

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**26th Day**

**Monday, April 19, 1976.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Hon. W. E. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and to Members of the Legislature eight guests that are here with us today. They are with the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and Adults who have made arrangements for them to be here. They are accompanied by Lori Phipps and Bill Lipsett. They have had a tour between 1:30 and 2:15. They will be viewing the Legislative Buildings further. It was my hope to be able to meet with them at about 3:15 but because of the consideration of the Department of Finance Estimates, I might not have a chance to visit with them. But I have made arrangements for other of our people to meet with them.

So on behalf of the Members of the Legislature, I extend to you a very warm welcome. We indeed appreciate you making the arrangements to be with us, and particularly I want to extend the appreciation of myself and I am sure the Members of the Legislature, to the Saskatchewan Council of Crippled Children and Adults for making the arrangements for them to be here. It has been good to see you here and I do hope you will enjoy your brief stay with us.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Guests From Muenster**

**Mr. M. J. Koskie** (Quill Lakes): — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House I should like to welcome a group of people from Muenster, Saskatchewan. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are here with their families attending the Centennial Hockey Tournament. In the group are Mr. Mrs. Joseph Dumba and family; Mr. and Mrs. Alphonse Heusler; Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Strome and family; my wife Shirley and daughter Lisa. I just want to say I hope that you have a successful hockey tournament and that your visit here in the Legislature will give you some appreciation of the hard work that we do.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Allegations of Bribery in Committee of Finance**

**Mr. D. G. Stuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the serious allegations made by the Minister of Finance in the Committee of Finance, Friday last, to the effect that two Members of the Conservative Party attempted to obtain copies of the Budget Speech in a wrong

manner before the Budget Debate, and in fact, attempted to bribe the Minister to give them copies of the Budget Speech, I wonder would the Minister now identify those two Members and explain to the House, the circumstances surrounding these extremely serious allegations?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I have already dealt with the matter. I believe the matter has been disposed of last Thursday. I have already withdrawn any allegations of impropriety on the part of any Member and I repeat that withdrawal.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In fact the Minister did not withdraw the charges . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! What is the supplementary?

**Mr. Steuart:** — My supplementary question is, in view of the charges made and not withdrawn, has the Minister of Finance, in view of the fact that the charges made were actually ones suggesting that two Members of the Conservative Party engaged in illegal activity, has he requested the Attorney General or taken any other steps to have an investigation made, again, of two Members of this House breaking the law. Has he asked the Attorney General to look into this. Can he report to this House any follow-up on these charges that he has made?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, no, I have not asked the Attorney General to make any investigations and report.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, just one more supplementary question. Is the Minister prepared to stand up now in this House, in the full House and withdraw — either substantiate or withdraw the charges, unconditionally?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that the matter has already been dealt with. The Chairman has accepted the matter as dealt with. The House has accepted the explanations and has dealt with it.

**Mr. R. A. Collver** (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Minister of Finance. Am I correct in assuming that the Minister is again withdrawing the remark in order to get on with the business of the House, as he did on Thursday?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

### **Has Information Been Obtained Illegally**

**Mr. E. C. Malone** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. During the Estimates over the last few days the Member for Nipawin has indicated on several occasions that he has information that he is privy to about one particular case of deficit budget, there were certain recommendations made to you by your

department officials. In view of this, Mr. Minister, have you caused any investigation to be made of your Department to see if there have been any break-ins, if any files have been rifled, whether anybody in your Department has improperly been talking to other Members of the Legislature and discussing Government business that is secret business?

**Mr. Smishek:** — You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that on Thursday, April 8, in the evening, the Leader of the Conservative Party made reference to a memo. I did ask him to table the memo because he asked me to respond to it. It was impossible for me to respond to a memo that I had not seen. I did ask him to table that memo. He has not. Our staff has considered the matter. I have not received any specific report from the officials of the Department of Finance.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, first supplementary question. Did you indicate, Mr. Minister, that an investigation is going on or was to take place?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, we have not conducted any investigation per se and I don't know what the Hon. Member for Lakeview means by way of an investigation, certainly checks have been made and are continuing to be made by the Department officials.

