

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature
25th Day

Thursday, April 15, 1976.

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. B. Allen (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce this afternoon to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly, a group of 66 Grade Eight students from Wascana School in my constituency. I am particularly delighted to introduce this group to the House because, Mr. Speaker, we have many fine groups of students who come to visit us from day to day in this Assembly and I assure you that none are finer than the group from Wascana School.

They are accompanied by their teachers, Jim Adair, and John Harvey. I think, Mr. Speaker, that most of us would agree that it is encouraging for people in public life to see the interest that our young people are taking in the parliamentary and democratic system under which we operate. I would like to welcome you this afternoon to the House and I look forward to meeting with you a little later. The students are in the Speaker's Gallery.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A. Blakeney (Regina Elphinstone): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might join with the Member for Rosemont in extending a greeting to the students from Wascana School. It is in his constituency, by a full hundred feet would be my estimate. It is the school which serves much of the constituency of Elphinstone. Two of my children go to that school and I share everything he said about what a good school it is.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Nurses' Strike

Mr. D. G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Health, but again he isn't here. I'd like to direct it then to the Premier. There is a great deal of talk about the possibility of a nurses' strike in all or part of the province, it could be most serious. I wonder if the Premier is aware of what action the Government is taking (a) to head off the strike and, (b) in the case of the strike to protect the patients in our hospitals?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member refers to negotiations between the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses and representatives of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. My understanding is similar to that of the Hon. Member, that the negotiations are at a difficult stage and that the strike vote has been taken. As I understand it, the union has been authorized to call a strike at their discretion. It is my understanding also that the strike is not or may not be imminent. It is my further understanding that representatives of the Department of Public Health are attempting to head off any such strike by discussions with both parties. I am also advised that a conciliation officer has been appointed. I am not fully aware of emergency plans which may have been made in the event of a strike. But it is also my understanding that the Department of Public Health is turning its attention to that matter.

Mr. Steuart: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier in the light of the settlement made with the teachers which ranged something around 20 per cent and a high of \$3,300, would the Premier assure the House that he will have agreed with the Minister of Health and the Department of Health they could make available to the hospitals the kind of money necessary so that they could offer a similar, I don't say exactly the same, but a similar generous settlement to the nurses who feel as strongly as the teachers do that they have fallen behind. Would he be prepared to take a new look at the budget for the hospitals, the SHSP, so that the hospital boards would be in a position to make as generous an offer to the nurses as has been given to the teachers of the province to avert this strike?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is yes, not that we will review the budget, but, yes, the funds can be provided to provide an offer as generous as that made to the teachers. It is my understanding, according to press reports (and I am not aware of this for sure) that the offer that has already been made by the employer would approximate that for which it is hoped they are prepared to settle, as the teachers were.

Grid Road Weight Limits

Mr. J. G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last night the Minister of Municipal Affairs met with the executive of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. As a result of that meeting: is the Government now prepared to back off its previously stated policy on weight limits and load limits? Would the Government further be prepared to continue the grid road system for this year for the rural municipalities that have not yet completed their system?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member asks me questions specifically in his terms, as a result of the meeting between the Minister of Municipal Affairs and some others. I was not at the meeting. I will take the questions as notice.

Mr. Lane: — A supplementary. I am advised at the meeting last night that the Association of Rural Municipalities denied

supporting the weight limit and load limit policies as proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Premier and the Cabinet. The Minister was so advised last night. In light of the contrary position taken and the indication from the Association of Rural Municipalities that they disagree with what the Minister said in the House, is the Government now prepared to withdraw that proposed load limit policy and if so, would you make that announcement today?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that he is not entitled in the question to give information and then ask questions about it. He proceeded to do that. It is an improper question and I don't propose to answer it.

Saskatchewan Potash Corporation — 1976-1977 Estimates

Mr. E. A. Berntson (Souris Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation has been formed, is there any reason to allocate funds in the 1976-77 Estimates under the Department of Finance for the advertising of Saskatchewan potash?

