

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature**  
**32nd Day**

**Tuesday, April 27, 1976.**

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

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**Mr. M. J. Koskie** (Quill Lakes) moved, seconded by Mr. Mostoway (Saskatoon Centre) that **The Second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Crown Corporations** be now concurred in.

**Mr. D. G. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a very brief word about the report at this time, then I am going to beg leave to adjourn the debate because we want to have time to consider . . .

**Mr. Messer:** — A good report.

**Mr. Steuart:** — A good report the Member says. If you had ear plugs throughout the entire hearings it might have been a good report.

There are parts of the report I agree with, there are parts of the report I disagree with. We feel so concerned about the need to update the procedure in the Crown Corporations Committee that I suggest that we will bring in an amendment for the consideration of the House and the guidance, I hope of future Crown Corporations Committees. So I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. A. Thibault** (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce a fine group of students, Grade Twelve students, from Cudworth High School, 18 in number. They visited the city today. This afternoon they are going to watch parliamentary procedures. They are led here by their school teacher, Mr. Bridgeman, and their chaperone, Miss Joyce Kopperud and Mr. Halaburda. I hope I got that right. This afternoon I am sure their visit here will be a very educational one and one that they can bring home pleasant memories from it.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. P. P. Mostoway** (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and this House a group of 25 to 30 students from St. Vladimir's College in Roblin, Manitoba. They are accompanied by one of their teachers and the principal of that institute, I believe, Reverend Methodius Kushko, a gentleman whom I went to school with at St. Joseph's College in Yorkton, a few years ago, if I may put it that way.

That particular group is an ecumenical group known as Mark 69. I believe they are in Regina here for business and

pleasure, and I certainly hope they enjoy what they see and hear in this House this afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. Banda** (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to go to the House a group of Grade Eleven and Twelve students from Maymont, Saskatchewan. They are sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers Dennis Dubé and Doug Sevick. These students and their teachers have travelled in excess of 200 miles to visit us here today and other points of interest in the city of Regina. I want to extend a warm welcome to them and hope that they will find their visit interesting and informative and we wish them a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **Welcome to Nurses**

**Mr. R. H. Bailey** (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to this House and particularly the Members opposite a group of individuals seated in the west gallery of this House. I am sure their presence here this afternoon will be felt and I am referring to the fine group of nurses who are in the west gallery.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **Welcome to Students**

**Mr. E. F. A. Merchant** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague Stuart Cameron who, though here earlier today in committee, is unavoidably detained and won't be back in the House until later on in the day, I should like to introduce to you a group of students from St. Leo School, who are here with their teacher, Mrs. Lipka. I hope that Mr. Cameron may be back to meet with you in half an hour or so, if not I will be down to say hello. I hope you enjoy your stay in the Legislature.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Mr. R. A. Larter** (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the House a gentleman and his wife from the Estevan area, from Outram, Margurite and Doug Bryson. They live in this district and have been very active. Doug is president of the Estevan Agricultural Society. He is presently district representative for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I welcome you here today.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### Will Government Settle for Nurses' Salary Request

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health I direct a question to the Premier. I wonder, would the Premier agree that in the view of the importance and the actual crisis situation in many of our hospitals, indeed in all our large hospitals due to the unfortunate strike of the nurses, would the Premier agree that having regard to the fact that many settlements, some settlements through the CUPE organization which have seen pay increases to workers in the same hospitals that these nurses are working in, of anywhere up to 27 per cent; would he also agree that having regard for the fact that settlements of government employees, including Liquor Store workers and other employees in this province which have ranged anywhere from 20 to 30 per cent; since the fact seems to be that the nurses are asking 23 per cent and have been offered 21 per cent, and since the difference of two per cent, while there is a great matter of principle to the nurses, is of relatively small concern to a government who is prepared to spend over a billion dollars in the potash industry. I wonder . . .

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

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, if you don't mind I am going to get to the question. I am asking . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am asking the Member to be brief and get to the question. I haven't got the question yet.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It is very difficult to set the stage, to talk about something as important as the nurses' strike.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — The point I want to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, I hope you don't say this isn't of importance; is he, is his Government prepared to instruct the SHA or to tell the Saskatchewan Hospital Association that they are prepared as a government to give them enough money, a very small amount of money in their view, give them enough money to settle this strike and get the nurses back to work? Show the nurses that we do appreciate their importance in the health care of this province and we don't want to lose them. Is he prepared to do that?

**Hon. A. E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think that on the results of what has happened in the health care field, our Government takes a back seat to no one in appreciating . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . the nurses. Specifically in answer to your question of whether I will instruct the Saskatchewan Hospital Association to . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . said instruct the hospital . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Hon. Member and I heard him say instruct. In answer to your question I am unwilling to instruct the Saskatchewan Hospital Association to do anything.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Saskatchewan Hospital Association are bargaining. They are bargaining I am sure as they think best, as I am sure the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses are. And I am as unlikely to instruct the Saskatchewan Hospital Association as I am to attempt to instruct the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. I did say instruct, I changed it, and I'm not going to allow the Premier to hide behind some little legal technicality to escape his responsibility. I now ask . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If the Leader of the Opposition could not engage in post debate and get to the next supplementary question.

**Mr. Steuart:** — The supplementary question is this. Will he make it possible, meeting with his Finance Minister and those responsible for the Budget, the Government of Saskatchewan, since we haven't finalized it, will he make it possible for them, the Finance Minister or the Minister of Health to give us a supplement or add to the Budget that they are giving to the Saskatchewan Hospital Association or giving to the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, so they can give more money to the hospitals of this province so that they can settle this strike immediately? Will he do that?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we have no evidence whatever before us that it is the absence of funds from the Provincial Government which is inhibiting any settlement in the course of collective bargaining.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Hon. Member will know that the budget for SHSP does not include enough to cover 20 per cent that there will necessarily be an augmentation of the amount payable to hospitals, presumably if we follow previous practices and that that augmentation is decided after collective bargaining so that we are not injected into the collective bargaining process. That has been the process in the past and will continue to be the process this year and in the future.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Is the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake asking a supplementary?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Final supplementary. Will the Premier in view of the importance of this matter and the crisis in this situation, will the Premier sit down with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and ascertain if it is in fact, a question of money and if it is a fact, as we're told a question of money, will he then open the purse strings, give them the money so they can settle this strike and keep our nurses here in the province?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we are, as the Hon. Member will know, in fairly regular contact with both parties to this unfortunate dispute. I'm sure that each is making known their views. It is my understanding, for example, that representatives of the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses are at this moment meeting with the Minister of Finance. Similarly representatives of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association meet with the Minister of Finance and others and his staff or staff of the Department of Health on a regular basis. We have no reason to believe that if this was the single factor which was holding up the settlement it would not already have come to our attention. We are, of course, willing to sit down with the SHA or the SUN or anyone else that might add, assist in the settlement of this dispute. That has been the policy, will continue to be the policy, but I reiterate again, the negotiations are between the SHA and the SUN and I very much hope they will reach a settlement. We as a government will offer our good offices, we will not attempt to impose a settlement on either side of this dispute at this time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. L. Collver** (Leader of Progressive Conservatives): — Supplementary question to the Premier. Yesterday in this Assembly I asked the Minister of Finance what was the amount of two percentage points as it relates to nurses' salaries in terms of the overall situation in the hospitals in Saskatchewan? The Minister of Finance, the acting Minister of Health in the absence of the Minister of Health, put me on notice to this question. Because of the seriousness of this problem, is the Premier prepared to answer that question today?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can answer the question precisely since I do not know whether you are asking those members who are members of SUN and the like, but on the broad question of what the wage bill is in Saskatchewan hospitals for nurses and they may well include people who are out of scope, supervising nurses as well.

I'm perfectly happy, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to answer the question of the Hon. Member for Wascana when he asks it but right now I'm dealing with the question of the Hon. Member for Nipawin.

The answer is, as far as I can find out, somewhere between \$300,000 and \$400,000 per percentage point. That is my belief of what the wage bill would be. I do not have accurate figures, but that is my understanding.

**Mr. Collver:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the very small amount of money, \$600,000 to \$800,000 as I understand it for a two percentage point difference, is the Premier not prepared to at least indicate that that much can be allocated to a fund, or to wherever it might be needed to be allocated to indicate that that much is available if the settlement cannot be worked out amicably between the parties?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, first I think any statement by us now on whether or not funds are available certainly injects us into the collective bargaining process and while in the past it has been the practice to consider the budgets of hospitals after bargaining, whether it be with the SUN or with CUPE or with any other union where the costs may be affected, it has been our invariable practice not to make statements about that during the course of collective bargaining and in my judgement that has been a good practice and we propose to follow it.

One other point. I do not believe that it can be asserted that the difference in wages is the only point in dispute. My understanding is that there are other points in dispute, involving weekend leaves, whether or not weekend leaves will be every third week or once every three weeks and I don't pretend to understand in detail all the points in dispute. But it is my understanding that some of these points are in dispute and accordingly I think that the impression should not be left that if the wage question was settled there would necessarily be a settlement.

**Mr. C. P. MacDonald** (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Supplementary. First of all I just don't think that is good enough, Mr. Premier. Has the Premier in any way heard that the SHA has implied that there is a ghost at the bargaining table is the Government's 15 per cent.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I just asked the Member to bring his question in a non-debatable manner. That is required by the rules.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I will certainly try to but this is a very debatable matter in minds of a lot of people. Has the Premier heard that the SHA has implied to the nurses' negotiating team that one of the reasons they are unable to provide increased money to settle this above the current offer is because of the limitations of the 15 per cent increase of the SHSP in hospital allocations in their budgets?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member asks whether I have heard that and the answer is no.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — A further supplementary. Would the Premier then admit that it is the Government that provides over 99 per cent of the money to finance our hospitals at least, if my knowledge is correct, and that the only place that hospital boards obtain money to pay nurses' salaries is from the Government of Saskatchewan through SHSP?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — No, I would not admit that. First, with respect to the first question, I don't know whether the figure is 99 per cent, but it is obviously a very high figure and so in substance I admit what you are saying that the bulk of the money for hospitals comes from SHSP. The Member says that is the only place. Certainly that is the normal place but it has not been unknown in the past for hospitals to run deficits and for these deficits to be met out of other funds. This is, of course, undesirable and rarely happens. I may say that it happens a great deal less in the last five years than it did in the five years prior to 1971. But leaving that aside there is another source of funds however undesirable.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Final supplementary. Would the Premier discuss with the Minister of Health some way of bringing some extraordinary measures, use his own good offices, to speak with the Minister of Health and to the Minister of Labour if necessary, to bring in mediation and conciliation and whatever is required? And also inform the Premier or the SHA as you have implied here today, that a supplementary warrant or additional funds will be allocated through SHSP if the settlement is above the existing contract or the existing offer and the existing 15 per cent?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I misled the Hon. Member. I meant to say that with respect to the provision of funds the practice of the Government has been not to make statements about where funds would come from during the course of collective bargainings, whether that bargaining is with CUPE or SUN or any others and that practice I would propose to continue. So in answer to that question the answer is, we follow the practice which has successfully been followed for governments in this province so far as I am aware since there has been effective collective bargaining in the hospital system whether by nurses or members of the non-medical staff or others. That practice we propose to continue.

With respect to whether or not conciliation services would be made available, the answer is yes, they have already been made available and we are perfectly prepared to augment them in any way which might appear helpful in resolving this dispute which we and I am sure all Members of this House would like to see resolved at the earliest possible time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **CP Transport to Stop Service**

**Mr. E. Anderson** (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that CP Transport gave notice that they were ceasing service to the towns in the southwest of my constituency at 6:30 tomorrow morning, there is no other service available to deliver parts, freight, groceries or anything, I should like to ask the Minister if he is contemplating any action to see that some sort of freight service is put into existence right away to serve this need?

**Hon. G. MacMurchy** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member. The Canadian Pacific have in fact placed the embargo on, the Highway Traffic

Board has informed CTC of the actions of Canadian Pacific. We would assume that CTC would ask Canadian Pacific to live up to their obligations with respect to service to those communities. I am told additionally that there is a meeting now between officials of Canadian Pacific and the Highway Traffic Board going on now. I don't know what that will lead to. As was indicated on Friday, the Highway Traffic Board is reviewing its position with respect to interprovincial rights for Canadian Pacific.

**Mr. J. G. Lane** (Qu'Appelle): — A supplementary to the Minister. In your statement you indicated that the Highway Traffic Board was going to act and you were very positive in your statement to take away the running rights of Canadian Pacific Transport if they decided to cut off the service. Now seemingly that would be a matter under the Canadian Constitution of Interprovincial Trade within federal jurisdiction and I notice today that you are seemingly backing off from that position. Are you agreeing with that position that such action by the Highway Traffic Board would be unconstitutional?

**Mr. MacMurchy**: — It would not be unconstitutional, the regulation of trucking is under provincial jurisdiction. It has been delegated there by the Ottawa Government so that the Highway Traffic Board would be within its rights in terms of the regulations at this time. The Highway Traffic Board has not backed off, it that's what you are trying to suggest, they are trying to seek a solution to the issue and ask CP to be as reasonable as they were with respect to this issue.

**Mr. Lane**: — Are you saying, by way of supplementary, that if you cancel the running rights of CP Transport in the Province of Saskatchewan that your advisors tell you that you are acting within the constitutional rights of the Province of Saskatchewan? Are you saying that positively?

**Mr. MacMurchy**: — That's the word I have from the Highway Traffic Board, that they have jurisdiction over both interprovincial and intraprovincial trucking rights.

**Mr. Collver**: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any truth to the report that the Canadian Pacific Transport contacted either your department or the Highway Traffic Board last September pertaining to this particular matter and that no discussions ensued or came forward from either your department or the Highway Traffic Board until March of this year?

**Mr. MacMurchy**: — I am informed that about September or October there was a letter from Canadian Pacific to the Provincial Government indicating this sort of general intention. So far as I am concerned as Minister responsible for the Highway Traffic Board the actual discussions with Canadian Pacific began on February 16th as a result of a meeting with Mr. Burbidge and myself in my office. At that time I told him that they should put forward their specific proposal to the Highway Traffic Board and I think following that meeting that is exactly what happened.



**Mr. Collver:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What happened then in the intervening period from the time when the Government was first notified of the intentions of Canadian Pacific Transport and that first meeting, if anything? Did the Government contact other truckers? Did you do really anything in that period of time to have avoided the kind of crisis decision making that is necessitated by the announcement within the last day or two?

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — Our Government is of the belief and I think that we should recognize this, that Canadian Pacific do in fact have an obligation to provide service to the communities, whether it is by truck or by rail. And that obligation comes as a result of Canadian Transport Commission rulings, going back to the '50s and then later to '69 in the Servo-Centre Hearings.

**Mr. Collver:** — A further supplementary. In the light of what you have just said, are you suggesting then that, and I accept the fact that that ruling exists in the CTC, but if Canadian Transport says, no way, and they pull their trucks, surely there should be some kind of an emergency service or alternative service as suggested by the Member for Shaunavon and the Government might have some way of at least ensuring that these small centres stay afloat.

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — As we always have, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this Government will see to it that small communities in Saskatchewan get the kind of services they need.

### USA Recruiting Nurses

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health who obviously doesn't think this is sufficient enough of a crisis to even come to the House, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier is aware, particularly in the past week, of an active recruiting program by employers of nurses from the State of Texas which follows on an active recruiting program particularly from California? And I wonder if the Premier is aware that a great number of our nurses are leaving this province because of the niggardly amounts of money that are being paid the nurses in this province?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I would ask the galleries to maintain order as well as the floor.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, may I reply once again to the non-question of the first part of the question by the Member for Wascana, the usual innuendo, as he perhaps did not hear, because he may not have been here yesterday, I reported that the Minister of Health was attending a Health Minister's Conference at Ottawa, the chief objective of which is to obtain more federal funds for Canadian and particularly Saskatchewan health programs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — To deal with the second portion of his question I am not aware that there are vigorous recruiting campaigns. They may well be there, I am not aware of them. Nor am I aware of any great exodus of nurses from Saskatchewan. When I was recently in North Battleford, no one raised that with me. When I was recently at several other places across the province, nobody raised that with me. And accordingly, it did not come to my attention. It may be true. The information I had is somewhat the other way, that there are a number of the recent graduates who are having some difficulty getting positions, but I may be wrong in that as well. I think that while I may know something about them, I don't seek so positively as do some other Members because I acknowledge that there are sometimes two sides to a question, an acknowledgement that isn't often made by some Members.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In essence then, I am not aware of any substantial shortage or nurses in Saskatchewan, nor any substantial exodus of Saskatchewan nurses.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Is it true that in the past year hospital boards indicated that part of the reason that they could not provide hospital services was as a result of a shortage of nurses and I secondly wonder if the Premier would give his commitment to the House to inquire from his Minister of Health about the number of nurses graduating in the province? Because a great number of them do leave this province as a result of the kind of money that that Government pays, Mr. Speaker, to nurses in this province.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, that is a typical question from the Member for Wascana. Let me tick them off.

I agree that there has been a shortage of nurses and no one of course, can deny that. I say that it is no longer present and I say that with respect to the graduates that some of them indicate that they are having difficulty getting positions in Saskatchewan. Furthermore it is my understanding that the purpose of the collective bargaining process which is going on now is to bring the wages substantially in line with Alberta and Manitoba.

I think that all will agree that the settlement being talked of, whether it turns out to be 20, 21, 22 or 23, or 24 or whatever it turns out to be, will be very much in excess of any likely settlement in Alberta or Manitoba. Very much in excess, in percentage terms. With the result, therefore . . . Mr. Speaker, may I have the opportunity to speak. The Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner) is always exceedingly vigorous speaking from his chair.

I wonder whether it has been suggested that there will not be a very, very substantial narrowing of the gap. I believe that there will be; I believe that whatever the settlement will be it will have the wages of Saskatchewan nurses substantially in line with those of Alberta and Manitoba. There may well be variations because I understand there are a number of different steps in the ranges, but they will be substantially in line. I am not saying they will be identical, but they will be very much more in line than they were six months ago.

