

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Eighteenth Legislature

April 25, 1978.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly this afternoon, a group of 32 adults from Prince Albert from the Community Awareness Program, and their teacher, Laura Neufeld. They arrived in town a little early and they have visited the RCMP Barracks. I will be meeting with them after question period for a few soft drinks and some pictures. I would like to welcome you to the Assembly and I hope your stay here this afternoon is informational and educational and I do hope you have a very safe trip back home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. FESCHUK (Prince Albert): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake in welcoming the adult students from Prince Albert. I wish them a pleasant stay and a safe journey home. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. B.M. DYCK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce to you and to this Legislature, 45 students from St. Michael School in Saskatoon. They are sitting in the west gallery over there and are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Len Wawyrk and his colleagues. I had the opportunity of meeting with those students a few weeks ago when I presented the school with a portrait of the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh and we had a very lively discussion. They are a very enthusiastic group at St. Michael and I look forward to continuing that sort of dialogue later on this afternoon when I meet them in the rotunda area. I hope they have an informative afternoon and a safe journey home to Saskatoon-Mayfair.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I understand that with these students from St. Michael are students from St. Charles/Bishop Murray Schools. Some of those students live in my constituency and I would like to join with the member for Saskatoon-Mayfair in welcoming those students to the Legislature. I hope they find the afternoon to be worthwhile.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. BAKER (Regina Victoria): — Mr. Speaker, through you and the members of this Assembly I am pleased to welcome a group of Grade Eight students from Thomson School. They are accompanied by Mr. Forrest, their teacher, and I am sure they will have a pleasant stay this afternoon and visit throughout this fine building. I must say that Thomson School was the place where my daughter took her elementary training and I had the privilege of being president of the Home and School Association for some

seven or eight years. I call it my home school. So with that I am sure they will gain much in the proceedings this afternoon, and I will meet with them a little later on and have a chat with them. Again, a warm welcome.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to welcome a group of students. I believe they are in the Speaker's Gallery, from St. John School. Am I correct? Yes, there they are — a happy bunch. And the teachers, (I hope I have the names pronounced the right way) are Messrs. Schnieder, Tourigny and Miazga. Did I pronounce them fairly closely — I think? No? I welcome them to the gallery and to the Legislature hoping that it will be an entertaining and informative afternoon. I think it will be. I wish them a very safe and pleasant trip back home to Saskatoon.

MR. KOWALCHUK: (Melville)— Mr. Speaker, through you Sir, I would like to welcome a group of trustees from the Herbert School Unit and particularly the chairman, Mr. Grieves, with whom I had a pleasant association way back many, many years ago when I was also chairman of the Melville School Unit Board. It is indeed a pleasure to welcome a person like Mr. Grieves here, with whom I have had the close association for many, many years. I hope we all welcome and wish him a safe journey back home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, let me as well join with Mr. Kowalchuk in welcoming the trustees from the Herbert School Unit. They represent the school unit in which I received my education. I am very pleased to see them up in the galleries and I look forward to having coffee with them later on in the afternoon.

QUESTIONS

MOORE INQUIRY — WALTER CHESTER

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) — A question to the Minister of Social Services. In the latest report of the Department of Vital Statistics which was tabled in this Assembly yesterday, there was a dramatic increase in the number of homicides in Saskatchewan in the last year and in the number of violent deaths by suicide. Would you be prepared to dramatically prove to the law enforcement officers of Saskatchewan that the government is supportive of their efforts, by immediately offering the complete reinstatement of Walter Chester with a reinstatement of all his lost wages and lost benefits due to the actions of the government office?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we have a psychiatrist in the House for the member opposite. He obviously is very disturbed. I was going to say that he should have directed his question to the Attorney General because he started with homicides and suicides and then he jumped from there to reinstatement of a guard at the Prince Albert Correctional Centre. I really do not understand the question. I have answered him before, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the individual member he is referring to, that any employee of the government of Saskatchewan, if he feels that he has been aggrieved, has the arbitration procedure before him. Mr. Chester has that procedure at his disposal and, as I indicated before, I will await the outcome of those procedures.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — On page 66 of the Moore Inquiry Report, they are very laudatory of Walter Chester. In light of the fact that Mr. Chester has, in fact, been exonerated by the District Court of Saskatchewan, would you not admit that your decision to demote Walter Chester, flying in the face of the Moore Inquiry and the district court decision, in fact in the case of the law enforcement officers of Saskatchewan that you are not subordinate of their efforts.

MR. SPEAKER: — Next question.

URANIUM FIND AT MIDWEST LAKE

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Charge of SMDC. The Leader Post and other news media have been carrying stories recently about Esso's recent uranium find at Midwest Lake in northern Saskatchewan. Esso owns this land with two other companies, Numac Oil of Edmonton and Bow Valley Industries at Calgary. My question of the minister, is it the intention of the government through SMDC or some other agency, to share in this particular discovery and obtain a 50 per cent interest as you are entitled by law?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Well, it may be, Mr. Speaker, but it is too early at this time to respond on behalf of SMDC. We have not had an opportunity to study the area of the find or the significance of that find.