Hon. W. E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't really quite get the question. You will have every opportunity to deal with the question during the consideration of the Estimates.

Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The reason for this question is that we have been trying to get an answer during Estimates for the record. The question was, Mr. Speaker, is there any reason for the allocation of funds in the 1976-1977 Estimates under the Department of Finance for the advertising of Saskatchewan potash?

Mr. Speaker: — Next question.

Increased Capital Borrowing — Reducing Credit Rating

Mr. C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Premier. On April 1, the Saskatchewan Government floated a bond issue of \$75 million at 10¼ per cent on behalf of Sask Power. At approximately the same time, Manitoba Hydro floated a bond issue of about \$40 million at 8¾ per cent. Does this indicate to the Premier, that this province's greatly increased capital borrowing is reducing the province's credit rating?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is, shortly, No. I think the issues were very different. Ours were in Canadian funds, I believe theirs were in Euro-dollars. It was certainly not in Canadian funds, not in the Canadian money market, and is accordingly in my judgment not comparable.

Mr. Thatcher: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the

Mr. Thatcher:

Government any intention of entering into the European money market, either for money to purchase a potash mine or for Sask Tel or Sask Power or any other Crown corporation?

Mr. Blakeney: — The answer is: we certainly do not exclude that possible source of funds. We believe that in general we should stay in that Canadian market where the exchange risks are less, but if it appears advantageous to assume that exchange risk in exchange for a lower interest rate, we are prepared to do it. We have no current plans for so doing.

Mr. Thatcher: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier confirm or deny that top level Government officials have been in London and held either discussions or negotiations with various financial institutions and in particular with a firm that represents almost exclusively the Kingdom of Kuwait?

Mr. Blakeney: — I have no knowledge of the alleged event which the Hon. Member refers to. I am not able to confirm it or deny it but I tentatively deny it on the basis of my knowledge.

Mr. Thatcher: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier assure this House today that Arab funds will not be used either directly or indirectly in any potash purchase or for use in any other Crown corporation?

Mr. Blakeney: — I assuredly will not assure the Hon. Member of that. If Arab funds are cheaper we will borrow where it appears to be cheapest and most prudent. We will not select our lenders and I know they won't select their borrowers.

Legislation on Land Bank Commission

Mr. R. H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last fall with the opening of the session on November 12 the Throne Speech indicated that there would be legislation brought in this Session dealing with the Land Bank Commission. The question to the Minister of Agriculture is: can we expect that legislation this Session?

Hon. E. Kaeding (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I think you will have to wait a few more days before the decision on that is made.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Will that legislation control the individual farmer who has sold land to the Land Bank and they are now leasing the same land back? Is that the nature . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Next question.

Mr. Kaeding: — Wait until the legislation

is brought down.

Allow Potash Industry a Normal Profit

Mr. E. C. Malone (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to address to the Minister in charge of the Department of Mineral Resources (Mr. Whelan) but I see he is not here so perhaps I could address it to the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation.

According to the former Minister's announcement yesterday on uranium royalty the Government is now taking into consideration the fact that private companies and private operators like to make a profit. It's apparent in the uranium royalty structure that the profit incentive is taken into consideration. My question to the Minister is: you now realize this as far as the uranium industry is concerned, are you prepared to reassess your position as far as the potash industry is concerned and allow them a normal operating profit?

Hon. E. L. Cowley (Minister of Potash Corporation): — Mr. Speaker, I must answer the Member that I think circumstances and situations, both with respect to the type of industry and with respect to the type of negotiations that the industry was prepared to carry on in uranium vis-à-vis potash, are different. With respect to the potash industry, we indicated at the time the reserve tax was brought down that we were prepared to consider variations and changes in the potash reserve tax, provided we were provided with the financial statements, which we were not. At the same time the uranium scale as the Member will know, is graduated, a sliding scale, and that in principle was said by the people in the potash industry to be unacceptable.

