

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
44th Day

Friday, April 22, 1977

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. H. H. P. BAKER (Regina Victoria): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to extend a very warm welcome to a group of students from Thomson School. There are 33 in number, Grade Eight students. They are accompanied by Mr. Forest and Mrs. Anthony.

Thomson School was our family school, the place where they had gone, taking their fine academic school training there. It is in a good central location in the city of Regina. There may be some students here who live in Mr. Shillington's constituency, but I believe most are from Regina Victoria.

I wish them a pleasant and fruitful stay this morning. I shall be meeting with them a little later on. Again, a warm welcome.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

RETROACTIVE LEGISLATION RE CIGOL CASE

MR. E. C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. In view of the introduction the other day of legislation, retroactive legislation in connection with the potash taxation, I am wondering if it is the Minister's intention at this Session or in the future to introduce retroactive legislation in connection with taxation paid by oil companies in this province. In particular, has the Minister any legislation drafted at this time to deal with the CIGOL case which is still before the Supreme Court of Canada waiting for a determination?

HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — The answer to all questions is, No.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do I take that there is no legislation at all drafted or prepared in connection with the CIGOL case should that case go against the Government?

MR. MESSER: — The answer as to whether we have legislation drafted is, No. I think it would be somewhat naive not to have looked at what the decision of the CIGOL case might be, what the effects may have on the Government of Saskatchewan and then undertake to give consideration to what the resolution to that may be. But certainly we have not at this point in time any legislation

drafted; it is too hypothetical. Certainly we would undertake to assume what the decisions may be and what the problems may be, but we have no legislation yet drafted.

MR. MALONE: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister or to the Attorney General. Have you had any advice from your agents in Ottawa as to when the decision of the CIGOL case is expected? As you know the agents are usually advised by the court prior to the decision being handed down.

MR. MESSER: — As far as I am concerned, or my officials, we have no indication as to when the decision may be coming.

BOARD ROOM IN SEDCO BUILDING

MR. R. E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In Crown Corporations Committee yesterday with SEDCO, the Minister was going to look into the cost of furnishing the boardroom in the new SEDCO building. I wonder if the Minister could tell us the cost per square foot of the suede leather walls and what each of the chairs actually cost.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland.

PREFIXES ON PUBLIC SERVICE VEHICLES

MR. H. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Government Services. There was a question here in the House several days ago as to prefixes on public service vehicles. The Minister indicated that there would no longer be one designation under the five-year licence plate system. I am wondering whether the Minister will be looking into the possibility of some form of external identification on public service vehicles for the purposes of internal control of government vehicles.

HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services): — The answer, Mr. Speaker, is No. We have had external identification on vehicles for several years and it serves really no useful purpose in the control of the vehicles. It is just a needless expense.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, even such things as government furniture, etc., are often marked so that it doesn't have a habit of walking out the door with other people's belongings. I wonder if you wouldn't then consider if there is some need for external identification or is there something on the part of the Government that they wish to hide?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I may have misunderstood the Hon. Member's question. I did not realize that he was concerned about the theft of vehicles. The theft of vehicles has not been an overwhelming problem with the Department of Government Services. I don't know that in fact we have ever had one stolen. I suppose if a vehicle is stolen, that will be time enough to plant a big sign all over the vehicles so that nobody would want them.

AMBULANCES SHOULD PROVIDE HIGHER DEGREE OF SERVICE TO INJURED

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Recently, I am sure the Minister is aware that one of the representatives to the Safety '77, the medical representative, recommended that ambulances provide a higher degree of service to those who are critically injured in traffic accidents. Has the Minister given any consideration to the doctor's proposal at this time?

HON. W. ROBBINS (Minister of Health): — We will be looking at those proposals along with the Road Ambulance Association when we meet them after the closure of the House. I think I intimated in the Estimates on Health that we were looking at the probability of a minimal cost of about \$2 million in a subsidy program that might be devised if we went the 'whole hog', if I may use that term, it would cost us up to \$10 million a year.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The suggestion or the report from the medical profession was that people in the rural areas who were involved in an accident have about a 25 per cent chance as to people who are in an accident in the city of getting medical treatment. That is due to the time in getting to the hospital. Would the Minister then not give some degree of assurance that not only will he be looking at, but be pressing very strongly, for this improvement for ambulance care in Saskatchewan?

MR. ROBBINS: — There are some offsetting factors. About 54 per cent of the accidents occur in urban areas, only 19 per cent on the highways. If we can get you fellows to support seat belt legislation, we will have a lot fewer accidents in terms of injured people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear.

RETROACTIVE POTASH LEGISLATION

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Would the Minister indicate whether it is the intention of the Government, through the passage of the retroactive legislation which they propose, to pull themselves out of the bind in which they find themselves in the potash legislation and particularly the Canada Potash challenge to the potash legislation.

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Member will have opportunity to debate what he thinks the Government's intentions or positions are in regard to the amendments that have been introduced to this House. As I indicated in my second reading speech with the mineral taxation amendments, the proposed amendments that come forward emanated from discussions between the Government and the potash companies. I think that it brings about some improvements certainly for the potash companies as well as for the Government. Those discussions are ongoing and it may be that there will be other proposals that will be advanced at future times that emanate from those discussions.

MR. MERCHANT: — Is the Minister saying that the retroactive legislation, which would appear to try to get the Government out of a bind in the courts, was something that flowed from the discussions with the potash companies?

MR. MESSER: — Well, certainly the discussions I think precipitated the legislation, some of the legislation that is included in the amendments. It is only the Member's interpretation as to whether the legislation is here simply to avoid what may be decisions that have yet to be made in the courts.

MR. MERCHANT: — Is it the view of the Minister and perhaps this question, Mr. Speaker, might better be directed to the Hon. Attorney General, is it the view in general, in terms of government policy of this Government, that they can get out of problems in the courts by passing retroactive legislation, problems over potash with retroactive legislation, problems with oil and gas in the CIGOL case with retroactive legislation? Does the Government believe they can extricate themselves in that manner?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Member is undertaking to assume that all decisions in regard to actions that are in the courts between potash companies and/or the Government are necessarily going to be negative in the interests of the Government. That is purely hypothetical. As the Attorney General has said, we have not yet lost a case, and therefore, I think it would be somewhat ludicrous to think that the Government would be undertaking, by retroactive legislation, to amend a problem that it does not even have at present.

REVOKING OF LIQUOR LICENCE

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, I would address this question to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister responsible for the Liquor Licensing Commission. As a result of the information that was brought to the attention of this Assembly yesterday, the error of 'commission' rather than the error of omission in terms of padlocking of corridors in hotels, would the Premier recommend to the Chairman of the Liquor Commission that the licence of the licensee so involved be under review with a review to revocation?

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think I would not recommend it. Basically the Liquor Licensing Commission does not feel that it is its role to enforce the fire regulations. Basically the Liquor Licensing Commission governs the conduct of the hotel insofar as its liquor vending activities are concerned. Where there is a breach of the liquor vending activities, the Liquor Licensing Commission intervenes.

The Liquor Licensing Commission only became involved in something like the Homestead, because of what is essentially a technical provision, that anyone who operates a beverage room must operate hotel rooms. They were not operating rooms when the fire commissioner closed down the hotel. I think I would prefer to leave the enforcement of the fire regulations in the hands of the fire commissioner, and if I may say so, the fire

has not been noted for any lack of zeal in the last year or two in the enforcement of fire regulations.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary question. As the Premier well knows, the Liquor Licensing Commission, in reviewing applications for liquor licences and also in its continuing review of licensees under the Liquor Act or under the licensing requirements on a continuous basis, is at all times upgrading its information pertaining to licensees as to whether or not they are satisfactory licensees under the liquor licensing regulations. This is not a breach of fire regulations that I am talking about today. What I am talking about is an error of 'commission', in other words, padlocking fire exits; is that the kind of liquor licensee that the Liquor Licensing Commission should have in the Province of Saskatchewan, the kind of individual who would padlock fire exits twice: once, and the fire commissioner draws it to his attention, the second time that the fire commissioner goes in, he discovers that they are still padlocked. Would it not be advantageous, or advisable, for the Government of Saskatchewan to ensure a high calibre of licensees to ensure that the kind of licensee that would padlock fire exits no longer has a licence under the Liquor Licensing Commission?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think the Hon. Member raises an arguable point in saying that the Liquor Licensing Commission should take into account all aspects which comprise the character of the liquor licensee. It may well be that if the allegations made by the Hon. Member for Nipawin are accurate, with respect to padlocking, that this would be an indication of the sense of responsibility, or lack of responsibility, of the liquor licensee. Undoubtedly the Liquor Licensing Commission does take those sorts of things into account.

However, I would not want the Liquor Licensing Commission to conduct any wide-sweeping investigation into the character of liquor licensees which could have the character of a witch hunt where the licensee carries on his activities in the vending of liquor in a satisfactory manner. It is clearly a case where one draws the line. I don't want to see any witch hunts. On the other hand, I would like to see the Liquor Licensing Commission consider those things which go to character. And if in fact there have been convictions for violations of the fire regulations, that may well go to character.

MR. COLLVER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier not agree that such an investigation by the Liquor Licensing Commission, as ordered by his office, does not constitute a witch hunt in the light of the announced error of commission of padlocking of fire corridors most especially in the light of the current Regina hotel fire, in another premise and the indication to the public that this is a very dangerous condition to padlock fire exits.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I don't think anyone will wish to argue with the Hon. Member that any practice of padlocking fire exits is dangerous. Nor do I think anyone will contest the proposition of the Hon. Member that this ought to be addressed in the most severe terms, as I think the fire commissioner did.

The role of the Liquor Licensing Commission is a little

less clear; however, I will ask the Liquor Licensing Commission to have regard to any convictions under fire regulations when they are addressing themselves to the granting or renewing of licences.

MAINTENANCE WORK ON DELTA HOLDINGS PROPERTY

MR. G. N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. On Wednesday, you replied to my question about DNS doing maintenance work on Delta Holding Limited property in La Ronge. Your reply was that you doubted that DNS was doing this. I am wondering today, could the Minister tell this Assembly if DNS is or has been doing this type of work on the Delta Holding Limited properties in La Ronge?

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the transcript before me, but the Member does not repeat the question which he asked the other day accurately. If I had the transcript here, I would refresh the Member's mind with respect to the question that he asked. He asked whether or not repair work was being done by the department to Delta Holdings at no charge to Delta Holdings Limited. I said I wasn't sure, but I doubted that was the situation, or words to that effect.

With regard to his question today, I maintain the same position as I did the other day.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The question the other day was much the same, Mr. Minister. I had added electrical plumbing and doing maintenance on the Delta Holding property in an apartment block. You said at that time that you doubted it. I just thought within the last couple of days you would be able to answer yes or no.

RETROACTIVE LEGISLATION RE CIGOL CASE

MR. E. C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. The response you gave to the question from the Member for Wascana was to the effect that the amendments to the potash taxation came as a result of negotiations between the Government and the potash industry. My question to the Minister now is, in view of the CIGOL case, and in view of the situation in Saskatchewan in connection with oil and natural gas development, are there any negotiations taking place at this time between the Government and the oil industry in connection with future regulation, future royalties, and indeed the possibility of retroactive legislation to change those royalties retroactively?

HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, let me say first that I think it would be somewhat inaccurate to relate to the activities between the department and its officials and the companies as negotiations. I think that it could be more appropriately called 'discussions'. I think, yes, there are general discussions going on with the oil industry, but certainly there are no discussions to my knowledge that would relate directly and/or specifically to the concerns that are now being considered by the Supreme Court in the CIGOL case.

MR. MALONE: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are any discussions, to use the Minister's word, presently taking place between the Government and CIGOL or the successor to CIGOL, whose name escapes me, the corporate title, to dispose of that particular action prior to the Supreme Court judgement coming down? Indeed, are there any discussions taking place at all between the Government and CIGOL, with a view to determining what will happen if that judgement goes against the Government?

MR. MESSER: — In both instances, certainly no discussions between myself and those persons or principals, and I know of none taking place between the department either.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that in CIGOL they had had some consideration of retroactive legislation and indeed, Mr. Speaker, as Members are aware, the Premier and the Attorney General have talked about the possibility of nationalizing the oil industry. I wonder, since we now see an attempt, retroactively, to deal with regulations in the potash industry, if the Minister would indicate whether the Government has a plan of action should they lose the challenge to the potash legislation? Is it the intention of the Government to move in a nationalizing direction if the potash challenges are upheld by the courts?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, again I must say that the Member is presupposing what's going to happen and he laughs and says, "let's win it", and I think, Mr. Speaker, we're optimistic about the position that the Government of Saskatchewan has taken and that we are positive about that and we will win those cases. I think that it's somewhat silly to assume the Government is now undertaking to pass legislations which will bring about a negative response to a negative decision, because we're optimistic about what that decision will be. So I think the question is hypothetical.

POTASH DEVELOPMENT - NEW BRUNSWICK

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. In Westmoreland County in New Brunswick the testing for potash reserves has obviously been in progress. Reports printed in the Fredericton Gleaner indicate that the test holes will prove the viability of a large scale potash development. The New Brunswick Government has indicated publicly it is its intention to push for such development and get the maximum benefits from such development. What effect will a potash development, a viable potash development in New Brunswick have upon the potash industry of Saskatchewan and what test studies or marketing studies have you done to protect the Government of Saskatchewan's position should such development occur?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that here again is a somewhat hypothetical question. There have been no positive announcements from any potash companies that they will undertake to establish potash operations in New Brunswick. Certainly they have undertaken some tests, some exploration and developmental activities, as they have in other areas, the United States for

example. I think that our interpretation of those activities would indicate that the costs of operating or mining potash from such underground mining operations would be more costly than it would be in Saskatchewan. From our point of view it is questionable as to whether they are, in fact, as viable as the Member or the paper, the *Fredericton Gleaner* that he refers to, says they are. I believe that it will be yet some time before final decisions are made. Therefore, we see no serious consequences or concerns to the Government of Saskatchewan in the near future.

MR. LANE: — By way of supplementary. What studies has the Government undertaken to determine the impact, should a development occur, and does the Government have contingency plans to vary taxation, stop further nationalization, whatever, should such a development occur?

MR. MESSER: — To answer the last question of the Member first, I do not believe that we have any plans in mind in regard to the present policy of the Government of Saskatchewan in its relationship to the potash industry. I think the answer to the first question could be better answered by the Minister responsible for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. However, I do believe that we are in as good a position as anyone, as the second largest potash producer in the world, to contend and to cope with expansion of industry in other parts of the world in order to retain what we think is a fair share of the market and what we think is fair price for that product.

MR. MERCHANT: — The Minister, Mr. Speaker, had indicated yesterday that the Government had made an error in the computation of tax. I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether the companies that have been bought out or compelled to sell, whether they will get a refund . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. LANE: — Now, can I ask a supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER: — No, you may not. I'll take a new question. Member for Rosetown-Elrose.

COMMON CARRIER TRANSPORTATION

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation in Saskatchewan. Recently some of the merchants in the western part of the province have had their common carrier, that is the trucking firm which normally brings their meat, shipped by some other form of transportation. They are at a loss, Mr. Minister, to know the reasons why they must have their meat come by a different common carrier to their place of business. Has this been the decision of the Minister of Transportation?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of that question.

PURCHASE OF LAND - SEDCO

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Question to the Minister responsible for SEDCO. Has SEDCO purchased any land on behalf of Eldorado in 1977, the nine-quarter piece that they've been negotiating?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, no we have not to my knowledge. I know we have some options taken for Eldorado, acting as their agent.

MR. KATZMAN: — Supplementary. Are you saying that the Saskatchewan Development Corporation has not purchased any land in those nine quarters that you were originally negotiating on on behalf of Eldorado?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, that is right. That is what I am saying.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the Hon. Minister a supplementary question? On February 18, 1977, did you not purchase the north-west quarter of Section 27 and the north-east quarter of Section 28 in Township 38, Range 4, west of the third meridian?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of. Maybe the Member knows more about it than I do. I will check into it.

PURCHASE OF CHAIRS FOR SEDCO BOARD ROOM

MR. MERCHANT: — Question to the Minister in charge of SEDCO. Did the Government purchase, for approximately \$900 per chair, 26 chairs for the outfitting of the board room of the SEDCO office?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order I'll take the next question.

OIL TREATMENT PLANT

MR. D. M. HAM (Swift Current): — A question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Is it true, Mr. Minister, that Lloydminster has been chosen over Swift Current for the proposed heavy oil treatment plant?

MR. MESSER: — I wish I could provide a positive and precise answer to that question, Mr. Speaker. The answer is that there are yet, I think, some decisions and a fair bit of groundwork to be done before a final conclusion is arrived at as to a heavy upgrading facility for crude oil in Saskatchewan.

MR. HAM: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do you have any idea, Mr. Minister, about what time or when that decision will be made?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that that depends a lot on the Government's ability and success to negotiate with all of the parties that are involved, including some other levels of

government, both provincial and federal. I, however, do want to convey to the Member that we are only talking about a heavy upgrading facility. It would, I think, be economically more feasible to locate it near the greatest supply of heavy crude oil and, as the Member is aware, that falls in the Lloydminster area. That's not to say that that necessarily has to be the site of the facility, if one is, in fact, established, but I think that that area has a lot going for it because of the volume of oil there that the facility would process.

STATEMENT

PURCHASE OF POTASH MINE - SYLVITE

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have a Ministerial Statement to make on behalf of the Government, I suppose on behalf of my colleague, the Chairman of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Board of Directors.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce that today the people of Saskatchewan have become the owners of a second potash mine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Final documents were signed this morning in Saskatoon by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Ltd. Formerly called Sylvite, the new mine will now be named the Rocanville Division of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Mining Ltd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear.

MR. ROMANOW: — With the Cory mine near Saskatoon and Rocanville, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan now becomes the second-largest potash producer in North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the cost of acquiring the Rocanville mine is \$144 million. I'm glad to report that not one penny of the money to buy this mine will come from the pockets of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The high level of health, education, highway development and other public services in Saskatchewan are not affected by the purchase, because we are investing money, resource revenues which would never have been collected if the Opposition parties had their way . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the statements are usually to be of a specific, brief and factual nature and up to this point, the Minister has been brief.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, maybe not brief, but certainly entirely factual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Since I only have another half a page or a page to finish off, I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to say that we are using bonus money, which invested in potash will return dividends to this province and its people for generations to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We intend to press forward with our potash policy to ensure that a fair share of the revenue from potash benefits the people of Saskatchewan. In the months ahead, we expect to be announcing further purchases.

Mr. Speaker, these negotiations have been difficult and complex. I wish to commend the negotiators, both for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, for their determination to resolve the complex legal and financial questions involved in the purchase.

Of the total purchase price of \$144 million, \$108 million will come from the Energy and Resource Development Fund, with the remainder coming from funds previously borrowed. The money in the Energy Resources Fund comes primarily from petroleum, a depleting resource. It just makes good economic sense, therefore, to take part of our oil revenue and invest it in potash.

Saskatchewan has approximately 118 billion tons of recoverable potash ore. At present rates of consumption, this should be enough to last about 3,000 years. The Rocanville mine has always been high on our acquisition list for several very good reasons.

First of all it is a good mine, a very efficient operation. Second, it has excellent expansion potential. Expansion will become increasingly important as world demand for potash continues to increase, as it will. Thirdly, Rocanville is the newest mine in the province and embodies the most modern technology. It has been in operation since 1970 and has reserves of 350 million tons of ore. It has a rated capacity of 1.2 million tons annually.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make this Ministerial Statement of the purchase of the Rocanville mine, Sylvite, a statement which I am sure will be welcomed by all Members of the Legislative Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — The statement, Mr. Speaker, may be welcomed by a majority of the Members of the Legislative Assembly, but it will not unfortunately be welcomed by a majority of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — For the Minister to say to us that not one penny of this money comes from one pocket of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan is pure unadulterated hogwash and he knows it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — To pledge the credit of the people of this province for \$36 million in an investment that they would not voluntarily have chosen, to spend the money of the people of this province out of the Energy Fund for \$108 million, for an investment that they would not voluntarily have entered into, is, we believe, a great mistake and that history will show it to have been a great mistake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of our spokesman for Mineral Affairs, I should like to comment on the Attorney General's certainly factual and brief and most unargumentative Ministerial Statement that we've heard in a great deal of time. However, one more used hole in the ground for the people of Saskatchewan when their hospital services are not up to standards, when their roads are not up to standards, will not be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I have to bring the Member to order that his response must be brief and factual as well and specific to the point.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, I thought I was making it as brief and factual as the Attorney General and the Member for Regina Wascana.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . tell us the facts about those filthy hospitals.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, the facts, Mr. Speaker, about this particular purchase, \$144 million for nothing. The Government of Saskatchewan already owns the potash mines in the province, all of them. The Government of Saskatchewan, people of Saskatchewan, already get the majority of benefits from the potash industry in the Province of Saskatchewan. There is absolutely no reason to invest one dollar, let alone \$144 million of the people's money that they are going to have to pay for and pay for and pay for, without any noticeable returns of any kind, whatsoever. It is totally beyond our comprehension that the Government could suggest, that after those two potash purchases, they are even going to consider more potash purchases in the coming months. It's like a man banging his head against a wall and continuing to run it through the wall and now he's got to have his body in it and he's going to keep right on going to try and get through. I suggest it goes down, Mr. Attorney General, rather than up.

It's also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that no announcement was made, whatsoever, today about who the manager of the new mine would be. We predicted some two weeks ago that the mine would be taken over on April 22. It's now April 22 and no announcement of any manager. We know that the old manager is leaving. We don't know who the new manager is going to be, even though we've asked in this Assembly time and time again. We suggest, Mr. Speaker, that not only should the people not have invested the money in the first place, but now the Government is going to manage it, in its usual, inefficient fashion.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 10:43 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.

POINTS OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a Point of Order regarding two questions that were forthcoming in the Question Period, the question by Mr. Nelson and the question that I raised. I think both questions were very pointed, but I submit to Mr. Speaker that it is not for Mr. Speaker to indicate that a question is too pointed or that a question is too detailed, and I assume Mr. Speaker has no knowledge of when those purchases were made, that the questions in both cases were questions if the Minister thinks were too pointed should say to put them on the Order Paper.

