doing their responsible job of checking into what is occurring with the taxpayers' money . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Mean mouth . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Mean mouth is it. Well, I'm going to tell you something, I'll mean mouth SEDCO any day of the week if they are going to squander millions of dollars of Saskatchewan money. I'm not going to stand up and let the Attorney General say we can blow millions of dollars and the Opposition will sit down and shut up so they don't mean mouth the Saskatchewan businessman. Is that what the Attorney General is saying? And if you think you are going to muzzle the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) and the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) because they find out a public scandal of the way you people are mismanaging SEDCO and SEDCO's affairs, then you have got another think coming.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about Mr. Beke. The Attorney General stands up here and talks about Ottawa. Well, I just wish the Saskatchewan Government would reveal the legal operations of its lawyers like the Federal Government. You can go in any time, you can find out what the Federal Government pays by province, by constituency, by lawyer, by subject, by department. Can you imagine what kind of a public scandal the press would make if Pierre Elliott Trudeau's former law partner was all of a sudden given a job of organizing, arranging, the legal representative of a federal funded corporation, receiving millions of dollars of federal funds? There would be a public scandal and Ed Broadbent and those Members of Parliament that were in this House would be legally attacking that.

Mr. Speaker, there is going to be something here that is determined. We want to know and the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know the affairs of SEDCO, the mismanagement, the blowing of millions of dollars of Saskatchewan funds, it is time for a complete revelation, it is time for a public inquiry, it is time to determine whether or not SEDCO is a valuable instrument in Saskatchewan or not. And we are asking you and I suggest to you, and I'll tell you that, any time any government

established a Crown corporation to disburse public funds either by loan or by guarantee, without the actual sense of responsibility of ensuring that that is a viable operation, that is mismanagement and that is squandering of public funds and the NDP record of the last 30 years is very bad in that regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — The Member from the North, stands up and screams about the North, about those people and what happened. The only reason they were paid is because they were telegraphed and I have this telegram here sent by the Member for Regina South and the Member for Assiniboia. That is what inspired the payment of those funds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Did you watch the television production, had it not been for the Member for Assiniboia and the Member for Regina South that particular company and those particular employees would still be in the same problem they were.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — Then he talks about the North, the Member for the North. I would like to ask the Member for the North. You know, the Member for the North gets up and shouts like a banshee, why don't you sit down and listen for a moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're shouting.

MR. MacDONALD: — That's right and I am going to shout some more. The Member for the North stands up. I wonder how many people in Saskatchewan realize that this year the Department of Northern Saskatchewan will spend \$52 million on 25,000 people. On 25,000 people. I would say that in northern Saskatchewan that the average family would be four, five, a mother and father, that is six, seven. You just sit down and assess how much money is being squandered in the North by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan of \$52 million.

MR. MESSER: — What does this have to do with the Motion for Return that we are discussing now, SEDCO, Meadow Lake Wood Industries with northern Saskatchewan and their expenditures?

MR. MacDONALD: — Well, I'll certainly tell you because it is another example of how you are squandering money, the same way you are wasting it in SEDCO.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — I would like to know if somebody would sit down and calculate the amount of money spent by the Federal Government in northern Saskatchewan, the amount of money spent by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, \$52 million, by these estimates right here on 25,000 people. You figure out what that

April 2, 1976

costs per family. You could bring them down and build them a palatial mansion anywhere in the North, give them a Cadillac.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell them . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — I sure will tell you. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, don't let the blunderbuss of the Minister of Industry and Commerce distract us by his personal attack on the two Members who carried out their responsibility of bringing this issue before the people of Saskatchewan. It is about time and all I am calling for, if you have nothing to hide, gentlemen, if you are not ashamed of anything, then let's have a public inquiry into SEDCO. Let's investigate whether it is doing its job. Let's find out whether or not there is a proper assessment of taxpayers' money then you and I can decide and the people of Saskatchewan can decide whether it is a good one or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER: (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives) — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it in the explanations of the Premier, I don't quite follow what the so-called war on business that's being discussed and thrown back and forth in this Assembly, has to do with it in this particular motion. As I understand it, the Government of Saskatchewan through SEDCO owns shares in Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited, as I understand it, and we, as the representatives of the people of Saskatchewan, presumably the shareholders, have called to account the Minister for the actions of a director of their corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Surely, if we as representatives of the shareholders call for the actions of the director we are entitled to this information without being told that in any way we are conducting a war on anyone. We are representing our constituents (who the Members opposite mention all the time are the shareholders of the Saskatchewan business), yet, in this Assembly, in Crown Corporations, in Public Accounts, the representative of the so-called shareholders are denied access to information because it would make the organization less competitive and it would release information pertaining to your fellow shareholders who are also small private businessmen. And unfortunately . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . how many. . .

MR. COLLVER: — If you really want to know a million six, does that answer you? Write it down.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order please! Again I'm sure that we will endeavor to give all Members a chance to get into this debate at the proper time and I've asked all Members when they are debating to try and relate their remarks to the Motion at hand. Member for Nipawin continue please.