Mr. Malone: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Again, the Minister of Mineral Resources indicated yesterday, not here but on TV, that one of the reasons this agreement was made with the uranium industry, the major reason for it was that the uranium industry was prepared to divulge their financial statements. Now if the potash companies should change their position and divulge their financial statements to the Government or to you or to the Minister of Mineral Resources, are you prepared to change the reserve tax structure?

Mr. Cowley: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we certainly will take that under consideration in the unlikely event that we receive the financial statements. And if we do we will have to take into account the circumstances both prior to and after those statements being received.

Mr. Malone: — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree with me, and is it not true that the reason that you handled the uranium industry in the manner that you did, was that exploration has not been completed to the same extent as the potash industry's exploration and that the potash industries are here and are a captive group of the Government while the uranium . . .

April 15, 1976

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Next question.

Spreading of Leafy Spurge

Mr. L. W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways. Is not the Department of Highways responsible for the spreading of noxious weeds, leafy spurge in this case, from an infested Government gravel pit?

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — All I can say to that is: I don't know what particular location he is referring to. If there is any property that is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Highways I would hope they would endeavor to keep the weeds under control as well as would any other citizen.

Mr. Birkbeck: — A supplementary. Then the Minister would agree that it is the responsibility of the Department of Highways to eradicate the noxious weed prior to removal of gravel?

Mr. Kramer: — If the Member would be specific and tell me just where the location is; if he would give me the location I could give him an answer much easier than replying to something hypothetical as to just exactly when and where this may have occurred. I say again, the Department of Highways is subject to the same regulations as far as The Noxious Weeds Act is concerned as any other body.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Last supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: — Next question.

Cable Communication

Mr. E. F. A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to one of the few Ministers who decided to show up today. The Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Mr. Blakeney: — Snippy.

Mr. Merchant: — Yes, it is a little snippy, isn't it. You should attend the House from time to time. It is an interesting place.

I wonder if the Minister would indicate the success or failure of his meeting recently with the Federal Minister of Communications and whether the Minister was successful in persuading Madame Sauvé that Saskatchewan should have a paramount right in cable communications within our own border in this province?

Hon. E. B. Shillington (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — To answer your question in a strict sense, that was never an issue. The Government of Saskatchewan has not taken

the view that the Province of Saskatchewan should exercise all jurisdiction with respect to cable TV. In general terms we do not quarrel with the view of the Federal Government as to what the constitutional jurisdiction is. Our main thrust has been the manner in which that jurisdiction is exercised. And to respond to your question it is difficult to gauge the success of our meetings because there were no conclusions drawn. We met, discussed the cable TV in Saskatchewan. It was a cordial meeting. The Federal Government appeared to be conciliatory and prepared to listen to the provincial point of view, but there were no conclusions drawn.

Mr. Merchant: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand this meeting was about ten days ago. Are further meetings planned with Madame Sauvé and were you the only provincial representative who met with the Minister at that time, or were there other Minister's advancing similar policies at the same time?

Mr. Shillington: — There are no follow-up meetings planned by myself with Madame Sauvé. I was the only Minister present at that time but I can tell you that she plans to meet, or I understand she plans to seek similar meetings with the other provincial ministers.

Mr. Merchant: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The enunciated policy, as I understand it, has been that the Province of Saskatchewan might deny the use of the streets and lanes for cable if the cable application of the province by Sask Tel is refused. Is that still the policy of the Government, or would you make it possible if a private cable operator were given licence, would you make it possible for cable to come to Saskatchewan say by the end of '77?

Mr. Shillington: — That is still the policy of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Merchant: — Is it still the policy of the Government of Saskatchewan to deny the use of streets and lanes?

Mr. Shillington: — It is still the policy of the Government that if the licences were given under what is known as a partial system we would deny the use of the streets and lanes.

Mr. Merchant: — A further supplementary. Would the Minister agree that only Saskatchewan and Quebec have this policy and that the other eight provinces are happy enough with the way that cable operates within the federal-provincial relations of the Dominion?

Mr. Shillington: — No, I won't admit that, other provinces in fact have adopted the position that Saskatchewan has.