The question particularly about the chairs when we were getting down to the matter of how much this Government - and I know politicians want to protect this Government and I know they want to protect their backsides - but how much this Government would invest on protecting their backsides seemed to me to be an appropriate question that the Minister could have answered.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will answer the Point of Order raised by the Member for Wascana.

He refers to the questions asked by the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson). I assume that he has the permission to raise that Point of Order from the Member. I called the question out of order because the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg was asking for detailed costs per square foot. He also stated at the beginning of his question that this was being dealt with in Crown Corporations and he was awaiting a reply.

Order! The Member had an opportunity. He didn't raise on a Point of Order; it was done by the Member for Wascana. If the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg can hold his tongue until I get the ruling out.

I was not impressed with the urgency of the matter to begin with and I was impressed with the fact that it had been asked in Crown Corporations and I expect he is going to get an answer in Crown Corporations.

The question of the Member for Wascana started by asking about the purchase of a number of chairs, 26 in number. I want to implore the Member for Wascana to put a sense of urgency in his question so that I can recognize it. Had the Member for Wascana said that there were no chairs and 26 were required to seat the members of the Agency, I would have accepted it as being urgent. I have no idea of whether they have chairs there or not; therefore I was not impressed with the urgency of the matter.

MR. J. G. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. First of all I should like to commend Mr. Speaker for not bowing to the immature whining of the Member for Regina South about other people getting in on supplementaries. I think it is fair practice for Members to ask supplementaries as did the Member for Regina Wascana.

In the question this morning, wherein the Member for Regina Wascana was allowed the final supplementary to questions that I had raised, it was obvious that it wasn't a supplementary, but a new question on a totally different matter. Having allowed a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, you committed the Chair to a final supplementary. You directed it to another Member. When the other Member defaults on a final supplementary, then the Opposition has lost what you had given it, the final supplementary.

Surely at that point, would the Speaker clarify his ruling that the supplementary should have reverted to, perhaps, the Member who asked the original question and wanted a supplementary. What you have done by your ruling, I suggest, is having given a final supplementary to the Opposition, you then took it away by reason of a Member defaulting. Surely you should have reverted to another Member.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am glad the Member raised that Point of Order. He was right in saying that the Member for Wascana was asking a question which was, in fact, not a supplementary to the question that was before us and consequently was ruled out of order. The question then is, should the supplementary go back to the Member who originally raised the topic or some other Member. I had concluded from the content of the questions asked by the Member for Qu'Appelle that his were bordering on hypothetical. They were discussion about possible developments in New Brunswick and possible contingency plans of the Province of Saskatchewan, with regard to that potash development. I had determined in my mind we had followed that trail long enough and that if there was one more supplementary I would allow it from the other group. I wasn't prepared to allow the Member for Qu'Appelle or any other Member to pursue the matter any further. I just was in the mood to change subjects at that time.

MR. LANE: — I am not sure that I, with respect, Mr. Speaker, can bow to that answer on whether the Speaker is in the mood. I would be prepared to accept the fact that Mr. Speaker would say that the questioning is hypothetical and that is as much as he is going to allow. I was speaking to the general matter, Mr. Speaker, of having committed the Chair to a final supplementary as you did, then retracting that, in fact, because of default on the question.

MR. SPEAKER: — I allowed the final supplementary; the fact that the Member didn't deliver on it is not my problem.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER ON PRIORITY OF DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: — Yesterday, the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Merchant) asked for Priority of Debate under Rule 17. Since the Hon. Member has not given the required notice under Rule 17(2), I deferred my ruling until today.

I have examined the notice carefully and note that part (a) and (b) raise a matter which appears to be of urgent and of public importance. Parts (c) and (d) used as alleged examples of (a) are questions which have been before this Assembly for several weeks and could have been debated in the usual way. On balance, because of the apparent importance and urgency of parts (a) and (b), I rule the Motion in order.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again, I obviously have to accept your ruling but I must say, quite frankly, I am somewhat puzzled by it, because I note a precedent on November 30, 1973 in which Mr. Speaker, considering matters under Rule 17, said several points must be considered. I believe there were six or seven points that were set out. Point number three in that precedent decision was:

(1) It must not be worded in general terms or covering a great number of cases.

(2) It must not be offered when facts are in dispute or before facts are available.

I believe that in respect to any one of those certainly as a minimum, facts can be in dispute, but most importantly, a motion for Priority of Debate is also out of order if the matter can be debated in the ordinary manner, with proper notice. I am asking Mr. Speaker to reconsider the ruling on the basis of those points because I believe this matter could at a minimum be placed on the ordinary way.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the Member has a right to his views about whether the matter is in order or not. I view the operative part of the notice to be the (a) part and I view it to be a definite matter and of urgent public importance, and consequently I ruled that way. The Member now has the right to proceed.

PRIORITY OF DEBATE

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENTS OF CABINET MINISTERS

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, this Priority of Debate asks the House to establish a commission of inquiry under The Public Inquiry Act. That has not been done frequently. I can think, frankly, Mr. Speaker, of only one example off hand when a commission of inquiry was launched and that, in my memory, was an inquiry into allegations of fraud by Mr. Fines under the government of Premier Douglas.

The question that is before the House is whether the use of influence by two Ministers of the Crown is a matter that the Government should consider and into which a commission of inquiry should be launched.

The evidence that we have, Mr. Speaker, would indicate that one Cabinet Minister interfered, quite directly, with the administration of justice. I am not, frankly, so critical of the reasons for that interference as the fact that he interfered at all. As I said, yesterday, to the Premier, does the Premier not find it surprising that the Hon. Attorney General, who was not in the House yesterday at that time, rightly and very scrupulously sees to it that he does not become involved with the police directly; that he does not take a personal part in the withdrawal of charges and, as I said yesterday to the Premier, is it not curious that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder), who is not even a lawyer, who does not have the responsibility for the administration of justice, would take it upon himself to directly contact an inspector of police and I understand, thereafter, talked with the officer who was dealing with the question and dealing with the question at the Homecoming Hotel.

MR. BOWERMAN: — . . . not even a lawyer.

MR. MERCHANT: — Well, the Hon. Member says, not even a lawyer. I think that the people of this province would accept that lawyers have some better understanding of whether charges should be laid or withdrawn. I think that is a pretty clear and obvious inference to be drawn.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney General rightly stays out of such matters, yet the Minister who has just taken from his seat to comment on that remark, is himself guilty - if you can use that word - of having used his influence in having become involved in another matter.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am delighted to find that when the Hon. Minister of Northern Affairs is pressed to the zenith of his abilities that he always replies in the great rhetoric for which he is famous and his grasp of the English language, in words which you can't always hear, Mr. Speaker, are sometimes entertaining.

Mr. Speaker, the question is whether Cabinet Ministers should personally become involved and personally go behind the law enforcement agencies and the public servants with whom they deal. I, for instance, happen to believe in fairness that the Liquor Licensing Commission, from time to time, acts with excessive vigour. I believe that they act with excessive vigour in situations when they are dealing with legions, golf clubs and curling clubs, that frequently they close down those establishments in an improper way, or at least move too vigorously in that direction. It should be changed in this Chamber if a change is to be made. If a change were to be made in the dealings with the Homecoming Hotel, then that should have been a change that was brought before this Chamber and the law changed. It should not have been taken upon itself by two Ministers to become involved as they did in that personal way. We have seen seven Ministers in this Legislature caught, if I can use that word, using their influence in a personal way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that may be fair enough for the people who contact them, but what about the 985,000 residents of Saskatchewan who don't have access to a Cabinet Minister? What about the people in this province who are not able to pick up the phone and call a Cabinet Minister and say, "Will you intercede, will you cut the red tape," even if the red tape is wrong. The question comes down to whether we will be guided by the laws laid down in this Assembly or whether we will be guided by the 15 or 20 Cabinet Ministers, however many the Premier may have at any particular time, in their personal interpretation of the way the law will operate and when the law will be ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I questioned the Premier yesterday about whether he had any guidelines for his Cabinet Ministers. Do they just go off holus-bolus, do whatever they please and the like in connection with criminal charges? Might we expect that the Minister of Agriculture next will be approaching a solicitor in his department to solicit that charges be dropped? Might I expect that a telephone call to an NDP backbencher could result in some Cabinet Minister and public servants acting under their direction becoming involved directly in the affairs of the police, becoming involved directly in the way the liquor licensing will operate, becoming involved directly in countermanding just with a phone call an order of the fire marshal? Mr. Speaker, I don't think

that the people of this province, when they view it in that perspective, will agree with the Premier that it is more important that Cabinet Ministers have the public service on tap, instead of having the public service on top of the Cabinet Ministers. That's not the question. The question is whether, we, as lawmakers, will be on top of the public service.

The Premier said yesterday that every four years the Government can be turned out, that every four years it is open to the people of this province to reject the Cabinet if that is what the people of this province choose to do. Well, that's not the rule of law, Mr. Premier. The way our governments are formulated is that even if you are a Cabinet Minister, even if you are the Premier, you are guided by the laws of this Assembly. Now that is the reason that our caucus yesterday moved for this priority of debate. We think that the direction that the Cabinet is taking is a wrong direction, a taking of power unto themselves, a taking of power unto themselves that we have all seen for these past seven years. It is almost something that flows with being an NDPer that you think that big government and big control is a good thing. But only lately, Mr. Speaker, does the Cabinet say that they have a right to do that, that having been elected they can do whatever they choose to do regardless of laws and regardless of the effect that that may have on the public service.

This Legislature should pass the laws, and the public service, if that public service is to be a public service not affected by political pressure, the public service then has to have the right to deal with those laws and to deal with those laws in a fair and unbiased way. They can't know that a phone call to a Cabinet Minister or a phone call to an NDP backbencher will result in those laws being ignored for some and not ignored for others. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in the two cases (a) and (b) that Mr. Speaker has ruled in order, I am sure that in those cases the Premier may well get up and say, the Hon. Minister of Labour or the Hon. Minister in charge of Liquor Licensing acted properly and they may have. But I suggest to Members of this House that you are not allowed the factual situation in this case to be used as a red herring to detract you from the principle. And the principle is whether the laws will govern this province or the Cabinet will govern this province. We say the laws and the public servants acting and carrying out those laws under the direction of this Assembly that is the top power in Saskatchewan, not Allan Blakeney and those Cabinet Ministers whom he may choose to have with him.

Mr. Speaker, you have chosen, and probably rightly so, to say that (c) and (d) as examples are not examples that may properly be debated in this priority of debate. But in those examples, I say that the Cabinet Ministers acted wrongly and those would be better examples for the Premier to try and defend in these particular circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I said in caucus and I say now to the house that indeed I thought that the Minister of Labour had not done what I would have considered to be an inappropriate thing. I say that in fairness, I don't want the House to believe that we are trying to tar that Minister or tar the Minister in charge of Liquor Licensing. I think in fairness that he acted out of compassion and it may well be that the Hon. Minister of Labour would say, I would have done what I consider to be a fair thing had I received that phone call from any operator of any business faced with the same kinds of problems. Indeed the politics which would be well known to the Minister of Labour, the politics of the

Minister who contacted him would either indicate that there was some connection of which we know nothing, which I doubt, I doubt it, although I know that some Members of caucus don't, and I know that some members of the press don't, but I doubt that. I think, in fact, that the Minister of Labour was responding to someone whom he knew, someone who asked for help and in some ways I think that it may be unfair that the Minister of Labour and the Minister in charge of Liquor Licensing find themselves in the eye of a hurricane because they may have been acting in fairness because there was some person asking for their assistance.