# **FIRST READINGS**

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved first reading of Bill No. 66 — **An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1970.**

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time on the following Recorded Division:

## **YEAS — 49**

Blakeney	Dyck	Wiebe
Pepper	McNeill	Malone
Thibault	MacAuley	MacDonald
Romanow	Feschuk	Penner
Messer	Shillington	Cameron
Snyder	Rolfes	Nelson
Byers	Matsalla	(Assiniboia-
Baker	Skoberg	Gravelbourg)
Lange	Vickar	Clifford
Faris	Nelson (Yorkton)	Anderson
Kowalchuk	Allen	McMillan
MacMurchy	Koskie	Collver
Mostoway	Johnson	Larter
Larson	Thompson	Bailey
Whelan	Banda	Berntson
Kaeding	Steuart	Katzman
Kwasnica	Lane	Birkbeck

## **NAYS — 00**

Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved first reading of Bill No. 69 — **An Act respecting The Transportation Agency of Saskatchewan.**

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time on the following Recorded Division:

## **YEAS — 31**

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Shillington
Pepper	Mostoway	Rolfes
Thibault	Larson	Matsalla
Romanow	Whelan	Skoberg
Messer	Kaeding	Vickar
Snyder	Kwasnica	Nelson (Yorkton)
Byers	Dyck	Allen
Baker	McNeill	Koskie
Lange	MacAuley	Johnson
Faris	Feschuk	Thompson
Kowalchuk		

## **NAYS — 12**

Steuart	Penner	Anderson
Lane	Cameron	Merchant
Malone	Clifford	McMillan
MacDonald	Wiebe	Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)

April 27, 1976

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) moved first reading of Bill No. 71 — **An Act to amend The Northern Saskatchewan Economic Development Act, 1974.**

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time on the following Recorded Division:

**YEAS — 30**

Blakeney	Kowalchuk	Feschuk
Pepper	MacMurchy	Shillington
Thibault	Mostoway	Rolfes
Romanow	Larson	Matsalla
Messer	Whelan	Skoberg
Snyder	Kaeding	Vickar
Byers	Kwasnica	Nelson (Yorkton)
Baker	Dyck	Allen
Lange	McNeill	Koskie
Faris	MacAuley	Johnson

**NAYS — 10**

Steuart	Penner	Anderson
Lane	Cameron	Merchant
Malone	Clifford	McMillan
MacDonald		

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) moved first reading of Bill No. 73 — **An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.**

Motion agreed to and Bill read a first time on the following Recorded Division:

**YEAS — 31**

Blakeney	MacMurchy	Shillington
Pepper	Mostoway	Rolfes
Thibault	Larson	Matsalla
Romanow	Whelan	Skoberg
Messer	Kaeding	Vickar
Snyder	Kwasnica	Nelson (Yorkton)
Byers	Dyck	Allen
Baker	McNeill	Koskie
Lange	MacAuley	Johnson
Faris	Feschuk	Thompson
Kowalchuk		

**NAYS — 11**

Steuart	MacDonald	Anderson
Lane	Penner	Merchant
Wiebe	Cameron	McMillan
Malone	Clifford	

**ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS**

At 3:40 o'clock p.m. the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

## STATEMENT

### Unparliamentary Expression — Conservative Bribery Affair

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

Before the Orders of the day yesterday the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) raised a Point of Order to the effect that the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) had used an unparliamentary expression. I have reviewed the verbatim transcript and note that the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview in his oral question said:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then in connection with the Conservative bribery affair . . .

I refer all Hon. Members to the ruling of the Chair on Thursday, April 22, 1976 where I cautioned everyone against asking questions which contained inferences or imputations. Votes and Proceedings, Thursday, April 22, 1976.

I want to stress to this Assembly the importance of this matter of implying that any Member of the Assembly has been involved in bribery without all of the facts being before the Assembly. Every Member's honor and reputation is at stake and it is for this reason that the parliamentary rule prohibits allegations, inferences or imputations. These expressions are used sometimes in a moment of heat during debate or unknowingly but if it does happen the Member is asked to withdraw such remarks.

The use of the words, "the Conservative bribery affair" assumes that there was bribery and wrong doing. I ask the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview to withdraw the remarks which were said during yesterday's Oral Question Period which contained allegations, inferences or imputations.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, I, of course, will abide by your ruling and will withdraw. But before doing so I wonder if the Mr. Speaker could advise me whether I may make a withdrawal of my remarks of the same nature that was made by the Minister of Finance when he made the withdrawal of his remarks.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No. Withdrawals when they are made are not conditional on other withdrawals that may have been made since those subjects are closed at that time. The second reason is that I was not here at the time that that withdrawal was made.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — On a Point of Order, if I might. I find I don't quite understand your ruling and I would like you to clarify it. First of all I have always thought that an imputation was related to a specific Member of this Assembly. The Member for Lakeview did not name any Member of the Assembly. He referred instead to the Conservative bribery affair which had been in the headlines and discussed right throughout the Province of Saskatchewan without saying that any individual Member was guilty without even suggesting that the Conservative Party was guilty of bribery. He used in quote "affair" to indicate the subject matter that he was asking the question to. I find it very difficult for me to

understand how you can say there was an imputation to the Conservative Party. I have heard Members stand up here and talk about those Liberals and those NDP and those Conservatives in the most derogatory fashion and never ever refer to an individual Member. Never since I have been in this House, in my memory, and I am subject to your correction, have I ever heard at any time any individual Member asked to withdraw a statement in reference to a political party that was not related to a specific individual. I cannot understand your ruling and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you clarify it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think my ruling is quite clear. I think the Member has acknowledged that there were allegations, inferences or imputations by the very nature of the fact that he said he intends to withdraw. I would say that allegations, inferences or imputations which are made against a group of Members or any individual Member in this Chamber falls in the same general category as this does. This is a very serious matter as I stressed in my ruling. The Members will be aware of that and consequently I have to view it in that light. I appreciate the remarks that the Member may be referring to at previous times where someone has said something about a political party or in fact about a government and while those may be unparliamentary I don't believe they fall in this same category. I will now leave the floor open for the Member for Regina Lakeview.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, I regret that it has come to this. I must say, of course, that the only reason that the remarks were made by me was because of the inferences made by the Minister of Finance in his remarks and, of course, you weren't in the House at that time so you, of course, are not aware of those remarks. But because you have ruled in the manner in which you have ruled, I respect your ruling and, of course, I withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We will continue with Orders of the Day. Member for Moose Jaw North.

## **MOTION BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

### **Withdrawal of Trucking Service by CP Transport**

**Mr. J. L. Skoberg** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Rule 39 of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly, I should like to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity having to do with the announced intention of CP Transport to place embargoes on all intraprovincial truck traffic handled by the company on its local routes in Saskatchewan, effective at 6 a.m. Wednesday, April 28, 1976. The urgency of this matter has to do with the limited time, April 24th, on which the announcement by CP Transport was given to its customers. There has not been any other opportunity nor will there be to debate this motion and the urgency of the matter is apparent.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, in line with Rule 39 that on April 21st a letter to all employees indicated for the first time CP were finding a similar arrangement in Saskatchewan as they have now in Alberta and Manitoba. And it wasn't until April 24th that CP Transport advised their customers for the first time of their intention and not before that date of doing away with their intraprovincial truck lines in Saskatchewan. I urge you,

Mr. Speaker, and I urge the Members to unanimously accept this motion that I would be prepared to move if I had the announced consent of the House.

**Mr. Steuart:** — On a Point of Order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Could I speak on a Point of Order, Mr. Leader of the Opposition?

Members will be aware that the Members asking leave under Rule 39 require unanimous consent, in other words leave of the Assembly to proceed in this matter and then the matter will be debated if leave is granted. This is separate and distinct from Rule 17 which deals with Priority of Debate. Now if the Members are prepared to give unanimous consent to this then we would proceed with the matter. Now if the Members wish before making their decision about unanimous consent I would read the body of the motion.

**Mr. Steuart:** — On a Point of Order. It seemed to me, did the Member not read it?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, I believe he read it.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, I thought in listening to him that he read it and I also thought he gave some reasons why he felt it was urgent. Just very quickly let me say that we think it is tremendously urgent, but we think this is a phoney move because the Government could have taken action long ago, they have known about this for some time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — And if the Premier had wanted to take action he could, instead of running off to China.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake is completely out of order, he's debating the issue and the record will show that. Order! The rule book also says that when the Speaker is on his feet the Members will resume their seats and that rule is breached more than it should be. I caution all Members that if they don't agree with this then all they have to do is not give unanimous consent and the matter is settled. In order to enlighten the Members as to the contents of it, I will read the body of the motion.

**Mr. Merchant:** — It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, from Rule 39, I think that is the case with the comparable federal Rule although I haven't found it as yet, that before the motion may indeed be put and I think Rule 39 is quite clear:

in case of urgent and pressing necessity previously explained by the mover.

And indeed leave would have had to be obtained before the motion was ever presented to the House and, indeed, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the way that this matter would have had to have been brought and indeed the way that similar matters as they

commonly come before parliament have to be brought, is that all that is said is, Mr. Speaker, I want to move a matter regarding CP rail abandonment. My reason for saying that it is urgent are such and such and such and such and such and such. While in fact what the Hon. Member, the backbencher not speaking for the Government has done is he has made almost a speech by moving his motion. And for you, Mr. Speaker, now to again move the motion which again is a speech, and I don't say that with disrespect to you, but the motion by its very nature embodies some principles. The motion on a Point of Order should not have been even presented to the House until consent was obtained and consent will not be obtained.

**Mr. Skoberg:** — If I may, Mr. Speaker, I adhered to the Rule as I understand the Rule under 39. I put before this House the urgent necessity of discussing an important item. I did not read the motion that would be presented if I had unanimous consent. All I did indicate was why I considered and as we do in the House of Commons in Ottawa, why I considered there was a pressing and urgent necessity to discuss an issue today. Tomorrow is too late.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think I will interrupt because I think I misconstrued something the Member for Moose Jaw North did or didn't do. I said that I believed that he read the motion and I stand corrected. If the Member for Moose Jaw North says that he did not read the motion, that's fine, he didn't read the motion. He explained why he thought it should be discussed and in that case I will not read the motion and the Members may decide at this time whether they desire to proceed with it on the basis as explained by the Member for Moose Jaw North, which I thought was rather brief.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, may I have the opportunity of speaking to the urgency of the matter as did the Member for Moose Jaw North?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, the Member may raise a Point of Order, but I think we are going to get to the question right away whether the Member has leave. Does the Member have leave to introduce the motion?

Leave is not granted.

## RESOLUTIONS

### Resolution No. 5 — Creation of a National Electrical Grid System

**Mr. D. H. Lange** (Bengough-Milestone) moved, seconded by Mr. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly requests the Federal Government to nationalize the railway road beds and co-operate with the provinces in the creation of a national electrical grid system to convert present diesel electrical rail operations to electric operation in the interest of resource conservation and pollution control.

He said: Mr. speaker, I should like to take a few moments of the House and deal with a matter of significance with regard to transportation in the Province of Saskatchewan. At the end of



my remarks I would like to move a motion which will request the Federal Government to nationalize and electrify the Canadian railroad network.

Now it is not necessary for me to review the significance of the role in society that transportation plays either in the Province of Saskatchewan or the Dominion of Canada. Perhaps in summary it is only necessary to cite the Hall Commission Hearings which are dealing with grain handling transportation and rationalization of the prairie rail network. It might also be necessary to cite the industrial development potential of rail networks in Canada and in Saskatchewan and the possibility of rail influencing demographic patterns in Canada. Rail transportation is significant from the standpoint of how tax dollars are invested in Canada.

Now the reason for no previous development in regard to the rail lines in Canada has been the fact that the railroad companies have owned the basic track network in Canada. Because of owning the track network and being able to decide where industrial, community or agricultural development will occur, it has been possible for the railway companies to manipulate the economy of western Canada. They have manipulated the rail lines to the point where they have removed the freight from the western railway tracks and transferred it to the trucking mode, allowing the provincial taxpayers to build roads and supply the fuel. Thus, the railway companies through their subsidiary trucking interests have collected revenue from freight hauling. At the same time they were collecting revenues from freight hauling by transferring from the rail network to trucking network. They have also collected the rail subsidy which they could now get because they had decreased the traffic on the railway network. So they were able to manipulate the trucking mode, against the rail mode to their personal benefit both ways. And the reason for that was simply because they were able to own the track network. Had the track network not been owned by the railway companies they would have not been able to manipulate one mode against another, both of which they owned, under the guise of competition. In fact it was not competition, but collusion that occurred.

We see the final chapter in the story of rail line manipulation with regard to freight transportation in Saskatchewan, will be closed tomorrow morning at 6:30 when the railways will place an embargo upon non paying trucking lines which they have established in order to collect the subsidy on their rail network over the last twenty years. Now they are foregoing those very same trucking lines which have enabled them to collect the subsidy from the Canadian taxpayer. They have decided that those lines are no longer a profitable venture and are going to forego service to the very communities for which they were allowed to obtain the subsidy on the rail line network.

There have been numerous suggestions made both by the railway companies and other organizations that there should be joint running rights between the railroad companies in some cases and in other cases, a transfer of track, CP for CN, CN for CP, in order to make a more coherent grid system. This does not eliminate the possibility of the railway companies still being able to manipulate to their own benefits, transportation revenue or transportation investment and profit. It's interesting to note the difference between the sociology that is exemplified by rural communities presenting briefs to the Hall Commission and the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways. The

rural communities come forward with briefs before Justice Emmett Hall and they talk about the sociology of rural Saskatchewan, about the life styles, the farm family, about the communities, about the historical development of the communities and their railroads. They talk about the culture of rural Saskatchewan. Contrast that with the cold and harsh analyses that the railway companies give to the Hall Commission. They are not talking about sociology, they are not talking about the rural communities, they are not talking about the life style of rural Saskatchewan, they're talking simply about cold, harsh economies. Profit and loss. The last thing, of course, that they are talking about is service to people as it relates to the railway network.

The railways' submission to the Hall Commission is one of lament. They talk about having no revenue, about having no profits to be able to maintain the tracks, they lament the fact that the sub-grade has turned to mud and that the railway ties have sunk into the mud. The railway ties are rotten and the steel is old and it breaks and they can't afford to replace it. And they talk about the general state of disrepair that the railroads are in. But at the same time they will collect the subsidy which they have been getting to keep those very same railroads in a state of good repair. It's rather interesting to note that the subsidy that they have been collecting over the last ten to 15 years to keep the railways in good shape has not been used for that purpose as they indicate before Justice Emmett Hall.

They use various techniques, they talk about the lack of facilities and they talk about the lack of repair equipment, they talk about the weather and how the weather is responsible for undermining the railroad track. They are not even able to repair the railway beds after floods. They are not able to remove the amount of snow that occurs in the winter time. They came to Radville for instance with pictures, that were taken in 1947 talking about how difficult it is to remove the tremendous amount of snow that accumulates on the track each year. They used pictures taken in 1947, the worst snowfall year in the history of Saskatchewan, but still implying in their submission that that kind of snowfall occurs every winter.

One has to ask what are the subsidies for? Obviously the subsidies were given to the railway companies over the last many years for the express purpose of keeping the rail lines up. So that they could provide service, particularly with regard to grain handling in rural Saskatchewan. The railway companies sum up their submission to the Hall Commission each time by suggesting that unless they obtain more revenue they will not be able to maintain the railways and maintain service in rural Saskatchewan. The mechanism for more revenue being the removal of the Crow's Nest rates and the introduction of flexible tariffs. The idea, of course, being for the railway companies to maximize the profit and in the process to minimize the amount of investment that they would have in rural railway lines. At the same time they will minimize the amount of service that they can offer to the public.

The tragedy of the situation with regard to rural Saskatchewan is the opportunity cost of abandonment of rail line in rural Saskatchewan to future generations of Saskatchewan taxpayers. At some future point, because of energy considerations, resource allocation considerations and tax money allocation considerations, we will be forced to use the railroad for industrialization, grain transfer and perhaps people and freight transfer in the

future. If those lines are removed now it will cost the next generation of taxpayers a tremendous amount more through grossly inflated tax dollars to replace the rail bed through the capital investment costs of the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of that analysis is to indicate how the railway companies can manipulate the Canadian economy to their own ends, to their own profitability, and to their own minimization of investment. It is absolutely imperative that that arbitrary power to manipulate the economy of the western provinces and even the economy of eastern Canada as well, be taken out of the hands of the railway companies. The only way by which that can be done is through a nationalized railway grid. We do not, for instance, have two roads coming into a particular city in Saskatchewan from the same direction, both of them being private with free and open competition on them. We don't have two power lines into a particular community both of them being private with free and open competition on them. We do not have two telephone lines coming into a community from the same direction both of them being private with free and open competition on them. That logic suggests that there should be no reason why we should have two railways coming into a particular city from the same direction both of them being private and both of them competing for the amount of business that they can get.

There is only one way to ensure that proper planning will occur in the transportation sector in Canada over the next several decades. That is to nationalize the basic rail network as it exists in Canada; to run the basic rail network as a public utility, the only consideration being service to people, service to communities and service to society.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lange:** — A nationalized rail bed does not preclude the possibility of free and open competition of rolling stock on the basic rail grid. The same way that we have free and open competition on our public roads or on our micro-wave system as it relates to telecommunications across Canada. Nationalized rail beds don't preclude competition from making the most efficient use of the transportation mode. Nationalization, on the one hand is imperative for long term future planning. But on the other hand it still facilitates free and open competition to help to maximize efficiency on the rail bed.

It is important that we consider at this particular time the necessity for planning in the transportation mode. If we look at twelve American cities, some of which are New York, Los Angeles, Boston or Washington or perhaps San Francisco, (Los Angeles and San Francisco being the two best examples) we can see what the lack of long term planning did to them during the 1930s and 1940s.

Los Angeles, for instance, until about 1935 or 1937 had the Pacific Electric Railway Company. This was a network of some 750 or more miles interconnecting Los Angeles and its subsidiary towns. It was a very efficient railway network; it was totally electric and it was tied in nicely with bus service and with street car service. San Francisco had a very similar development called the Key Railway Network. At about the same time, 1935 to 1937, it's interesting to note, that both of those electric railway companies were sold. The rolling stock for the Key Railway Company of San Francisco, incidentally, is still operating in Buenos Aires, Argentina where it was re-installed. This

is some indication of the tremendous technological achievements that were accomplished in 1935 in electrified rail networks.

Now it is said that General Motors Corporation is responsible for the demise of those very efficient railway systems. That General Motors in fact bought controlling interest in the railway companies, while at the same time holding the bus franchises for the cities. Because General Motors had controlling interests in them, they sold the railway companies out, at the same time decreasing the bus service which they also controlled, thereby forcing the average passenger into cars. This, of course, was General Motors' original intent.