Mr. Merchant: — Could I ask one last supplementary? Are you then saying if the parcel application is refused, that the

position of the Government of Saskatchewan will be that cable will again be denied to the people of this province because of your activity?

Mr. Shillington: — No, it is hypothetical and the whole question is much more complex than that.

Mr. Lane: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not admit that the reason that the people of Saskatchewan don't have cable television is because of your blockading of attempts to get cable television?

Questions on Porcupine Cubing Plant

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) asked me some questions about the Porcupine Cubing Plant. I would like to respond to them now if I could, Mr. Speaker.

The details of the loans that were guaranteed to the Porcupine Cubing Plant are fairly expensive. I will give them all to you if you wish. It isn't clear from your question whether or not you wanted that. Perhaps if you prefer I will table the information, or perhaps I could just give it to you.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the Minister consider putting that information in a form that could be tabled?

Mr. Shillington: — Sure, if you would rather I will table the answer.

Land Bank

Mr. R. L. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Do the regulations under the Land Bank Commission, at the moment, permit a father to sell to the Land Bank, the Land Bank then rent to the son, the son takes a job 300 miles away — a permanent job and the father farms the land?

Mr. Kaeding: — That is not a normal situation and there can be situations, I suppose, where the son would go away for a job for the winter. I wouldn't assume that if a son went and took a permanent job away from home, I think that he would then be reneging on his lease and it might be a cause for cancellation. That would have to be considered. We would have to look at that.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister saying that that is not permitted under the lease and the regulations of the Land Bank Commission?

Mr. Kaeding: — Well, the lease says that he must be farming as his full time occupation. He is permitted to take off-farm income or off-farm employment for a part of the year, but he must make farming his major occupation.

Mr. Collver: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the limitation on income from outside employment relative to income from farming? Is there any in the leases or the regulations?

Mr. Kaeding: — No, there is no limit to the amount he could earn off the farm as long as he is doing a good job of farming and taking care of his lease and making his payments, that is his privilege.

Mr. Collver: — A further supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. In the Minister's opinion then, I gather that the son could in fact earn \$50,000 in a job outside farming and could earn \$5,000 in farming, having paid . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Next question.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it now possible for a farmer then to sell land to the Land Bank and lease the land back to himself?

Mr. Kaeding: — Yes, under certain circumstances.

Mr. R. E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. Would he consider a teacher teaching in Saskatoon would have the right to have land under the Land Bank 250 miles south?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I just might point out that the last three questions have been questions asking for information which is equally accessible to all Members by examining the regulations or the legislation and, therefore, on that basis, I rule the last three questioners out of order.

SGIO Rates

Mr. C. P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

A short time ago I wrote to the Saskatchewan Prices and Compensation Board asking them if they would review the SGIO rates and other rates. I received a letter back today from Mr. Boychuk indicating that the SGIO rates and other Crown corporations are being reviewed and when a decision is made that they will then be made public. Would the Premier tell me what the Government is going to do now that all of the citizens of Saskatchewan are busy buying their licences at the SGIO rates that have not yet been approved, if the Prices and Compensation Board rejects the SGIO approval? Just exactly what is the Government of Saskatchewan going to do?

Mr. Blakeney: — That is clearly a hypothetical question and if the Board rejects, the problem will arise and we will advise you what we are going to do if the problem arises.

April 15, 1976

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary question. Is what the Premier is saying, is that the Prices and Compensation Board are rubber-stamped and that the Cabinet will overrule it?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Conversion of Provincial Community Pastures

Mr. Birkbeck: — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it true that the provincial community pastures are being converted into co-op pastures?

Mr. Kaeding: — We would like to see some of our community pastures being incorporated into and made up into co-op pastures. We think that we would like to see the farmers operate their own pasture system. So we are attempting in some cases where it is convenient to do so, to get these people to organize themselves into co-ops. In other cases we wouldn't recommend that.

Mr. Birkbeck: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will this conversion provide more farmers with grazing privileges?