It may well be that anyone who asks for their assistance in that way, under those circumstances, would have received the same kind of help. But that means that there is a different law for the couple of thousand who have access to a Cabinet Minister and for the 980,000 Saskatchewan residents who don't. That means that the public service must know that even though they are doing what the law says they are to do, that a policeman would know, even though he is doing what the law says he is to do, that he may be interfered with by a Cabinet Minister acting, no matter how well motivated, that that public servant would be interfered with, even though he was doing what was right according to law. This priority of debate asks the Government to bring forth a commission of inquiry to do what the Premier should have been doing. The Premier should yesterday have been able to stand in his place and say the rules that I lay down for my Cabinet are that they are not to interfere in these circumstances, they may in some circumstances, but that is something they should discuss with me. In a circumstance regarding the withdrawal of a charge, that is something they have to bring to the attention of the Hon. Attorney General before a Cabinet Minister sends a former law partner to negotiate that withdrawal, that surely he has to get in touch with the Attorney General. Surely all of this comes back to the Premier, because the Premier should have laid down those kinds of rules. He said yesterday he doesn't have those rules.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier won't do the job that he should do to protect the rule of law in this province, then I say to this House that this House should pass a commission of inquiry to do what that man should have done years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member is obligated to move his motion now.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, curiously, the only copy of the motion I have is in your hands. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. McMillan (Kindersley) under Rule 17 a Priority of Debate for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance and I state the subject to be:

The urgent and compelling need for this Assembly immediately to cause an inquiry to be made, by a Commission of Inquiry under the provisions of the Public Inquiries Act, into:

(a) The potentially illegal use of influence by a number of Cabinet Ministers, the evidence of which has come to light during this Session; and

(b) Specifically the interference by Ministers Snyder and Byers and public servants acting on their direction into the operations of the Regina City Police in reference to the illegalities of the Homecoming Hotel Ltd.

Mr. Speaker, the matters regarding Messrs. MacMurchy and Bowerman and the RM of Garden River and the matter of Mr. Tchorzewski, I will withdraw from the motion which I presented to you in draft.

Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I may have misinterpreted your ruling because I would prefer in fact to rule (c) and (d), but it was my understanding from your ruling and my colleagues are indicating that it may have been a misunderstanding, that if I rule (c) and (d), Your Honour might rule the matter out of order. Was that your ruling or was it your ruling that they are less urgent but that the entire Priority of Debate was in order?

MR. SPEAKER: — The Speaker is under obligation to make his decision on the Notice. The Notice that came before me had preamble and four sections, (a), (b), (c) and (d). I made my decision on the basis of that which was before me and I said in fact parts (c) and (d) used as alleged examples of (a) are questions which have been before this Assembly for several weeks and could have been debated in the usual way.

On balance, because of the apparent importance and urgency of (a) and (b), I ruled the Motion in order. So in effect I was saying that I made the decision on the basis of what was before me and now it is up to the Member, in moving his Motion, to word the Motion. If he words the Motion and it contains fewer words than the Notice, that's the obligation of the Member.

MR. MERCHANT: — Before I take my place, I move:

(c) And specifically the interference by Ministers MacMurchy and Bowerman and public servants acting on their direction into the affairs of the RM of Garden River No. 490;

(d) And specifically the interference by Mr. Tchorzewski and public servants acting on his direction into the operation of the Western Development Museum and the illegality of Orders in Council No. 641 of 1976 and 561 of 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will ask the Member to de-initial that section and initial the de-initialling.

MR. G. H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct some remarks to the fourth part of that Motion despite the fact that you suggested a minute ago that it was of less public urgency than the earlier part of the Motion. My understanding is that the entire Motion stands.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling is such that

the entire motion is open for debate and that accordingly your ruling is that parts (c) and (d) are based upon facts which are not in dispute and the other several rules which govern Rule 17? I understood you to say that you accepted the Member's Notice of the item which was the statement shall we say under Rule 17 of Priority of Debate because it did contain one thing which was in order, but I would not have thought that this gave any justification for permitting irrelevant things to be in the Motion. While a statement can be in order because only a portion of it is out of order, the Motion is now a separate motion moved by the Member for Wascana, seconded by the Member for Kindersley, which is quite another procedure now and it seems to me that the Motion cannot contain things which are clearly out of order and which with all deference I think you have found out of order, even though you said that on balance the statement under Rule 17 was in order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Members will agree with me that I cannot attest to the validity of points (c) and (d). As far as I am concerned, it is a question of argument and debate and that is what the purpose of this exercise is. It is for the Members to either substantiate or refute that portion or those words which they don't believe to be accurate or believe to be incorrect. But, in essence, I find the Notice and the Motion to have substance in light of the Priority of Debate rule.

MR. COLLVER: — May I rise on a Point of Order?

Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Speaker accepted the Motion made by the Member for Regina Wascana, he then rose on a Point of Order and added two other items to the Motion that he made. It seems rather strange as that was the gist of what I just saw happen. Now if that is possible that a Member can sit down, make a motion, sit down, rise on a Point of Order and add to that motion, I would just like to have it clarified to this Assembly at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that the Speaker has to make a decision when he feels that he has had the motion moved, and I didn't feel that I had the motion moved. I felt there was some doubt and I asked the Member to clarify it. In fact, the Member asked for clarification of what I had said. Until such time as I am satisfied that the motion has been moved, I am not prepared to cut the Member off just on a mere technicality.

MR. PENNER: — Mr. Speaker, then thank you for your ruling and I wish to pursue the matter that is dealt with in section (d) of the Motion that is before us, specifically for a few moments to direct your attention to two specific pieces of legislation that are in force in the province at the moment, related to an Act to provide for a Western Development Museum and I think, Mr. Speaker, that that will get all Members to see clearly that there is a discrepancy between the Orders in Council that have been passed and the wording of the legislation insofar as the Western Development Museum is concerned and therefore puts into question what the Western Development Museum Board has done over the last period of time.

I should like first of all, Mr. Speaker, to have all Members of the House note that in both of the Orders in Council, Order

in Council 61476 dated April 27, 1976 and Order in Council 5611977 dated April 6, 1977, that the word Chairman appears after one of the Members of the Board listed and that the word Vice-Chairman is indicated after one of the names listed of the Board, and with regard to the word Vice-Chairman, Mr. Speaker, the Order in Council dated April 27, 1976 lists one R. J. Reynolds of Moose Jaw, Vice-Chairman and the Order in Council dated April 6, 1977 lists one Alex Balych, North Battleford, Vice-Chairman and that there can be no arguments that it is simply a matter of designating who the previous officers of the Board were, since clearly one of the officers of the Board changed due to the resignation of Mr. Reynolds, effective April 5, 1977. I think, Mr. Speaker, one must look at those two pieces of information and then look at Section 5, Sub-section 1 of the Act, which says the Members of the Board shall choose one of their number to be Chairman, one to be Vice-Chairman and one to be Secretary. The power is not vested in the Cabinet to name the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Western Development Museum Board. It is clearly, by Legislation, Section 5, Sub-section 1, the responsibility of the Board to do that. In this case the Board has obviously not done that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct your attention as well to another section of the Act related to the Constitution of the Board. This is Section 3, which says that there shall be a Board to be called the Western Development Museum Board, consisting of fewer than three and not more than 11 persons who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct all Members' attention again to Order in Council 61476 dated April 27, 1976, which indicates that there are 12 members listed to the Board of the Western Development Museum in contravention of the legislation, which clearly says there shall be a maximum of 11 members. Any Member who wishes to read the Order in Council will see the names listed and when one adds them up, will see that the total comes to 12. Now Members opposite must say that is a small point. Members opposite might say that's just a little technicality, one more person on the Board just adds that much more 'umph' to the Board. Members opposite might suggest that the point made by my colleague from Regina Wascana is just a technicality and there is no point in worrying about it, but I think it fits into a broader spectrum that there is a responsibility which Government has, and maybe more particularly the Cabinet has, to see to it that the legislation they have a responsibility to work within is not exceeded, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is no excuse for a Minister in charge of an Act not to be aware of the provisions of the Act. I don't pretend to think that he should be aware of every provision on his own, but he ought to have people within his department who can see through it, that when legislation or when Orders in Council are passed under legislation, that the Orders in Council meet with the perimeters that the legislation has put.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, when a Board has been set down outside the perimeters of legislation, when it has 12 members, when it clearly can only have 11, then whatever that Board has done as a Board, is in question. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, to you, and through you to other Members of the House, that the actions taken by WDM Board at a time when it had 12 members, when clearly the maximum allowed was 11, are in question. That relates, of course, to an incident that has been made much of by volunteers related to the Western Development Museum Board in Saskatoon, by the Moose Jaw Branch of the

Western Development Museum Board, by the city of Saskatoon and by the Canadian Museum Association, all of whom are asking someone take a look at the operation of the Western Development Museum Board, or offering their services if that were to be the case. I think the situation with regard to the motion that is before us, having an implication for the subject matter that I have just raised, is the kind of thing that all Members of this Assembly ought to support in terms of the motion, and that we ought to have the opportunity to have the kind of investigation that I suggested with regard to the Western Development Museum.

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some brief comments. As the Members are aware, I was one of the Members yesterday who raised the question in the Legislature. It is particularly disturbing to me that, and I put this question of the floor yesterday, that a Minister of the Crown, when he knows very well that an illegality is being committed, goes to our law enforcement officials and tries to use his influence to encourage them not to proceed with charges in the face of that crime being committed. I find that disturbing. The Premier rose to his feet yesterday and said, yes, yes, but in a case of a technical breach of the law, then it is condoned. He certainly suggested that it was possible for his Ministers to get involved in situations like that. I'd like to examine the two particular instances that happened, supposedly, according to the information that is available to the Members of this House, and just examine what sort of a technicality was involved, and what in fact the Minister actually did. Both Ministers, both the Minister of Labour, who is responsible for the Fire Commission, and the Minister of Environment, who is responsible for the Liquor Commission. The hotel was closed by the Fire Commission for good reason I suspect; I don't question that. The closure of that hotel put that liquor licence for the beverage room in that hotel in suspension. No one quarrels with that. It is illegal to operate a beverage room unless there are guest rooms available. There were no guest rooms available. The Liquor Commission made it plain to the proprietor of the hotel, and I suspect through him to the Minister of Labour, that that liquor licence would not be revalidated unless the Liquor Commission received, in writing, information acceptable to him suggesting that the use of those rooms was again permitted by the Fire Commission. As well, I understand, he conveyed to the proprietor of the hotel, or the Minister of Labour, that should one or the other of them, or particularly the Fire Commission - perhaps Mr. Atwell - contact him by telephone, to assure him that the fire regulations were met, that the Liquor Commissioner would re-establish the licence for that beverage room. That was never done. The Minister of Labour apparently is peeved at the fact that he was unable to contact the Chairman of the Liquor Commission to have that licence re-instituted or revalidated, knowing very well that despite the conditions laid down by the Chairman of the Liquor Commission for the re-opening of that beverage room, despite the fact that he knew very well that without a licence that beverage room was operating outside of the law, and with that knowledge, he tried on two different occasions to contact the police when apparently they were in the midst of pressing charges, to encourage them not to go ahead with those charges when he knew and the police knew that the liquor licence was not valid and that the hotel therefore to be open, the beverage room was operating outside of the law. The Minister is certainly going to have an opportunity to stand on his feet and correct Members of this Legislature and members of the media who obviously have the story wrong.