MR. COLLVER: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I certainly am pleased

to hear, having just gone through the first 43 days of the first session and the last ten or twelve days of this Session, listening to the friendly remarks made by the Members to my right that I am now a front for the Liberals and I sure hope that that will be mentioned in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't understand why the shareholders or the people of Saskatchewan on the one hand, should be called shareholders when their representatives can't get information and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I don't see how either this Motion should not be in order to release information to the public on behalf of these private businessmen, or on the other hand the Government shouldn't involve itself in these private organizations to begin with.

HON. E. KRAMER: (Minister of Highways) — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a word or two to remind some of the former Members — there are so few of them left that probably we shouldn't remind them, and some of the new ones, about the efficiency of some of the enterprises that were started by the people opposite. One Member of the Treasury Benches is left, yes one.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! I don't believe the Member is speaking to the Motion . . .

MR. KRAMER: — Oh yes I am. There has been a great deal of reference to how government should conduct business. Let me remind them of some millions, which is now interesting, of another enterprise that was started on April Fools' Day, 1965, called the Primrose Forest Products of Meadow Lake. A great enterprise put forward by that Party, rooted by that Party. You know, Mr. Speaker, a funny thing happened on the way to that enterprise. It was supposed to have employed 500 people and they got so enthusiastic that that government actually built 46 miles of highway from nowhere to nowhere, spending \$1.2 million on it and it is still sitting there — opening up the North, yes. Opening up the pocketbook of the taxpayers to a little enterprise that was going to net a few shareholders a few bucks. Unfortunately, another Mr. Nelson got wise to it —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order, please! I would ask the Hon. Member to try to confine his remarks strictly to the Motion.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I am relating to the type of management that these people were guilty of mismanagement — and I could also relate a little further, where they spent \$6 million at the Anglo Rouyn, and the Anglo Rouyn mine was well named, the Liberals got the angle and people got the ruin. They spent \$6 million on a highway, again, for an industry and they collected, Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$90,000 in revenue for high-grading the copper ore out of this country and built a road for them to steal it, for their friends again. That is how they did it. They lecture us!

Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly just about one year ago there was an official opening of the Meadow Lake Wood Products. Who officiated it? Not the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, not the Minister of Industry, no, the Hon. Cliff McIsaac. I can produce a picture. There was the Hon. Cliff McIsaac

and Mr. Nelson sawing off a piece together, a piece of wood that is. Why was the Hon. Clifford McIsaac there representing the Federal Government? Because DREE sunk a lot of money into it. And I am sure that they did some research as to the validity and the future of this company, the possible future. I am not criticizing that DREE put this money in, but these imbeciles would stand up here in this House, I withdraw that Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. They lack a little intelligence I should say. They would tell and they are trying, Mr. Speaker, to brainwash — and God knows there is not much laundry over there — brainwash the rest of the Opposition in thinking there is something wrong.

At least, Mr. Speaker, we do have a plant and it is a viable plant, built by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, federally, assisted by SEDCO provincially, mismanaged by some Conservatives from Alberta, to the extent that it went broke, probably ripped us off a little as those people are bound to do eventually. However, it is a vastly better than Primrose Forest Products which never came into being and in which we invested millions of dollars into building roads for a nonexistent industry by the Liberals.

So I would suggest that they look a little at their history. I know there are a lot of novices over there who don't remember the history. But the financial critic does; the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) does because he was one of the authors of it and the author of a good many fiascos. You talk about spending, and you raised it, you didn't call him to order Mr. Deputy Speaker, about money being spent in the North.

Well if he would like to tell us about all the buildings that were built by some friends in the North by that Government, not even tenders and they ripped off the taxpayers left, right and centre, under the former Minister of that area, the Hon. Allan Guy. I don't like to talk about these things and I didn't want to, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let them just look into their own closet before they try to attack SEDCO, which is taking risks in an effort to develop industry in Saskatchewan. I don't apologize for what SEDCO is doing. We are taking risks; we know we are taking risks; we will continue to take risks on behalf of businessmen in Saskatchewan, for the people of Saskatchewan, assisted by DREE, which has a great deal more intelligence apparently than the people opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) — Mr. Speaker, at the present time I just want to ask the Minister of Highways if he would in fact entertain one question.

MR. KRAMER: — Be glad to.

MR. BAILEY: — I understand that the Crude Lake Cattle Company, or something like that, I understand that this company has gone broke, is that correct?

MR. KRAMER: — Apparently it has gone bankrupt and it is being sold by the sheriff on the instructions of the Department of Indian Affairs. That is right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order please! Again I do not see how this relates to the Motion that is at hand.

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, I just have one quick remark to make before closing debate on this one and it would certainly appear, Mr. Speaker, like we have a tiger by the tail.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 4

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 4 showing:

(1) The amount or amounts loaned by Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation to Dowie Construction Limited or Len Dowie Construction Limited, and the dates of each of said loans. (2) The security taken by Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation in respect of each of such loans. (3) Whether there has been default on any such loans and if so, the particulars thereof. (4) Whether Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation has sustained a loss in respect of any loans made to the said company. (5) Whether Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation realized any return on its security in respect of such loans and if so, the amount or amounts so realized and the full particulars thereof.