Mr. Kaeding: — Well, there are regulations under which farmers can put cattle into co-op pastures at the present time and those same regulations would apply and I am sure that the local co-operative association, which was being formed, would be the ones who would be working for the benefit of their patrons and, therefore, I would expect that they would be responsible.

Mr. Birkbeck: — What financial assistance would be available for these co-op pastures?

Mr. Kaeding: — I don't recall the total extent of assistance to the co-op pastures, but there has been assistance in terms of providing grants for fencing and for corrals and that sort of thing. There has been a substantial amount of assistance in that area.

Guaranteed Annual Income Plan

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance. We heard yesterday some references to the Guaranteed Annual Income Plan and the opinions of the Minister of Social Services.

Has the Government done any estimates on the cost to the province of entering into the Guaranteed Annual Income Plan proposed at the meeting which you chose not to attend and, secondly, is the Minister aware that Ontario finds that the figures of the Federal Government are out by 300 per cent and their Minister of Finance believes that it will be three times more costly for the provinces and 4.4 times more costly by 1978 than the federal estimates?

Have you done estimates and do you consider the federal figures correct?

Hon. W. E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Hon. Member might direct that question more to the Minister of Social Services. Our Department does provide assistance to all the departments on these kinds of matters, but I have not had a report from my officials on the matter. Perhaps the Minister of Social Services may have some information.

Mr. Merchant: — Does the Minister of Social Services contemplate the question? What is the anticipated cost of the program that you told us yesterday you approved of personally, and do you accept the federal figures in light of the fact that Ontario says that they are wrong by 300 per cent?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Merchant: — He said that yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't care what he said yesterday. The question is out of order.

Conversion of Provincial Community Pastures

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it true that money has been left out purposely of the Budget of the Department of Agriculture applicable to the community pastures so that the community pastures are not able to function and, therefore, forcing the community pastures into co-op pastures?

Mr. Kaeding: — No.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Then what are the prerequisites for co-op membership in the pastures?

Mr. Kaeding: — I'm sorry, I didn't get the question.

Mr. Birkbeck: — What are the prerequisites for co-op membership in the pastures?

Mr. Kaeding: — Those regulations have been there for many years as to who can be a member of a co-op pasture and I'm sure that if the Member would examine the regulations he would find the prerequisites there. I'm sure that I couldn't keep them in my head and I'm sure that you couldn't either. I suggest that you go to the regulations and find out.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, is the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If you are not going to pursue the line that was followed by the Member for Moosomin, you can go ahead with the supplementary.

April 15, 1976

Mr. Collver: — Supplementary question. Is the Minister aware that in the constituency of Nipawin that the community pasture is short funded and is not able to staff itself and therefore is being required to convert into a co-op pasture?

Mr. Kaeding: — No, I'm not aware of that and I don't think it's probably true.

POINT OF ORDER

Question Period

Mr. Malone: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, on the Question Period. In connection with the question that you cut me off on, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation, I would draw your attention to the fact that only yesterday we received the announcement from the Minister of Mineral Resources about the new uranium royalties situation. I think that it's a legitimate comparison to talk about uranium royalties on one side, potash royalties on the other side and I merely asked the Minister, would he not agree . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'm aware of what the Member asked the Minister and the point of the Member's question I believe, if I'm not anticipating him, is why did I cut you off?

Mr. Malone: — Right.

Mr. Speaker: — The reason I cut you off is because I judged it to be debatable. I think the record will show that. Next point.

Mr. Malone: — Are you cutting me off now?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Lane: — I'd like to raise what is becoming an obvious inconsistency, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Regina Wascana asked a question, you cut him off. It was getting too long and that was your ruling and yet when the Minister of Consumer Affairs was prepared to go into a long and five minute answer and reading it, you made no move to cut him off. Now when an Opposition Member gets up and starts getting long you cut him off . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Do I understand the Member's Point of Order to be he wants to know why I didn't cut the Minister of Consumer Affairs off?

Mr. Lane: — How do you apply such rules consistently?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, we'll deal with one rule at a time. Now if he wants to know why I didn't cut the Minister of Consumer Affairs off, I'd be glad to tell him.