MR. MALONE: — Supplementary question. Is it not the government's intention to share in all finds in northern Saskatchewan in the uranium sector? I can recall certain speeches of the minister and other members of the government giving the government's intention to become a 50 per cent partner in these finds notwithstanding the fact that those who find the mineral may not be desirous of having the government as a partner. Will the minister be able to tell us within this week whether or not the government is intending to move in this direction?

MR. MESSER: — No. Mr. Speaker.

MR. MALONE: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What is the criterion that the government will be looking to to determine whether or not they should become a 50 per cent partner with Esso and the other two companies involved?

MR. MESSER: — The same criterion that has existed for about the last year in regard to all joint ventures that we have reviewed and/or undertaken to acquire an interest in.

BAYDA INQUIRY

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he now has word when the Bayda Inquiry Report is coming down?

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

MOORE INQUIRY

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. He didn't get an opportunity to answer my last question. Will you not admit that in light of the laudatory comments made by Judge Moore of Walter Chester and in light of the fact that he has now been exonerated by the district court, are you now prepared to

completely re-instate Walter Chester and prove to the law enforcement officers that this government does in fact support them?

Mr. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker. I have already answered that. There is no doubt that Mr. Chester, as we have indicated in our letter to him and as we indicated in the Moore Inquiry, that there were many good points about Mr. Chester. But, Mr. Speaker, at that time when we demoted Mr. Chester we had indicated many other reasons as to why demotion or suspension at that time was necessary. I had hoped that many of these reasons would not have to be made public for the interest of Mr. Chester, but Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that I have no alternative and in estimates I will make those particular reasons available to the House as to why Mr. Chester was demoted and why, finally, the department made a decision. Mr. Speaker, we will await, as I said before we will await the outcome of the grievance procedure that every employee has under the government if they feel they have been aggrieved. Then they should ask their union on their behalf to proceed with grievance procedure and I will at that time study the outcome and make my decision at that time.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Supplementary to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Next question.

LIQUOR LICENSING LEGISLATION.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana) — Question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister in charge of the Liquor Licensing Commission about the legislation now proposed. I ask the minister whether by the amendment substituting clause at the amendment regarding the electronic deletion, is it your intention to stop all ads regarding any form of liquor or is it your intention to stop local companies from advertising in the United States which they may not now do through Williston and then get into the Saskatchewan market?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the intent is clear in the explanatory notes which say that the amendment is aimed at creating a prohibition against the advertising of liquor by electronic means and was prompted by the introduction of cable television into the province.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister, perhaps out of hypocrisy, why now you feel that something has to be done, when for many years you have allowed Weyburn and Estevan to have liquor advertising coming to their area and why you allow all magazines and other forms of liquor advertising to come into this province even though you feel that liquor advertising has such a terrible effect on people in this country?

MR. BYERS: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been cable television in the province at a number of places like Prince Albert and Elrose and Weyburn and Estevan that has been shown for a number of years. However, with the licensing of the cable operators by the CRTC in the four major cities where the messages will be beamed at substantially larger numbers of people, it is therefore deemed expedient to merely extend the current law as it applies to liquor advertising on the national networks to the cable operators and that does not seem like an unreasonable approach.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, does the minister not believe that given the fact that it will place such an onerous expense upon the cable companies to delete the ads that

you could get most of the effect of stopping Saskatchewan sellers from going to the United States and advertising in Williston if you used your current powers under The Liquor Act to stop those companies from advertising rather than worrying about what little American advertising might come in if you took that step and didn't take the overall step?

MR. BYERS: — That would be a very inappropriate way, Mr. Speaker, because there may well be distributors of certain products that are not now listed with the Liquor Board and they may then use the method suggested by the hon. member of the opposition to promote sales so they could argue their sales were up so they could get listed.

MOORE INQUIRY

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — A question to the Minister of Social Services. Would the minister not admit that his recent admission or his previous admission that he in fact withheld information from the Moore Inquiry colors further this government's position when it has the reputation of not being supportive of our correctional officers and law enforcement officers in the province?

MR. ROLFES: — Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, I indicated before and I will indicate again if the member would only listen, that we have made those points, I think, available to the Moore Inquiry. We had hoped that the character of Mr. Chester would not have to be further defamed and that it could be protected but if the members insist, then I think we will have to make that public and that we will have to go into the other reasons. I will be prepared to do that if the members so insist in Estimates.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, on page 66 of the Moore Inquiry, Judge Moore says that he was satisfied that Chester was a dedicated employer, a leader respected by both staff and inmates and a disciplinarian but with a sense of fairness. Are you now prepared to say that the information that you have given to the Moore Inquiry which was overruled by Judge Moore, that Judge Moore in fact is totally wrong and you are carrying out a vendetta against a correctional officer?