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to ask this Assembly to defeat this Motion for Return. I ask that for a number of reasons. The Order asks for the amount of moneys loaned to Len Dowie Construction Limited. It also asks for the security taken in each loan. I am not saying that that isn't bad or that there is substantively something wrong with that, but it goes on to ask whether there has been any default and if so all particulars relating to that default; and it asks whether SEDCO has sustained any loss; and it asks whether SEDCO has realized any return on its security.

To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, this company is still operating and we have no reason to believe that we will be sustaining a loss with that company. To reveal detailed information to the public concerning its financial affairs I don't believe can be interpreted to be deemed in the interests of the company or the general public. In fact, I think what it does, is take the company that is now operating, operating within the lines of SEDCO in a way that is allowing it to meet its obligations and commitments to SEDCO. To undertake to answer this kind of question and to provide the information I think in effect shrouds the company in a cloak of suspicion as if there is something that is going on that we don't know about or something that is about to happen to hinder the company. We have no reason to believe that. It has been advertised as a policy of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation that SEDCO will maintain a confidential basis in the dealings with anyone who approaches the corporation or who undertakes to do business with it. And certainly for companies that are operating with

assistance from SEDCO and there is no evidence of any problems in regard to those companies, I think to undertake to provide the information would in effect be a breach of confidence with those parties and individuals and/or companies.

I don't believe it would be appropriate for SEDCO to violate this principle which I believe is based on sound business ethics and in particular could be of advantage to SEDCO's competitors in the lending field. So that I ask that the Members opposite give consideration to the ramifications that I think the answer to such a question may have for the company and its operations and allow the motion to be defeated. I would like to convey to the Member that if he has some reasons for us, some reasons that he believes there may be problems or problems in the future, that he bring them to my attention and I would be more than happy, in confidence, to pass on to the best of my knowledge the situation in regard to that company. But I think to make that information available to the general public at this time is not really in anyone's best interest so I move that the Assembly defeat Order for Return No. 4 showing.

MR. COLLVER: — Before the Member takes his seat would he permit a question. Does the Government of Saskatchewan own shares in the Dowie Construction Limited or Len Dowie Construction Limited?

MR. MESSER: — They are two separate companies. To the best of my knowledge we do not own any shares. They both may well be clients of SEDCO, certainly this one is. I can't speak for the other company, but I can almost say I am certain that we do not own shares in the companies.

MR. S.J. CAMERON: (Regina South) — Mr. Speaker, I want to address a comment or two on why this question appears on the Order Paper and what it seeks. Our information in this connection is as follows. We are told that Len Dowie Construction Limited, or Len Dowie Construction, one of the two companies set up a business under that corporate vehicle by the name of Deluma Campers. And it was the Deluma Campers portion of the operation which received a number of loans from SEDCO, I believe more than one, in fairly substantial amounts. There was quite an announcement not so many months ago about the opening of the business, Deluma Campers in Regina which manufactured campers for the back of trucks. I have forgotten the date on which the business was opened, but our understanding was that SEDCO loaned money to this company for that purpose. There is also information we have in respect to which we would like to ask questions. I don't want to overstate it because as the Minister said Len Dowie Construction is still a viable company and still in operation. So I want to choose my words particularly carefully because it isn't our intention to bring any embarrassment on that company. What we are really attempting here is to get at how much money was loaned to that company and for what purpose. Because, Deluma Campers operation has now gone under. There was a notice not long ago in the newspaper of a sale of remaining stock by Deluma Campers which was done by an auctioneer which is a pretty good indication that that company, that portion of the company has gone under.

Then indeed we have information in other respects that

would indicate that more attention should have been paid by SEDCO management to the way in which that arm, Deluma Campers was being conducted in view of the substantial amounts of money that went to it. That is the background that generates the question.

Now perhaps what we can do to satisfy the Minister, because obviously the Members opposite are going to vote against providing the information. We will redraw the question to exclude Len Dowie Construction and draw it only in respect of loans advanced for the establishment of Deluma Campers. How much that was and how much we lost in that connection? So what we will do — Members opposite will vote it down = what we will do is bring another question back, directed specifically at Deluma Campers and it's the kind of information which I think surely we should have.

Motion negatived.

RETURN NO. 5

MR. R. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 5 showing:

(1) The name and address of the general contractor respecting the construction of the plant owned by Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited in Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan. (2) The names and addresses of all major suppliers of materials, equipment and for labor used or employed in construction of the Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited plant in Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan. (3) The total amounts of money paid to each of the general contractors and the major suppliers of materials, equipment and for labor respecting the construction of the said plant. (4) The names and addresses of any persons, including corporations, with whom Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited may have entered into a management contract with or the equivalent of a management contract.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: —I think in item 5, to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 5 showing, that I would like a little longer to see if this pertains to the provincial issues. I am speaking of this owned by Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited in Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan. I would like to reserve judgment on this motion at this time and ask that it be stood.