Now it's interesting to compare what has happened to those American cities, because now they are trying to re-instate rail service at a cost of billions and billions of dollars. Not only were the rolling stock and the tracks sold, but the rights of way were sold as well. Now the cities have to buy them back, remove the houses and sub-development built on those rights of way, and re-invest in very expensive railroad technology at today's grossly inflated dollars.

Now the same kind of thing that General Motors did to those two American cities 40 years ago, can be done to Canada by the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways. If they are allowed to manipulate through, for instance, the elimination of the Crow's Nest rates, the future of rail transportation in western Canada, then it will be the next generation that will have to re-invest future inflated capital dollars to replace the rail network that presently exists in Saskatchewan.

So an analogy can be drawn between what General Motors did to Los Angeles and San Francisco and New York and Boston and Washington and seven other major American cities, and what the Canadian national and the Canadian Pacific are doing to Canada today. So there is a logical reason to nationalize the railway in Canada. The logical reason being, to make the best utilization of future tax dollars by planning transportation policy in society around a basic rail network.

Another justification for nationalization is that it would maximize use of the resource, labor, and land allocation of the railway network. A final reason is the energy considerations that are going to loom on the horizon in the next ten to 20 years. But as well as a logical reason for nationalizing the railway, there's also a political reason. The political reason relates to the history of the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railway in Canada. It's interesting to note, that out of an original 3209 miles in all of western Canada, Saskatchewan had 885 miles of original rail network between the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific Railways. For 3209 miles of railway track built by those companies they were granted by the Government of Canada, 31 million acres of land in all of western Canada, plus the mineral rights beneath those 31 million acres. These 31 million acres, incidentally, were free to be chosen any place in western Canada by the railway companies as they decided where they were going to put the railway network. Out of the 31 million acres that was granted to the railway companies, 15 million acres were granted in the Province of Saskatchewan, largely because of the agricultural and townsite development that occurred along with the advent of the railroad in the early 1900s. So Saskatchewan, although it gave the most acreage to the railway companies received in return the least amount of original traffic. Fifteen million acres out of a total 31 million

acres for only 885 miles of track out of a total 3209 miles of track.

Presently, 23 per cent of Saskatchewan's arable land is owned by the railway companies. And under that 23 per cent of Saskatchewan arable land the railway companies also own the mineral rights. From the mineral rights that accrued to the railway companies from free land that was granted to them along with the development of 885 miles of track in Saskatchewan, they have expanded into mining and smelting and forest products and steel production and telecommunications and shipping and trucking and all of the other interests that are ancillary to those developments of CN and CP in Canada. They have accumulated a total gross worth of something in the order of \$10 billion plus. In spite of the fact that they built all of that from the free-holdings that they got from the people of Canada, there is presently 40 per cent of Saskatchewan's rail lines up for abandonment.

Last year CN made gross revenue of \$1.7 billion making it by the Financial Post's analysis the ninth largest of the 100 largest corporations in Canada. CP trails closely behind with 17th position out of the top 100 corporations in Canada, with gross revenue from the rail network of \$949 million last year. CN rail \$1.7 billion gross revenue, CP rail \$949 million gross revenue, respectively the 9th and 17th largest corporations in Canada and yet they suggest that they cannot operate a railroad company, because they do not have proper revenue coming from the railway network.

Not only are they suggesting they don't have the proper amount of revenue to operate a railroad company, but they are also implying that they do not have the technology that is necessary to be able to operate and maintain the rail network in Saskatchewan and be able to handle the 262,000 pound hopper cars that are necessary for loading of unit trains. They suggest that they don't have the technology to be able to build those rail beds and to maintain them and to haul the trains back and forth on them.

Well if they don't have the technology for that, one would have to ask, where on earth they got the technology to build the CN Tower on the waterfront in Toronto.

The CN Tower as everyone is aware, cost the Canadian National \$30 million in investment, 130,000 tons of concrete to place 70,000 square feet of floor space 1815 feet above the surface of the earth. They could manage to develop the technology to accomplish a feat like that and yet they suggest that they cannot develop and maintain a railway network.

The CN Tower has among other things, revolving restaurants, boutiques and scenic elevators on it. The Canadian national is doing a tremendous job of promoting the potential success of that tower. Along with the media and scenic lift promotion that they are doing, they are even making glasses in the shape of the tower; postcards and T-shirts with a picture of the tower on them. They have bumper stickers and decals; they have paper sculpture replicas of the tower; they have lapel pins and necklaces and rings and tie clips; they even have technology that goes into the 21st century, laser beam telescopes, which people can use 1,200 feet above the ground to zero in on points of interest on the Toronto skyline. Everything from bumper stickers

April 27, 1976

to laser beam technology, the CN could employ in the promotion of the CN Tower. In fact, they are even outdoing Disney Land in the promotion of that venture.

Now if they were to apply some of that promotion to the railway network, what would be the result in passenger service or the appreciation of people for railroads in Canada? They can promote something like the CN Tower on the Toronto waterfront, but they cannot increase the passenger service on CN train lines.

And from the standpoint of technology again it is interesting to note that the Canadian National, which would not even repair the Avonlea subdivision when it washed out last spring due to a minor flood in the area, because they simply suggest they don't have the technology, that they could employ an optical plumb system to build the CN Tower, which ensured that that tower as it grew 1815 feet into the air, only had askew of 1.1 inch in 1800 feet. They can employ that kind of optical technology to ensure that the CN Tower was virtually perfectly straight for 1800 feet and yet they cannot repair the Avonlea subdivision. They could even, for instance, compensate for torsional oscillation which is an interesting problem that the CN had to contend with. When very tall buildings are built in the northern hemisphere they tend to twist in a counter-clockwise direction because of the rotation of the earth. The CN could compensate for that by using both optical technology and other physical techniques and yet they can't repair the washout on the Avonlea subdivision.

They invested \$30 million in a tower that rises 1815 feet above the ground to do nothing more than kill birds and yet they cannot even pay off the original debt that was incurred from 1918 to 1923 when the Canadian National Railway was formed. It is rather ironic that they can apply the technology, the best resources that they have to build a tower 1800 feet above downtown Toronto, but they can't upgrade and maintain a rail system flat on the ground in rural Saskatchewan.

Although CN is particularly bad in that respect, CP is worse. Business Week Magazine of two or three months ago had an article on Ian Sinclair, President of CPI — Canadian Pacific Investments Limited. In that article Sinclair says that it galls him that most people still think of the Canadian Pacific as a railway company, as opposed to an industrial company. He is upset because he does not want to run a railway in Canada. He wants to expand rather, into mining, steel making and fabricating, oil and gas development and production and particularly hotels, which is the direction that the Canadian Pacific Railway has gone since it got its original franchise and its original gift of 31 million acres of land.

On that gift of land and the \$25 million that it got originally to build a railway from eastern to western Canada, the Canadian Pacific has gone into trucking and shipping, 29 ships in the international waters, telecommunications, two forest product companies — Marathon Realty which has 550,000 acres of prime land for sale in Canada; hotels, from Paris to Acapulco; Cominco Mining, Pan Canadian Oil and Petro Company; Algoma Steel. It has minor interests in gold mines and fertilizer plants, lead and zinc refineries and smelters; mining interests in Rio Algoma Mines, Uranium, Union Carbide of Canada; minor interests in TransCanada pipelines, all of which it has gotten out of rail. And yet it galls Ian Sinclair because the public looks at the Canadian Pacific as a railway company.

The total vast enterprise of Canadian Pacific Industries Limited, which total some \$6 billion in asset worth, was built on the backs of the Canadian taxpayer and yet only 17 per cent of the total net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Industries Investment Company accrues to rail. CP has been built on the backs of the Canadian taxpayer. Now they are trying to divert all of their interests away from the railway network which gave it its start. Sinclair as much as admits in the article that they would like to unload the railway network and divert instead into mining, steel making and fabricating, oil and gas production and into their hotel interests because that is where the money is to be made. They would also like to divert investment out of Canada and invest in the United States.

I don't think that much more needs to be said by my political party in Canada with regard to the necessity of taking over the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific rail beds. The necessity of nationalization is to remove from those railway companies the arbitrary power to be able to manipulate and coerce western Canada, indeed, all of Canada into other areas of mineral development, hotel development, steamship lines, trucking, telecommunications and towers that rise 1815 feet above the ground.

From the standpoint of long term planning on the part of the provincial governments, municipal governments and federal governments it is mandatory, it is essential that the rail bed be owned by the people of Canada and not by private railway companies so that they can further their own ends through manipulation of that very vital process that is necessary for the development of any society. That is, transportation.

We can start nationalizing the CN by, first of all, paying off the debt that it has originally incurred in the early 1920s. Because the Government of Canada has always paid the interest on that debt there has never been any necessity for the board of directors to pay the debt off. So how do we nationalize the CN? By paying off the debt.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Who owns the CN?

**Mr. Lange:** — There is some question as to whether or not the CN is a public corporation, because of the fact that the debt has never been paid off.

Along with the nationalization of the railway bed and because of long term planning considerations for respective governments in Canada, some experimentation should be done, looking into the possibility of electrifying the total railway grid in Canada. Now the reason for electrification is several fold. First of all, is the fact that energy resources of Canada are extremely limited, limited from the standpoint of a society that will go on for two or three or four centuries more.

When energy is limited, sensible planning is required for the allocation of that energy over the next several generations. The use of electrical energy for motor power makes eminent good sense from the standpoint of physics, because electrical energy provides the most torque. For torque power or motor power, electricity is the best form of energy. In Canada a tremendous amount of extra electricity is available for rail networks because of the amount of hydro power that we have that is not being utilized during the night. We have turbines that are turning but the energy is not being used.

So from the standpoint of availability of hydro power in Canada and being able to transfer it from one province to another because of the time shifts across a very, very wide nation, it is an important consideration for future planners, to be able to apply electrical energy to transportation modes. And the best place to apply that is, of course, the railroad mode, because not only can you use it from an overhead wire, but you can also use it in the form of storage batteries, either to be located on the train itself or to be located alongside of the track. So while the turbines are turning at night they could very well be charging up electrical storage systems which could be used the following day.

So the use of electrical energy makes eminent sense as it relates to the railroad network; eminent sense from the standpoint of torque, actual physical utilization of electrical energy applied to wheels, but from a standpoint also of utilization of energy in the future.

It is interesting to note that David Cass Beggs, a former notable Saskatchewan person, has suggested that if we could convert the rail network in Canada to electrical propulsion and if at the same time that we converted the rail network to electricity, we could also induce 20 per cent of the people in Canada to leave their cars at home and use the rails for passenger service, that we would be able to save in a year the equivalent energy supply of the total Syncrude operation. In other words, by electrifying the rail network and using electricity, which we have in abundance in Canada today, we would be able to save the Syncrude operation for other things such as industrial development of plastics or even of fossiliferous fuels in other transportation modes.

It is also interesting to note the industrial potential that might accrue to the society of Canada if we embarked up on a program to electrify the rail system. It is estimated that \$6,000 million will be spent in the next ten years on rail electrification experimentation in Canada and that that expenditure alone will provide an extra 14,000 jobs in Canada over the next ten year period.

Mr. F. J. Craig, manager of Market Evaluation and Analysis, of the Ontario Transportation Development Corporation, suggests that in the future, as much as \$3,000 million per year of electrified railroad technology can be exported from Canada. So there is obviously a tremendous amount of industrial potential for Canada in electrifying a railroad network. It is not as though we do not have precedents in the world for electrification. Everybody I am sure is aware of the systems Europe and Japan are using. Totally electrified rail networks which handle people and freight very efficiently at very high speeds and relatively cheap compared to fossiliferous fuel. We have many, many prototypes in rail electrification in North America, Westinghouse, Ford and many Canadian companies that are doing experimentation in electrification. We have French, German and Japanese precedents for electrified rail. There is no problem with the technology, the problem is simply making the decisions as a Canadian Government that we are going to do it.

So in order to co-ordinate the resources, the energy, to co-ordinate the transportation tax dollars and to provide long term transportation policies, it is absolutely essential that we electrify and nationalize the rail network in Canada. Having a nationalized grid system which works as a public utility would also allow free and open competition of rolling stock on the rail network.



Now is the critical time for Canada with regard to transportation. Particularly because of the limited future resources and the necessity for governments to allocate those resources according to the best use possible for society and to the greatest profitability for society. Because also of the opportunity cost to future generations if we do not preserve the rail network now as it exists, so that future generations will be able to use that capital facility that is in place, paid for and fully depreciated. Most important, perhaps, because of the critical juncture in history of the Hall Commission in the development of transportation in western Canada. It will be the recommendations of the Hall Commission which will determine to a large extent, the type of transportation policy that we will have in western Canada over the next several years. If we do not have a nationalized rail bed upon which municipal and provincial and federal governments can plan, then we will not have any hope for future transportation policy.

In light of this, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Skoberg, Resolution No. 5.

**Mr. J. L. Skoberg** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that nationalization of the road beds appears to be the only answer more so today than has ever been in history. I would like to suggest that the Canadian Pacific has no intention of serving the needs of the people of this province or any other province and that they are doing everything in their power to discourage patronage of their services for the benefit of their financial corporate power.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that a good example of this type of service that is being downgraded, a good example of why we should talk about nationalization of the road bed and in fact with the public outcry we hear today that we should talk about not only nationalization of the road bed but also a nationalization of all the other areas that CP has some control over, and that's the subsidiaries. I am suggesting that as an analogy, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen a situation occur here most recently where a private company, the Canadian Pacific has suggested to the public of this province that they are not interested in serving them whatsoever. I am saying that if this motion was passed at least then that may be a start in bringing about some service to the public which was promised some time back by that one same Canadian Pacific.

In 1959, Mr. Speaker, in public hearings across this country before the Canadian Transport commission, and Saskatoon is a good example, the CP then said at that time when they were introducing the customer service centres that they would provide service to the people of this province and that it would be better service than it had previously been by means of rail.

I am suggesting that the Canadian Pacific has no intention and had no intention at that time to provide any service to the people of this province. An example of that, of course, was today when those opposite were not interested in having the people of this province serviced by the Canadian Pacific trucks or any other modes of transportation. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while we may talk about the Canadian Pacific approaching the Government back in September as their letter to the customer suggested, I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that even though they approached them back in September there was no clear cut plan placed before the Government or the Highway Traffic Board insofar as providing service to the people of Saskatchewan.

April 27, 1976

And in fact if those opposite would have listened a little earlier on they would have realized that the Canadian Pacific only on April 21st said at that time that they were planning a similar arrangement in Saskatchewan. But they were not prepared to listen, they weren't prepared to be concerned about the type of service the communities in this province are going to obtain.

I am only saying, Mr. Speaker, that surely we in this House do expect service from our transportation facilities. We do expect service that will service the people of this province and surely we can agree on one area and that is that we must have a mode of transportation that takes into consideration every segment of society, takes into consideration every community in this province and not be based on an improper system of transportation.

I would urge that the Members look at this Resolution. I am certain that there is no question on the electrification of our rail transportation system. But I would also urge that they look at the nationalization of the road beds as have been suggested by many, many eminent people in this country and elsewhere in North America. I would suggest that the adoption of this Resolution may be a small step in the direction that we would like to see the Federal Government move in this entire regard.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. L. W. Birkbeck** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, the two Members opposite have undoubtedly struck my imagination in this debate — well, nevertheless they have — and there have been many points raised by both Members which I would like to discuss at some length and therefore I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate Adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 13 — Alleged Bribery and Leak of Confidential Documents**

**Mr. D. G. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. Malone (Regina Lakeview):

That this Assembly urges the Hon. Attorney General to initiate an investigation:

- (1) into the alleged bribery by two Conservative Members of this Assembly; and
- (2) the apparent leak or theft of certain confidential documents prepared in connection with the 1976-77 budget from the Department of Finance.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I finish this short speech I intend to present this motion.

Now I should like to very briefly review what's happened in regard to this situation. To begin with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) under questioning about his Budget in an apparent fit of anger or it might not have been a fit of anger, however whatever motivated it, made the statement in this House to the effect that two Members of the Conservative Party had tried to obtain a copy of the Budget from him before he presented it to the House. He added to that statement words to the effect that they had offered him some consideration, I think he might have even used the word 'money'.

Now, as you can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, there was quite an uproar including Members of both the parties of Opposition demanding that he name them and state the case clearly or withdraw. After a great deal of debate and Points of Order he did make a sort of withdrawal. He stated words to the effect that while he felt that what he said was true he would withdraw it to get on with the business of the House. And as a result of that he left the question hanging over the head of two of the Members of the Conservative Party that has not been cleared up. In doing that we feel very strongly that he has left a cloud over the head of all Members of this Legislative Assembly. I think that he should have at some time been prepared to stand up in this House and substantiate his charges or withdraw them totally and absolutely and apologize.

It he is allowed or any Member of the Government is allowed to sort of get away with this type of smear or tactics at any time . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to bear with me for a moment because I feel that the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks at this point is challenging a decision that has been made in the House and I want to cite Beauchesne to just make the rule clear to all Members of the House in regard to this debate. I ask all Members to keep this ruling in mind when they are debating the issue and keep my ruling in mind today that I gave before Orders of the Day. Ruling citation 148 on page 126, sub 2, says:

It is irregular to reflect upon, argue against or in any manner call into question in debate the past act or proceedings of the House on the obvious ground that because besides tending to revive discussion upon questions which have already been once decided such reflections are uncourteous to the House and irregular in principle inasmuch as the Member is himself included in and bound by the vote agreed to by the majority; and it seems that reflecting upon or questioning the act of the majority is equivalent to reflecting upon the House.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in regard to your ruling I feel very strongly that I am talking about something that while I agree that it was raised in this House and it has been raised in the question period and at different times and quite often has in fact not been decided and this is sort of the whole thrust of this motion is in some way to get the question resolved and the question is obviously hanging over the proceedings of this House. I feel that until the matter is cleared up it does leave a sort of a cloud over some Members in this House particularly some Members of the Conservative Party, but as you point out and has been pointed out before when any Member of the Assembly is hurt or is slandered or is brought into question then it weakens the whole structure of the Legislative Assembly.