The other question that arises is the conduct of the Minister responsible for the Liquor Commission, who, after the fact, used his influence and a Department of Labour lawyer to encourage the Crown Prosecutor to withdraw charges, supposedly because they had been laid under bizarre circumstances and in a technical nature. Well, the technical nature was the fact that I suppose the Fire Commission had again opened the hotel and that upon their admission that the hotel guest rooms were liveable, then one would assume that the beverage room licence could at some time be re-instituted and that would make the hotel legal. That never happened. The beverage room operated without a legal liquor licence and was therefore operating outside of the law. That is the one point that is interesting, and that the Minister of Environment apparently used his influence to overcome.

The other one I could put to the floor of this Legislature more in the form of a question because I am not specifically sure exactly what happened, but the evidence would indicate that the Ministers' involvement was perhaps a little more questionable than at first glance it would seem. Apparently the beverage room was re-opened the following morning, according to the information, at 10:30, and police again re-entered the beverage room and pressed charges. I would be interested to hear the Minister responsible for the Liquor Commission clarify whether or not this happened. That is the evidence as reported in the media; we can gather our information from that but I'd like to know if the Minister finds it correct. If, in fact, that information is correct, it raises some pretty serious questions. It would not be a technical breach of the law for a beverage room to operate at 10:30 a.m., it would be an out and out blatant breach of the law. Beverage rooms, to the best of my knowledge, and I hope the Minister responsible for the Liquor Commission can correct me if I am wrong, beverage rooms are not allowed to operate at 10:30 a.m. I believe the provisions of their licence allow them to open their doors and serve the public at 11:00 a.m. I'd like to know if, in fact, this beverage room was operating at 10:30 in the morning; if in fact charges were laid as a result of that, and if so, why the Minister of Environment used his influence to have those charges withdrawn, not on a technical breach of the law. I would be interested in hearing some comments about that.

I would like to go on to say that the Premier has suggested that it's acceptable for Ministers of his Crown to interfere in legal proceedings when he feels there is an inconvenience to citizens. The problem here, of course, is that we don't and have not established a regulatory body on a daily basis to interpret what a technical breach of the law might be. That power I suspect is generally left to the judicial system that we have in Saskatchewan. The Minister involved knew that what he was doing was, technically, outside of the law. In this instance, certainly if we can take the remarks made by the Premier to heart, he is to be excused for what he has done. Who is to say that on some other occasion his own personal interpretation of technical breach might be greatly expanded. I am sure the Premier, as a supposedly trained legal mind, is very well aware of the implications of that. If the interpretation of the laws, as they are applied in this province, is left to individual Cabinet Ministers to operate as they see fit, the dangers to the people of Saskatchewan are extremely large and as well the implications to our legal system and its effectiveness in the Province of Saskatchewan are serious.

If, in fact, the Members of the Government and this Cabinet are the ones to interpret law and apply it in Saskatchewan, then certainly the need for a judicial system is somewhat lessened. I hope the Government has taken a lesson from the problems that have been brought before this Legislature, the lack of respect they have shown for laws and regulations that are established by this Legislature and by Boards of Commission struck by this Legislature. I hope they have learned a lesson as well. I hope they have had time to pause and reflect upon their actions and realize the serious consequences that could result if actions like this are condoned by that Government and are, in fact, continued by the Ministers of the Crown. I think the actions of both Ministers are questionable. I could not, as the Member for Wascana suggested, and would not, have undertaken to do something like that myself. I can't understand a Minister who would get involved to the degree where he might be sacrificing his reputation of political integrity. I can't, under the best of circumstances, understand why you would do that and technically step outside of the law to use your influence in having these regulations overcome. I must say I am disappointed and I certainly hope that the matter, when cleared up, won't have to be put before this Legislature again.

MR. R. E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a few words to the particular Minister that I believe has used political interference in the affairs of the Rural Municipality of 490 of Garden River. It goes back to 1974 when that particular Rural Municipality Council wanted to build a bridge that had been closed on the Northeast Section of Township 50, Range 24, west of the second meridian. This particular bridge had been closed; the Rural Municipality had looked into building on a road allowance and found that the cost of the bridge would be some \$32,000. They decided to look into the possible building of the bridge beside the road allowance on private property and found out that they could save thousands of dollars for the taxpayers of their Rural Municipality.

They approached the Department of Municipal Affairs and asked for assistance to build this bridge. In a letter, dated February 12, 1974, the matter was discussed. The letter was from a director, the Director of the Saskatchewan Municipal Road Assistance Authority to the RM. In this letter he indicated that assistance wouldn't be forthcoming and he stated: "It, therefore, follows that if your municipality wishes to proceed with this project, the cost incurred would be the responsibility of the municipality." In saying this, he certainly did not in any way tell the RM that they could not build the bridge on private property. He, in fact, gave them the go-ahead providing they paid the entire dollars. Now they went ahead and built the bridge to serve one individual farmer. The cost of the bridge turned out to be \$1,927 to the RM. Some irritated followers of the local MLA and a Member of the Cabinet approached the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister, in an interfering way, set up an inquiry board to look into the situation in the RM. He put on the inquiry board the particular individual who was really causing the trouble in the RM.

The findings of this inquiry committee said that in fact they had built the bridge on private property. Very little else resulted from the committee. The Minister interpreted the Act that said the RMs may charge an individual for any work done on private property. The Minister interpreted the 'may' as 'shall'

and told the RM council that they must charge that particular individual for the bridge. He did not ask them to charge the \$1,927 that the bridge cost. He sent up engineers to value the bridge. The engineers valued the bridge at \$5,200, even though the bridge had cost just \$1,927. Then the Minister insisted that the council must charge that individual \$5,200. If they did not do this, they in turn would have to pay \$5,200 to the PM. I say this Minister has completely interfered with the local government of that RM. After being told by the council they would not pay, they had no intention, they would reserve their right to charge or not to charge, there was then political interference by the individual who was on the inquiry board. He then ran for reeve of the PM and he circulated the Minister's recommendations (not recommendations, but the insistence of the Minister) that they pay for this bridge. He said that the council had acted without right in building this. He was put in as reeve and immediately after this happened, the new council fired the secretary of the RM without any reason whatsoever. The Minister was asked on two occasions to have an inquiry into this firing. He did nothing until such time as we raised the issue in this House on more than one occasion, and then he agreed to appoint an inquiry board to look into this situation. I believe the Minister's interference has caused very much hardship on this particular individual who was fired after 12 years of loyal service, who was fired without any reason. Mr. Speaker, I believe there was gross interference on the part of the Cabinet Minister of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I think a few points deserve to be made at this time with respect to this tempest in a teapot.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think that Members should agree that in a great many instances the spirit of the law must be observed and at the same time, in many instances, in so doing some common sense needs to be applied and observed in places where the absolute letter of the law is not appropriate.

Members opposite, and I believe all Members of this House, will be aware that over the last number of months, in particular since the Department of Culture and Youth and the Department of Municipal Affairs have provided funding to a number of communities for community recreation centres and the like, the Fire Commissioner's office and my office have been deluged with complaints from these various communities about the strict adherence to fire regulations that are being imposed upon them by the Fire Commissioner's office. I think perhaps in some instances there has been too rigid an application of the National Fire Code, in instances where the safety of the general public would not be jeopardized by accommodating the requests of these small local communities.

The Fire Commissioner's office has been, I think, under a great deal of criticism, and, in turn, I have also been criticized by my own colleagues and I believe from some Members opposite who have delivered up correspondence to me and asked that a more sensible approach be assumed with respect to some curling rinks, skating rinks, community halls and the like. I suppose one that sticks in my mind very clearly is one complaint which arrived by way of a telephone call from the former Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Steuart), who requested that I

make some accommodation for a community hall in Prince Albert-Duck Lake where they had failed to submit their plans to the Fire Commissioner's office and had accordingly found themselves in violation of the building code. At that point in time the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, Mr. Stewart, asked what I could do in order that this could be accommodated. To the extent that it was possible, we did attempt to accommodate so that that community would not be penalized for having ignored one of the principle rules - that is to submit your plans to the Fire Commissioner's office before you build. I don't believe that the people in that community, and a great many other communities, have deliberately gone out of their way to violate any law, but found themselves in violation of the National Building Code, and accordingly the Fire Commissioner's office found it necessary to apply the provisions of the code. So once again I say, I think the spirit of the law has to be observed, particularly when the health and the safety of the public is concerned, but certainly it must be tempered with a degree of common sense in the whole scheme of things.

Just to deal with the specific case, Mr. Chairman, I think Members should be made aware of some of the difficulties that were being encountered as relayed to me by the proprietor or owner of the Homecoming Hotel. When his operation was closed as a result of violations being observed by the Fire Commissioner's office, he indicated some of the problems which caused those violations to be put into place in the first instance. He indicated that some of his guests were allowing the fire escape doors to be opened, with additional numbers of people coming into the hotel, and as a result, guests who were not paying guests were inhabiting the rooms at night. Accordingly the violations took place with the chaining of the fire doors. We indicated to him conclusively that this could not be tolerated, that there is just no method by which a hotel can be permitted to operate unless means of egress is provided on each floor at the appropriate levels and appropriate distances apart.

Just to deal once again with the chronology of events, on the 28th of February, if my memory serves me correctly, an indication was given to me that all of those violations, all of those correction orders which had been issued by the Fire Commissioner's office, had been complied with. At that point in time the Fire Commissioner had received assurances, he believed from the Chairman of the Liquor Licensing Commission, to the effect that it would be automatic that the licence be restored. He had then, at that point in time, attempted to contact the Chairman of the Liquor Licensing Commission at 4:25 or 4:30 and was unable to find the Chairman in his office, which he and I found somewhat annoying at that point in time.

Accordingly, I think in keeping with the spirit of the Act, and in light of the fact that the licence to operate the licensed premises was contingent upon complying with all of the orders of the Fire Commissioner, I regarded it as being sensible and reasonable to indicate that for my part I would be willing to do whatever I could in backing the Fire Commissioner when he suggested that, having complied with all of the correction orders, the hotel should then be allowed to resume business and allow the employees to return to work to earn their daily bread and to allow the proprietor of the hotel to also continue his operation.

I want to make one point particularly clear and correct an erroneous assumption that was apparently made by the Regina

Leader-Post or a reporter or someone who provided information to the news media. I want to indicate clearly that I did not contact the city police. I was contacted at my home by a police officer. I relayed to him some information with respect to what had transpired.