MR. CAMERON: — I wonder then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I can address one or two comments to you in connection with the decision which you have made. The point is that SEDCO loaned to this company about \$2 million. So it is SEDCO money that is being used by this company in its construction phase and later.

The second point is that SEDCO owns 45 per cent of the shares of Meadow Lake Wood Industries. It is a major shareholder. Hence . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — So what?

MR. CAMERON: — Let's not so what. The point I am making is simply

this: Since it is \$2 million of SEDCO money which belongs to SEDCO and the Government and the people, since we hold 45 per cent of the shares, since we have a member on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan on the Board of Directors when these decisions were made, I say that that is a very tight and a sufficient link to justly bringing forward the kind of information we seek. Now, may I just make one more point in connection with it for you to consider.

Again, our information here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the company that constructed the plant for Meadow Lake Wood Industries is owned by the same Mr. Nielson who is the principal shareholder in Meadow Lake Wood Industries. So the point of the question is to find out how much Saskatchewan money went to Mr. Nielson's second company who constructed the plant? Whether the Government was aware of that, whether it was endorsed, what decisions were made, that is what it is aimed at.

As, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will know it is very often that a company in being established will enter into contracts with associated companies. Management contracts, construction contracts. Mr. Deputy Speaker will also know, and I don't make this suggestion here because we don't yet have the information, but if I may make this last point, you will know that those kinds of arrangements are occasionally used to siphon off funds from one company to another, that is what these questions are directed at.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! I have stated that I should like to reserve my judgment on this motion at this time. I am prepared to bring back a further judgment on it.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I speak to the Point of Order?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — All right, but very briefly.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Member has pointed out, the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron), the Order is asking for information involving subsidiary companies. I don't argue that our partner, Meadow Lake Wood Industries was Mr. Nielson, 55 per cent. Mr. Nielson's subsidiary companies were involved in the construction of the plant. We have no reason to believe that everything wasn't anything other than above board. But I don't see how the Government has the authority to undertake to ask Mr. Nielson's subsidiary companies or the other companies who may have undertaken work and in turn passed that work on as subcontracts to companies that have absolutely nothing to do with Meadow Lake Wood Industries and nothing to do with the subsidiary companies of Mr. Nielson and have them convey to us the information that this question asks for. It is an impossibility for the Government, on the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, to force other companies, some perhaps related to Mr. Nielson, others which obviously were not related to Mr. Nielson, some even located outside the Province of Saskatchewan to convey to us the amounts of money that were paid to them, the names and addresses of the suppliers and the materials to them that were used in the Meadow Lake Wood Industries operations. I ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking to this Point of Order that you rule the Order out of order when you have time to deliberate

over the connotations that the question has.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I will address the Hon. Members and I say that I think I have been fairly lenient, I have given you both a chance on the Point of Order from both sides. I have expressed my desire. I will take into consideration the remarks you both have made and from that I will give you my judgment at a later time.

RETURN NO. 6

MR. R. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 6 showing:

(1) The dates of each of the contracts entered into between Len Dowie Construction Limited and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in each of the years 1972, 1973 and 1974 and 1975. (2) The amounts of money paid by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to Len Dowie Construction in each of the years 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975. (3) The particulars of each of the said contracts. (4) Whether any portion of the contract price, in respect of any contract between the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Len Dowie Construction Limited has been assigned to Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation or is payable or being paid to Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation in any manner whatsoever.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to propose an amendment to this Order for Return. I do this in light of the fact that the firm that the Order relates to has been in business for quite some time in the Province of Saskatchewan, certainly prior to 1972, has in fact had business with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation prior to the time that the Member seeks information for. I should like to provide him with some more complete and extensive information. It is with that in mind that I move, seconded by Mr. Romanow, the Member for Riversdale, that the Motion for Return No. 6 be amended to include the years 1969, 1970, and 1971 in parts (1), (2) and (3) of the Return. I so move, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I would ask the Hon. Member either we take time for him to make more specific the intent of his amendment or that we stand it at this time and it be resubmitted. I do not think that it is specific enough to attach to the original motion at this time.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you have the only copy of the motion, if I could take a look at it. I attempted to make it specific, '69, '70 and '71 as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order to enhance the progress of the House, we will stand it and submit an amended motion at some later date.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Then I take it that the Hon. Member is asking for

adjournment.