However, leave that for a moment and come back to the other part of the motion which deals with certain allegations made from time to time by the Hon. Member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party who has stated, now this has never been dealt with in any way to my knowledge, but he has stated from time to time in the House and indicated that he has letters or documents obtained from government employees concerning advice given by senior officials in the Government to the Minister of

Finance concerning possible deficits, concerning the possible development of the Budget. He continued to claim both in this House and outside the House that he has forces in the Government who have supplied him, I don't say on a regular basis, but certainly has supplied him with information. In fact he said he usually gets it in a brown envelope. He even went on television and urged civil servants to come forward with confidential information and in fact to leak confidential information to Members of the Opposition. And in this House when the question was raised he asked of the Premier, I think it was, it was a rhetorical question, but the question was in effect, what is a civil servant to do or a government employee to do if he finds the Government is committing a wrongdoing, is doing something wrong, if he doesn't bring it to the Opposition, how does he air it? Well, I suggest that if anyone is working for the Government or in politics or is any way connected with the Government in any other institution, find someone committing a wrongdoing, doing something wrong, in this case I refer to something illegal, then I think that the proper procedure would be to go to the police. If we followed the Member for Nipawin's suggestion that every time they think there is some wrongdoing instead of going to the police if they are breaking the law they come to us, I don't think that is the proper way to proceed. And if he meant by that not wrongdoing in a sense of breaking the law, but if he meant that they didn't agree with the Government, that they didn't agree with government policies, that they didn't agree, for example, that the Government should try to bring in a budget that should estimate the revenues at only \$1.3 billion when in fact he was convinced that the revenues would only be \$1 billion.

In other words if the civil servant disagreed with a stand taken by the Government or figures put forward by the Government and these are a matter of opinion, not illegal, just something he disagreed with, if he is suggesting then that those employees of the Government should come to the Opposition, I would just like to have us pause for a moment to think of the results of that. If this is carried through to its ultimate conclusion there are hundreds and hundreds, they grow every day, of civil servants, thousands, and there are hundreds and hundreds of senior civil servants who are privy to secret documents, who are privy to information that is private to the Government and should remain that way. And if they decide, the civil servants individually or in a group, what they shall keep secret and what they shall leak to Members of the Opposition or the press, I suggest we would have a civil service that is shot through with informants, with snitchers, we would have people breaking an oath and I think some senior civil servants do take oaths of secrecy with regard to certain documents. What else would result besides having a very untenable situation where no Minister of the Government could trust any civil servants if they had been there for any length of time. I think another result of this development would be after each change of government there would have to be wholesale dismissals of senior civil servants.

Now I am not suggesting that there shouldn't be some dismissals of civil servants. There are some senior civil servants, some senior employees of the Government, of any government who are hired on a political basis, and I don't argue with this. The Government goes out and looks for people who reflect their philosophy and they bring them in and they put them in positions of trust and importance to help them guide the type of policies that that particular government wants to see put into effect. And I don't deny them this right, I think it is proper and I think it is right. I don't buy the theory of a totally

independent civil service that just retains security of employment when in comes a new government and the civil servants walk in and they just deal with a new government. I don't buy this theory in total, I think it's one of the problems in Ottawa. The people can get at the Government and fire them if they want, but nobody can get at the top civil servants. However, that's dealing with a very few civil servants. There are very few even with the government opposite who have a very strong tendency to hire a great many people of their own political persuasion and sprinkle them throughout the civil service. We are still talking about a very small percentage. The vast majority of civil servants in the employ of this province, those employed I think in every province, in every government in this country, are independent and they are prepared to serve successive governments of whatever political stripe in a fair, intelligent and confidential manner. And if the suggestion of the Member for Nipawin was carried on, this confidence that an incoming government, a change of government could have in 95 per cent of all the civil servants would soon disappear.

Let me say that if Members of the Opposition come into position of documents or letters that are embarrassing to the Government and they do from time to time, I am not suggesting they shouldn't use them. I am not suggesting that we wouldn't use them or that I wouldn't use them. Of course we would and of course we have. But I am not suggesting either that if a civil servant came to me and gave me a letter that I wouldn't use it. I would use it as quick as any, in fact we had letters in the Crown Corporation this morning from a former employee of a Crown corporation who had been fired and he gave us some letters and gave us permission to use them. But that's one thing, but actually saying publicly to the civil service we think you should do this, we think this is a proper way to behave, I think that is going too far. I think it is wrong for the Member for Nipawin to continue to say that he has informants or an informant in the Government, I think it is serious because it casts a cloud over all senior civil servants especially those in the Department of Finance. I think that this thing should be cleared up. I think the situation should be cleared up because if it isn't cleared up I wouldn't blame the Government if they were right now, and I understand they are carrying out an internal investigation to attempt to find out where the leaks are and there may be and there probably are some innocent people, some civil servants who are quite sincere and quite capable and quite independent who are suffering or may suffer or will suffer as a consequence.

So we have these two situations. I think they are most serious. I don't think there is any question that the charge of trying to obtain budget documents in an improper way and the charge of offering money for them, bribery, is most serious and if there was nothing to it, then I say that an investigation on the part of the Attorney General could and should clear it up and then there should be an absolutely clear statement made by the Premier, I think by the Finance Minister, stating without provocation, without any conditions, that he was wrong and that it didn't happen or it happened in such a way that it was not really serious and the air should be cleared.

If in fact it's true then I say that the Minister has just as serious an obligation and so has the Premier and so has the Attorney General, since he's the chief law enforcement officer in this province, to pursue it and to take whatever steps are necessary if there's been something illegal carried on or done or suggested to clear that up.

So I think that there are several ways, this isn't the only way that this matter could be brought to a head. It could be referred to a committee in this House, Elections and Privileges, which I'm not sure, it has never been used in my time for this sort of thing, but it's been used in Ottawa and it's used in other jurisdictions. We've suggested this to the Government and the Government always has had this ability to do this, they've had the right to do this. I understand we're not the only ones that suggested it, one or maybe more, I don't know. Members of the Tory Party say they'd like to see this happen, but the Government hasn't been prepared to do this. They've chosen to do nothing and say nothing. The Minister of Finance refuses to respond, refuses to say anything. While the Premier has admitted that he got some documents or he got some information, he got something from the Minister of Finance, he too has refused, I say, to face his responsibility and bring this out in the open and either clear it or pursue it to whatever proper conclusion it should come to.

But as long as the Minister of Finance is allowed to get away with this and the Government is allowed to get away with it, then I'm afraid we've set a pattern that every Minister can follow. Get in trouble, get in trouble with your Estimates, get in trouble with a bill, get in trouble in committee or any other time and then hurl out an accusation or two, smokescreen or red herring and take the heat off you and then when you get cornered give some kind of a half-baked withdrawal and in the meantime, you've directed the attention away from the problem at hand or some other channel.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I have to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition again because he's dealing with a subject matter not within the jurisdiction that I hold. It's previously been decided by the House and he's reflecting on that decision which has been taken by the House. That's the citation I just referred him to in Beauchesne.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, speaking to your Point of Order, I just want to make one thing very clear, is that I know you weren't in the House when this occurred, but what happened was that the Minister of Finance, in withdrawing his remarks . . . now just a minute, Mr. Speaker, surely you are going to hear me out on this.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I'm getting into the position where I'm allowing the Members to reflect on what happened which was not within my jurisdiction, consequently I'm not prepared to hear it. The person who was in charge of the situation at that time heard whatever the substance of it was and made the decision. That decision was appealed to me and it was confirmed by this Assembly that the decision was correct.

**Mr. Malone:** — That's right, Mr. Speaker, that's what I'm trying to talk to you about.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Therefore the matter cannot be referred to at this time. It's a closed issue.

**Mr. Malone:** — Surely I can go back . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I implore Members to keep within the rules. I realize it's difficult to keep within the rules just because of the way this Motion is worded, but I'm going to have to insist on it because any allegation of impropriety in relation to this Motion is out of order, because there are no allegations of impropriety. Therefore, the Members can talk about an alleged situation and can refer to committee, but I don't think we can get into a discussion about the merits of the case.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, that decision in this House was to uphold the decision of the chairman of committee and the decision has been made, I do not question it in any manner whatsoever. But I suggest to you that it's entirely appropriate for me to talk about that decision and point out to you what it was. Now that decision was upheld. The chairman accepted a withdrawal from the Minister of Finance that contained the words, this is true but I'm going to withdraw to facilitate the business of the House, or something to that effect. The chairman said that that was sufficient in his mind. We challenged it and the decision was upheld. But surely we can talk about what was said . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The Member is discussing the merits of his case now, rather than raising a Point of Order. In this situation I have to equate discussion with questioning of the decision. I think that's quite clear that the discussion of the case as it occurred in committee, regardless of what it was, equates to questioning the decision and I can see no way around that at this time and anything of that nature is out of order.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. It's entirely appropriate for Members on this side of the House and sitting over there and on that side of the House to comment on what people say in this House. That's exactly what we're doing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member is quite right to be able to comment on things for which decisions are not made. That is the purpose of the debate, to allow Members to comment on decisions that are not made at this time and that's the very reference I made in Beauchesne. I realize it's a difficult situation and it's difficult to discuss, just by the very nature of the thing. But I can't allow Members to discuss decisions that are already made, whether they are resolutions or whether they are rulings.

**Mr. Merchant:** — . . . if I may only briefly. I think that the suggestion that's being made by the Member for Lakeview and I completely uphold it, is that when the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake suggests that he can refer to what happened, he's not challenging the fact of the withdrawal or the acceptance of the withdrawal, but he's only giving a chronicle of the fact that those words were said. That's one Point of Order and the second is that, and that I suggest is closer to the line. The second I suggest is that quite clearly, though the allegation may have been withdrawn, the substance of the charge still stands, so that the Member . . .

**An Hon. Member:** . . . privilege . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . precedence over Points of Order.

**Mr. Collver:** — On a Point of Privilege, for the Member to suggest after your ruling today, that the substance of the matter still stands, when you have ruled already in this Assembly that the substance of the matter does not stand, it seems to me to be totally and against the rules of this Assembly.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that is partially a Point of Privilege but partially a Point of Order too. It's questionable which it is. I reject what the Member for Wascana says. I'm sorry, but the point that the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake was making was really in effect challenging the decision because he was questioning the withdrawal. The record will show that.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, may I finish only with an example on the Point of Order that I tried to present in my own way. Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that there were an allegation made of some wife that she had committed adultery. That allegation would be a matter rightly for a libel and slander case. And it might well be that the libel and slander case would find that the allegation was improper and that the remarks should not have been made. That, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't affect the factual question which might well arise, for instance, in a divorce action or whether in fact the adultery had been committed. There's one question over the saying of the words, the slandering if you like when the Minister said what he said and then withdrew. That's different from the questions about the facts of the charge. And the question of the fact of the charge, the rightness or wrongness of it, is very much before the House in the resolution that's put by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I've heard the Members words and my statements I've made still stand. The Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that a situation doesn't arise in this House ever where a Minister can avoid his responsibility to explain either his Estimates or his Bills or if he's cornered with a good point that he can by some subterfuge, by throwing charges around escape the consequences of his action. I hope this doesn't arise, I hope that we're not setting the stage ever for this sort of situation to develop.

However, I was about to conclude when the Points of Order and Privilege broke out. Just to sum up I hope we take this very seriously, I'm sure that the Government does, I'm sure that the Members to my left do and it should be taken seriously. They are two very gray situation that have been brought forward in this House and the air has not been cleared and the air should be and must be cleared and we're suggesting one way of doing it and that is through this Motion and have the Attorney General's department and he has access and he can do it in any way that he wants. He's got legal people in there, he can make his own decision as to how he carries out the investigation, but I think an investigation should be carried out and a full report made publicly in this Legislative Assembly, even to the point of being able to debate the findings that would be brought in.

So I move, seconded by Mr. Malone, Resolution No. 13.



**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to you and to this House on the second end of the question in greater detail, because it is in fact, in my view, although it may be different for other Hon. Members, the second area over which investigation is suggested that is the more consequential area and the more consequential area for the body politic of Saskatchewan and for the good of the public service and the good of the province as a whole. If, Mr. Speaker, on the first area that is to be investigated it were found either by a committee of this House or an investigation by the Hon. Attorney General that some wrongdoing had taken place by two Conservative Members, I suggest that that wouldn't have the long term effect, the very detrimental long term effect that the actions by the Hon. Member for Nipawin will have unless they are stopped, unless the Hon. Member for Nipawin is told either by this House or as a result of an investigation by the Attorney General's department that that course of conduct is an improper course of conduct.

Mr. Speaker, let me take you back to the two statements which were made by the Hon. Member for Nipawin, which have become the subject matter of this presentation by the Hon. Member for Duck Lake and the subject matter of the investigation that is encouraged. They were made, Mr. Speaker, in the electronic media so that it was easier to know exactly what had been said. It wasn't therefore a situation of a quotation of a newspaper article, but in fact, statements which were specifically said by the Hon. Member and of which transcripts could be obtained.

The sum and substance of what the Hon. Member said was that he would encourage senior members of the public service to keep their eyes and ears open about wrongdoing by the Government. What really would be the effect of that kind of public servant? Not only, Mr. Speaker, would that set man against man within the public service, set employee against employer, it would result in backbiting, snitching. It's very curious, Mr. Speaker, that an Hon. Member comes into the House and a Mr. Clean Hon. Member, and not six months later he's advocating that an employee be snitching on the Government that that employee serves.

What would the result be? Think back. What would the result be? where would the line be drawn? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of encouragement may well mean that there are now public servants who think that with the Hon. Member for Nipawin they can curry attention, that they can perhaps curry promotion, should to the great misfortune of this province, the man ever be the Premier of this province. It would mean that they now think that they can curry his favor by dropping him a few crumbs of confidential information. He, in fact, said, he would encourage them to get in touch with him with confidential information. But not only would he encourage them to be sneaks, but in his contorted thinking on the matter, if they are sneaks and if they do bite the hand of the Government that employs them the result will be that he'll think that they've acted in an appropriate and proper way. That he thinks is the way a public servant should act when they are in the employ of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Where would we end up? Beyond a shadow of a doubt we would roll back the clock of political hiring 65 years to almost the turn of the century. We would roll back the clock of the quality of the public service to the point where every government would have to fire, certainly all of the top public servants, would

have to fire down to whatever level they thought was not of consequence. And to carry the thing to its logical conclusion, if the principle of the Hon. Member for Nipawin were carried to its logical conclusions, people in a position of knowing confidential material would have secretaries and surely the Hon. Member for Nipawin would say, it's the duty of a secretary who's a public servant, to pass information to the Opposition. So should the fateful and unfortunate day ever come that the Hon. Member for Nipawin were the Premier of this province, all of the senior public servants would have to be fired, because he would assume that they were going to snitch, be encouraged to snitch. Their secretaries would have to be fired because they were potential snitches. Who, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't come under the cut of the Hon. Member for Nipawin, who, if he knows anything at all, knows that none of the public servants are supporters of his party. If he knows anything at all, he knows that overwhelmingly they are either Liberal or NDP. Frankly, my suspicions always have been that they are overwhelmingly Liberal.

**An Hon. Member:** . . . policy, Tony.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Those, Mr. Speaker, have always been my findings in the good constituency that has the kindness to send me here. That is my belief that public servants are by and large Liberal supporters. It certainly wouldn't ever cross my mind to, in any way, encourage the people who I know to be Liberal within the public service to breach the fiduciary relationship under which they received information, any more than I would go to a lawyer who is a friend and colleague and say, "Tell me what is happening with your partner on a particular lawsuit." Or give me information that I know to be improper coming from you.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that that portion of the area about which this House is asked to have a review done, that portion of the area is really far more serious in terms of the long effect that it would have on the way the public service, a very excellent public service in this province, the way the public service would operate.

If, Mr. Speaker, the bribery question came before the Elections and Privileges Committee, for instance, I suggest that that probably and I realize that there is a split motion in some ways, but in many ways the Elections and Privileges Committee would have been the better area to look into the bribery questions. Because the curious thing that we see is that though there is some tendency to deny, there is no specific encouragement by the Conservatives to have some investigation conducted. If I, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The Member is discussing bribery and without the word alleged before it. I would say the situation is sensitive enough even with the word alleged before it but when the member discusses it in the full sense of bribery, that in my view is an allegation of impropriety. The Member will be aware that there is no substance to that at this time. Therefore, the matter cannot be referred to in that way.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, I was only going to say in closing briefly, that were I as a Member in a lily white situation, I don't know whether other Members are lily white over these suggestions that are contained in the resolution, I don't know that answer, but I

know that if these kinds of suggestions were being made about me, and I were lily white and clean, I'd be the first to stand on my feet and demand that this House conduct an investigation to clear my good name.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Merchant:** — But, Mr. Speaker, if I were tainted or touched or colored somewhat, I think that my attitude then would be that I'd say that the House was picking on me. I might well say that the House has been picking on me for some time. I might well say to the press that since this House started there have been 160 personal attacks on me. I might well say to the press that this is some kind of gamesmanship by Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would assure you that for my own part particularly over the question of encouraging public servants to breach their fiduciary relationship to release confidential information, for my own part, I view that as a very, very serious matter and so do Members of this caucus. Mr. Speaker, if I were untainted and clean over such a very serious allegation, I would be the very first to demand that the House clear my name in the only way that the House can clear my name. With some investigation, with perhaps the hearing of evidence under oath. Those are the kinds of lengths that I would want to go to, to be sure that my good name were cleared.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and other Members of the House whether your reaction would not be the same. I ask you to weigh the reactions that we have heard from some Members of the House about whom allegations have been made and their reaction has not been to demand an investigation. Their reaction has not I submit, Mr. Speaker, been the reaction of someone who was lily white and clean.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. H. Bailey** (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to for a few moments speak to the resolution that is before us. I appreciate your comments earlier about the difficulty in speaking to this particular resolution we have here, number thirteen, and still remaining within the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that the Members of the Conservative caucus are not a group of people who are trying to hide anything. We are not a gutless group of individuals as the Member for Wascana may lead someone to believe.

I'd like to take this House back to the period of time in which some statements were made in the House that have led the official Opposition to come in with this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I think that I would be quite in order by saying that during the heat of the debate on the Budget, we might point out Members of this Assembly will remember, that it was the Member for Nipawin who had done a great deal of work in posing the questions and figures and so on to the Minister of Finance.

Out of the frustration and the anger of the Minister of Finance, I remember his words very well, he questions, I believe he said that two Conservative Members, he said, "it could have been in jest, made some offer to get the Budget or whatever it was."

April 27, 1976

Mr. Speaker, the Members to my right, the official Opposition, every single Member in that group, every single one, knows that there is absolutely nothing, there is absolutely no grounds whatsoever for using the word bribery any time, none whatsoever.