**Mr. Malone:** — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As a result of that check are you in a position to report to the House of any improprieties, any wrongdoings in your Department?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to report on any details at the moment.

**Mr. Malone:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the allegations of the other day about bribery and so on, is there any tie-in, Mr. Minister, between the information that the Member for Nipawin appears to have and the allegations that you made on Thursday, last?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that is a speculative question and I am not able to answer at the moment.

**Mr. Colver:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any question of any impropriety of any kind whatsoever as it relates to myself and the Department of Finance?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I am indeed concerned about the matter of a memo, of how that kind of a memo would get into the hands of the Leader of the Conservative Party. It is precisely why I asked that the memo be tabled and that it be identified. You remember, he asked me to respond to the memo. If I were to respond to it I would have to have it identified. Memos are written by officials on a regular basis as part of information. I would like to see what this memo says and in what context it was written. I would like to see who wrote the memo and to

whom it was written and let the Member for Nipawin, if he wishes to, stand up and tell us how this alleged memo came into his hands. Maybe it is an erroneous memo, I don't know . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The Minister is starting to debate the issue.

**Mr. Collver:** — The Minister has answered my supplementary question. My question was a very specific one and can be answered yes or no. Is there any question, any impropriety of any kind whatsoever as it relates to myself . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Malone:** — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree the very fact that the Member for Nipawin has in his position a Government memo, would that not suggest to you that there is an impropriety somewhere, either in your Department or on the Conservative side?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it's a speculative question. I cannot answer it, whether there was impropriety or not. But I am concerned about how a memo got into the Member's hands if he in fact has such a memo.

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

There have been some very serious accusations and I am sure that the Minister would agree, the Minister of Finance has cast a slur on two Members of the Assembly. In turn there have been slurs cast on senior civil servants in relation to the information relating to the Budget. I should like to ask the Attorney General, neither one of these matters has been cleared up, no matter what the Minister of Finance says or anybody else. They have been reported by the media, the electronic medias, written media, people of Saskatchewan demand an explanation.

Would the Attorney General be prepared to make a complete investigation on both of these matters and report back to the House and to the public as to whether or not there is any bribery attempts made; whether there was an impropriety on the part of either the Conservatives, civil servants or to the Minister of Finance, so that this matter can finally be cleared up for all of the Members of the House, as well as for the public of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the material and information that I have before me the answer to that question is, No.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that it is the responsibility of the Attorney General of the Province of Saskatchewan when one of his fellow colleagues, a Minister of the Crown, makes an accusation of bribery by Members of this Assembly in order to obtain advance information of the Budget, a highly secret document, which

contains tax increases and so forth. I don't think that I have to remind the Minister and Members of the House how serious the allegation is . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! What is the question?

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Would the Minister not consider that the accusation of the Minister of Finance in itself is more than sufficient reason that the Attorney General and the Government of Saskatchewan should call an immediate investigation?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Finance both in Committee and in the proceedings today on Oral Questions has made a statement of withdrawal of any allegations of impropriety and I am working on that basis.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — A further supplementary. Would the Attorney General not agree that it was reported electronically and written as well as we who are witnesses in this House, that it was not a withdrawal, it was a conditional withdrawal? Would the Minister not agree with that?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Next question.

**Mr. G. Lane (Qu'Appelle):** — A supplementary question to the Attorney General. Was the Attorney General aware of the alleged attempted purchase of the Budget Speech or has the Minister of Finance brought that particular allegation to the attention of the Attorney General, prior to raising it in the House on Friday?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of any formal allegation in this regard by the Minister.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Attorney General confident that there has been no impropriety performed on behalf of any Member of this Legislature?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I believe that is about the third time that question has been asked. The Member for Estevan.

### **Expansion of Coal Gasification**

**Mr. R. A. Larter (Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry. Is the expansion into coal gasification part of this Government's policy as it relates to future energy resources for Saskatchewan?