MR. ROMANOW: — He has made the motion, let me adjourn the debate. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 9

MR. R. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 9 showing:

(1) The amount of money loaned by the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation to Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited, together with the date of the loan, the interest rate, the security taken by Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation and the loss sustained thereon. (2) The maximum number of employees employed by Meadow Lake Wood Industries Limited. (3) The date the said company ceased doing business. (4) The date the said company was placed into bankruptcy or receivership.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to ask the Members of the Legislative Assembly to defeat Return No. 9. I advance the same reasons that I advanced in the Notice of Motion for Return No. 4 in regard to Dowie Construction. Even though the Meadow Lake Wood Industries operation is now in receivership, not yet bankrupt. We are hopeful that we will be able with the receiver manager in place to solve some of the problems that Meadow Lake Wood Industries is confronted with. I think at this time to provide that information to the general public may well have some negative reactions in our ability to either reopen the company or interest other principals in reopening the company. I think that information as to how much money is owed to SEDCO and/or the interest rate, the amount of money that we may stand to lose will certainly jeopardize our position of recovery, if in fact, there are interested principals interested in reopening or acquiring the company. I am sure that if the Member who asked the question truly has no war on business in Saskatchewan he will appreciate the fact that if the assets are to be sold, it is in the best interests of the company and those who have advanced money not to have the general public know the amount that is outstanding. I think it certainly has a relationship in regard to what may be paid for the assets knowing that some of the principals at least will stand to get nothing out of it. And some others perhaps because of the information advanced would be satisfied to get a far lesser return on the dollar invested than they would be if that information was not known by the general public. I say for those reasons and the reasons that relate to the optimism that we may be able to work something out in reopening the company. I should like the Members to consider defeating this Motion for Return No. 9.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I can address a couple of comments to that point. There is no use my directing a lot of comments to it. It is futile obviously to argue the point. Members opposite are not going to give us the information. Except to say that there is no substance really to the point

the Minister makes. All we ask for here is the amount of money which SEDCO loaned to Meadow Lake Wood Industries because our information is that there were two loans, one of \$765,000 and one of \$1.9 million. We want to know if that information is correct. What portion of those loans have been retired, how much is outstanding? In view of the fact that this company is in a mess and no one can deny it is a mess, it is a major mess, we ask for the interest rate, what security we have, what are we likely to lose. The disclosure of that information I suggest to you will have no bearing at all on trying to bring the company back together again which is a move we support.

I think, if I can just briefly say, it is a deplorable attitude. Obviously the Government is highly sensitive about the Meadow Lake Wood Industries thing. This sensitivity in connection with it really is going to spur us on to ask more questions and dig deeper and eventually we will get the information.

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — I should just like to make some very brief comments in this regard. I think that we are looking here at a much larger principle. The principle relates to the relationship that SEDCO has with businesses. Essentially the question is: should this Legislature allow information such as is being asked here to be made public on companies where the file is active? The matter is in receivership and there are these other public considerations that the Minister has indicated.

The Minister took the position in an earlier order for Return requested here, the Dowie Construction Return. The policy of SEDCO has always been in those types of circumstances, not to provide the information. That policy is a sound policy. It has always been the policy even under the Liberal government, and it is now the policy under the NDP Government. To allow the file on Dowie Construction, for example, to have been passed or to allow the file in the case of a company such as this which is still an open and active operation, makes it almost impossible to draw the line with other individual businesses that may be involved here. I think that is the larger issue which is at stake. I would simply agree with the Minister of Industry that in this case, in any case where the company file is active and the company is not bankrupt, the file is not in that sense final, that it would not be in the best business interests or keeping our trust with the small businesses to make such a file open. So I would support the Minister of Industry in his view.

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been listening with interest to the remarks both of the Minister of Industry and the Attorney General. I simply cannot accept what they say. This is a company which I am advised is owned 45 per cent by SEDCO, a Crown corporation, 45 per cent of the company is owned by the people of Saskatchewan. And the people of Saskatchewan are entitled as a right to know what the condition of this company is financially and otherwise.

The Minister of Industry has indicated that it would act to the detriment of the company if a prospective purchaser

April 2, 1976

knew exactly how much the company owed in the way of obligations to SEDCO. Surely this is nonsense. Surely no purchaser is going to buy a company unless he knows exactly how much money it owes, how much money it has, what its assets are and so forth.

Furthermore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, much of the information that we ask for here is of public record, if it is by way of a mortgage loan or by way of security filed at the Central Registration Office in Regina. Frankly, I just don't see any reason whatsoever for this information not being given to us by the Government without any problem. I think it is a different situation in the Dowie Construction case referred to earlier by the Minister.

I want to consider what both the Attorney General and the Minister have said before deciding which way to vote on this matter. I strongly feel that they are both wrong. I strongly feel that they are trying to hide something. Mr. Deputy Speaker I should like to consider their remarks and the Members on this side of the House I think would like to consider their remarks further, so accordingly I ask leave to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — The Member for Regina Lakeview begs leave to adjourn debate, is leave granted.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No!

MR. ROMANOW: — On a Point of Order. Am I in error. The Motion made by the Hon. Member for Lakeview wasn't adjourned on Item No. 9, Motion No. 9, to which that motion was presumably defeated. I think we are still on Item No. 9.

MR. MALONE: — On the Point of Order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe you ruled that it was agreed and that we have now moved to No. 10.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! My ruling, and I ruled — I only heard one voice from that side and I ruled that I agreed for the adjournment of it.

MR. COWLEY: — That was a big voice and I asked for a recorded vote.