MR. ROLFES: — Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, and in no way did Judge Moore overrule our decision. In my conversations with Judge Ben Moore, he clearly indicated to us that there were some difficulties, certainly, and in my discussion with him, certainly we took his advice and I am following that advice, Mr. Speaker. I will again say that I will await the decision of the arbitration board and make my decision at that time.

I will repeat, Mr. Speaker, our decision to suspend and then to demote Mr. Chester was not solely based on the assault charge that was laid against Mr. Chester. We are not particularly concerned as to whether he was guilty or not guilty of that assault charge. Our decision was not entirely based on it and I have stated that in the House before.

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie) — Mr. Minister, if we are going to delve through the Moore report and drag up a number of other things, are you also considering possible charges to members who were included in the report including members to my left?

MR. ROLFES: — That, Mr. Speaker, will certainly be taken under advisement.

NORTHLAND AGREEMENT

MR. A.M. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister

responsible for Northern Saskatchewan.

I am under the impression as a result of an article run in the Star Phoenix that the new Northland Agreement which expired on March 31 is about to be re-entered by the provincial government. I would like to know if the minister can give me the assurance that before the provincial government signs the final form of that agreement if they will make every opportunity available for representatives of the northern government LACs, LCAs and NMCs to make presentations to the provincial government so that the northern viewpoint might be better understood by both parties entering into that agreement?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN:(Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): —Mr. Speaker, in the development of the agreement, the Northlands Agreement, every opportunity has been provided for the Northern Municipal Council and the local councils to be involved. In fact there was funding provided for them to make representation to the Northlands Agreement and I would not make any further commitment with respect to it.

MR. McMILLAN — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact, Mr. Minister, that the NMC felt that on every occasion where they attempted to in fact put their case before the provincial government before it entered into a final agreement on the Northlands Agreement, they were snubbed as a result of the attitude of your civil service and your ministry in particular.

MR. BOWERMAN: — The answer to the question is, No. I indicated already to the member, Mr. Speaker, that there were provisions and funding for not only the Northern Municipal Council but for the local councils and for the representative groups, the Association of Non-Status and Metis people as well as the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. They made their representations to the clauses in the proposed agreement and as I indicated already I would make no further commitments with respect to the agreement.

PRINCE ALBERT CO-OP FISHERIES.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Co-operatives. Mr. Minister, last week in a press release it said that the Prince Albert Co-op Fisheries of Prince Albert is in danger of bankruptcy within a month and will have to close its doors putting some 100 plant workers out of work and interfering with the lives of 1,500 other commercial fishermen in Saskatchewan. The Co-op has been forced now to go under the management of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation apparently, the very corporation that caused them financial hardship in the first place. Mr. Minister, will the government at this time reconsider its decision and give financial assistance to this Co-op at this time?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue): — Mr. Speaker, the department of the government has given financial assistance in the past over a number of periods of time with respect to Co-operative Fisheries Ltd. I think the question should be more properly directed to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan who is much closer to that scene.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of DNS answer that?

MR. BOWERMAN: —Mr. Speaker, we have over a rather lengthy period of time given assistance, financially and otherwise, to Co-operative Fisheries Ltd., in their difficulties which they experienced with their relations with the Fresh Water Fish Marketing

Corporation. We will continue to do that or we will continue to consider that at least. That does not indicate that we will provide financial assistance to the CFL now without some other considerations and some more study in detail with respect to what the implications of that would be.

MR. WIPF: — . . . you said we may give them more financial assistance, Mr. Minister, is it not true that right at the present time they are in need of more moneys, or else they are going to have to close the doors and put some 1,500 people out of work — probably as commercial fishermen. Would you not agree that at this point if we did give them some money to help them over the problem that they have right now, it would be of great benefit to the 100 plant workers and the 1,500 commercial fishermen in Saskatchewan?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with that. Every consideration is being given to the implications of what would be involved if Co-operative Fisheries Limited was to cease operations. There is a meeting scheduled tomorrow with their Board of Directors in Prince Albert, at which time I will be attending a part of that Board Meeting, to decide and to determine the current state of affairs with respect to them and to what relationship the department should take or the government should take, in their future operations.