**Hon. J. R. Messer (Minister of Industry & Commerce):** — As the Member I believe is well aware the establishment of coal gasification is a very, very costly one and a very large undertaking. There are undertakings within the Saskatchewan Power Corporation working jointly with the Canadian Government as well as agencies of the Government of the United States of America towards gasification of coal which will make it much more economical than the present process which is utilized in

Europe.

**Mr. Larter:** — I wonder, could the Minister tell me if any of your people have had any input or research out of the coal gasifications in North Dakota, coal gasification plants — experimental?

**Mr. Messer:** — I will take that question as notice and respond to the Member at a later date.

### **Allegations of Bribery in Committee of Finance**

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. In view of the allegations that were made and conditionally withdrawn by the Minister of Finance on Thursday last, allegations of bribery, are you saying to this House and I am asking you right now, that you are not going to make any investigation whatsoever in connection with these allegations?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next question.

**Mr. G. H. Penner** (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Would the Attorney General not agree that the withdrawal given last Thursday by the Minister of Finance was a conditional withdrawal?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next question.

**Mr. Penner:** — May I ask what is the matter with the question that I asked?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, you may ask before the Orders of the Day.

**Mr. Lane:** — Is the Attorney General not aware that one of the first and primary responsibilities of his position is the administration of justice in the Province of Saskatchewan and would the Attorney General not admit in light of the serious allegations that he should have already commenced the inquiry into the allegations made?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for that timely reminder of my duties. I would only say to the Hon. Member as I repeat again, on the basis of the information that is before me no investigation is warranted.

**Mr. E. F. A. Merchant** (Regina Wascana): — I wonder as a result of the comments of the Attorney General if by that you mean that some information has been placed before you in connection with this matter in your capacity as the Attorney General, and if any information was given to you about this matter by the Minister of Health other than the information which you gleaned from your passing from time to time in and out of Finance Committee?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have no

information other than what transpired here on Thursday, last. May I just make an observation that from time to time Members in debate make statements where it could be reasonably viewed as a subject of investigation and no investigation is carried out and I viewed those in that light.

**Mr. E. A. Berntson** (Souris-Cannington): — In view of what the Attorney General has just said there doesn't seem to be enough information to warrant an investigation, I would suggest a question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. In view of that statement, would not an unconditional withdrawal now be in order?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! That matter has been dealt with two or three times already. Next question.

### **Control of Rats**

**Mr. Larter:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. Did you find my rats the other day, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. W. A. Robbins** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, yes, we checked on this matter. The Department of Health draws to the attention of the Department of Agriculture any problems related to rats but does not have jurisdiction over rat control.

**Mr. Larter:** — Question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would you not agree that the rat situation is getting to be very serious in Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. E. Kaeding** (Minister of Agriculture): — There is some indication of that, Mr. Speaker. There are provisions available to the municipalities to take action against rats and there is a policy which gives them some assistance on that, a regional assistance policy and if they want to use it it is available to them. The same as the program on warble control.

**Mr. Larter:** — Mr. Minister, as you know the Alberta Government has done a fantastic job of ridding the province of rats and would it not be proper for the Government to take leadership in pushing these programs to the municipalities?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next question.

### **Allegations of Bribery in Committee of Finance**

**Mr. Malone:** — A question of the Attorney General. Have you asked of the Minister of Finance for particulars of his allegation to bribery that were made in this House on Thursday, last?

**Mr. Romanow:** — No.

**Mr. Malone:** — Do you intend on doing so?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I don't intend on doing so.

**Mr. Malone:** — Do you not consider the fact that an allegation of bribery is a very serious charge and should be investigated?

**Mr. Romanow:** — He has given a withdrawal.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Next question.

**Mr. Collver:** — A question to the Premier. Would the Premier not agree that if aspersions are cast on the character of one of the MLAs and then withdrawn in order to get on with the business of the House, that every Member of this Assembly is open to question . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next question.