MR. MERCHANT: — On a Point of Order, we are now on the next item. The next item has indeed been moved and has now been given by the Member and has been presented to the Clerk.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — My ruling was that I agreed that the debate was adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 10

MR. R. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 10 showing:

(1) The amount of money loaned by the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation to Sportsman Campers and Trailers Manufacturing Limited, together with the date of the loan, the interest rate, the security taken by Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation and the loss sustained thereon. (2) The maximum number of employees employed by Sportsman Campers and Trailers Manufacturing Limited. (3) The date the said company ceased doing business. (4) The date the said company was placed into bankruptcy or receivership.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, just before the question is taken I want to say that we will be providing the information that Order No. 10 asks for. But I want to convey to the Member that throughout most of the orders that have been moved today there is an assumption that whenever SEDCO is involved in a business that finds itself in some economic difficulty, SEDCO is the responsible party and/or that SEDCO sustains a loss. Certainly it is alluded in all of these questions that SEDCO is in fact losing money by participating in these businesses. I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is unfortunate that the company that is referred to in this particular Order, Sportsman Campers and Trailers Manufacturing, did run into economic difficulty and ultimately went into receivership and bankruptcy. But in this particular instance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was no loss to the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation because of the security that was taken and I think the action that was taken by SEDCO in recovering its money. That is not good news for any one because we would have liked to see the industry continue to operate.

But SEDCO doesn't operate the industry. We look at the proposal as it is advanced to us as we did in this instance. It looked as if it was worth the risk that was involved and for a number of years in fact it was a viable company. Because of economic circumstances and competition it wasn't able to continue its viability and ultimately went broke. We did I think recover the money that was invested in it. I don't say this to be interpreted critically but I think this company was also one that received a grant from DREE. And certainly the money that was advanced in the way of a grant in good faith by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion at the federal level was not recoverable. And that is a cost to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and Canada.

The point that I think has to be made is that, Yes, sometimes we get ourselves into similar difficulties where companies find themselves bankrupt and we are not able to recover all the money that we have advanced. But this is one where we have. Unfortunately the other partners in the general sense, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion were not so lucky. And it has cost the taxpayer some money.

MR. LANE: — Would the Minister permit a question before he sits down? Have all the employees been paid the full amount of any money owing to them? By that phrase I mean all back pay.

MR. MESSER: — I suspect that they were. I am sure that the Member is well aware that the outstanding wages have first claim on any of the assets. I am sure that the Workmen's Compensation

April 2, 1976

Board is responsible for that . . . then I will have to take the question as notice. I am not in a position to answer specifically.

MR. THATCHER: — Would the Minister accept another question?

I should like to ask the Minister, what is SEDCO's position when a proposal is advanced to it, to SEDCO that has previously been advanced to IDB and turned down by IDB? Will SEDCO consider the matter, will they consider it and in some cases even approve it?

MR. MESSER: — The Member asks about the Industrial Development Bank. There hasn't been an Industrial Development Bank for some time now. There could be that there has been significant change since. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Today . . .

MR. MESSER: — Well, okay then, we are talking about a different agency. If you are talking about IDB it goes back some time ago and the circumstances that you are talking about, a proposal that was advanced to them and turned down, could now be well different in substance and the climate that it is being offered in could be different. But, if he is talking about the Federal Business Development Bank, if they have just recently been turned down by that organization, I think that we would have to certainly review the application. We won't just simply turn a blind eye to a proposal because it has been turned down by such an agency. We have a number of proposals coming to us that have been turned down by other credit institutions as well as the Federal Business Development Bank. I can't say that we may or may not undertake to give assistance in finance. I think each situation would have to be evaluated on its own merits.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 11

MR. R. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 11 showing:

(1) Particulars, including the name and address of the borrower, of all loans made by the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation in the years 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975 in respect of which there has been default. (2) The action taken by the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation in respect of each of such loan defaults, the amount lost, if any, in each case and the present status of the borrower that is still in business, or in bankruptcy, or in receivership.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to address a few words to the Assembly prior to asking to have this Notice of Motion for Return defeated.

This Notice of Motion for Return, Mr. Deputy Speaker, No. 11, asks for all particulars in all loans for the period 1971 to 1975. It goes on further than that. It asks for all

money that may have been lost, assuming that money was lost in these instances. It asks for the present status of bankruptcy. It asks for the present status of receivership.

May I firstly say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these types of questions or Notices of Motion, or Orders for Return, when they were asked between 1964 and 1971 were never, never, Mr. Deputy Speaker, answered by the then Liberal Government. Now the Members on the Government side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, say, Oh! And I think one has to respond, I say why did the government between 1964 and 1971, the Liberal Government not want to provide the information at that time?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think one can only assume when we look at this Notice of Motion for Return in the specific years between 1971 to 1975, not wanting to go into the 1964 to 1971 era when they were the government, indicates that they may well have had something to hide, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — And if it wasn't something to hide specifically in relation to some of the activities of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was the record of the Liberal government in SEDCO between 1964 and 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Just let me remind some of the Members to your left, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that between 1966 and '71 under the former Liberal government, they undertook to approve 241 loans under SEDCO for a total amount of \$65 million. Whom did they give those loans to? Did they provide loans to small businesses, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The answer is no. No loans to small businesses in Saskatchewan. Were they undertaking to look at Saskatchewan and recognize the problems that small urban communities have in Saskatchewan and the need for financing by some institution which would take a greater risk than the established lending institutions? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they would not take that risk nor would they look at that small community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they said that they were not for the retention of small urban communities or diversification in the Saskatchewan economy.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether they wanted to encourage through this government agency an opportunity to decentralize business, manufacturing and other industry in the Province of Saskatchewan, the answer is No, because the loans that they did give were almost totally extended to industries or businesses located in Saskatoon or Regina.