MR. McMILLAN: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that your provincial government is seriously considering the establishment of a provincial fish marketing board or agency?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. When you say serious consideration, I would say that because of the implications which the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation has had on the fishery in Saskatchewan and specifically, with respect to the agents operating in this province and for the maintenance of a fish processing industry in Saskatchewan, we find that it is necessary and incumbent upon us now, because of the financial implications and financial disaster which has been brought about on the agents and fishermen of this province, to consider alternatives to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

MOORE INQUIRY (CONT'D)

MR. MALONE:— Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Social Services. A moment ago, in response to the member for Qu'Appelle, you indicated that you had discussions with Judge Moore in connection with Mr. Chester. Now, this is the first time that I have been aware that there were discussions between you as a minister and the judge conducting this inquiry. Would you tell us at this time when these discussions were held? Were they held at the time the inquiry was going on or before and whether or not Mr. Chester was made aware that you were discussing his case with the Judge? If so, was he invited to attend these discussions?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, the only time I ever met Judge Ben Moore was when he submitted his report to me. It was at that time that we discussed the report and also his comments in regards to the handling of Chester affairs. The only time I ever spoke to Judge Ben Moore and it was the only time I ever met him. I haven't met him since, nor have I spoken to him since.

MR. MALONE: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General in view of Judge Moore's findings in his report about the actions of Mr. Bogdosavich and

the actions of Mr. Thompson in consulting with the officials of your department and with the judge involved in the Chester case, have you recommended or taken any disciplinary measures against these two civil servants for acting in the manner that they did, that is, seeing the judge or the prosecutor before the case was heard, talking to your members of your department about an appeal, not on the merits of the case but because of some embarrassment that would be caused to the department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I have not and I do not intend to. I do not believe that is my responsibility. Furthermore, at first analysis, I do not see anything particularly untoward from a criminal justice point of view, with respect to the representations that are made. Any judgment calls or opinions with respect to the whole Chester affair in the social services context — Well, we have Judge Moore's views on that; but in terms of the criminal justice situation, I think that there was no impropriety. Indeed I think Judge Moore found that allegations which were made during the course of the inquiry, that there had been an interference with the administration of justice, simply were not so.

MR. MALONE: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it from the Attorney General's answer then that he approves of government officials having consultations firstly with prosecutors before a case has been tried, and secondly having government officials contact his department to be advised on an appeal, not on the merits of the case, not on whether justice has been done or not been done, but just on the basis that it puts the department in a difficult position? Do you approve of that procedure?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I stand to be corrected because it has been some weeks and months indeed since I looked at the Moore Report but my recollection is that there is no evidence of anybody having talked to the prosecutors in advance of the charge having been heard and determined. I stand to be corrected by that but I believe that that is an accurate recollection of the facts.

As the second aspect of it, namely the urging of the appeal, the person can make an urging of an appeal to the department. The key question is, was the correct decision taken or not taken by the department in light of all the circumstances? In this case I submit that the decisions taken by the department were indeed proper and I think Judge Moore has indeed substantiated that. As I said, the allegation by the Leader of the PC Party was right during the middle of the inquiry of Ben Moore, that there was some sort of a substantial interference with the administration of justice by the Department of Welfare.

Judge Moore specifically said, relating to this incidence which arose from the allegations, that was not so, and I stand by that.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — A supplementary to the Attorney General. Would you not admit that condoning the actions of the senior civil servants, of going around to push a prosecution and push an appeal, and demoting a corrections officer for actions that the Minister of Social Services said took place in 1968, indicates in the strongest way that you are not prepared to give support to our corrections officials and will further increase the morale problems that exist in the correctional system?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I, and I am sure the entire government, supports the difficult job that correction officers and police officers have to fulfil in our society today. We back them 100 per cent of the way. Having said that, there will be occasions of which Chester may or may not be an incident I do not know, where through the normal procedure of grievances, some disciplinary action may or

may not be necessary against an individual person, be that a corrections officer or anybody else who works for the government of the province of Saskatchewan. The position that Chester is in now, I say to the hon. members opposite, this is something which is before, the mechanism of the collective bargaining agreement, we ought not to be making it a political football at this stage of the game, we should be allowing that process to run its normal and due course with a final decision after it has been taken.

MOORE INQUIRY — WALTER CHESTER.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier of Saskatchewan. Today in this assembly, the Minister of Social Services stated categorically that he had information pertaining to Walter Chester that he was prepared to now release that was not formally released to Mr. Justice Moore in his inquiries. The Attorney General has just categorically stated that no one spoke to Mr. Justice Moore prior to the report issued by Mr. Justice Moore in which Mr. Walter Chester was praised. My question to you is this, as a Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, in order to prove to law enforcement officials across the province that we, the government of Saskatchewan are behind the law enforcement officers and the duties that they have to perform in our society, will you ensure that the Minister of Social Services does not merely state that he is going to blacken an individual law enforcement officer's name but Mr. Premier, will in the light of the comments made today, insist that Mr. Walter Chester be reinstated.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, three points. First, Mr. Walter Chester's rights are being determined pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement between the government and the Saskatchewan Government Employee's Association and we intend to keep our bargains, we intend to keep our bargains, and that will determine whether or not Mr. Chester is reinstated. Point number one. Point number two. We yield to no one in supporting the forces of law and order in this province. We have consistently supported them and we will continue to support them. Point number three. I am not aware that the Minister of Social Services has indicated the remarks attributed to him by the member for Nipawin. I sat here. I listened, I didn't hear what he heard.