**Mr. Lane:** — I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General. Several years ago I believe the Attorney General closed down the Centre of the Arts to a pyramid scheme that was holding a meeting notwithstanding that the pyramid selling scheme was lawful at that particular time. It was certainly an indication at that time that that was a breach of the Bill of Rights of the Province of Saskatchewan. Is the Attorney General now prepared to assure this House that in light of the serious allegations made by the Minister of finance that he is prepared to exercise his position as Attorney General in an independent and non-biased and non-political basis?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I try to do that as best as I can, keeping in mind the nature of the office and the job related to the office. I try to do that throughout the piece, make it as independent as I can. The situation with respect to Dare to be Great, a company which at that time certainly had a number of either convictions or pending charges before it in various parts of North America, none in Saskatchewan, that's true, but North America. It was an entirely different situation, one that had been subject to some considerable study by consumer departments throughout the country.

### **Municipal Road Load Limits**

**Mr. W. C. Thatcher** (Thunder Creek): — A question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Minister has now met with SARM and still has not made a statement that is positive and definitive on the Government's intention on the load limits. When can this House expect a ministerial statement clearly outlining the Government's intentions?

**Mr. G. MacMurchy** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, an announcement will be made in due course.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister anticipate that the load limits will be imposed by Order in Council or by separate legislation?



**Mr. MacMurchy:** — The new load limit structure will be imposed by Order in Council.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that in protecting our municipal roads that the Minister is allowing the heaviest axle weights on the North American continent to operate?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — No, I do not know that.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware that the rear axle weight on a three ton truck will increase from 18,000 to 22,000 and that on the rear axle of a tandem from 32,000 to 40,000 and therefore how can he justify this?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, next question.

**Mr. Lane:** — I have a supplementary question. I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs met with the executive of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities last Wednesday or Thursday evening, did the executive of the Association deny advocating the load limits as proposed by the Minister to the SARM convention?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — I met with them last Wednesday evening. No they did not make that denial.

**Mr. Lane:** — A further supplementary. Did they then support the position taken by the Ministers?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, they are providing their executive director, Mr. Wilkinson, to work with Highway Traffic Board and Government officials to work through the details of the new policy in line with the policy outline that I gave to the SARM convention.

**Mr. Lane:** — Why then is it a new policy if it is different than the one you outlined at the SARM convention?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — I indicated to the Member for Regina, Mr. Speaker, that we would be putting together the details and I think I indicated at the time of the announcement that there were some administrative problems which would have to be worked through. Mr. Wilkinson will be assisting us in working through these administrative problems.

**Mr. Lane:** — A further supplementary. Would the Minister not admit that in fact the SARM denied having the basis for the load limits as you proposed in this Assembly?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Next question.

### **Teacher Tenure Legislation**

**Mr. R. H. Bailey** (Rosetown-Elrose): — A question to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister plan as previously announced to introduce teacher tenure legislation this Session?

**Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski** (Minister of Education): — If there was legislation to be introduced in this Session it would be announced in due course. At the present point in time there are no plans to introduce such legislation.

### **Request for Legal Opinion**

**Mr. Merchant:** — I would like to direct a question to the Hon. the Attorney General. Is it in fact illegal under our law for people within the Department of Finance to leak confidential documents to a Member of the Opposition? Is that a crime?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to give an answer to that question. I don't want to be taking the time of the House, but I believe that there is a specific prohibition under Beauchesne as to a legal opinion that I am asked to give. I don't think the question is in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is correct.

### **RMs Overcharged on Regional Libraries**

**Mr. Larter:** — A question to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister know that the RMs of Saskatchewan are being overcharged approximately 20 per cent throughout the whole province on their per capita charge on regional libraries?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — No, I don't know that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Larter:** — Mr. Speaker, the RMs are being charged a \$1.10 per capita on the basis of the 1971 census and under the actual account in all RMs now there is a difference of about 20 per cent. Municipalities in Saskatchewan are paying something over \$50,000 in excess of what they should be paying on regional libraries and I think all but three in this report are on the 1971 census.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, no such representations have been made to me by the rural municipalities or by the regional libraries or by the Library Trustees Association. I certainly would be prepared to take a look at the information that the Member has if he would provide it for me.