They did provide money to some activities in the province, manufacturing. I am not saying that that was wrong. But in far too many instances they neglected to look at small manufacturing businesses which wanted to expand. They turned a blind

April 2, 1976

eye to new manufacturing operations which were willing to start small but had tremendous growth potential. Consequently those industries never got started in the province between '64 and '71 . . . oh! they did undertake to finance some hog operations in the Province of Saskatchewan. Most of them were sitting empty by 1971 because after advancing the money and in fact giving encouragement to diversifying that portion of the agricultural economy, they wouldn't give them any assistance when markets dropped down to all time lows and the producers had no resources to cope with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, what were some of the consequences of that Liberal attitude? In 1969 the population dropped by 2,000 people. In 1970 the population dropped by a further 17,000 people. Those residents of Saskatchewan couldn't even survive until the next provincial election when they knew full well that that Government would be defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, compare this to the New Democratic Party now. Population 1974-75 an increase of 25,000. In 1975 alone an increased 16,000 people and I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a lot of that relates directly to the attitudes and objectives of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Co-operation.

Now just let me give you an example of an urban community in Saskatchewan. Even though the former Liberal government gave preference to only the large urban community, Saskatoon is an example, and I am sorry that the Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) is not here. He always has such a great concern for the city of Saskatoon. In 1970, as far as the apartment vacancy rates were concerned for the city of Saskatchewan, they were in excess of 20 per cent. In 1971 there wasn't one . . .

MR. LANE: — On a Point of Order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — What's your Point of Order?

MR. LANE: — Well, it's over this particular Resolution and the motion and it talks about the names and addresses of companies, co-operatives, partnerships, sole proprietorships, other persons or entities that received loans from the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation in the years 1971 to 1975. Now, nowhere in there is there any talk about population, civil servants or anything of that nature that he has referred to and I think it may be, I realize that the Hon: Member is not used to that sort of thing, this is a little different role than the Throne Speech or the Budget Speech Debate. Perhaps he should stick to the Motion and I think that is the rule of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — In response to the particular Motion, I would ask him, if that is the situation, to strike his remarks from the Motion.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is exactly what I am going to do. If the Member for Qu'Appelle doesn't realize or recognize that the lack of industrial development and the lack of the environment or atmosphere for industrial development works on populations and/or businesses in the Province of Saskatchewan, he doesn't know very much. And to say that this Return cannot be related to economic achievement and economic buoyancy in Saskatchewan he doesn't know what we have been talking about in this Legislative Assembly all afternoon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was using Saskatoon as an example as to what happens to a community when you have got an inept government in regard to encouraging and planning economic advancement in this province. And I said that there wasn't one single apartment started in the city of Saskatoon because there was no financing, no opportunity . . .

MR. LANE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Member has been getting away with murder and abstruse remarks with absolutely nothing to do with the Motion before the House. Now surely the Hon. Member has been talking about this particular subject all afternoon.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! I find the remarks of the Minister in order.

MR. COWLEY: —To comment on the Point of Order, the only murder is the death of the Liberal Party, talk about murder.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! I find your comments out of order. I ruled the comments of the Minister in order.

MR. MESSER: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let me say that the level of manufacturing in that urban community during that inept Liberal period in time . . . to 142 manufacturing establishments employing only 4,000 people. The level of retail trade was \$197 million. Now compare that to 1975 after a new attitude was injected into the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation to encourage industrial development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Construction in that city in 1975 was \$128 million, or ten times what it was in the last year of the Liberal Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Retail trade has increased from \$197 million to . . .

MR. MERCHANT: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What possible relevance can this have other than the fact that they are both talking about SEDCO? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to remember that you are supposed to bring some unbiased rulings to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

April 2, 1976

MR. MERCHANT: — That the man that you are replacing does well in that post. The man that you are replacing, the ordinary Deputy Speaker, I think tries well and does well and your rulings over the Points of Order raised by the Member for Qu'Appelle were clearly not fair and unbiased rulings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, rising on a Point of Order, I believe that the remarks of the Member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) are a slur on the Chair, not only the matter if objectionable about the Chair, but from the Speaker down. Mr. Speaker, no Member — I have the floor . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! I recognize the Attorney General. Order!

MR. ROMANOW: — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Ask the Member for Wascana to withdraw those remarks because it doesn't relate to you acting as the chairman now. Those are remarks which are tied directly to the Chair and I simply ask the Member who was not here for four years from 1971 to 1975, when you ably acted as Deputy Speaker, to withdraw those remarks. Nobody has been allowed before in the House . . .