The Minister of finance knows it, the Attorney General knows it, the Premier knows, everyone on both sides of this House knows that there was no bribery whatsoever.

How the Member for Wascana should think that the Conservative caucus would say we are lily white when the connotations appear that we are all little sneaky individuals, and they are the white saints that walk around this building in the hallway. Even the people of Saskatchewan don't believe that. Particularly with the allegations that are going on in Ottawa with that particular party right now, that would be a laughing stock.

Every one in this House knows, Mr. Speaker, that in frustration the Minister of Finance, in order to retaliate and he probably realizes now he made a mistake, in order to retaliate, not only to the questions, Mr. Speaker, from the Member for Nipawin, but also the financial critic of the official Opposition party, but most of the heat, Mr. Speaker, happened to be coming from the Member for Nipawin. In order to retaliate to get the heat off himself, he made the statement.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a look at what the Member for Wascana just said. He said to this effect, "If," he said, "if I were lily white and clean, I would be fighting this thing and I would be demanding an inquiry." The Member for Wascana knows full well, he has taken this resolution, he has taken his comments to play the games again with the press in trying to belittle the conservative caucus in this House. I don't think even the Members opposite really have appreciated the statements made by the Member for Wascana.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to say something. And I am not questioning your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I am not questioning the ruling of the chairman of the committee at the time, but as I understand at the present time that there have been no allegations whatsoever of impropriety by any of the Members. That is my understanding. And yet, somehow I read into this motion, and they used the words "alleged bribery", Mr. Speaker. To me the word "alleged" is against the ruling that this House had already made. There was no alleged bribery because the statement was retracted. And yet a motion comes into this House which states the "alleged bribery".

Mr. Speaker, any Member of this caucus, Conservative caucus we know full well that there is no guilt upon this caucus in any attempt of bribery. Everyone in this House knows that. And for the Member for Wascana to stand up and say, "If I was little dark cloud maybe I would be doing just what the Conservatives are doing in saying nothing." In other words what he is saying to the House and to the people and to the press and trying to get the message across to the province, the reason why the Conservatives haven't spoken on this is because they are guilty. That is what the Member for Wascana just said. That was the connotation, the full thought of the statement that he just made. He knows and every Member of that caucus knows that there was no alleged bribery.

Mr. Speaker, in taking a look at the resolution itself, I am certainly not questioning the rule of the Chair. I want to

suggest that word “alleged” before the word “bribery” in this particular resolution, I don’t think it is really in order, Mr. Speaker, because it has connotations that a bribery attempt or a bribery was in fact conducted. That point was withdrawn by the Minister of Finance. He said in this House, in committee and every Member that was in the House said at that particular time, he said it was in jest. He didn’t know the Members. I wouldn’t be a bit surprised if something was said it could well have been a Member of the Liberal caucus who happened to say something on the way to the cafeteria. I don’t think for one minute that there is any single, I don’t think that the Minister of Finance can and possibly could identify two Members of this caucus as making an alleged bribery attempt.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives know, we have a resolution coming up which we are going to talk about to clear ourselves, to clear the continual attack which is degrading to the Conservative Party. Because we haven’t been hammering on the desk and pounding for an investigation, is not because we have any guilt whatsoever, there is no guilt whatsoever within this party. I want to suggest to the Members who are sponsoring this motion, they know, the Members on the Government side know it. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I just hope the Government Members and the Members of the Opposition will spend as much time in Resolution No. 3 and listening to some of the comments that will be made by my deskmate the Member for Souris-Cannington as we have been in listening to the Hon. Member, the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I think the sooner we get this thing over with and get on, it is wasting time. There is nothing to it, there is no substance to it. I am really disappointed in the official Opposition party if this is the depth of trying to carry on something of a substantial nature in this House, I want to suggest to them that they had best get into some meat of the bills coming up, rather than in dealing with the frustration of a statement made by a Minister of Finance, some time ago and trying to place the Government in embarrassment and trying to place us in embarrassment and they come out of it lily white as the Member for Wascana says.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call it 5:30.

The House recessed until 7:00 o’clock p.m.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the Conservative caucus will be supporting this resolution. I want to say that we are supporting the resolution for different reasons perhaps than we know find in the official Opposition. We are supporting it for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, there is no guilt whatsoever in the Conservative caucus as alleged in this particular resolution. I am sure that my colleagues will be very proud to join with me and if we go into a hearing and if it is necessary that we should have to testify under oath, we would be very pleased and proud to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we will be supporting this resolution because we are not guilty of the alleged bribery. And we are not guilty of theft either.

Mr. Speaker, on speaking on this before this afternoon, I find it very, very difficult that a Member of this Assembly of much longer duration than I, would make certain accusations in regard to what a Member has said in this House. It disappoints me when the Member for Wascana picks up a document and reads

into it certain words, the very document that was tabled in this House, words which were not found within that document whatsoever and later on this evening, I hope that all Members of this House will listen very closely to the actual transcript of what the Member for Nipawin said.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in a period of time when public opinion polls show that the general public do not place too much confidence in government at a provincial level or at the national level. That is a deplorable situation. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this particular resolution that is on the Order paper at the present time is in fact a resolution which contains a certain amount of accusation against us. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, and in placing this before the Assembly it seems that if you keep saying something long enough, you keep saying there was bribery, you keep saying there was theft, that sooner or later some people are going to believe that there was some element of truth to it.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege the short time I have been in this Assembly to meet with several Cabinet Ministers, taking certain problems to them. I have found one thing that has impressed me is the confidentiality that we can have one with the other whether we are on the same side of this House or not. Whether we are dealing with a specific problem with which we may disagree, but at least our conversations are in fact of a confidential nature.

Certainly this afternoon I was speaking to the Minister of Social Services and we were expressing our viewpoints. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to say or to use some statement that the Minister of Social Services might make. We were simply expressing confidential viewpoints between ourselves, as well should be the behaviour of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that every Member of the Liberal caucus listens very carefully this evening when my colleague will pick up this particular debate and read exactly the transcripts that were alleged, that the Member for Regina Wascana says that this is what he said, when in fact the Member for Nipawin did not say this at all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we will be supporting this resolution. We are sorry that the incident happened. We are sorry that the Government is somewhat embarrassed because the Minister temporarily lost his cool. I don't think it should have had to come to this. Everybody knows that there is nothing in the way of bribery, there is nothing in the way of theft whatsoever. But if it takes a hearing, no matter what it may be to clear the air on this particular issue, we in the Conservative Party will be very pleased to support it. And using the words of the Finance Minister himself, get on with the business of this House.

**Mr. E. A. Berntson** (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled as to why this resolution even exists. On the first point of the resolution, the alleged bribery. The Minister of Finance has withdrawn this allegation, however wishy washy. And it was voted on in this House and that should have ended the whole issue right there.

This is not the first time that that Minister has made utterances in this House when the heat was on, for which he later

wished he had bitten his tongue.

On April 2, 1968 this same Minister uttered something about a Liberal Government bugging the Opposition lounge, causing an immediate investigation to be conducted by the RCMP. The results of that investigation incidentally were negative.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had in fact been the recipient of a bribery attempt, it should have been reported immediately to the authorities, not brought up in a fit of rage in this House at some later date.

The Liberal Opposition is also rather difficult to understand. All through the potash debate they were pleading with the government to table secret documents. Now according to a recent CKCK news item, the Member for Regina Wascana advocates secret or closed government. He also said and I quote:

It was not proper for the Hon. Member for Nipawin to have used confidential documents.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berntson:** — I think the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana either has a copy of those documents or he knows more than any other Member in this House about them, because it has not been determined, even if they exist, let alone whether or not they are confidential. To add to the confusion of the Liberal position, there is a later news report, April 23, from the Regina Leader-Post in which the Member for Regina Lakeview says:

It would be permissible for a Member to accept and make use of information brought to him by a civil servant on this civil servant's initiative.

He went on to say:

Most of the Liberals work involves tracking down information available to the public and civil servants helped them with this.

What is the Liberal position? Is it for closed government or open government? I wonder if any one of their leaders could stand up and speak for the caucus. Probably not. I can understand the Liberal Party advocating closed government, or government secrecy. Had it not been for an honest and genuinely concerned civil servant, we would not have a skyshops affair, or a Hamilton harbor affair, or a judges affair in Ottawa, with their socialist counterparts in it right up to their collective necks.

**Mr. Faris:** — Who wrote that?

**Mr. Berntson:** — I did. It is easy to understand the Government's position. This whole Budget is a work of fiction. And if all the facts were known it would soon become apparent that this Government is loaded with secrets. If they were made public this whole mess would overshadow Watergate by a mile.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berntson:** — The Department of Northern Saskatchewan is so riddled with secrets and deception. If the facts of this Department alone were brought to light it would be sufficient to topple this Government forever.

People are entitled to know what their Government is doing. It is incumbent upon Opposition parties to keep government honest and open. I would encourage anyone to do anything legally possible to keep government honest and open. Remember in a democracy, government must be the servant, not the master. In the light of recent suggestions that the Government of Saskatchewan is fast approaching a deficit situation and this is a fact in Ottawa, the time is fast approaching under these collective secretive governments when the question will not be, can Saskatchewan or Canada be saved? But is she worth saving?

The so-called collectivist governments, whether they be NDP or Liberal, say there is no right or wrong, there are no absolutes, whatever is socially acceptable is okay. That is just not so, Mr. Speaker. There is right and wrong. And for a government of any political stripe to deceive the people they serve is wrong.

If a preacher preaches a new moral code, you don't need a new set of values, you need a new preacher. Likewise if a government practises deception, you don't need a new set of values, you need a new government.

Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that there is a giant conspiracy to keep the Conservative caucus behind the eight ball. Let's take a look of the events of the last few days.

Today, just today, the Liberals had advance copies of 18 bills to receive the first reading. We did not. I suspect the press will report that the PC caucus sat on their thumbs, not that they didn't have copies of these bills and couldn't vote on them intelligently. Just as the press recently accused this caucus of not offering any defence to the allegations in this resolution. The press conveniently forgot when this whole affair surfaced, the press was given a copy of a news release which read in part, I can't read it all in . . .

**Mr. Malone:** — . . . you want . . .

**Mr. Berntson:** — I will explain in a minute.

If this charge is not valid the Minister as the Member for Regina North East has brought serious charges of misconduct against other Members of this Assembly and the charge is totally unsubstantiated and without merit and therefore the Minister is bound by tradition to resign. Either way it is incumbent upon the Minister of Finance, either to apologize or withdraw completely, absolutely, and totally his remarks and therefore, I demand his resignation today.

The reason I can't read it into the record in total is because the Speaker ruled it out of order at the time we tried to read it into the record.

On one of the recent newscasts this affair was referred to as an attempted bribery, not an alleged attempted bribery but an



attempted bribery. In fact there have been allegations, but nothing to substantiate these remarks, Mr. Speaker. I would be the last one to say that the press gallery in this House are irresponsible. But I would suggest that they have difficulty following what is going on in this House. But I fear, Mr. Speaker, that I have missed the real issue.

**An Hon. Member:** Agreed.

**Mr. Berntson:** — The real issue is the Progressive Conservative threat to the political future for both the Liberal and NDP Parties in this province. This whole question is just a smoke-screen.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berntson:** — If you think we are not a threat, and I commend the Member for Regina Wascana, he counted 160, I only counted 130 personal attacks on the Leader of our party and other Members of this caucus, on record. If you think we are not a threat, why then a survey to catalogue the Conservative membership in Saskatchewan neatly disguised as a survey to study community impact, a survey contracted by this Government through the University of Saskatchewan at an estimated cost of \$174,507.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berntson:** — I admit, Mr. Speaker, there was more to the survey than just the cataloguing of Conservatives. But I would venture to say that 30 per cent of the contents of the questionnaire had little or no relevance to the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! The Member is alluding to discussion that really I can't see is pertinent to the resolution before us. He is talking about a real threat and now he is talking about some survey. That is not in the resolution. I wonder if the Member could get back to the resolution.

**Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, this whole mess was an unfortunate circumstance of utterance of the Minister of Finance, capitalized on beautifully by the Members to my right. All of it designed to discredit the Progressive Conservative caucus and I say keep it up. The people of Saskatchewan are not stupid. They can read through this situation and all you are doing is helping our cause. Of course we are a threat and of course this thing will drag on. Because the NDP and Liberal Parties will do everything in their power to discredit us no matter how deviously or unscrupulously.

And during all this time I will still be advocating open government as will every Member of this caucus. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this resolution because an investigation would only serve to clear our good name and show the people of Saskatchewan the real story behind this whole mess.

**Hon. R. Romanow** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to prolong this debate very long, at least I hope I am not going to prolong this debate.

April 27, 1976

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a situation which is certainly, I think, awkward and embarrassing for all of us as Members of the Legislative Assembly regardless of how the circumstances arose. I am not saying regardless of what was said because one cannot be unmindful of those remarks, or of remarks made by whoever or whatever person of this House.

I have given this matter some considerable thought over the last few days. I also have had opportunity to discuss this with my colleagues over the last few days as to what if anything should or shouldn't be done on this matter. And I can tell the House quite candidly, Mr. Speaker, we have concluded as a Government, if I can put it in those terms, certainly as Attorney General, I can't support the motion that is before us today.

Let me very briefly give my reason for this and see where it goes, either the Members on the opposite side approve of it or don't approve of it. Basically it is as follows.

There is a two-pronged motion here. With respect to the first part of the motion which is the question of statements made by the Minister of Finance. I view it really in these terms.

**Mr. Malone:** — How does the Minister of Finance view it?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, the Member for Lakeview says, how does the Minister of Finance view it? The situation is as follows, Mr. Speaker. This is factual.

First, during the course of Committee of Finance proceedings, the Minister of Finance has made some statements respecting comments what has been widely termed as bribery.

The second fact is that Members from both Opposition parties asked the Member to either substantiate or to withdraw.

Thirdly, the Minister of Finance made a statement which he said was a withdrawal without condition. The Liberal Opposition, in particular, the conservatives, secondarily but also there, said that was not a withdrawal because of attached condition. I happened to be in the Committee at the time. The condition being that it was for purposes of getting on with the business of the House.

The chairman, nevertheless sought then to make a ruling to the effect that it was withdrawal. That decision was challenged by the Members of the Legislative Assembly and it went straight to the Assembly and the Speaker, as was incumbent upon him not being privy to the proceedings in Committee, put the simple question to the Members of the House, "Shall the chairman's ruling that the withdrawal was adequate and unconditional be sustained or not?" It was sustained by the House. That paraphrases the question, but that certainly was the effect of it.

So the effect at that stage was that the House voted to support the ruling that there was a withdrawal. A withdrawal according to the parliamentary practices of this Legislature, whether those parliamentary practices are in Beauchesne or where ever.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that on April 26, during the

course of the question period, the Leader of the Opposition asked a specific question of the Minister of Finance which was subsequent to what I have already related in this particular area. And the Minister of Finance on that date, actually it was on April 19, said:

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.

In other words repeating the withdrawal again today and then there was a series of questions urging him to clarify in the light of what took place in the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, if you put all of those facts together, what does it tell this House? It tells the House that there is no allegation of impropriety, that any Member has made. The Member has withdrawn the allegation of impropriety.

What Members opposite would want us to do is to launch an investigation on something that the accuser, if I may put it in those terms . . .

**Mr. Malone:** — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, comes by way of a question. How do you permit the Attorney General to make the comments that he's been making about what the Minister of Finance did on the day in question and absolutely refuse to allow myself, the Leader of the Opposition and I believe the Member for Rosetown-Elrose to make the same comments?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that the gist of the matter is that Members must not cast reflections on decisions already made by the Chair. Now . . .

**Mr. Merchant:** — . . . can I . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I think if the Member for Wascana wants to get up and make that point he can do it at some time later when he has the floor, but not while I have the floor.

Now, Members are not in the position where they can cast reflections on decisions made by the House or by the Chair. I didn't gather any reflection on the decision that was made by the House with regard to what the Attorney General was saying. As a matter of fact some of the statements on the other side of the House today were of that nature . . .

**Mr. Malone:** — Where?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I don't intend to recount it, it's in the record, just check the record, and some of them were pretty close to casting a reflection, but some of them were not casting reflections on the decision made by the Chair, they were in fact, dealing with that Member's interpretation of what occurred.

Now, if the Attorney General is not casting reflections on decisions made by the House or decisions made by the Chair, then he should stick to the content of the resolution before us and he would be in order, as were other Members today, whom I listened to.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might speak to this Point of Order, because in fact I had never known and I doubt that Hon. Members of the House had ever known that what you were saying was, and you may be right, that your objection to comments about the allegation and withdrawal were objections to criticizing the withdrawal. What the logical conclusion that you draw then is that you can support the position that was taken by the Chair, that you can do what the Hon. Member has just been doing, the Hon. Attorney General, outline why the decision of the Chair was right, outline why the withdrawal was indeed a withdrawal, but that Hon. Members can't criticize whether there was a withdrawal. It in essence says that you can hear one side of the argument on the withdrawal question, but you can't hear the other side. As I understand what Mr. Speaker has just been saying, you are saying that the reason that we went wrong in criticizing the withdrawal and the course of action in the withdrawal was that Mr. Speaker had been saying was you couldn't comment upon it because it was a thing that hadn't happened, that it was a thing that because it was withdrawn ceased to exist.

If you carry Mr. Speaker's argument through, it creates a very difficult . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think I've got the intent of what the Member's remarks were. I'd be quite prepared to examine the record to see when I raised the matter today if the Members were in fact criticizing the decision made by the House or the Chair. I didn't gather that from the Attorney General's remarks, that he was reflecting on the decision made by the Chair or the decision made by the House. Members are not, strange as it may seem, I guess it's not so strange, Members are not allowed to compliment the Chair on decisions made or criticize the Chair. Not that the Speaker very seldom has to interrupt the Member for complimenting the Chair on decisions they've made, but however, they are not able to criticize the decisions made by the Chair and I didn't observe any criticism in what the Attorney General was saying and I didn't observe any reflection on the decision that was made by the House or by the Chair.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, if I might just to conclude this portion of my remarks, I wanted in the review of the record, to simply say, what has the House been left with? Whether we agree or disagree with the decisions, of which I make no comment on, what is the House left with, upon which an action or a grounds upon which some form of investigation could be initiated with? The purpose for my review is that there is nothing, because any statements that have been made have been withdrawn and in the due course handled by the House, proper or improper I make no comment, but that's the situation. No Member has come forward to the Attorney General, subsequent to any of the developments and has indicated in document or in any shape or otherwise, that the statements that were made on April 19th about unqualified withdrawal should be modified with additional evidence or additional statements.