COMMITTEE TO LOOK INTO STRIKES AS PERTAINING TO PERISHABLE PRODUCTS.

MR. WIEBE: — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, in presenting its brief to cabinet, make the recommendation that cabinet and government set up a committee to look into strikes in essential services, i.e., especially as pertains to perishable products. Is it the intention of your government to accept that recommendation and set up such a committee?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Cameron, we haven't had time to evaluate that particular request on the part of SFA. I simply indicated, as I did to the press, that I felt that the negotiations procedure which we undertook worked out very well. We were able to make use of a negotiator and a mediator, we were able to get an agreement which seems to be satisfactory to both sides. It seems to me in any negotiation that is still the best method to use and unless we find some real good merit in a different proposal I suspect that that's the method we will continue to use.

MR. WIEBE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As is the case today, a lot of concern is expressed regarding the concerns of labor and management and very little concern is shown in regard to the innocent third party. As an example, the recent dairy producers' strike. Is it the intention of your government, can I ask you once again to

provide the kind of assurance that the innocent third party does need in regard to labor and management strikes and look into the recommendation that the SFA has asked your government to do and at least set up a committee to study the possibilities of strikes in essential services?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the recommendation is better directed to the Minister of Labour. However, I do believe that there is a need for us to look at a better way of handling labor-management relations but I suspect that that is not only true in terms of agriculture but in many other areas of industry. I suspect that the Minister of Labour will have noted what was said.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 2:38 o'clock p.m. His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the bills presented to him.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 11 — CONDEMNATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RE WESTERN ALIENATION

MR. R.L. COLLVER: (Leader of the Conservative Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose):

That this Assembly condemn the federal Government for failing to come to grips with western alienation by refusing to act upon legitimate economic and social concerns of western Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion and to make this motion to this Assembly, I would like to, first of all, draw to the attention of the present government of Saskatchewan that there is contrary to some of the rewards made by the Premier at the recent meeting in Yorkton, continuing and growing feelings of alienation amongst the people of western Canada and, more specifically, in the province of Saskatchewan.

These feelings of alienations were brought about by long time problems pertaining to freight rates and pertaining to centralization of power in Ottawa over areas of jurisdiction that have traditionally been the province's over the last number of years.

Continued lack of economic development in the province of Saskatchewan, caused by these centralized policies and caused by the lack of concern or apparent lack of concern of the present government of Canada to implement for example the Hall Commission, to implement material changes in their attitudes toward the entire freight structure of western Canada, the continued attitude of the government in Ottawa to develop policies by planners in Ottawa relative to unemployment insurance as an example, relative to the Canada Pension Plan as an example, where these policies made in Ottawa are not felt by the people of the province of Saskatchewan or the people of western Canada to in any way, enhance the development and the social development of western Canada.

Now in his remarks made at Yorkton, or the impression of the remarks made at Yorkton and also the remarks that the Premier made at Banff, there seems to be in the mind of the Premier of Saskatchewan, some kind of change in that attitude over the last few years. At least that was the impression that I got, especially from his speech that he

made to the Alternatives Canada Conference in Banff.

He seemed to imply that Ottawa now is listening to Saskatchewan and yet what do we see Ottawa do with reference to the oil legislation in Saskatchewan? We have a continued attack by Ottawa on western Canadian resources with reference to oil. We have an export tax on oil, as an example but do we have an export tax on nickel? No, we don't. Do we have an export tax on the products of eastern Canada? No, we don't, but we have an export tax on oil which is the product of two provinces in western Canada primarily. Certainly, we in western Canada have come to believe for some considerable years that if oil for example, were found in Ontario near Thunder Bay or in Ontario near Toronto or in Quebec near Montreal, near Quebec city, then the entire policy of the federal government would change. The population centres of Ontario and Quebec, of central Canada, would bring their power to bear on the parliament of Ottawa and certainly then, the export tax would be removed because otherwise the government of Saskatchewan and the government of the province of Alberta, in attempting to deal with their natural resources which belong to the people of those areas and which by constitution are under the jurisdiction of the provinces, could benefit all of the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta (and to a greater extent in Saskatchewan because Alberta is getting their substantial amount of money now out of that resource) but could benefit secondary industry and the development of real jobs and opportunities in the province of Saskatchewan. Instead, we have a federal government that continues to insist that only the interests of the population centres in Ontario and Quebec should apply across Canada.