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Point of Order, there is no doubt and I will endorse what the Member for Regina Wascana said and I'll say, secondly, I know why he got removed from that position last time. It is because of rulings like that and I'll challenge that Point of Order.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Challenge the ruling.

MR. ROMANOW: — On the Point of Order, you have no other option, I don't see, but to ask the Hon. Member to withdraw and to take the appropriate action if they refuse to withdraw.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! The Member has challenged the Chair, the ruling of the Chair. I have ruled this Point of Order out of order. I am going to ask the Assembly to vote on that challenge.

MR. MALONE: — What's the challenge?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I believe you challenged my ruling did you not? I ruled that the Minister of Industry and Commerce was in order with regard to his remarks on Return No. 11.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — My ruling has been challenged, is it the pleasure of the House to uphold my ruling; call in the Members.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Otto Lang will hear about this.

Ruling of Chair sustained on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 28

Blakeney	Faris	Rolfes
Pepper	Kowalchuk	Cowley
Thibault	MacMurchy	Skoberg
Bowerman	Mostoway	Vickar
Romanow	Whelan	Nelson (Yorkton)
Messer	Kaeding	Allen
Byers	Kwasnica	Johnson
Kramer	McNeill	Thompson
Baker	MacAuley	Banda
Lange		

NAYS — 10

Stodalka	MacDonald	Anderson
Lane	Cameron	Merchant
Wiebe	Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)	Thatcher
Malone		

MR. ROMANOW: — I rise on a Point of Order relating to the comments of the Member for Qu'Appelle, preceded by the comments made by the Member for Wascana. I believe that both comments cast a slur on the Chair of this Legislature. I believe that if it casts a slur on the Chair it casts a slur on me and all Members of this House. I ask both Members, being lawyers, knowing their responsibility not only in terms of legislature but in that broader context, to reconsider and to withdraw those remarks made to you.

MR. MALONE: — On the Point of Order, may I suggest to the Member opposite he can have any opinion that he wants about remarks made from this side of the House. That does not make those remarks mean what he thinks they mean. If you had taken any exception whatsoever to the remarks made by the Member for Qu'Appelle or the Member for Wascana, you could have said so. You didn't say so. You were not offended by them particularly apparently, only the Attorney General appears to be offended by it. It may be because of his thin skin. I say that it is not a proper Point of Order even to be considered by you because you, yourself, didn't feel anything was wrong at the time, so I suggest we get on with the business, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROMANOW: — On a Point of Order, what the Member talks is pure nonsense. If the Hon. Member, in the course of a debate, gets up and says to this Member that he is a liar or a thief and then argues because I wasn't affected or didn't take any notice of it, that that isn't a slur on other Members, he doesn't know what the rules of the House are. The simple fact is that he made remarks to the Speaker that I view, as a Member, to be inappropriate and I have asked, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you ask the two Members to withdraw those remarks. That is the least they can do.

MR. MacDONALD: — A Point of Order. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest because the Attorney General happens to sit with the majority of this House that the only recourse that the minority have is to stand up and express themselves.

MR. ROMANOW: — You don't . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — Would you please keep quiet. You just finished making your speech.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I'll recognize the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley.

MR. MacDONALD: — All I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, if we have a question about the decisions and the conduct of the House, the only opportunity of a minority in this House who cannot overrule the majority is to stand up and express themselves. I do not believe there was an intentional disrespect, it was a discussion of a decision in letting the Minister of Industry carry on and discuss something that was unrelated to the topic. All I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I do not agree with the Attorney General that that was out of order. The minority, in my opinion has a right and a responsibility to question the decisions of the Chair, if, in their opinion they are being subjected to muzzling by the majority in this House.

MR. ROMANOW: — On a Point of Order, my issue is not that the Opposition does not have a right to challenge your (or Mr. Speaker's ruling) or anybody's ruling. That is not my Point of Order. My Point of Order is, and the record will clearly show and the Members know that they in addressing their remarks to you make remarks specifically about bias, and the Member for Qu'Appelle talked about knowing now why you were removed as Deputy Speaker was the remark, and the record will clearly show that. That's the issue. Not that they don't agree with the motion. They can challenge anything they want. They can call me anything they want. They can do anything they want, but when they get up to the Deputy Speaker and say that type of thing, that is when I think the line has to be drawn. There is a vital principle involved here and I simply ask one more time, would the Hon. Members on the Point of order, please get up and withdraw the remarks, that they were not made intentionally, that they were made in haste. No one is going to hold that against them. Just withdraw as gentlemen and get on with the business of the House. I raise that Point of Order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I would like to get the business of the House back to Resolution No. 11. I think every Member has a right to disagree with the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker. I think my ruling was challenged. I think my ruling was sustained by the Assembly and I'll ask all Hon. Members to address themselves back to the Resolution No. 11.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I would like to recognize the Minister of Industry.

MR. ROMANOW: — I move this House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:12 o'clock p.m.