Mr. Lane: — Fine. Tell me.

Mr. Speaker: — Because I didn't judge him to be reading a long statement, he read a few lines, some Member said would the Minister table it. I asked the Minister if he would table it. He said, yes he would. End of incident.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the question was cut off at about 45 seconds into the question by the Opposition. He went over a minute and a half before you . . .

Mr. Speaker: — What question is the Member talking about? I don't understand it.

Mr. Lane: — The answer by the Cabinet Minister was a minute and a half before you moved to cut him off and you're not applying the same rules to both.

Mr. Speaker: — Specifically, what question was the Member referring to? I don't understand that.

Mr. Lane: — The one by the Member for Regina Wascana.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member for Regina Wascana on the question on cable television was entirely in order and was not cut off according to my records. Next Point of Order.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, in my line of questioning to the Minister of Agriculture, I did have one further supplementary and you didn't allow me that supplementary. I'm just wondering is that because I didn't preface it with supplementary, Mr. Speaker? Is that an absolute necessity to say 'supplementary' when I'm on a direct line of questioning?

Mr. Speaker: — Is the Member referring to the question about community pastures?

Mr. Birkbeck: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — The reason I cut the Member off was that I feel that the information he was seeking was the same type as other questioners had been seeking, i.e. information which is equally accessible to all Members of the House because it's laid down in regulations and statutes.

Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on a further Point of Order. I was led to believe by the guidelines laid down by the committee, that there would be no Points of Order entertained during Question Period, yet when the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) stood up on a Point of Order, you did entertain that Point of Order which was to ask to table a document from the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

April 15, 1976

Mr. Speaker: — I don't understand the point. I think the Member was offering to take the information in a tabled form.

Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, he did stand up on a Point of Order and you did entertain the Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I don't think it was raised as a Point of Order. Possibly it was.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize on a Point of Order, it was the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg whom you cut off and that time frame still applied, that you cut him off after 45 seconds and yet you allowed the Minister to go on for some considerable length of time before you moved. Now, seemingly, and what my Point of Order is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — What question was the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg asking at the time? Perhaps you'd let the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg make the Point of Order.

Mr. Nelson: — On my Point of Order I was questioning policy of the Government and it was my understanding that that was your right in Question Period. I was ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Absolutely correct. It is right to ask the Government what their policy is. However, the Member was asking for information and I specified this, that it was equally accessible to all Members either through regulations or legislation. It's very clear in the Interim Report that this is not a proper question for an oral question period.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, what the particular problem was with the question as I posed it, it almost seems to me that if it's not possible to correlate to some extent and indicate what's happening in other provinces, as if the Question Period will be limited to asking whether the Minister of Highways was aware that there are dandelions growing on some . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I gather the Member is asking why his question to the Minister of Social Services was cut off? About the Guaranteed Annual Income?

Mr. Merchant: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — The reason it was cut off was because you asked the Minister for the cost of his personal plan. That's not a proper question for the oral question period. You can't ask Members of the Cabinet what are their personal views.

The second reason was that you were asking the Member to comment on another jurisdiction, i.e. Ontario, which is not really within the jurisdiction of the Minister.

Mr. Merchant: — Could I just make some comment? Obviously there was some misunderstanding because all that I was referring to in reference to him personally is that he had yesterday indicated that he was in favor of the program, while that hadn't gone through Cabinet as yet. But one then makes some reference to other jurisdictions and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that very frequently it will be necessary to say some province says this, do you agree; the Federal Government has said this, do you agree?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think we are getting into arguing whether I made the right decision or not. Maybe I made the wrong decision. I'll stand on the record, whatever the record says.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, on a further Point of Order on the Point of Order period. Is it your intention to continue to allow Members to express further views on the questions in the Point of Order period to explain what they meant to say and to bring out their case more on the Point of Order period after the Question Period?

Mr. Speaker: — I think that I have had unhappy experiences with that, I might say, from a personal point of view. Maybe it's because I like to get into the debate. I find myself getting into the debate when I allow Members to express further views on their question, whether it was a legitimate question or not. I intend to allow them to put the Point of Order and I'll tell them why I ruled it out and after that it's just a question of whether the record bears me or the Member out.