We haven't seen, with relation to the federal government in Ottawa, any change in the attitude of the present government in Ottawa towards western Canada. Look at the record over the last ten years. Look at the kinds of policies that have been implemented. When the western Canadian farmers couldn't sell their wheat the Prime Minister of Canada threw it in their faces. That's what he thought of western Canadian farmers — threw it in their faces in Winnipeg, (and the members to my right laugh) but every resident of western Canada and every resident of Saskatchewan remembers. The members to my right think that the people forget these incidents — forget the incident in the past but they remember all too clearly, the attitude of the Prime Minister at the time that western Canadians couldn't sell their wheat. Then the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, the man who was supposedly going down to Ottawa on behalf of western Canadians and he was going to . . . (I remember this, Mr. Speaker, because he was the candidate for election in Saskatoon). I remember many of the speeches then. He was going to go down and teach Ottawa about the concerns of western Canada. He was going to tell them, he was going to shake them loose; he was going to (in his words) back in 1968 and again in 1972 in those two famous campaigns in Saskatoon-Humboldt. He was going to shake that federal government because he was the only man that could go there and join with the government. A very similar pitch he made back then, Mr. Speaker, to the pitch being made by the member of Regina South and the member for Regina Wascana today where they say, elect me because I can join with the winners. Don't elect me because I can stand up for western Canada, don't elect me because I traditionally have stood up for western Canada and I have forcibly drawn to the attention of the government in Ottawa the concerns of western Canadians, the real concerns, don't elect me for that reason, elect me because I can join the winning team and by doing so I can make a major impact on the future of western Canada. Let's look for a minute at the major impact on the future of western Canada made by that gentleman from Saskatoon-Humboldt who has been a member of Cabinet ever since in the last 10 years. Have we seen a dramatic change in the development of secondary industry in Saskatchewan? The reverse is true. We have lost

our meatpacking industry, we are down to one plant and that is half owned by the present government of Saskatchewan. The others are closing their doors or planning closures. Have we seen development in the rapeseed industry? No, we haven't. The development and processing of rapeseed? No we haven't. The plant in Nipawin and others in the province of Saskatchewan have had less volume lately than they used to have. Why? Because the implementation of this gentleman who was sent down to Ottawa to stand up for and represent western Canadians wanted to implement his own brand, his own brand of western Canadian politics. Mr. Speaker, that's what the member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, the member of parliament really wanted to do was to create a rapeseed crushing industry in Windsor, Ontario. That's how he represents the people of western Canada and the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Have we seen any dramatic improvement with the marvellous location — Mr. Speaker with deference, may I ask you to call the members behind me and the members to my right to order, it is very difficult even to hear myself let alone try and listen to them. It is very difficult, back and forth. I wish you would call them to order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, has there been any change in western Canada or in the province of Saskatchewan, especially in the province of Saskatchewan relative to the creation of jobs and opportunities? The answer is a resounding, No. Our manufacturing sector in the province of Saskatchewan has deteriorated in the last 10 years; it has deteriorated. We have local Saskatchewan organizations such as Morris Rod Weeder, out in Yorkton, who have had to open, who have improved their business all over the world., all over the world, but where are they creating the manufacturing jobs — North Dakota, Minnesota, not in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now we can talk about the present government's policies of decentralization and the fact that we don't think that they exist and that they are not really trying to create these opportunities in the small centres but the government in Ottawa has got to take their share of responsibility for this. We are faced with a situation in western Canada where it is our time, where it is our era and we are not proceeding to get the kind of treatment from the central government in Ottawa that is necessary and essential for us to develop those jobs and opportunities here. What kind of policies could the present federal government enact, for example? What kind of policies could the present government in Saskatchewan insist that the present government in Ottawa enact in order to improve the situation in the province of Saskatchewan and in western Canada? Well, first of all, I must commend the NDP for this, they can insist that the present government today implement the Hall Commission. And they can do this as forcibly and as dynamically as they possible can so that we can have a real and meaningful improvement in our grain-handling system in the province of Saskatchewan and in western Canada.

What could they do further? They could insist that the federal government create a tariff pool from the tariffs that we pay on the manufactured goods and extend the crowrates to the processing industries of our agricultural projects. Who will that help? That will help the processing industries, rapeseed crushing, the meatpacking industry. It will help a great many of the processors to establish right here in the province of Saskatchewan rather than to establish in heavy populated centres and see our raw materials exported out of the province of Saskatchewan at world market price while we have to pay the protected price for the merchandise that is brought in to protect the eastern Canadian industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are a couple of things they could do in the economic sphere.

Is DREE establishment in Saskatoon really benefiting the people of Saskatchewan? The answer is no. Do they really make decisions in Saskatoon that apply to the province of

Saskatchewan? About \$4,000 a month in telephone calls between the DREE office in Saskatoon and the DREE office in Ottawa counters that particular statement. Decentralization? Nonsense! Additional staff, additional civil service directed and controlled by Ottawa — that is correct. Really, what projects has DREE really gotten off the ground that would not otherwise have gotten off the ground in Saskatchewan by the people of Saskatchewan anyway? If we had tax benefits, if we had equalization amounts so that the government of Saskatchewan could determine priorities, we are convinced, Mr. Speaker, totally convinced that the projects that develop in the province of Saskatchewan would dramatically improve and would greatly enhance the industrial sector of our province.