So I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that on that first ground there is nothing upon which one could reasonably base a particular course of action or could reasonably base an investigation to be carried out by the Attorney General.

Now, I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the second point

and that is the question with respect to the so-called documents that were leaked or as the motion says, leaked or theft of certain confidential documents, the apparent leak or theft.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of this entire debate there has been no evidence, certainly no evidence of a theft, no evidence or suggestion of a theft, an apparent theft. If there is such, I think that by this stage in the game, an Hon. Member somewhere would have laid some documentation or made some specific accusation of concern to the Attorney General or the concern of the House upon which an action could have been founded. I stand to be corrected, but from my perusal of the record there never was any such statement of evidence which would lead this House or any person acting reasonably and responsibly to say that there was a theft.

The question with respect to an apparent leak is a different situation, Mr. Speaker. Quite clearly, the Minister of Finance has said that he is embarking on an in house check to see whether or not there is a leak or some form of a security problem. I submit to the Members of the House that that in itself should be sufficient.

I believe the Minister of finance, having undertaken such an investigation of leaks, has taken the appropriate action to stop them. This should allay concerns of Members of the House that if leaks do take place that something at least is being done to handle those particular questions. Mr. Speaker, I think that the matter can be strictly handled in that regard.

I simply want to close by saying that if you look at this second portion of the motion, there really is no evidence upon which to base an investigation. No evidence has been tabled so far or claimed so far. I believe that most people will disagree with the Leader of the Conservative Party when he says that civil servants should leak information to Opposition parties. I subscribe to the comments made from the Member for Regina Wascana and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think this would be a very bad practice to encourage employees to purposely subvert their employers, whether it be in private enterprise or in government enterprise. I think that is an unfortunate call. I believe the civil servants of Saskatchewan, regardless of the political party that's in power, have always been fairly loyal to their governments and I think that will also be the case here and I don't think that the call by the Leader of the other Opposition party will bear very much fruit. Frankly, I attribute that more to a degree of political inexperience, perhaps political immaturity in a sense, rather than I do maliciousness on the part of the Leader of the Conservative Party. I believe that if one looks at it from that particular point of view, he too will on reflection note that the remarks made are really not in the best interests of government or in the best interests of all of us as Members of the Legislative Assembly. But looking at it in as objective a light as I can, Mr. Speaker, with, in effect, no formal allegations of "bribery", said allegations have been withdrawn and certainly nothing documented or laid before me to take further steps, with no evidence or otherwise of an apparent theft, with any evidence of an apparent leak having been taken steps by the Department of Finance to repair, of which Members can ask the Minister of Finance in question period as to the outcome, it seems to me on balance that the motion should not be supported at this particular stage in the game and that we should get on with the business of the House and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to support the motion.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Minister takes his chair I wonder if he might answer a question. The Minister in question period on two occasions indicated that transcripts of material were before him and had been referred to his department, and it may well be that the Minister and other Members were at that time over reacting to the suggestions made by the Hon. Member for Nipawin. I wonder if the Minister would now indicate whether anything has come of the investigation that he requested by his department into the encouragement to give confidential documents and I wonder, secondly, whether the Minister, within his department, intends to carry that investigation any further?

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I would advise the Hon. Member that I do not intend to carry the matter further and I have not found, at this stage in the game, anything which would warrant me to carry it further. I don't want to transgress on the privilege of the House because I'm only answering a question. I again, think it's a question of how you attribute the Leader of the Conservatives' remarks. I attribute them in the light of his attempt to clarify the question period, namely related to acts of criminal wrongdoing in a somewhat different light, as they would have appeared at first blush on the initial TV which appeared to be a simple, open invitation for the revelation of information. If that's the case, then I don't think that there is any further basis upon which anything should be done or could be done and I don't intend to pursue it further, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words to reply to the Attorney General and to make a few brief comments about his remarks, but before doing so I'd like to make a few brief comments on the rather curious position taken by the Conservatives in the debate on this motion. I assume that the Leader of the Conservatives is going to be speaking, if not on this motion on the next one to perhaps explain some of his remarks. I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that before we broke for dinner, the Member for Rosetown-Elrose was speaking and I was listening very carefully at that time and at no time did I ever hear him say anything about denying the fact that there were these offers made. Now certainly after dinner he made it very clear that this was not the case, at least as far as he was concerned, but during that earlier part of his speech, he talked about what went on in the Minister of Finance's head. I'm not sure about the talents of the Member, but I'm sure that they don't go so far as to be able to read what goes on in the mind of the Minister of Finance. In fact, if he had that talent I suspect we wouldn't be talking about this, because he'd already know what the Budget was before it was introduced. But he went on at length about what he thought the Minister of Finance said, about whether it was in jest or not and so on. Quite frankly, I don't recall the Minister of Finance ever saying that these offers or alleged offers or whatever euphemism the Speaker will accept, were made in jest. It was only after dinner that he came in and specifically denied that these events had occurred and I welcome that statement by the Member. I haven't been in the House all the time and it's the first definite statement that I've heard in the House of the Tories' position.

But again it's a rather curious position because that particular Member got up and said that he was satisfied with the so-called withdrawal made by the Minister of Finance and that the matter should have ended there and that would have finished

the whole situation. But two minutes later the Member for Souris-Cannington got up and made a point of reading into the record the position of the Leader of the Conservative Party, to the effect that he wasn't satisfied at all and was calling on the Minister of Finance either to put up or shut up as the case may be. In fact he was very clear and quite properly, in my view, in his remarks to the press, remarks which weren't made in here and which may be later tonight, some days after this event occurred. But the Minister of Finance should have either given particulars of what his allegations were, a full apology, or resign as the case may be.

Now, I'm not quite sure which way the Tories are going. One Member is saying that they want the Minister of Finance to do this, another Member is saying that he was happy with the withdrawal, or so-called withdrawal of the Minister of Finance and hopefully the Leader of the Conservatives will clear this up when he takes part in this debate.

I'd like to also look at the rather curious position of the Attorney General and of the Government. This matter has been on the Order Paper for some days now. I can recall that I spoke last Friday to stand the matter on the resolution on behalf of the -lo and advised at that time that it would be going on today for sure. I would have hoped that the Minister of Finance could have seen fit to be in the Legislature to participate in this debate. He's not here. I'm sure that he was well aware that the debate was going to take place. We haven't heard from him. The Premier, no one really knows where the Premier is these days, whether he's off to China or some other place, but I would have hoped that he would have been here to take part in this debate and we haven't heard from him. But we did have the Attorney General get up and say that, if I can paraphrase his words, that he didn't think there was sufficient evidence or no further evidence had come to his attention to warrant an investigation. What's he trying to say? If there was an alleged bribe that those who attempted to give the bribe should have come forth and given him the evidence and then he would have had the investigation? I suggest to the Attorney General that all the evidence we know about is on your side of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Malone:** — All the evidence that we've been told about came through the mouth of the Minister of Finance who sits not two feet away from you.

Now, if there was no evidence have the Minister of Finance get up and say so. If there was some evidence, let's get on with some investigation or with some inquiry or with an apology from the Minister of Finance. But don't get up in this House and say that the reason you're not supporting an investigation, is because nobody's come forth with any evidence.

**Mr. Romanow:** — . . . withdrawn, that's all I can do.

**Mr. Malone:** — Well, apparently the Member for Nipawin isn't very happy with that. Apparently you weren't very happy with that in your own words. You were saying, when you were describing the events, you said, whether you accepted that withdrawal or not.

But don't come in here and say that the reason that you can't conduct any type of investigation is because no one has come forth to give you proper evidence, is the reason you're not doing this, because the man who has the evidence is only two feet away from you most of the hours of the days we are in here.

So, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the performance of the Government in this regard is anything but satisfactory. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that unless we either hear from the Minister of Finance or that there is an investigation that we can consider the voting of the Government to defeat this resolution, is no more than a coverup of the smear by the Minister of Finance.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Malone:** — Either that or these events actually did occur and the Minister of Finance is afraid to get up in public and talk about them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to hear that the Conservative Party will be supporting the resolution, as all Members in this caucus will be.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to this motion I would first of all like to make a comment about the motion itself.

The motion itself suggests I think in its wording, two things that were never suggested even by the Members opposite. And even by the Minister of Finance in his discussions or in his fit of pique or whatever else you call it. It caused him to suggest that two Members of the Progressive Conservative Party had approached him for an advance copy of the Budget and one of them had even offered to pay him for it. This is as I remember the Minister of Finance's words. But at no time did he suggest that there was any theft of any confidential documents. At no time did he make such a suggestion. Nor in fact did the Attorney General make such a suggestion when questioned by Members to my right repeatedly the next week. Nor in fact did the Premier when questioned repeatedly by the Members to my right in the ensuing weeks. This suggestion of apparent theft of documents is even more abysmal in the light of the fact that no specification or charge of any specific document was even suggested either in this House or outside this House.

A reference was made by myself, a question was asked of the Minister of Finance whether or not his Budget director wrote a memo in which he stipulated that the percentage increase for the civil service in the forthcoming year would be 20 per cent. And this question, asked of the Minister of Finance, was stated after he had repeatedly stood in his place and said that the Government of Saskatchewan and the Budget Bureau and the Minister of Finance — I will continue when the Attorney General and the Leader of the Opposition finish their snide remarks . . .

**Mr. Dyck:** — . . . collecting your thoughts.

**Mr. Collver:** — Sometimes yes, sometimes. But fortunately for the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair I have some thoughts to collect.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of apparent theft made by the Members to my right when no charge was ever laid or even



suggested was a cheap political charge that suggested alleged bribery, which words were not used by the Minister of Finance and they were not used when I asked the Minister of Finance to withdraw his remarks. They were used by Members to my right. I wasn't happy with the withdrawal that the Minister of finance supposedly perpetrated on the House. I wasn't happy with the way the Minister of Finance conducted himself after his proposed withdrawal.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member is now in the position of reflecting on decisions on the House already made.

**Mr. Collver:** — But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the suggestions by the Members to my right of continued personal attack if you want, on me, is not going to be convincing to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact we have found since the attacks began primarily by the Members to my right, admittedly they have a little more to lose than the Members across because by the time the next election rolls around they'll be wiped out, the Members across will still be around but the Members to my right will be wiped out.

**Mr. Thibault:** — You hit a raw nerve there . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — I think so too. But I can't figure out which of the leadership candidates over here is going to use his legal expertise to try and twist the words around again to fit their purpose and to suit their purpose.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . personal attack.

**Mr. Collver:** — Name one personal attack, I'll name it right now. A question by the Member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron):

On learning, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that a Member or Members of the Legislature got a copy of the Budget in advance.

Number one, that was not a fact; number two, no one across the way had even suggested for one moment that anyone got a copy of the Budget in advance.

**An Hon. Member:** — Personal attack on . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, according to the record, Mr. Member for Regina South, it says 'got' not 'sought', got a copy of the Budget in advance.

Mr. Speaker, we believe more important than the supposed alleged bribery which was withdrawn conditionally and then withdrawn and then admitted to by this one and that one to withdraw their remarks, what is even more important than that and even more important than the so-called theft or apparent leak of documents, of confidential documents, even though it was never determined whether or not any documents had been confidential, even though it was never determined as to which confidential documents the Members were referring to, we are more inclined to concern ourselves about the suggestion by both the Government opposite and the Members to my right that our suggestion that if

civil servants see the Government committing wrongdoing and they bring those to the attention of the Opposition, that somehow we are wrong in suggesting that civil servants should continue to bring this kind of information to the attention of the Opposition parties. The civil servants may not believe that there is any kind of criminal action involved on the part of the Government, but they may believe that a terrible wrongdoing has been done by the Government, on the people by the Government. For example, I heard the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) criticize severely the Government opposite and the Cabinet opposite and I heard him say this is a deceptive Budget, this is a terrible thing that the government has perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan. This is a monstrous Budget, it is wrong, but he had no facts other than the fact that he happened to find on one page some kind of 15 per cent change and 25 per cent change in terms of the hospital budget. But I agree, Mr. Speaker, with what the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley said, it is wrong for the Government of Saskatchewan to try to deceive the people of Saskatchewan into believing that the civil service has been reduced by 75 when in fact it has been increased by 250. That is a terrible wrongdoing. It is wrong for the Government of Saskatchewan to shift its numbers around within its Budget, to present a balanced Budget to the people when it knows well in advance that the Budget is not going to be balanced at all but that the Budget is going to be unbalanced by some considerable margin and it even knows the amount in advance of the presentation of the Budget.

I think presenting this information to the people of the province is a wrongdoing and I think it is important that this kind of information be brought to the attention of the people of the province and I think it is important that this kind of information be brought to the attention of the Opposition parties because they can more effectively bring it to the attention of the public than can really anyone else in our society. It is not a criminal offence, the misrepresentation of budget information is not a criminal offence but it is wrong for the Government to do that.

When the Member for Regina Wascana persists in suggesting on behalf of his party, that it is important for governments to retain secrets, what will happen to that feeling, that wonderful feeling of openness presently held by the civil service; what will happen to that wonderful feeling of loyalty presently held by the civil service in the Province of Saskatchewan if a little fresh air were allowed to breathe on some of the departments?

Mr. Speaker, in order for the Government to withhold, or a civil servant to withhold a secret of wrongdoing perhaps the best answer would be for the Government not to commit the wrongdoing in the first place. But if the wrongdoing is committed then it is committed by the Government to the detriment of the province. It is important that this information be made public and the suggestion by the Liberals and by the NDP for that matter . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . place.

**Mr. Collver:** — Unlike some Members to my right, I don't have a place.

Mr. Speaker, it is a curious thing to suggest that the civil servants by not revealing wrongdoings and having to live with wrongdoings on a day to day basis even though it goes against

their sense of propriety, are somehow going to be more loyal and more acceptable to the Government as employees, in my judgement is not correct. As a matter of fact it creates less of an atmosphere of positive behaviour on behalf of the civil servants to have them feel that they have to commit wrongdoings on behalf of the Government just because the Government of the day says, you must not reveal this information, this evidence of wrongdoing.

Now the Members to my right have suggested that somehow I said that the senior civil servants should release confidential information after taking an oath of office. This quite frankly, was never said and never intended to be said. What was said and I think it is very interesting that the Member for Regina Wascana cannot even read a transcript that was filed in this very House. He has to interpret it in his own legalistic fashion and I think quite frankly in his own garbage fashion.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . cheap shot.

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, I would say that was a cheap shot and I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. It is not a garbage attack at all, trash maybe.

Mr. Speaker, the Member suggests that the truth is wrong. That secrecy is important. The truth is wrong if it comes from a civil servant. A civil servant, Mr. Speaker, is not entitled to be a citizen of this country according to these people. Mr. Speaker, they are not entitled to present their evidence of wrongdoing to the Opposition. As a matter of fact, according to the Members to my right, they are not even entitled to belong to certain political parties because if they belong to a certain political party they might somehow jeopardize their oaths of office, they might somehow jeopardize their position as civil servants. I say that is nonsense, I say that civil servants are as much citizens of this country as anyone else and if they find evidence of wrongdoing then it is not only their responsibility but it is their duty to bring it to the light of day and that a little fresh air in the Government of Saskatchewan, a little fresh air in the Government of Canada would make all the difference in the world in the way governments operate in this country. Perhaps though the Members across and the Members to my right would rather governments not act that way because they are too interested in providing special favors to their friends, special favors to senators, special favors to potential senators.

**An Hon. Member:** — What are you . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, I don't know, I don't see any charges in this Legislature, but there certainly have been some charges that have developed as a result of skyshops; there certainly have been some charges developed as a result of the harbor dredging affair, and those are not cheap shots, those are charges and criminal charges have been laid. I suggest that if the Member wants to rise in his place and make a specific charge, a specific charge in this Assembly and then stand behind it instead of lacking the intestinal fortitude by hiding behind interrogative questions and interrogative accusations, then I suggest the Member should keep quiet.

Mr. Speaker, anyone can participate in the kind of cheap politics that have been participated in by the Members to my right over the last six months. Anyone can. Anyone can make

suggestions and allegations in this Assembly; anyone can make comments about one's own business affairs, anyone can make comments about the partnerships that have been entered into by different Members; by the kind of behavior that certain Members have in conducting themselves outside the Legislature, anyone can make those comments. We don't think that it is productive and we don't think it is reasonable and we don't think it is in keeping with the traditions of the Legislature.

**Miss Clifford:** — At least they do this talking in the House.

**Mr. Collver:** — The Member for Wilkie in her clear voice has suggested that at least they do their talking in the House. I challenge them to do their talking outside in the corridor, let's have some of these charges and allegations out in the corridor where they are subject to the laws instead of in here where they are subject merely to a vote of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina Wascana suggested today that somehow the Members of the Progressive Conservative Party should rise and clear their good name, answer charges that weren't make. Now, Mr. Speaker, we attempted to do so on several occasions with all deference to the Members of the press corps. We attempted to introduce it in terms of a motion to yourself and we were ruled out of order, probably justifiably. We attempted to present it in Committee of Finance and as soon as we rose, the Member for Regina Lakeview, who goes on and on about the kinds of charges and counter charges and allegations and counter allegations last evening and the moment that we rose to speak on that matter that the Member for Regina Lakeview is speaking on; you have to go on to a new line of questioning. Every time, Mr. Speaker, that we got up to try and 'clear our names' we were ruled out of order. It was ruled that we couldn't do so. This has been the first opportunity that we have had to clear our names, to clear our good name as a party, and to clear our good name as individuals.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the very moving of this motion is in fact a breach of The Legislative Assembly Act, is in fact a breach because it is unacceptable behavior for any Member to cause any other Member to be investigated for matters brought before this House. It is against the privileges of this Assembly for Members to rise and ask that charges be laid under certain special committees.