### **Cypress Hills Community College**

**Mr. D. M. Ham** (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Education. Is it true that Mr. Steuart McPartland, Principal of the Cypress Hills Community college recently has his employment terminated?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — That is a question that would have to be directed to the Board of the Cypress Hills Community College because it is the Board that does the hiring and the dismissing of any principal or any other employee in the community college region.

**Mr. Ham:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Minister tell us who appoints the Board?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The Board is appointed by the Minister through Executive Council.

### **Help for Dairy Industry**

**Mr. L. W. Birkbeck** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In light of our Federal Minister of Agriculture's recent statement regarding this new dairy policy and the investment of dollars that our Provincial Government has made to encourage production in Saskatchewan, in the immediate future, the industrial milk industry in particular being in jeopardy, what will you be proposing to help save this industry in Saskatchewan from bankruptcy?

**Mr. Kaeding:** — Mr. Speaker, there is the milk share quota which has been set for the Province of Saskatchewan. We negotiated a special quota of an extra million pounds which is sufficient we feel to provide for the producers in Saskatchewan a substantial quota for this year. It is true that some of the established producers will have to cut back their quotas by ten per cent but the new people who have gone into it through the Farmstart program and any kind of an incentive program, will be permitted to expand their quotas and there will be an additional quota available for them.

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When was that extra million pounds acquired?

**Mr. Kaeding:** — That was completed about the middle of March.

### **Indenture Policy**

**Mr. Lane:** — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Robbins).

Mr. Minister, last week I asked you a question about the indenture policy of the Government, requiring dental nurses to agree to work for the Government of Saskatchewan and no other employer when they commence the dental nurse training program. I understand they now have been advised at the institute that many dental nurses will be fired or released from their present employment and jobs will not be available for all the dental nurses.

Will the Government now amend its policy to allow dental nurses graduating next year to take other employment?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, officials of the Department tell me there will be no problem absorbing the people coming out of the dental program until the year 1978 – 79.

**Mr. Lane:** — By way of supplementary, if it is impractical for some of these graduates to leave the city of Regina, is it the Government policy to require them to take employment anywhere in the province of Saskatchewan or will they have their freedom of choice of their place of employment?

**Mr. Robbins:** — Part of the program with respect to the dental program is to ensure that we get dental people in the rural areas. And obviously if we withdrew that policy we would be in difficulty with it.

## STATEMENTS

### Point of Privilege — Allegations in Committee of Finance

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before the Orders of the Day, I have a statement which I would like to give to the Assembly.

This morning I received from the Member for Nipawin a notice on a Point of Privilege, for which I thank the Hon. Member. The point raised was to the effect that the Privileges of this Assembly have been violated by the Minister of Finance, in the Committee of Finance, on Thursday last.

I want to point out to all Members that by procedural tradition the Speaker leaves the Chair when the Assembly resolves itself into either the Committee of the Whole or the Committee of Finance. The proceedings in either of these committees is the direct responsibility of the Chairman of Committees. Points of Privilege and Points of Order raised in either of these committees must be decided by the Chairman.

I refer all Hon. Members to rule 81, subsection (3) which is as follows:

The Chairman shall maintain order in the Committees of the Whole Assembly, deciding all questions of order subject to an appeal to the Assembly; but disorder in a Committee can only be censured by the Assembly, on receiving a report thereof.

Our Rules allow an appeal from the Chairman's Ruling in the Committee at which time, the Committee Chairman reports to the Assembly on the point raised and that the ruling has been appealed. This in fact was done on Thursday last.

The Speaker cannot comment on the proceedings in the Committee but is obliged to immediately put the question: "Shall the Ruling of the Chairman be sustained?" The Rules prohibit any comments at this point by either Mr. Speaker or any Member. (Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, cit. 232(1), page 197).

On Thursday last, the Assembly confirmed the ruling of the Chairman and the Assembly accordingly resolved itself again into

the Committee of Finance.

I stress that the appeal from the Committee is to the Assembly and not to the Speaker.