One of the Members opposite said that he hoped that we had learned a lesson and that we should not interfere. And so accordingly I trust, Mr. Speaker, that I shall not be receiving any more letters or requests from Members opposite respecting their community hall or their curling rink which has been closed. I trust that I shall not be receiving from them any enquiries or any requests for special dispensation with respect to the rigid application of the fire code in their curling rink or their community centre.

I think Members opposite and all Members of the House should know that in many cases alternative arrangements have been made to accommodate curling rinks and community centres in rural communities. They have been made to deal with special and particular problems and when this can be done without jeopardizing the safety of the public, I think this is an eminently reasonable approach, rather than the rigid enforcement of a law which in many instances is so costly that it would affect the closure of a number of skating rinks and curling rinks.

I suppose my only purpose in speaking on this debate is to attempt to clarify some of the matters that have been drawn to my attention. It certainly isn't my intention to apologize for anything that I did in connection with the Homecoming Hotel, or any effort that I made to provide a service to a citizen and a businessman in the city of Regina. I suppose I might be somewhat inhibited from repeating the practice in light of the fact that Members opposite choose to jump upon picayune matters in an attempt to make a capital case of something which I think can be recognized as an attempt to inject a little common sense into what was, I believe, a difficult set of circumstances for the particular person involved.

Having said that, I think all Members opposite will agree that there is hardly any possibility that anybody could impute motives to me with respect to any friendship that might exist between the person in question and myself because I think all Members will have to agree that Wilf Gardner and I have never belonged to the same political party, nor could we be regarded as buddies or friends. I think, under the circumstances, I would have been inhibited somewhat in performing the same service for a rock rib New Democrat because I probably would have been criticized. Certainly I didn't believe that a single Member could take the position of offering criticism because of some assistance that was offered to a businessman who had been, I think, involved in what I regarded, and what the Fire Commissioner regarded, as an unsavoury practice, which had been corrected.

So for good reasons or poor, Mr. Speaker, just let me repeat that I believe in the total context of things, that there was nothing improper that has been done in the course of the whole matter surrounding the Regina Homecoming Hotel. I think it was the application of some good common sense and if the Members want assurances that this will never happen again, I think they are out of step or out of touch with reality if they believe that the absolute strict letter of the law must be applied in all instances. I think there are reasons to temper

the law with some degree of common sense and justice, and at the same time not place public servants in the position of enforcing a law which obviously has some features about it which would be detrimental to the community in question and perpetrate an injustice upon the people who are involved.

I don't think I have a great deal to add with respect to this particular debate, Mr. Chairman, except to say that the chronology of events, as I have indicated, are accurate as near as I am able to tell, and I want to repeat again that the indication in the Regina Leader-Post which suggested that I had personally been in touch with the Regina Police Force is totally erroneous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. H. BAILEY: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment before debate closes.

It is quite obvious from the questions yesterday in the Question Period and again today, that the debate in this House is not going to provide all of the answers to this Assembly, to this House, as to the allegations and the counter-charges that have been going back and forth. Perhaps more important, Mr. Speaker, the answers should be clarified to the citizens of Saskatchewan that all the facts related to this entire issue should be forthcoming. For this reason, we will support this motion to cause an inquiry to be made. I think that that is proper and I think that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know of the situation, as well as the Ministers involved. Perhaps the Ministers should have a right to have their name cleared if that should be the case. So we will, in fact, then be supporting this motion.

HON. E. L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, I too should like to say a few words on this motion. I want to speak most directly to the section that is commonly being called section (d), to which one of the Members of this House has spoken.

In doing that, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe it would be useful to give a brief outline of the events that led up to the kinds of allegations that some Members opposite have been making in this House, which I think indeed have been unfortunate. I shall attempt to show, Mr. Speaker, why I believe that to be so.

The series of events that we have seen happening during the last several weeks originated because of an action that the Board of the Western Development Museum took in the middle of March, a Board which is a corporate body, a Board, Mr. Speaker, which is an independent board, composed of people who are responsible people, people who are dedicated to the needs of the Western Development Museum in its four locations in Saskatchewan and also to the needs of museums in general in this province. In its wisdom, that Board of lay people, Mr. Speaker, decided after a great deal of deliberation and consideration that they felt there was a need for them as responsible managers to dismiss the Executive Director of the Western Development Museum. Whether that Board, Mr. Speaker, in its role as manager, had the right to do that, I think, should be unquestionable. It indeed has that right and in fact, if it feels it must make that right, should have the responsibility to exercise it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that indeed it is unfortunate that some Members of this House on the Opposition side have questioned the right of the Western Development Museum Board to do this as well as other things in its discretion.

It is interesting that until that happened, Mr. Speaker, that there was no concern expressed by any of the Members opposite about some of the things mentioned by the Member for Saskatoon-Eastview (Mr. Penner) or some of the things mentioned in this house and publicly in this respect, which I will deal with in a minute. I think, Mr. Speaker, that among all of the things that are being discussed here this morning and this afternoon, one issue is the one of allegations and therefore the unsubstantiated accusations against those people who act as responsible citizens in service of the Western Development Museum and the Province of Saskatchewan. That cannot go undenied or refuted, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Wascana has indicated by his resolution and the Members in the Opposition who have spoken today and have spoken in the past are really saying that those individuals who serve on that Board will allow themselves to be influenced. I reject that accusation, Mr. Speaker. I know that every member of that Board would as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The Member for Wascana in his resolution, Mr. Speaker, alleges that there has been in some circumstances in various cases inappropriate interference by some Ministers of the Crown. Yet, both the Conservatives and the Liberals demand, both Conservatives and Liberals in this House and in the public demand, that in fact there be interference with the Board of the Western Development Museum. That cannot go refuted either, Mr. Speaker. Time and time again, over the past several weeks, they have in this house indicated that somehow there should be an interference by this Government and by myself as a Minister in the decision of the Board when it dealt with the matter of executive director in its right as the management.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the allegations made have no substance of support, and once again reiterate that really what the Opposition has done is attacked the members of the Western Development Museum.

I really regret that; I indeed do, with all seriousness. I regret that in an attempt to get some politics out of this kind of an issue, those Members would do anything. They would say one thing at one time and act completely opposite at another time.

Mr. Speaker, what the Members are saying is that for example Mr. Balych, who is a prominent member of the Chamber of Commerce, I believe he is the secretary, those Members over there are saying that he would be influenced. I deny that on his behalf and on mine. What the Member for Saskatoon-Eastview and the Member for Sutherland and the Member for Wascana, in his resolution, are saying is that Mr. Streelasky, who has been recommended to us to be appointed by the city of Yorkton, would allow himself to be influenced, and I deny that and so would he. What the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are saying in this issue is that Mr. John MacLeod, who has been recommended to be appointee to the Board by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, would

allow himself to be influenced. I wonder how they would explain that, Mr. Speaker. I deny that on his behalf in this House for the record and I deny it on mine.

The record will show, Mr. Speaker, that indeed the allegations which they have made in this House, in fact, do not really have the evidence to support them. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the Board of the Western Development Museum is the management of the museum. The record will show, and the minutes of the meeting will show, that in its dealing with the question of the administration of the Western Development Museum there was passed a resolution in which concern was expressed about the administration of the museum. There was a great deal of discussion on that item I am informed. That motion, Mr. Speaker, was passed unanimously with no dissension on the Board or no difference on the Board. The Board then dealt with the question of the dismissal of the Executive Director. Once again only one member of the Board voted against it and the rest, the majority, voted in favour of it.

The Member for Saskatoon-Eastview alleged that the Government or the Minister more directly interfered in the selection of the executive. I have denied that in the past and I deny it again and the interpretation that has been provided to this House, a legal opinion and a legal interpretation, clearly shows that there is support for the fact that the executive of the Western Development Museum was, in fact, not appointed, because there is no legal binding in the brackets portion that has become the point of discussion.

MR. PENNER: — What is the likelihood of . . .

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I will get around to that, Mr. Member for Saskatoon-Eastview, if you will be a little patient. Every record, Mr. Speaker, from the minutes of the Western Development Museum Board meetings over the past several years, every record shows clearly that every executive of the Board, indeed, even during the years when the Liberals were in government, that executive was chosen by the members of the Board at a duly called meeting. In fact, that will once again happen, Mr. Speaker, when the Board meets at the end of this month as it regularly does to deal with that question again.

MR. PENNER: — What is the likelihood . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Will the Member control himself. He had his opportunity to speak in this debate and he took it.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite knows something about what the likelihood is of who might be the executive of the Western Development Museum Board, but I don't know that, because that is something that they are going to decide at their meeting.

I have been checking into the record, way back into the 1960s, Mr. Speaker, and it is especially interesting that the records show, clearly, that the last time there was interference on the Board of the Western Development Museum as I would interpret it, a direct interference was in 1966 . . . I wonder,

Mr. Speaker, why the Members of the Opposition protest in embarrassment at this particular time - maybe they have remembered something. But it so happens that in 1966 there was a Board appointed. And it so happens, and I don't know the reason why, I will not elaborate on it at great length, that on that Board as far as I am able to determine the only time there was appointed a Minister of the Cabinet, there was appointed a Member of the Liberal Government Cabinet who at that time happened to be the Minister in charge of Public Works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Ohhhh!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker . . . Yes he was the Minister in charge of Homecoming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Now I don't want to implicate that individual. I just want to conclude this portion of my comments to ask, I wonder in those days who ran the Board of the Western Development Museum? I wonder.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell us who it was.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, if the Members really insist, as I read the Order in Council, the first name on the list was a certain Minister of Public Works, address Regina, one J. Wilfred Gardner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Ohhh!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — In the kind of things that the Members opposite have been saying, both Conservatives and Liberals, in their comments and their questioning, Mr. Speaker, are once again asking for this Government to interfere in the decision making of the Western Development Museum as it exercised its right in the dismissal of the Executive Director.

We know how it was done prior to 1971, Mr. Speaker. And I would certainly hope that we don't want to get into that kind of operation in 1977.

That Board, Mr. Speaker, has done, I think, an outstanding job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — For example, the Member for Eastview and the Member for Sutherland as well as the Members for Saskatoon on this side of the House would certainly agree that there have been some very major improvements at the Western Development Museum in Saskatoon. There have been some very significant improvements in the Western Development Museum at North Battleford. There has been the construction of a new Museum at Moose Jaw, a transport museum, and the opening of a new museum at Yorkton since 1971.

Using the arguments of the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, it could be argued by some of them that because the Western Development Museum did not build a museum in Humboldt or Hudson

April 22, 1977

Bay or Estevan or Swift Current that somehow the Government should be interfering with them or maybe the Government, in fact, interfered because it did not do that. That is the kind of arguments that they are using.

Let me deal with another part of the issues raised. The Member for Saskatoon Sutherland raised the question the other day, and I think it was a good question, I don't deny that; the Member for Saskatoon Eastview asked about the question of 12 members of the board of the Western Development Museum that were appointed to the Board in 1976, in April. I must say that in fact this error was indeed made and has been corrected in the Order in Council appointing the Board for 1977, which names 11 people.