Mr. Collver: — Would you not feel then if in a Question Period, are you not taking the gamble that in the Point of Order period afterwards those questions that were not able to be posed that were ruled out of order in Question Period are subsequently going to be posed and answered by Members in the Point of Order period? And, while we, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if I might, that in the last three or four days one or two Members at least have used the Point of Order period to bring out further questions and to present their case a little bit more fully to this Assembly. If that is acceptable to Mr. Speaker, we would like to know so that we can use the Point of Order period for the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The observation made by the Member for Nipawin is well taken, because this is the very thing I was talking about. I was allowing Members to give reasons why they thought they had a good question, rather than making a Point of Order and asking me why I ruled it out. Therefore, I have stated that I don't intend to allow Members to comment, I intend to allow them to make the Point of Order. But they can not say what a good question they had and all the reasons why it's a good question. You'll notice that I interrupted some Members today, I appreciate that I'm shifting a little bit because I was getting into trouble with that other procedure. I want to see that this is able to work.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . Points of Order . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Does the Member for Regina South have a Point of Order?

Mr. Cameron: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Can you get on your feet and express it?

Mr. Cameron: — You had indicated to us that you would permit us, I gather you've changed your mind, you were going to permit us Points of Order, but we can't precede the Point of Order with any explanation. Simply all we can do is say why was that question ruled out of order, is that what we are getting to?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, I think that the Member will have to be satisfied with the interim report. They ask the Speaker on a Point of Order, why was my question ruled out? I think that you will find, and I've examined the House of Commons Oral Question Period for the days that the Committee was in the House of Commons observing it in action, that this is the type of reason that Speaker Jerome gives to the Members when they raise Points of Order after the Oral Question Period.

CHALLENGE OF RULING IN COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Mr. J. A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, during the proceedings of the Committee of Finance I ruled that the Minister of Finance had made some unparliamentary remarks which I asked him to explain or substantiate. The Minister then explained and withdrew his remarks which met my satisfaction. My ruling was challenged.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Merchant: — On a Point of Order. That is supposed to be submitted in writing and if the matter is not submitted in writing I submit to you that there is more that could have been submitted. Namely, that when the Minister purported to withdraw he did not withdraw unconditionally, but, in essence said that what he had said was true but to expedite the matter he would withdraw. And the rule is very clear that it should be submitted in writing.

Mr. Speaker: — With regard to the Member's Point of Order, I'm informed that the usual practice of the House has been carried out, to this point. The question before the House is: shall the ruling of the Chairman be sustained?

Ruling of Chairman sustained on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 25

Thibault
Smishek
Romanow
Messer
Snyder
Byers

Kwasnica
Dyck
McNeill
MacAuley
Feschuk
Shillington

Tchorzewski
Matsalla
Skoberg
Nelson (Yorkton)
Allen
Koskie

Kramer
Lange
Mostoway

Rolfes
Cowley

Johnson
Banda

NAYS — 18

Steuart
Stodalka
Lane
Malone
MacDonald
Cameron

Nelson (Assiniboia-
Gravelbourg)
Clifford
Anderson
Merchant
McMillan

Thatcher
Collver
Larter
Bailey
Berntson
Katzman
Birkbeck

Mr. Malone: — On a Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — What is the Point of Privilege?

Mr. Malone: — On a Point of Personal Privilege, Mr. Speaker, I want to advise you and through you to the House, that I was not one of the Members referred to in his remarks.

Mr. Merchant: — Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform you and the House that I was not one of the two Members referred to by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order, order! Committee of Finance has been called.

Mr. Collver: — I believe I have prima facie evidence to exhibit to Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Then the Member will do it in the usual form.

Mr. Collver: — Is the usual form . . .

Mr. Speaker: — As laid out in the Rule Book.

It's now Committee of Finance and I do leave the Chair. I've already informed the Members.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:10 o'clock p.m.