The Members to my right, the Liberal caucus, have a number of lawyers in their caucus and I am surprised that they would cause a suggestion to be laid before the press that — and I suggest in question period and here as well — but laid before the press that this matter of bribery should be brought before the Privileges and Elections Committee as set out in The Legislative Assembly Act. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, or ask those lawyers outside this Assembly to make a legal opinion to the press: under what part of what Act they would submit the suggestion that I suggested that secrets in government should not be as prevalent as they are today and that if a civil servant examines or finds a case of wrongdoing that he should bring it to the attention of the Opposition parties. I suggest that these lawyers express their views outside the Assembly and give a legal opinion as to what section of the Act would you be suggesting that that committee examine those statements; outside

the House, because, Mr. Speaker, on a matter of politics, on a matter of differences of opinion, and this is obviously a difference of opinion, I differ with the Attorney General on this and I differ with the Liberal Party on this, I don't believe governments have to act as secretly as they do today. I don't believe that government needs to commit the kind of wrongdoings and hide things from the people and even demand an oath of secrecy as much as they do, and the Premier has already suggested that they don't even do that very often. Very few of the civil servants take oaths of secrecy, if any, as the Premier suggested in his place the other night.

Mr. Speaker, that is a difference of opinion; it is a difference of political opinion and the voters of this province will decide. They will decide who is right and who is wrong.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Collver:** — I am glad that the Members on my right are applauding that comment, because I think they (the people) will too; that the voters of this province will decide which position is right, but it is not a matter to make a charge that the Attorney General should investigate. It is not a matter to make a charge that a committee of this Legislature should investigate. Because if that is allowed to happen, Mr. Speaker, then any political difference of opinion can be brought before this House and investigated by the Attorney General's department and that would be a breach of a free society.

If the Cabinet is allowed to bring that kind of an investigation to bear on individual Members of the Opposition, the Opposition will cease to function. These Members to my right who are so concerned about these Bills that are being loaded and dumped upon us, 18 new Bills dumped upon us today, dumped on us today as far as they are concerned and as far as we are concerned dumped on them yesterday. The 18 Bills that were dumped on them today, they are so concerned because they have to get back to their farms, the five of them out of 15, that are going to have to go on the land. Five of us out of seven have to go on the land. We haven't made any huge objection to the fact that these Bills were dumped on us today or dumped on them yesterday. We haven't made that suggestion at all.

The Members to my right spend 80 per cent of their time arguing about personalities, arguing about personal behavior of other Members; 80 per cent of the time. Do they ever talk about issues? Very seldom. Do they ever present alternatives to this Assembly? Very seldom. Do they ever make a suggestion as to how this Assembly can improve itself? Very seldom, very seldom. But personal attacks, personal abuse of Members and of Ministers, we don't think that that is acceptable either to this Assembly or to the people of this province and we think in the next provincial election that that will come to bear on the people; that that will be brought to bear on them and that they will elect to eliminate that kind of behavior in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we are extremely concerned about the way that these continued personal attacks are continuing . . .

**Mr. Malone:** — Name one personal attack.

**Mr. Collver:** — Perhaps the Member for Regina Lakeview might wait until

Item No. 3 and he will hear several.

We are concerned about that. We are concerned that this motion was even brought to the floor of this Assembly. We are concerned that interrogative accusations were used by the Members to my right, if you want, to fool the press gallery into believing that somehow charges could be laid under an Act. That they were prepared to spell out under what section of that Act that they could ever be laid or ever be made of any kind and, furthermore, under that very Act, under The Legislative Assembly Act, if an investigation is made of a Member of this Legislature for a difference of opinion that they had with other Members, that that particular Member who makes that investigation or causes that investigation to be made, is subject to the censure of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, at no time did any Progressive Conservative Member of this Legislature ever offer any money or inducement of any kind, whatsoever, to the Minister of Finance for an advance copy of the Budget, nor did any Member of this party, the Progressive Conservative Party, any Member of this Legislature who is a Member of our party, make any request for an advance copy of the Budget at any time, whether it be for any amount of money or for nothing. At no time, Mr. Speaker, did I receive an advance copy of the Budget. As a matter of fact I was as surprised as the Leader of the Opposition when the Budget Speech was dropped on our desk that afternoon, the afternoon of the Budget Debate . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . didn't know what it was.

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, that may be so, I am a new Member of the House, like the Member for Kindersley. I was shocked at that in the light of advance copies of the Budget being provided to members of the press. I think I was equally shocked today when it was put up before this Legislature this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition that the Bills that are presently before this Assembly are not even yet before the Assembly, were discussed in some considerable detail, I am talking about last evening, with the Premier during Committee of Finance. I was shocked that this was not ruled out of order, that Bills that are presently before the Legislature are not to be discussed, as I understand the rules, until they are brought up on the Order Paper, yet this was discussed in considerable detail last evening by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Premier. I was surprised that that wasn't ruled out of order.

**An Hon. Member:** — Why didn't you object?

**Mr. Collver:** — We didn't object because we were interested in hearing what the information was in those Bills since we didn't have a copy.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about this resolution and we are concerned about the attitude that it indicates. The attitude that this Assembly is nothing more than a place to attempt to destroy the personal character of individuals in this Assembly. No one, Mr. Speaker, is elected to this Assembly to be attacked personally on a personal basis. No one's constituents expect him or her to come to this Assembly and listen to the kinds of personal attacks that have been, I think, probably traditional in this Assembly. No one expects their Member to take that kind

of abuse. On the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, we are perfectly prepared to continue to take it; we would be happy to have both Members on my right and the Members across continue with this kind of behavior because we know that in the next provincial election they are going to be eliminated from this Legislative Assembly if they continue doing it. If you want, Mr. Speaker, we encourage them to continue on with this kind of behavior because the voters are rejecting it; the voters are rejecting it all over the province and we know that and perhaps they don't know it but they will find it out when they go to call for meetings. I heard earlier one Member suggest that 600 people came to a fund raising dinner in Saskatoon by the Progressive Conservatives . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — 500!

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, I was told 600. Listen if it was 150 people that would be more than you get today. Well we will see how you do tomorrow, or whenever.

**Mr. Steuart:** — . . . we got . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Is that before or after your appointment, Mr. Leader of the Opposition?

**Mr. Steuart:** — Right in the middle.

**Mr. Collver:** — Right in the middle of your appointment. Who is your appointment with?

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support this motion because it will be misconstrued otherwise; because it will be misconstrued by Members to my right and by the legal verbiage that will ensue. It is my intention to support this motion because, I, too, am a little sick of the kind of unsubstantiated charges that have been thrown around this House, and I, too, would like to see these come to the light of day and be finished with one way or another. And therefore, I will support this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. G. Steuart** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a moment or two, before we take a vote on this issue, with some of the remarks of the Leader of the Conservative Party.

He came into this House a few months ago and as someone said, Mr. Clean. He had been in the House exactly three days when he proceeded to read Members who had been in here for 15, 16 and 20 years, a little lecture. He set himself a very high standard which his Members have been breaking, but no one as much as he has, daily ever since. He has the nerve to stand up here and say that we don't talk about issues but that they do. Not only Members on this side of the House but people all over this province were convinced that the Conservative Party led by the Member for Nipawin was struck dumb in the potash debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — They were referred to and still are as the ‘silent seven’. Mind you, after listening to them open up in the last few weeks I think that their previous stance was much more to be recommended to themselves than the one they have taken lately. They remind me of the story of the politician who said, if I don’t talk a lot they will think I don’t know anything. And I said, when you do, by God, they are sure of it.

I want to remind the Leader of the Conservative Party that we have heard these little claims by Tories before, ever since 1935, that they are on the verge of something. We heard them two or three times in the past and I wouldn’t let seven Members and one little burst of glory in 40 years go to his head. I have seen freshmen Members come in here and they were going to set the world on fire and if you want an example of what happens, go and take a look at those pictures downstairs and try to find the number of people who come back to this House in second, third or fourth sessions and then you had better enjoy your time here because it is liable to be very short with the continued performance that you have put on since you came here a few months ago. Don’t worry about where I am going; don’t worry about where I am going in a few months from now.

Liberals follow the leader; Conservatives swallow the leader! I don’t think that you are in very good shape.

Let’s see what he called cheap political shots. Well, was it the Members on this side of the House, of the Liberal caucus who accused two of his Members of attempting to obtain a Budget, or a copy of the Budget, improperly and then was it one of us, or any of us on this side, who said that they offered them money? Now in any other terms, that is a buy. It wasn’t us, it was the Minister of Finance who said that. He said it, he said it in this House. Whether he withdrew it or not I am not going to deal with that. It has been stated over and over again that he withdrew it. Some say that he did withdraw it properly and some say that he didn’t. I happen to say that he didn’t, if the Member for Nipawin agrees with me, the Speaker doesn’t.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I don’t want to get into debate. I just say you are casting reflection on decisions that are already made.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I was like the quarterback, I knew that I was getting knocked down from the side, so I got down quickly.

I would remind the House that it wasn’t us who began this. If the Member for Nipawin or anyone else thinks that we are going to sit here and listen to charges of bribery and charges of improper conduct and not do our best to get to the bottom of this he is mistaken, he is wrong.

I want to say that it wasn’t Members of this party or it wasn’t Members of the party opposite, but it was he himself who talked about the documents that he had; who talked about and boasted about the fact that some civil servant delivered to him secret information in little manila envelopes.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, I did not make those remarks and the Leader of the Opposition is



attributing remarks to me that I did not make and unless he has proof he must not use those remarks.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I was quoting a press source that quoted him and he speaks in the alleyways here more than he does in the House. However, I don't even have to talk about that. Let's talk about what he said in this debate tonight and follow the logic of what the Conservative Leader has said to the thousands of civil servants who work for the Government opposite — it just happens to be an NDP Government now. It might be a government of a different political philosophy in one, two, three or four years from now.

What he is saying to them is this: if you don't like, in your opinion, the way the Government acts then your responsibility as a citizen is to ferret out little memos of secret information and run around the deliver them to Members of the Opposition. He poses the question, and he says, what is a civil servant to do if he doesn't like the way the Government is behaving?

Well, I say what a civil servant or anyone else does if the Government which he is working for, or the company that he is working for, a group that he is working for, are behaving in a way and asking him to take part in a way that goes against his conscience, he resigns; he doesn't sneak out in the dark of night, phone you up quietly and say, I am sending you something in a little brown manila envelope because I don't like the way, in my opinion, the Government is acting in the best interest of the people. Who is to judge whether the Government is acting in the best interests of the people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — And that strange logic, that strange new moral logic that comes along with his new Mr. Clean look that says no, it's not only quite proper, but it's an act of good citizenship for somebody to run out and snitch or inform or tattle on their employers. That's exactly what you are saying, it nauseates me, I wouldn't want to live in that kind of a country where people worked for the Government in that way.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — That's the sort of thing you might expect behind the iron curtain or some dictatorship. That people sneak out and hand out a little information. We don't live that way. Now I'm not suggesting that from time to time, obviously he had a piece of paper here, a memo, he didn't have the intestinal fortitude to table it. He had a memo that he claimed was signed, I guess, by the head of the Budget Bureau that gave some information that appeared, according to him to be contrary to something the Minister of Finance was saying. What did it mean? Well, he said that our financial critic got up and based his criticism of the Budget on adding something up of 15 per cent here and 25 per cent here and something he found in the Estimates and in the Budget Speech.

But I suggest that that is the proper way to do it. I suggest that this is the way you operate. You look at the documents that are given you and you analyse them. But I don't suggest that that little letter you had that you didn't table that you read from and you went through a Perry Mason routine for an hour here. Attempting to get the Minister of Finance to admit something and holding this paper up and we rose to sixteen climaxes waiting for you to table it and then you shoved it under there and said, well I don't want to table it, I guess I might, my informer might come to light and something will happen to him.

What did it say? According to you it said that somebody had advised the Minister that they might, that there's going to be a 20 per cent increase in the Budget and he should put more money in or they shouldn't. It didn't prove anything. If you needed that to tell you that the Budget was a, I say, a dishonest document and did not truly reflect the proper budgeting of the Government, then I say you are in a pretty bad way. The evidence of what the Government was doing was clearly and is clearly in the Budget Speech and in the Estimates and in the Public Accounts. There for any Member with common sense and a little bit of knowledge and a bit of ability to do a bit of adding and a bit of subtracting there, plainly for them to see that's exactly what we did, that's exactly what any sensible person in the Opposition would do and they don't need any more.

So, when the Member says that this is cheap, a cheap shot by somebody, I think he better go back and take an honest and hard look at what he has been saying lately. I think if he does or maybe if he can't see it, if he can't see what he has been recommending to the civil servants as something wrong ethically and wrong morally, then I have a pretty low opinion of his moral outlook or his moral fibre.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — I say what he's suggesting is contemptible and I think it will be treated by the public and the civil servants with a contempt that it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in regard to the Government's attitude that I'm sorry to hear that they will neither obviously support this motion nor are they prepared to offer any alternative action. They don't consider this the proper vehicle of any or alternative action to clear this air. The Attorney General stood up and spoke out very strongly against the attitude of the Leader of the Conservative Party and this so-called obtaining documents and obtaining some secret information. He has stated, as Members of the Government have, that they take it seriously enough to have an internal investigation. If nothing else had been said in this Legislative Assembly that would call for, at least for the matter alone to be referred to the Committee on Elections and Privileges, that's what it's all about, that's what, probably the major reason for the existence of that committee is for, the behavior of Members of the Legislative Assembly, how they behave in and outside this Legislative Assembly. If for no other reason, I would think you would have followed that, taken that attitude and followed that line.

In regard to his attitude as to what the Minister of Finance has said and it's interesting that he's not here, has not been here today. I think he is absent from the House on purpose, recognizing that this debate would come up. Because I

am convinced, not only do I know that he said, I remember clearly, but I am also convinced that he left the matter hanging up in the air and if I were the Conservatives, I'm pleased in supporting this resolution, I would be demanding in a much louder voice than they are, that he either clear the air or he apologize. I think that he has acted in a very, very improper way, for a Member of this Legislature, never mind a responsible Member of the Treasury Benches.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Assembly did not leave the matter up in the air. They dealt with the matter as they saw fit or the committee dealt with it as they saw fit and that was confirmed by the Assembly.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I said the Minister of Finance left it up in the air, he did leave it up in the air. His withdrawal wasn't worth the breath that was uttered and the chairman and you and anyone else can use all the whitewash that you can find in Regina, you still won't whitewash it and you won't make it go.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Leader of the Opposition is out of order in his comments. Because his withdrawal was dealt with by the committee and it was confirmed by this Assembly and you are reflecting on the decision of the committee in this Assembly which, according to Beauchesne, is improper.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Anyway in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I believe and I firmly and sincerely believe that the attitude of the Government opposite, with the absence of the Minister of Finance, the continued absence, on any point that's brought up in this House almost, of the Premier and the attitude obviously taken on behalf of the Government by the Attorney General, is a cop-out. And I presume, I can only presume, that they figure that it's in their best political interest to leave this thing floating up in the air, rather than to bring it down and either point the finger at the one, two Members of the Conservative Party or else expose the Minister of Finance for what he did and what he may well have done which was just in a fit of temper. Throwing accusations that he could not back up.

So, I do, I ask the Members on the back benches to think about this seriously. And I hope that they will vote in favor of this motion. It can do no harm, I say, if it's followed through properly, it can do a great deal to clear the air and a great deal of good.

Motion negatived on the following Recorded Division:

**YEAS — 16**

Steuart	Nelson (Assiniobia-	Collver
Lane	(Gravelbourg)	Larter
Wiebe	Clifford	Bailey
Malone	Anderson	Berntson
Cameron	Merchant	Katzman
	McMillan	Birkbeck

**NAYS — 24**

Pepper	Kaeding	Skoberg
Thibault	Kwasnica	Vickar
Romanow	Dyck	Nelson (Yorkton)
Messer	McNeill	Allen
Byers	Feschuk	Koskie
Mostoway	Rolfes	Johnson
Larson	Tchorzewski	Thompson
Whelan	Matsalla	Banda

**Resolution No. 14 — Interrogative Accusations During Question Period**

**Mr. E. A. Berntson** (Souris-Cannington) moved, seconded by Mr. R. H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):

That this Assembly regrets the use of interrogative accusations, during question period as they relate to certain unsubstantiated allegations and insinuations that tend toward character assassination.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution that I intend to move in a few minutes, that this Assembly regrets the use of interrogative accusations, and for the benefit of my legal friends to my right, it was a phrase I picked off the top of my head because I wrote it in a hurry. What it means is we are sick to death of questions being formed in the way of accusations and further that certain insinuations that tend to discredit certain characters on both sides of this House. I cite a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. One tonight where the Member for Regina Wascana stood up and suggested that the Member for Nipawin had encouraged civil servants to divulge certain information. According to the transcript that he was referring to at the time, it says: “encourage people who are keeping their eyes on government.” I would never suggest that civil servants aren’t people, but there is still quite a difference in the quote.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, is from the question period on December 28th from the Member for Regina South, April 28th, sorry about that:

A question then to the Premier. On learning Mr. Premier of the fact that a Member or Members of the Legislature got a copy . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Sought.

**Mr. Berntson:** — “Got”, it’s in the records.

got a copy of the Budget in advance, did you discuss this matter with the Attorney General to determine

whether or not an offence or an attempted offence may have been involved?

On the same day, the Member for Regina South:

Question to the Premier.

**An Hon. Member:** — What day?

**Mr. Berntson:** — April 28th.

**An Hon. Member:** — That's tomorrow.

**Mr. Berntson:** — Sorry, April 21st, 28th day of the Session. I wasn't reading from the transcript though, this is a record, there is a difference.

Question to the Premier. In view of the fact that the Budget came down on March 24th, may I ask the Premier when and by what method did he first learn of the approach by one or more of the Members of this Assembly to obtain a copy of the Budget in advance?

And in fact it hadn't been substantiated that this approach had even occurred. There are several of this type of questions back over the last week or ten days. After the Minister of Finance stood on his feet and said, I've already withdrawn any allegations of impropriety on the part of any Member and I would repeat that withdrawal.

**An Hon. Members:** — But it's true.

**Mr. Berntson:** — It's not in the record my friend.

The Member for Regina Lakeview:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. During the Estimates over the last few days, the Member for Nipawin had indicated on several occasions, that he has information that he is privy to about one particular case of deficit budget. There were said 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 has been any break-in, any files have been rifled, whether anybody in your department has been improperly talking to other Members of the Legislature and discussing government business that is secret business?

There's example after example, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to go on with this. Everybody in this House knows what's going on.

**Mr. S. J. Cameron** (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, only briefly and in connection, particularly with the reference to the two questions that I asked that the speaker made reference to.