I therefore rule that all of the proper procedural practices were followed and that no Rules or Privileges have been violated. I rule that there is no prima facie case of Privilege in this case.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, how does one go about appealing to the Assembly then if one can't appeal to you? How can one go about appealing to the Assembly on that matter of Privilege that I raised this morning, the two issues?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the Member will recognize that the subject matter was appealed last Thursday when the incident occurred. Further guidance as to how the Member can deal with any subject of the Legislature, not necessarily this one, is a matter that the Member will have to settle. He is not necessarily able to request guidance from me at this time.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise then on a matter of Personal Privilege today, with reference to the decision that this Assembly made last Thursday.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I want to stress to all Members that Beauchesne's Parliamentary Procedures, Fourth Edition, is quite clear on this matter. Chapter 5, and I refer to Page 149, and this is one of the things that cannot be done, criticize decisions of the House. The House has made its decision and consequently that decision cannot be criticized.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, just for my own future reference. Am I understanding you to say now that the Member for Nipawin cannot rise on a Point of Privilege. It has always been my understanding that the Member rises, makes his Point of Privilege or Point of Order or whatever and then you, as Speaker, determine whether it is in order or not.

I don't know what the Member did this morning with you or what sort of notice he gave to you, but it is my understanding that he gave you notice that he was going to rise before Orders of the Day and state his Point of Privilege. Then after he does that you then determine whether it is in order or not.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Not necessarily so. I was under the impression, when he rose, he stated what he intended to do. I stated the citation that says that he cannot do that. As I said in the beginning of my statement, if the Member had listened carefully, that the Member did give me notice, for which I thank him and he gave it to me in writing and signed his name to it, and I dealt with it in the proper manner as prescribed by the rules.

**Mr. Malone:** — I am not trying to quarrel with you, I am just trying to get, my understanding of it is that I had always assumed

in the past, the Member gives notice and then he comes in and stands up and states his Point of Privilege and then you have notice, you hear the Point of Privilege and then you make your determination.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is quite common for a Speaker to ask Members of the Assembly on any side of the House if they wish to comment on the point which was raised.

**Mr. Malone:** — He hasn't raised it yet.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Oh, yes, he has raised it. As a matter of fact he raised it in the written form to me in my office.

If the Speaker does not wish to accept any opinions from Members of the House he is quite free to do that. It is strictly up to the Speaker whether he wants to accept opinions. I have, at different times, accepted opinions from Members in the House. In this particular issue the decision has been made. I brought my statement in and that closes the matter.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know what that Point of Privilege was. And it is the same on a Priority of Debate, notice is given to the Speaker, but that does not prohibit the Member from coming in and announcing and proclaiming what he is moving a Priority of Debate on. The only reason is that it is the courtesy of the Members of the House, in my understanding, to give the Minister notice so that he will then be able to prepare the Speaker, prepare and do the investigation that is required. But any Member of this House has the right to rise on a Point of Privilege and then you make the decision. And the fact that he gives you notice does not prohibit the rest of the Members of this House, in my judgment, from hearing the Point of Privilege and then you have the right to make that decision.

All that notice is, in an effort out of courtesy to the Speaker in order for you to ascertain your arguments and to do the investigation that is required, on all the matters of notice to the Speaker, at least in my experience and I could be wrong, I am not trying to say that in all other matters of notice. But in all matters of notice that I have come across in this House the fact of a written notice, in no way prohibits the Member from rising because now none of the other Members of the House know anything about the Point of Privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I don't require any more guidance on this particular matter at this time.

**Mr. Lane:** — . . . you do . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, you may think I do but that is your opinion and that is subject to debate and I can't get into debate unfortunately.

The Point of Privilege as handled by the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) was dealt with strictly according to the rule book. If the Members would look at the record of what happened today and look at the statement I have given, they will

find that everything is in order. Therefore, I can't accept further debate of the manner in which it was handled because that is contrary to the rules under which this House operates. You can't debate the rulings that have been made by the Speaker.

**Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question then for further clarification.

Are you really saying then that when Members want to rise on a Point of Privilege that they ought not to give you notice so that they will be able to rise and make their point?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think it is quite clear if the Member reads the book. It says how the Point of Privilege has to be made, clearly in the book, and that is what was done according to the book.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, then on a matter of Personal Privilege. Members of my caucus, or in fact our entire caucus, have had their integrity questioned in this Assembly . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The Member is out of order.

## **POINTS OF ORDER**

### **Question Period**

**Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Speaker, during the Question Period I directed a question to the Attorney General. It was a very straightforward direct question: whether or not he agreed that the withdrawal given Thursday was done . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I have the question that the Member is dealing with. Does the Member want to know why it was ruled out of order?

**Mr. Penner:** — That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I ruled it out of order, if it is the question that I heard you say, because it is a multiple of a previous question that has been posed and the record will show that.

**Mr. Penner:** — On a further Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Would it be possible for you to give us a list of the questions that you will not allow so that we need not worry . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, it will not be possible for me to form the questions for the Members. The Members will do them according to the Interim Report.

**Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Personal Privilege. On Thursday last the Minister of Finance, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) made very serious accusations against two Members of the Progressive Conservative caucus . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! What is the Point of Order?

**Mr. Berntson:** — It is a Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the Member is not dealing with the subject that has already been dealt with you may proceed, otherwise the Member is going to be out of order.

**Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, unfortunately those remarks were made during Committee of Finance and therefore no verbatim record is available. However, in substance, they were the two Members of the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I have just finished referring to Beauchesne for the Member for Nipawin and I make the same reference to the Member for Souris-Cannington. Exactly the same reference and I have already outlined it. The Member is out of order.

**Mr. Collver:** — A Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. If the Speaker is not going to allow us to clear our name in this Assembly, we shall do so outside this Assembly . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! That is not a Point of Order.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order on another subject.

I was ruled out of order on a question this afternoon and since our little intellectual debate last week I write my questions down. I submit to you that granted that I was giving information, as you ruled me out, but I would like to submit to the Speaker today that there are times which in order to ask a question at least some bare information must be given before the question is asked, therefore it has no relevance whatsoever. I would submit to the Speaker today that the information I gave was very brief and it was very relevant and I then asked the question. I will submit to the Speaker that the Question Period loses its meaning if the Cabinet Minister involved does not fully understand what you are pertaining to.

I would respectfully suggest to Mr. Speaker, that in evaluating questions in the future that while it is question, granted, that you are going to have to allow us in some cases to give very brief, concise information as a preamble to that question. I would ask you, Sir, to take that into consideration.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I appreciate the manner in which the Member's comments were put. I will examine the record and certainly if I am wrong, if it was not debatable, I will convey that to the Member.

**Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I wonder if Mr. Speaker is aware of the precedent that has been set with



April 19, 1976

this ruling and that is that I can stand here and call the Minister of Finance a liar and then in order to get on to the business withdraw that remark.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the Member's comments are unparliamentary and really in bad taste. I don't think any precedent has been established. Precedents have been adhered to in the manner in which this is being handled and the Member is continuing to attempt to make points which are out of order. In other words, criticism of decisions that have been made either by the Chairman or by the Assembly.

**Mr. Lane:** — Would Mr. Speaker not admit that the ruling that has been made endorses, or qualifies withdrawals of unparliamentary language?

**Mr. R. A. Larter** (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, on the same Point of Order. As long as we state that we are going to follow the rules of the House and get on with the House business we can withdraw anything we call a Member from now on.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I don't think that is really a Point of Order, it is an observation.

**Mr. B. Allen** (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, in fact I think it is true, that once a decision has been made, a decision of the Legislature that is made, Members who question that decision are in fact in contempt of the Legislature. I suggest that all of these Points of Order are in contempt of the Legislature.

**Mr. R. E. Nelson** (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. On Thursday last, the Minister of Co-operation agreed to table some documents and as yet I haven't been able to get a copy of those documents because they haven't been tabled. Could you, Mr. Speaker, tell me when I might expect them to be tabled?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I am sorry I can't.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:33 o'clock p.m.