The fact is that when these planners in DREE, for example, and many, many other central bureaucratic organizations out of Ottawa, through the Department of Industry and Commerce and other such organizations, attempt to try to develop western Canadian industry with central Canadian thought processes, they are doing so on one basis and one basis only; throw those western Canadians a soup bone while the real development takes place down here where the population centres are. Yet, Mr. Speaker, at the same time that that is happening, we see in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec tremendous social problems developing around the major cities: smog, pollution, rampant crime. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the people of those areas are very concerned about continued development of that kind of nature of secondary manufacturing and so on in Ontario, the Golden Triangle, and in Quebec.

They are equally concerned about increasing their population centres. They are equally concerned and here we are, in western Canada, having to export our very prime resource and that is the educated young people of the province of Saskatchewan.

We are still doing it, Mr. Speaker. We heard in Health Estimates this year, the minister agree and admit that the percentage of the Saskatchewan population over the age of 65 is dramatically increasing while the population in total is relatively stagnant. What that means, basically, Mr. Speaker, is that people in the productive years of their lives still are leaving the province of Saskatchewan.

Now admittedly, many of them are going to the province of Alberta but many of them as well, Mr. Speaker, are going to the central or populated areas of our country because that is where jobs and opportunities are continuing to develop. Why, for example, has the Premier in his statements at the Premier's conferences — why has he not made dramatically clear in the economic sense, dramatically clear, that the people of western Canada expect now, not in 10 years or 20 years a slight improvement, but now expect to be able to be creative in the development of those opportunities economically. Why has he not made it eminently clear, eminently clear, that the —

MR. BOWERMAN: — What do you see about Saskatchewan that brought you to Saskatchewan?

MR. COLLVER: — What do I see about Saskatchewan that brought me to Saskatchewan?

AN HON. MEMBERS: — In your younger years.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, everyone has to go somewhere. Ted and I thought I wanted to be near you.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that we want those jobs and opportunities here in Saskatchewan. We think the government of Saskatchewan could be doing more in emphasizing throughout Canada the importance of the development of these jobs. We do commend the present government for their stand, for example, with reference to the right of the government of Saskatchewan to tax their resources as they see fit, we commend the government for that and for standing up for that. We commend the government of Saskatchewan for the demands on the Hall Commission but we think you could do more. We think the government could be making suggestions with reference to the development of some kind of system to extend the crowrates. The suggestion that the Premier made at Yorkton which was a copy of Dr. Grant Devine's suggestion of about a month before the Premier made his suggestion, we think is a step forward and we hope that the Premier will continue in the statements that he makes outside the province of Saskatchewan to try to extend those benefits of crowrates to the processing industry which will help to develop the province.

We hope, as well, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier in his meeting with reference to the federal provincial meetings will take to heart the continued centralization of power in Ottawa with reference to things like DREE and will ask, instead of having the DREE office located in Saskatchewan, for additional equalization payments, so the government of Saskatchewan can determine where their resources should go, not the government in Ottawa, who do not understand the real problems of the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this motion also suggests that there is western Canadian alienation relative to some social issues. I would like to address my mind to those in addition to the economic issues that I have mentioned already. Such social issues, for example, as in unthinking, uncaring, federal government that abolishes the death penalty against the wishes of the Canadian people. Some issues as the development of welfare programs and health programs in Ottawa and educational programs as well and imposing them through their grant system — and I am sure the Premier will have some comments on that one — imposing them through their grant system on western Canadians. Take for example, Mr. Speaker, the development of research in the province of Saskatchewan through our universities. The research grants coming out of Ottawa, rather than to be filtered through the, for example, the research council of the province of Saskatchewan, where the decisions could be made here, only decisions relative to our needs, are made out of Ottawa and they are made on the basis that the western Canadians, that the Saskatchewan educators have to apply to Ottawa and to be told by an Ottawa board where these moneys are to be spend. Such decisions, for example, as a requirement in terms of Canada Council Grants for the arts, for theatre, for these decision have to be made by planners located in Ottawa rather than in the province of Saskatchewan. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is wrong. We believe it is wrong, for example, that last year the Canada Council in the arts almost totally excluded the province of Saskatchewan in their grants. Absolutely true. The member for Regina Wascana says, not true. Well the member for Regina Wascana I am sure will be able to list all of the Canada Council Grants made to the field of the arts in the province of Saskatchewan relative to the total grants made in Canada in that very important area.