The first one was the question I directed to the Premier which was preceded by the comment "on learning of the fact," and my friend takes some issue with that. The background is this. I was in the House the day the Minister of Finance said, and I heard it clearly, that two Members of the Conservative

caucus had sought a copy of the Budget in advance. I heard him say a little bit later that it's true, he said, "it's true." I then asked the Premier a question in the House. I said would he give the House an assurance that two Members of the Conservative Party did not approach the Minister of Finance for a copy of the Budget in advance. He said he wouldn't, he did not give us that assurance.

Now, I myself heard what the Minister of Finance said. I then asked the Premier to give us an assurance that two Members of the Conservative Party had not sought a copy of the Budget in advance. The Premier having said no, he would not give us that assurance. I don't know what more one needs to precede a question by saying, "on learning of the fact" that the Progressive Conservatives had sought in advance a copy of the Budget. When we talk of the withdrawal or the non-withdrawal, we're talking about the surface of the thing. The fact remains the Minister of Finance said it, and the fact remains the Premier would not give us the assurance the approach hadn't been made.

Then when I said in the second question, my friend referred to, that he takes objection to when I asked the Premier when he first learned of the approach by the two Members of the Conservative Party he had obviously learned at that stage, of the approach from the Minister of Finance. I think he indicated that in the response. So whatever the version of the Minister of Finance is, the fact is that he did inform the Premier apparently that some approach had been made. Those being the facts, there's certainly nothing whatever wrong in the two questions that I had asked.

One last comment. It isn't for that Member or for the Member for Nipawin to take objection to the way in which I ask questions. That is a matter that is in the discretion of Mr. Speaker. If Mr. Speaker finds my questions out of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure he is happy to draw that to my attention and bring me to order which he has done on several occasions. He did not do it in respect to these two particular questions. May I say it is a very, very weak argument that we have just had given to us in support of the resolution. It really demonstrates clearly that there is very little to the resolution. It is surprising indeed that it makes the Order Paper. The remarks of my friend in support of it are pretty barren and we can only conclude that the substance of the resolution is barren in the same way.

**Mr. Malone:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about this resolution. It is understandable to me that our friends to the left are very sensitive about question period and the questions that are asked and I don't blame them for being sensitive about the question period, in view of their performance over the last six months. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I think they should be sensitive because of certain allegations that were made in this House and now apparently have been withdrawn and not withdrawn as the case may be. I want to tell those Members that we in this House who sit in the Liberal caucus are concerned about the operation of this House. If there are questions that deal with the reputation or the abilities of Members in this particular Legislature or whether they have done or not done certain things, we intend on pursuing the matter and finding out if possible, answers to those particular matters. It appears that the Attorney General and the Government Members opposite do not share our view in this way of trying to pursue these matters and finding out the answers or they would not have voted against the last resolution.

Really, Mr. Speaker, what this resolution on the Order Paper is, is nothing else but a thinly disguised attack on yourself and your office.

If the Members are unhappy with the question period or the manner in which questions are asked, they have a perfect right to rise on points of order after the question period at 3:00 o'clock and make their feelings known to you. I can't recall them doing so in regard to any of the questions that were discussed by the Member for Souris-Cannington. I can't recall them ever raising any points of order about any of the questions we have asked by the Liberal caucus. At least in recent days in any event.

The motion is ill advised, Mr. Speaker, because as I say it is really an attack on this House and an attack on you in the manner in which you have handled the question period. For that reason I won't be supporting the motion.

If the Members who sit to my left had been able to substantiate their claim that there has been character assassination, interrogative accusations, whatever they are, unsubstantiated allegations and insinuations, perhaps I would change my mind. But from the remarks of the Member for Souris-Cannington, I haven't been able to ascertain anything to lead me to believe that there has been character assassination by Members on this side of the House, in this caucus. There has been some self-destruction attempts made by the Members who sit to my left, which perhaps could be described as character assassination. But that is their problem, not ours.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion.

**Mr. R. A. Larter** (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion, I should like to thank the Government Members and the Members to my right for the assistance they have given our party during this Eighteenth Legislature. I said thank you because I really believe both of the parties have lived up to our expectations and in the eyes of the public have continued the aggressive digging of their own graves.

Mr. Speaker, this NDP Government is a closed government and one that is only responsible unto itself, so they think. The socialist Trudeau Liberals on our right know full well that the day has long been fixed and their fate is sure and it is factual. By the time the next election rolls around, their group will be nothing but a very bad dream, that just could not have happened in this province.

Here is a group that feels they are the all-knowing as well and like the Trudeau socialists they can rule with a different sort of rules. But then their party is great at adapting to skyscrapers, judges affair, Hamilton dredgings and maybe even Mirabel, we don't know yet. Just hush them up and people will forget.

No, my learned friends to the right, people will not forget what you are doing to the morals of this country in laying out your Liberal standard, your new Liberal standard. But also they are not prepared to follow a party that has no direction.

Mr. Speaker, both the Liberals and the NDP are guilty of delaying this Legislature to hours of bickering and tearing down

each other over the years. They are both guilty of slandering and personally attacking our PC caucus, and falsely accusing us of bribery and revealing of private government secrets.

Mr. Speaker, this Government and the official Opposition through their continual talk, hour after hour, through two sessions have done more to waste taxpayers' money and to completely disgust this public on politics, on integrity than anything I have ever seen in my life.

The complete disregard for the public by this Government by introducing bill after bill . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! What is your Point of Order.

**Mr. Malone:** — I don't like to interrupt the Member, Mr. Speaker, but I wonder if he could give us some indication when he intends to start dealing with the resolution.

**Mr. Speaker:** — While I am on my feet I will bring a couple of points to the Member's attention. The Member is making reference to alleged bribery and leaking of confidential documents. In effect dealing with a resolution that has already been dealt with by the Assembly and cannot be re-discussed. I would agree with the Member for Lakeview that I have been unable to relate it as closely as I think it should be related to the topic, relate your comments to the topic.

**Mr. Larter:** — Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I thought I was right on.

Mr. Speaker, if government legislation was to be half as long, with half the pay for the Members and twice the work done through sensible government, built on government for the people, with less controls, I am sure that the people of this province would look more favourably on the MLAs who represent them and the statute of this Legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Larter:** — Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion which will give us the opportunity to show the people of this province just what the NDP and the Liberals through fear for their future are attempting to do by slander and deception.

**Mr. Romanow:** — I had really not intended to enter this debate, that I can say genuinely, but I must say the Hon. Member for Estevan has provoked me to say just a few words. I believe very firmly that the Conservative Party was a party that many of us in this Legislature were looking to advance new ideas, new program policies and the like, rather than advancing motions such as is before you at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Member for Estevan talked about the delay in the proceedings and proceeded to blame the Liberals and the NDP. Goodness knows I disagree with my friends in the Liberal Party very frequently, but I need not remind the Member for Estevan that it was his party that delayed the proceedings for about a week and a week and one-half with respect to the Budget Debate on March 12, 1976.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — The simple fact of the matter is that that was not something which can be attributed to the Liberal Party and it cannot be attributed to the NDP, but it can be attributed to the Conservative Party. I think that when the Member for Estevan gets up and expects us to accept allegations that somehow we are delaying proceedings of the House, that somehow we are wasting the taxpayers' money, it is about time that he take a look at the conduct of his own party and his own caucus. I want to emphasize to him again the conduct in delaying the presentation of the Budget on March 12 is directly the fault of the Conservative Party in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also say that I find that it ill behoves the Conservative Party to get up with righteous indignation and castigate the Liberal Party and then indirectly us, for personal attacks and then proceed all the time to make these types of references to Mirabel, the skyshops and all of this other business that is going on. Which, I say, Mr. Speaker, in my judgement is almost about as simple muckraking that any Conservative operation can do. And then to get up and to simply say that somehow these are personal attacks on us, forget about us for the moment, I am just going to slide in there with skyshops, I am going to slide in there with Mirabel and I am going to slide in with the Liberal socialist Trudeau operations, even I can't buy that. But I would have expected a lot more from the Member for Estevan and the Party Whip or the Party Deputy Leader or whatever his status is of the Member for Estevan than those remarks.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by mentioning one other thing which has bothered me a considerable amount, is this business of closed government. This business of having a closed government. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it absolutely clear we are talking about two different issues. Talking about civil servant loyalty, talking about civil servant oaths of office, oaths of secrecy is one thing. Talking about government actions and deciding to table documents or not to table documents when requested by the Opposition, that is another thing. You can argue on that latter half that we are a closed government, that we are a secret government, that we are not tabling potash agreements, that we are not tabling all sorts of survey reports; that I may not agree with you on, but I think a case can be made there on closed government. But please don't extend that argument on closed government to the first example and that is loyalty of civil servants. Don't ever somehow say that because civil servants are required by law and by reputation and by experience and by precedent in the Province of Saskatchewan to be loyal to their employers, that somehow that is opening up government.

I said in my earlier remarks on the motion just before us and I repeat here again, how would the Member for Estevan, how would the Member for Estevan like it, he's a businessman, if it was open season for his employees to tell his competitors all the documents that he has and the manner in which he runs his business? Now is that what he is asking society to be founded on?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now I interrupted the Member for Estevan because he was discussing a previous resolution and I think the Attorney General is, although he is responding to the Member for Estevan, he is out of order as well and I am asking him to get back to the resolution.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to say that I am out of order I guess in rebutting the speech which is out of order by the Member for Estevan.

I want to close by saying that I am not going to support this resolution. I am not going to support this resolution. I am not going to support this resolution because I believe its introduction was based on faulty logic and no facts. I believe that it was supported by the Member for Estevan on not only faulty logic and no facts, but what I would call his personal innuendo which I regret very much. I believe that Mr. Speaker protects this House and the Members of the House from improper questioning throughout the piece. I don't think it is related at all to any of the issues which we have dealt with earlier. I think this motion is a waste of time with respect to taxpayers and MLAs and the sooner we defeat it and get on with the business of the House the better we will all be, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the previous speaker addressed himself to this motion at all and I sincerely hope that he will change his mind when he rereads the motion.

What we are suggesting in this motion is that the use of acts or questions to make accusations of a personal nature on the part of other Members of this Legislature is unacceptable to the Legislature and unacceptable to parliamentary tradition. Interrogative accusations can be made easily by any Member and it is only because it is posed as a question that it is ruled in order. I will agree in part with the comments of the Member for Regina Lakeview that we are, in this motion, making a comment about, if you want, the standards of this House. And, if you want, the rulings of the Speaker. But as I understand, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to make this as a motion: that we decry the use of interrogative accusations. In fact, as the Member for Regina Lakeview has said, at no time did we raise a point of order and yet we did raise a point of order pertaining to these questions, which Mr. Speaker refused to accept as a point of privilege. We surely have the right to bring forward a motion to this Assembly where we regret the use of this kind of accusation which we have not been able to bring to the attention of the Assembly in any other way.

Now it is not difficult for a Member to make this kind of accusation. One could ask the Premier all kinds of questions and relate them to his previous business and use the question period to reflect on the Premier's character. And this has happened, this has happened in this very Assembly and it has been ruled in order. The Premier has refused to answer it, of course, but that kind of accusation has been made. One could ask the question, for example, about the partners of some of the Members to my right.

**An Hon. Member:** — You did.

**Mr. Collver:** — As a question of the partners, no I did not. If the Member would like to suggest that I did I would be happy to stand on the record on that particular score. But one could have gone further on a particular series of questions and gone on to assassinate

the character of a particular Member of this Legislature. One could have done that but one didn't do that . . .

**Mr. Lane:** — The Member for Moosomin . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — The Member for Moosomin did not. I certainly did not, I did not mention at one time the Member of this Legislature nor alluded to the partner of the Member of this Legislature, nor alluded to wrongdoings on the part of any Member of this Legislature.

**Mr. Malone:** — . . . stand on . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Well I don't think that is true and you get the record and I'll stand on that record. I'll stand on that record and on that question.

Mr. Speaker, one could use the question period for that basis and this Assembly would deteriorate and become worse than it is not, which is continued accusations and charges back and forth, continued arguing and bickering, if you want, as opposed to discussing the issues that come before this Assembly. We are asked as a party and as a group, every time these kinds of accusations are made on us, if we don't stand up and respond to them, we are accused that they must be true. The press say, they must be true because they don't respond and yet we don't want to respond to them. We would be happy to provide to the Attorney General, or to the Speaker, or to the members of the press, the 130 times that have been counted in terms of personal accusations not about things like Mirabel where charges are contemplated, not about suggestions of skyscrapers where charges have been laid, not about suggestions about harbor affairs where charges have actually been laid against individuals, but about personal behavior, personal business affairs of the individual Members; 130 different occasions in the 77 or 78 days that we've been in this Assembly. If that, we just had to keep score because in the last week, the Members to my right have persisted to such an extent and the press have suggested that because we don't defend ourselves we must be guilty and that kind of behavior quite frankly, is not acceptable, I don't think, to the people of this province and we would be more than happy to lay that issue before the people and will, and more than happy to stand on the basis that we believe that this kind of accusation and this kind of behavior is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, for too many years, too many years, the Members of this Assembly have lowered themselves, in my judgement to that kind of behavior and I sincerely hope that it will stop. I sincerely hope the use of this kind of accusation will be prevented in this Assembly by the Members of this Assembly and by others who are more responsible and I hope that more responsible views in each of the caucuses will come to bear and that this kind of accusation and so on will not be allowed to continue in this Legislature.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, I wanted only to speak to this matter at a number of levels. First let me speak to what little tiny merit the resolution may have and my comments will be brief in accordance with the degree of merit that the resolution has.

If this kind of a resolution were passed and if these were the rules of the Legislature can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the great flow of questions that are always used in this House, that would then be denied to the Opposition? You see one of the problems that the Hon. Member for Nipawin tends to have and you may want to score this as the 167th personal attack, is that he tends not to look more than about a foot and a half beyond his nose and when he is faced with some little problem like interrogative allegations, however they refer to it in the motion, then his response it, well, that should be stopped. Without then looking at the fact that a sort of standard question that is made in this House, "Does the Minister intend to go on covering up the SEDCO disasters?" That's a question that is an interrogative, that implies something and that would be out of order. As another example of a question which would now be out of order, "Is the Minister the only person in Saskatchewan still unaware of the noxious weed problem?" Or, "Do you know anything at all about the Department of Highways?" A question that came up the other day, not in question period, but in Estimates, "I suggest to you that the trip to New Zealand for you and your officials was just a junket," I suppose the same kind of question might perhaps improperly be put now to the Premier over his trip, those questions would be out.

Mr. Speaker, at the level of merit, if there is any merit, the question is whether this House would want to so completely restrict and whether that group as Opposition Members would want to so completely restrict themselves in the kind of questions they could ask. It's interesting that when the Hon. Member does what he said the other day, he said, we want to "unimpune" ourselves, whatever that means, and the Hon. Member decides that he will "unimpune" himself, he looks not very far beyond his nose.

If, Mr. Speaker, I might quickly do what everyone else has done improperly, I suggest that the same thing flows from the unfortunate comments that he made in the media about the release of documents by public servants. If what he was really doing was saying, gee, I like getting those few documents and he didn't then look down the road at what that would lead to.

Mr. Speaker, I'm leaving that area immediately.

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . warned me in advance.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Mr. Speaker, what has the Hon. Member for Nipawin particularly done? First he attacks the Liberals, then he attacks the NDP, then he attacks Mr. Speaker and this resolution particularly attacks Mr. Speaker, who is the controller of the question period and I suggest rightly so in this relationship. Lastly in this night, certainly they've attacked the public service.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this will be 168, 169, I doubt that we've had a more paranoid Member of the Legislature, probably in its history. A man who would sit and keep count of the allegations against him, the personal attacks . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Nixon did that and kept a list.

**Mr. Merchant:** — Nixon did, Nixon kept a list, kept a list of the press,

kept a list of the things they were saying, kept a list of who in the press was picking on him and who wasn't.

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Your name was in the book . . .

**Mr. Merchant:** — Well, I suspect that my name has reached the book of the Hon. Member. Have you ever had a better example of the paranoia of the Hon. Member for Nipawin than last week with the suggestions that he has made in the press and made in the House and certain comments that he has made this evening and in particular in relation to this resolution, when he says, we kept a count and we started keeping the count as soon as the first allegation was made? A very curious kind of suggestion from a man who says that he should be the next Premier of the province and in that same paranoid speech earlier this evening didn't just say that he was going to be the next Premier but that somehow he was going to wipe us all out. It was going to be a wipe out, it was going to be a clean shot. Even the Hon. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) is in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, that is quite the move from paranoia to 61 Members. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the Hon. Member can't do any better than he has done this night, cannot do any better than he has done on previous occasions when he feels that he has been personally attacked, if that is the best that the Hon. Member can do, I think he will do well to come back himself, never mind come back with 60 others beside him.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member for Regina Wascana would accept a question before he takes his chair?

I wonder if he would mind defining for me the word 'paranoia'?

**Mr. Merchant:** — A paranoid, Mr. Speaker, is the one who thinks that everybody is against him and as we go from the general to the specific, a paranoid is someone who thinks that we two parties are not letting them have their way in this House. He is a man who thinks that somehow two parties are ganging up on the seven who come into the House. He is the man who thinks that the press are picking on him and ganging up on him. A paranoid is someone who is concerned because people are out to get him. And that is in the general and that is in the specific and I am pleased to give definitions any where at any time, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Speaker, you don't think that that was a personal attack in any way? Would you suggest that, the Member for Wascana, that that was a personal attack in referring to one of the Members as paranoic? You wouldn't do that without substantiation. If the Member wants to substantiate that particular comment . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Point of Order . . .

April 27, 1976

**Mr. Speaker:** — I can't, I don't feel that I can make a judgement on that. The Members will have to make their own judgements as to what paranoia is, whether the Member for Wascana was right. I would suggest that Members not ask leading questions if they are afraid of the answers.

Motion negatived on the following Recorded Division:

**YEAS — 6**

Collver  
Larter

Bailey  
Berntson

Katzman  
Birkbeck

**NAYS — 34**

Pepper  
Thibault  
Romanow  
Messer  
Byers  
Mostoway  
Larson  
Whelan  
Kaeding  
Kwasnica  
Dyck  
McNeill

Feschuk  
Rolfes  
Tchorzewski  
Matsalla  
Skoberg  
Vickar  
Nelson  
(Yorkton)  
Allen  
Koskie  
Johnson  
Thompson

Banda  
Steuart  
Lane  
Wiebe  
Malone  
Cameron  
Nelson  
(Assiniboia-  
Gravelbourg)  
Clifford  
Anderson  
Merchant  
McMillan

The Assembly adjourned at 9:16 o'clock p.m.