The Member for Wascana makes the comment which I think is indeed an unfortunate one and I think the member he talks of would even support what I say there, that the member for Moose Jaw, Mr. Reynolds, who is not on the Board this year, is not on the Board only because he decided not to be. As a matter of fact, as is always my practice, I had my office call each member of the Western Development Museum Board, including Mr. Reynolds, asking them to once again let their names stand to be re-appointed and he, on his own volition, indicated that he would rather not, and so, therefore, he was not re-appointed. Otherwise he would have been, because it is my practice to appoint two members from each of the communities in which there is a Western Development Museum.

But going back to the subject, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the House should have an explanation of how it was that there were 12 members last year, and I want to give that explanation. I don't think I have anything to hide. It was during the process of re-appointment of the Board in 1976 that the members were canvassed in the usual way which I have just outlined. One member, a Reverend Rudolph Novecosky, who had been on the Board, asked that he not be re-appointed because of health reasons and other obligations. Another member of the Board at that time, Mr. John MacLeod, did not reply, so a decision there was made to appoint two new members to the Board, a Mrs. Cheryl Schoffer of Yorkton, and Mr. John Uncles of Moose Jaw. But after that Mr. MacLeod indicated that he would indeed like to remain on the Board for another term. So then he was added to the list of names on the Order in Council. Unfortunately no provision was made to delete another name. Therefore, the result was that there were 12 members on the Board, and this administrative error, for which I make no excuses, was made. But I can assure you that we have asked, as I have assured this House a day or so ago, that we are getting the necessary legal opinion on the status of the Board and we are seriously looking into the situation, but in no way, no way, can this be interpreted as some form of interference, Mr. Speaker. Every member of that Board will clearly, at any point in time, when asked I know, support that and say it.

There have been requests for someone to take a look at the operations of the Western Development Museum and the Member for Saskatoon Eastview, indeed, made that request again in his remarks.

Since the issue arose, Mr. Speaker, there has not been a regular meeting of the Board of the Western Development Museum, which will be held next Friday as I indicated. There has been an indication by the Canadian Museums Association, in fact the

association has been in touch with officials in my department, with the Deputy Minister, to indicate that indeed they will be making some inquiries. I will be interested, indeed, in the position of the Canadian Museums Association, which surely no one would question, whose impartiality certainly no one would question. I will be interested in what they have to say about the issue at hand.

I have never indicated that at some point in time there may not, indeed, need to be some consideration of the operations of the Western Development Museum, but I have said, and I continue to say, that I don't question the responsibility, the determination of the members of that Board to run it appropriately.

I just want to close by saying, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't matter how you look at it, we have seen here an unfortunate attack on individuals of the public. Mr. Speaker, they can't deny it. I welcome the Members opposite to read some transcripts of the last several weeks and I welcome the Members opposite to read some news reports in the last several weeks and even though I have mentioned some of the other things that have happened and admitted to the 12 member Board and explained how it happened, the fact that some Members opposite have attacked the individuals who serve on that Board, I say is unfortunate. It should not be happening.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I respect the members of the Board of the Western Development Museum who are there from every portion of this province. They have acted responsibly and they have acted in good faith and they have acted in the interests of the Province of Saskatchewan with the museum's needs in mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I have known the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) for a long time. I knew him long before he took his seat in this Assembly. I knew him as a member of a school unit board. I knew him as a member of local government. I am amazed and have been amazed in the Hon. Member's involvement in this issue. Mr. Speaker, I'm not shivering in my boots, I'll say that to the Hon. Member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I've also known for some time the Hon. Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka). I've also known for some time the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Eastview (Mr. Penner), two Members who are presently employed by local government, who from time to time are called upon to advise local government on appropriate procedures of local government.

Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed that they would support the Hon. Member in his questioning and in his attempts to deal with the issue of RM 490. Mr. Speaker, I'm also one who has known for a long time, the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey). I know him as being a Member who has been a school unit superintendent, advising local government from time to time on what is appropriate. I think the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and the Hon. Members that I've mentioned, must know that decisions that are made by local government must be in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, those decisions must relate to the best interests of all of the people within the jurisdiction of that local government. Mr. Speaker, in the case of the RM 490, decisions of that local government must be made in the best interests of that municipality.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg when he rose to his feet, indicated that in 1974 the municipality RM 490, made a request to Municipal Road Assistance Authority to cost share in a bridge, on the northeast of Section 11, Township 50, Range 24, west of the second. The Municipal Road Assistance Authority considered the request and they said, no, to the cost sharing.

Mr. Speaker, we heard the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg read in this House what the Municipal Road Assistance Authority said in response. And they said, no. Mr. Speaker, that's all they said. Mr. Speaker, they said, no, to assistance. That's right. No. Now, Mr. Speaker, evidently the municipality proceeded with the bridge. They built the bridge on northeast of Section 11, Township 50, Range 24, west of the second.

Mr. Speaker, on November 15, 1975, I received a petition signed by 96 people. It's from the 96 ratepayers of the rural municipality of Garden River 490. Addressed to me, it says:

Whereas it is alleged that a bridge has been built on the lands and for the private use of a councillor of the said municipality, it is alleged this bridge was built with taxpayers' money, municipal funds, machinery and equipment, this seems to be a violation of the way municipal funds are spent. During this time the roads in his own division and in the municipality were in bad shape, while taxpayers' and municipal funds, machinery and equipment are alleged to have been used by this councillor to look after his own interests first, rather than serving the public. If, upon investigation, the said allegations are found to be true, we the undersigned hereby petition the Minister that the following steps be taken:

(a) the bridge be relocated on the road allowance for the benefit of all of the ratepayers, with all of the costs of moving, relocating and replacing any materials damaged during this process, to be borne by the said councillor.

(b) to compensate the public for inconveniences suffered, interest and penalties be included and that the said councillor be made to resign.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, have I had experience, as the Hon. Member has, in local government for some time. I have viewed the petition as a very serious petition. Mr. Speaker, I then brought this matter to the attention of the department and after some very careful consideration, we decided it would be appropriate to appoint a committee of investigation into this allegation. On June 7, 1976, I issued a Minister's Order under the authority of Sections 14 and 19 of The Department of Municipal Affairs Act. I appointed the undermentioned persons to carry out an investigation of the complaints lodged with me by petition, dated November 15, 1975, relating to the affairs of the rural municipality of Garden River No. 490, in the Province of Saskatchewan, and such other matters as the committee may decide.

A report respecting the findings of the committee and any recommendations it may make shall be submitted to me in writing. I appointed the following committee members: Mr. Adam Bishoff as chairman, from Regina, an employee of the Department of Municipal Affairs; Mr. D. T. J. Benson, of Raymore, a Director of Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities; Mr. Nick Rudwick of Regina, who was an employee of the assessment branch in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Mr. Denepyh, RR 4, Prince Albert.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee conducted their investigation. In fact, as the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg pointed out, did report, that there was a bridge built on private property, using municipal funds.

That committee viewed that as a very serious matter. They made the following recommendations; that the council of the RM of Garden River 490 collect all expenses incurred by the municipality in the construction of the bridge on private property on the northeast of 11, 50, 24, west of the second; that the council perform maintenance work on the private road on the northeast of 31, 49, 22 on a custom work basis only. It was suggested that the consideration be given toward the reorganization of rural municipalities 490, 491 and local improvement district 959, in order to provide a larger tax base for a single jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, upon receiving the recommendations of that committee of investigation, I then forwarded a letter to the RM 490, indicating to them the first two recommendations. In that letter also I indicated that we wanted to consider the third recommendation and that we would perhaps, in the future, set up a kind of an independent committee to examine the possibilities of reorganization.

There was a concern by the committee, there was a concern also by the department that the committee did not forward the value of the bridge. I asked the engineers of the Municipal Road Assistance Authority to examine the bridge, provide a value of the bridge, and I subsequently forwarded the value of the bridge to the rural municipality. I subsequently set up a committee under the third recommendation to look at reorganization. That work is presently going on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's true, there was an election in that municipality following the work of the committee of investigation. Now, is the Hon. Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg saying that a resident ratepayer of that municipality does not have the right to stand for election of reeve of that municipality? I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member had more experience in the workings of local government than to make any suggestion such as that. Is he saying, Mr. Speaker, to this Assembly that the people in that rural municipality, who were involved in those elections, don't have a right to elect a reeve? Is he saying, Mr. Speaker, that the people in that municipality made a bad choice? Talk about interference, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there was an election. Mr. Speaker, there were some new members elected to that council. I think it's the right of the voters in that municipality to do just exactly what they did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, following the election of the new council, the Secretary-Treasurer was dismissed. The Hon. Member surprises

me, and all Members who have been involved with him on that side of the House and the Hon. Member for Rosetown-Elrose surprises me. I had always felt, as a member of local government, the decisions of whom that local government should hire as their staff was a jurisdiction that they should have, that the decision of whom they should dismiss is their decision and not within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and not within the jurisdiction of the Department of Municipal Affairs. That's a matter for municipal government and it must remain so. I am surprised that the Member for Saskatoon Eastview, with his experience, should involve himself in support of this Priority of Debate resolution, because while he commented on one of the items, he is supporting this particular one.

Mr. Speaker, there was a dismissal of the Secretary-Treasurer of that municipality. Mr. Speaker, he made a request for a board of reference under the Act.

Now, as I said, I consider dismissal and hiring a very important item to remain with local government. In consideration of his first application, I replied to him that I did not feel I had sufficient information in his request to grant the board of reference and I think I was right in doing so. Mr. Speaker, he made a subsequent application, providing more information and we responded to the request, not to the questions from the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, but to the request from the Secretary-Treasurer. A board of reference is being established and will be soon set up to report back after its work, probably within one month's time.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicate, I am amazed that this should be called interference. I am amazed particularly as it relates to the operation of the municipality in the area of the bridge, a bridge on private property. To me it is a very serious matter. We had it investigated and I think that was appropriate that we do that and I hope that from the information that we have provided, the Hon. Members will withdraw from this attack on the councillors and the ratepayers within RM 490.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it has been very interesting for me this morning to sit here and listen to the Members opposite enter into this debate. It has become very apparent to everybody on this side that they simply don't understand what the issues are.

I listened to the Minister of Labour and he talked about this matter that we are debating now of being a tempest in a teapot, being picayune little matters. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister and to the Members opposite, that I don't think it's a tempest in a teapot or a picayune matter when two Ministers of the Crown interfere with the police investigation in the city of Regina. I don't think that is picayune at all or a tempest in a teapot. I don't think it is a picayune matter either when a Minister of the Crown becomes involved in the day to day deliberations of the RM of Garden River 490, as he apparently did last year. I don't think it is a picayune matter either, Mr. Speaker, when the Government passes Orders in Council, which on the face of it are illegal.

I think what the Members opposite should be doing is directing their attention to what the real issue is. The real issue,

Mr. Speaker, is not the actions so much of the Ministers that we have been talking about today; it is their attitude. The attitude of the Minister of Labour saying that he has to interpret the spirit of the Act; the attitude of the Ministers who say they can interpret what the Act means.

Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what they are elected to do is not to interpret the law; not to say what the spirit of the law is, but what you are elected to do is to administer the law as you find it, as you pass it. It is not up to you to say what the law means or what you think it means; it is up to the courts of this land to say what a law means.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the actions of the Ministers that we have been talking about today should come as no surprise to the people of Saskatchewan, should come as no surprise to the people of this Legislature, because from the time that this Government was elected, they have been doing exactly the same thing as they are doing now - operating a government with a complete contempt for the law.

We can go back to almost their first official act of office, when they were elected in 1971. At that time they passed a bill providing for a moratorium on debts. At the time they passed that act, and indeed it was a very popular act, but that is not the point. At the time they passed that act, the Attorney General admitted that the act was unconstitutional. The Attorney General said publicly that by the time the matter gets into the Supreme Court of Canada, it won't matter anyway.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that type of attitude shows a contempt for the law and it comes from the chief law enforcement officer of this province, the Attorney General. We can go further, Mr. Speaker, and talk about other things that this Government has done; torn up timber leases; torn up agreements with the potash companies; passed a royalty legislation for the oil and gas companies which is now being tested before the courts. The whole attitude of this Government is to show a contempt for the law. They govern under themselves only.

What do they say though when we bring this to their attention? One Minister gets up and says, this is a picayune matter; it is a tempest in a teapot. Another Minister gets up and he says, oh, if you question what we are doing, you are attacking public officials. That is absolute nonsense, Mr. Speaker, absolute nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution which you have allowed to proceed today, I think, should be considered by all Members of this House and they should be voting in favour of it. What this resolution asks for is to have good government in Saskatchewan. Members opposite and Members to my left, if they decided to vote against this resolution, are in effect saying that they don't care about good government in Saskatchewan; they don't care about how the affairs of this province are handled by the Cabinet Ministers appointed by the Premier, because their whole attitude to date, the whole attitude in the past few years, is that they are not going to govern by what the law says; they are not going to govern what the people of Saskatchewan want to do; they are going to govern about this province in a manner that they determine as how they best feel about this province and that means interfering with the police; they interfere with the police. If that means interfering with an RM in northern Saskatchewan, interfere with the RM. If that means interfering

with potash companies or oil companies and timber companies they just interfere.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there has been a government in this province or a government in the British Commonwealth that has shown such contempt for existing laws as this Government opposite.

MR. ROMANOW: — What about Ottawa?

MR. MALONE: — The Attorney General mentions Ottawa. That is just fine. Let's just dwell on that for one moment.

One of the Ministers in Ottawa was accused of phoning a judge, once, to inquire as to how a case was coming, a very improper thing to do, indeed, very improper to do. He resigned when it came out. What would you suggest, Mr. Attorney General is more wrong, phoning a judge or becoming directly involved with a police investigation? I suggest to you that what your Minister of Labour and what your Minister in charge of the Liquor Board did is far more serious than what that Minister of the Crown did.

MR. ROLFES: — You have rocks in your head.

MR. MALONE: — Well, Herman, you are an expert in rocks, of course, because you have so many in your head.

Mr. Speaker, what this resolution asks is for a public inquiry, a public inquiry to determine, to investigate the good government of Saskatchewan, according to the Public Inquiries Act. What we are concerned with here, Mr. Speaker, is the good government of this province. We feel that the actions of the Ministers mentioned in this particular resolution have not been contributing to the good government of this province; indeed, they have been doing just the opposite. That is why the resolution is important, Mr. Speaker. That is why we feel that the matter is very serious and that is why we urge all Members to support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think that this morning has been an indication that the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan has not changed. It has not changed its focus, it has not changed its emphasis. Notwithstanding the fact that it is rather clear that their attitude in the past is unacceptable to the public, they still continue the negative muckraking attitude toward government which they have consistently displayed. They have, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, taken their stand once again on behalf of the resource companies. We just heard the Leader of the Opposition say that your government has been interfering, has been interfering with the oil companies, interfering with the oil companies by passing resource legislation, royalty legislation, which has been challenged in the courts. Fancy that! How could you interfere more than that? We have even gone so far as to interfere with them by passing oil royalty legislation, which has been approved in the Court of Queen's Bench, which has been approved in the Court of Appeal five votes to zero and which is now before the Supreme Court. We are now alleged to be interfering simply because the Supreme Court did not bow

immediately and say we were right. We will see what the Supreme Court says, but it is rather clear, I should have thought, that oil royalty legislation, which commands the support of the Court of Queen's Bench and the unanimous support of the Court of Appeal, at least has some color of legal right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear.

MR. BLAKENEY: — It may be that the Members opposite had total contempt for the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal but I don't. It is always possible that law may be found to be invalid, but surely a law which starts off with the first six Superior Court judges saying it is right, is a law which a Legislature is entitled to pass. Indeed, it may turn out to be an error at some future time, but the suggestion that that is administrative interference, arrogance on the part of the Government, is surely insipid. It is surely nonsensical to allege that that is interference by a government.

I could go on to say the same thing about these alleged interferences with respect to potash. We lost one potash case in the first court; we have won it in the Court of Appeal. The others have not come to trial and yet Members opposite, who presumably have some knowledge - I am replying, Mr. Speaker, to the remarks for the Member for Lakeview . . .

MR. MERCHANT: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. If the remarks by the Member for Lakeview were not on the Motion, that is no justification for the Premier to go further afield and not address himself to the Motion. He has now been speaking for four minutes and has yet to say a single word that addresses itself to the Motion that is now before you.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Unfortunately the Motion that was put before us, in my view, is poorly drawn and it is rather broad. As I said before, I had to make a decision on the essence of what was there and I took the essence to be improper use, alleged improper use of influence by Cabinet Ministers and supported by some evidence which was presented in the Motion. I heard the Member for Regina Lakeview talking about this subject and about interference and I gather, using influence, and I can't help but think that the remarks are still in order.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I understand the sensitivity of the Members opposite. I understand, also, the Member for Wascana pointing out the fact that the Member for Lakeview was out of order. I felt that it was inappropriate for me to do that, but the Member for Wascana has cleared that up. There is bad blood between those two that doesn't exist between me and either of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I will turn to the particular remarks made by Members opposite with respect to the items that they have mentioned. I want to take just two or three minutes to talk about the perception of our constitution outlined by the Member for Wascana when he first stood up, saying that we, in this

Legislature, pass laws and it is up to the public servants to adhere to those laws and it is not up to the Cabinet to have any direction or control of those public servants. It is not up to us to tell them what to do. They are to take it from the books. Now that, of course, is not our constitutional system, that is not our system.

Our system is one that confers this Legislature, confers powers on the executive, namely the Cabinet, and the Cabinet has the responsibility of seeing that those laws are adhered to and we come into this Legislature and respond to it. I want to point out what our laws say. Let me read, just shortly, about how a department operates because Members opposite don't appear to have a grip on this. I will take the Department of Municipal Affairs, because the Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) seems to feel that if the Minister has any role in the administration of that department, he is interfering. Now let me read what our predecessors in this Legislature have passed.

There shall be a department of the Government of Saskatchewan which shall be called the Department of Municipal Affairs, over which the Minister of Municipal Affairs shall preside. The staff of the department shall consist of a deputy minister, to be called the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, and such other employees as may be required for the proper conduct of the business of the department, and the deputy and other employees shall do and perform all such action things relating to the business of the department as they may be directed to do and perform by the Minister.

Is it then in any way improper for the Minister to follow that law and direct them to do acts and perform acts? Clearly this is what our constitutional system contemplates. We are doing that and we propose to carry on as every constitutional system has in the British Commonwealth, in the way indicated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now within that general framework, let's look at a couple of examples mentioned, and I may say that the facts were substantially distorted.

It was alleged, for example, that the Minister of Labour had contacted the police. He had contact with the police because the police called him at his home. The Members opposite are saying that if a police officer calls me at my home and asks a question, I am to hang up on him, I am not to reply. It may be the view of Members opposite, that they should not co-operate with the police in the enforcement of their duties, but it is our view that we should co-operate with the police.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — It is clear that any telephone contact that that Minister had was initiated by the police and not by him.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order! Could I ask for order on both sides of the House as I am having trouble hearing the speaker.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I have tried to make myself heard, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite also alleged, for example, that the Minister of Labour was countermanding orders of the Fire Marshall. I am glad they didn't attempt to substantiate that because there are simply no cases of that. The Minister of Labour pointed out that on occasion he has to talk with the Fire Marshall about how to apply the law, the building code, the national building code to Saskatchewan circumstances and it seems to me that is an appropriate thing for the Minister to do. It is appropriate for him to say, let us see how this law applies to our situation. We want to take part in the national building code, but we want to make it work in Saskatchewan.

Let me turn to this RM of Garden River, where it is alleged there is some impropriety on the part of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy). The facts are crystal clear. A bridge was built on private land. If there is any legal basis, it will doubtless come out, but so far, if there was any legal basis for building a bridge on private land, it has not been revealed either to this House or to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Now we will go on from there. The Minister received a petition signed by a high proportion of the ratepayers of that municipality. The people who signed that petition, at least up in that country, are their own men and they don't sign petitions brought around by their MLA without thinking. Furthermore, that was not circulated by the MLA.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — At this point the Minister had to do something and he appointed a Board of Inquiry consisting of reputable people, or is it alleged that they are somehow disreputable? Is it alleged that Mr. Don Benson, executor of SARM is disreputable, is not reliable, is that what you are saying? And if not . . . I am glad to see that the Members opposite admit that that was a good board. They brought in their report; they couldn't find a legal basis for this bridge. They couldn't find on what basis it was done, and so the Minister acted again, if I may point out, scrupulously in line with The Rural Municipality Act.

Keep in mind that he appointed that board pursuant to particular and specific provisions of The Rural Municipalities Act, and the sticklers for the law are saying that he shouldn't have done it. Now after that, he got his report and before he could effectively act on the report, there was an election. What happened? The Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) first thinks it is improper for a reeve, who he just doesn't approve of, to stand. And even more disreputable in his mind is that the people up there elected the wrong fellow. The people of Dark River are interfering with the administration of their municipality, because they are electing a reeve and council that he doesn't approve of.

It is lodged in the view of the Liberal Party that it was all right for the people to have a vote, but when they voted in the way the Liberal Party didn't like, they were interfering. At Garden River they are saying the same thing. The people at Garden River elected that council and that council acted and they discharged their secretary treasurer. It is not, I hope, suggested that the Government had any part in that. You can go up and poll that council again if you like and see if the result isn't the same. Once again the sticklers for the law are saying,

April 22, 1977

that while the law says that the council shall hire the secretary treasurer, if the council doesn't do what they like, never mind the law, let's have a poll of the ratepayers or something else for which the law doesn't provide. These sticklers for the law, as I say, like the law when it suits them, and they are perfectly free to ignore the law when it doesn't.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — So it seems to me that thereafter the Minister acted, again, precisely within the powers given to him by The Rural Municipality Act. There was a discharge; the secretary treasurer asked for a board of reference. The Minister, quite within his powers, asked for some more information. Thereafter the Minister had indicated that he proposed to appoint a board of reference, again within the strict word of the law, and Members opposite are complaining that somehow he is interfering again. He is doing exactly what he is charged to do.

MR. MERCHANT: — On a Point of Order. Does the Premier intend to allow this matter to go to a vote, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — That is not a Point of Order.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — May I suggest that we don't want the Premier to stop progress . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the RM of Garden River and I say that not one shred of evidence of any interference by any Minister of the Crown has been shown.

MR. SPEAKER: — Being one o'clock, the House now stands adjourned until two o'clock, Monday.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:00 o'clock p.m.