Now, again, I have to commend the government of Saskatchewan for their efforts in terms of the promotion of culture in the province of Saskatchewan. But I think they can go further, and I think that the government can go even further. If it wasn't limited by the fact that the government of Canada insists on making the decision as to what kind of art they think is right rather than what kind of art we, in the province of Saskatchewan, think is right. The really internationally famous artists as an example

and I am only suggesting that because it is true in the field of art, it is true in the field of music, it is true in the field of research, it is true in all those cultural and social activities. The really internationally famous people are the ones who develop their talents here in Saskatchewan, not through any great Canada cultural grants but develop their talents here in a home grown fashion. If the government of Canada really wanted to make western Canadians feel that they were a part and a total and complete part of Canada, they would insist that the government of Saskatchewan and that the people of Saskatchewan be allowed to make these decisions themselves.

Mr. Speaker, no, some of it wasn't filled in so you have to do this properly, Mr. Speaker, in a couple of minutes I am going to move that this assembly condemns the federal government for failing to come to grips with western alienation by refusing to act upon legitimate economic and social concerns of western Canada. In summary, Mr. Speaker, we in western Canada believe it is our turn. We believe it is our turn to make the decisions that we need to make as good Canadians and as good western Canadians here at home. We are in exactly the same position today, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians were in, relative to Britain back in 1867. We in western Canada don't want to be treated as colonials; we don't want to send our supposed spokesmen down there to Ottawa (as we did with the member for Saskatoon-Humboldt), who was going to look after strongly, the interests of western Canada, and who in turn was usurped by the eastern Canadians and proceeded to create such marvellous policies as LIFT and that sort of programs that did not do very much for the people of western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we believe the government of Canada can do much more, both in the economic and social areas, as well as the cultural areas. They could develop the kind of western Canada or help us through unconditional grants to western Canadians. They could help us . . . well the member for Regina Wascana laughs . . . he thinks that unconditional grants — that we are not entitled to a share of the profits of Imperial Oil whose head office is in Toronto, that we are not entitled to a share of the profits of Shell or any of the other major corporations, doing business in western Canada, that those profits which are taxed in Ontario and are taxed by Ottawa in Ontario, that they shouldn't be given back to the people of western Canada. I say, let the member for Regina Wascana stand on that issue, we think that western Canadians are entitled to a share of that taxation revenue and that is what unconditional revenue sharing is all about — for the benefit of the member for Regina Wascana.

We believe that the government could do more in this area and could conserve by means of real decentralization of power, by real and meaningful turning over to western Canadians, their own destiny as good Canadians, that we in western Canada could in fact, achieve our era as we should. Therefore I move, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

MR. MALONE: Mr. Speaker. I noticed this particular motion on the order paper now for some weeks and I assumed the member who moved it, the member for Nipawin, would prepare his speech and come to this Assembly today and have perhaps a new slant on the problems of western alienation. I can think of a number of things that I could have spoken on without giving too much thought to, which would have been much more appropriate than the remarks from the member for Nipawin. In fact, indeed Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that I have heard such an inane speech in this Legislature. It reminds me of the person who got up and said. 'I really don't know too much about the subject matter'. Spoke and proceeded to over-demonstrate the point to his audience. I think that is the situation the member for Nipawin finds himself in today.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to compare that speech with the speeches that we have been hearing for years, from the members opposite. It was the same speech, Mr. Speaker. The same speech that goes on and on about this jealous feeling towards central Canada, the jealousy towards Alberta and British Columbia, but really no constructive suggestions as to how this very vital problem can be solved. We have heard the Premier make the speech, we have heard the Attorney General make the speech, we have heard the members opposite applaud and pound their desks when they went through the same inanities that the member for Nipawin just did. It is rather strange for us sitting on this side of the House, to hear a speech that the NDP have given for years, come from a leader of a party that says he wants to defeat the NDP. Time and time again, he congratulated the Premier, he congratulated the NDP, he said what great fellows they were, what a good job they were doing for the province of Saskatchewan!

If he feels that way about it, Mr. Speaker, I suggest he just move his chair over there and join with the rest of them! Because that's all his speech was, that was all it was, a speech saying what a great group the NDP are. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP have not done very much for Saskatchewan. The member for Nipawin seems to think that their oil legislation is appropriate. He seems to think that bill 42 was a good idea and Bill 47 was a good idea. Presumably if he takes that approach towards oil, we can believe he takes the same approach towards potash.

He also talked about unemployment insurance, the Canada pension plans, as being plans that somehow are not for the benefit of the people of western Canada and the people of Saskatchewan. I suggest he go out on the hustings and try to sell that message, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there is anybody in Saskatchewan who does not acknowledge the Canada Pension Plan and the Unemployment Insurance are good plans, although subject to abuse. That seems to be the thrust of that speaker's remark, Mr. Speaker, that these aren't good things and that somehow they are not coming to grips with the interest of western Canada. But I was particularly appalled, Mr. Speaker, with this continuous reference to Quebec and Ontario. Quebec and Ontario do this; Quebec and Ontario do that. Nothing, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, leads to Canadian unity being harmed when one region attacks another region. Whether it is the Atlantic provinces attacking Quebec, whether it is western Canada attacking Ontario, we have had these attacks in the past, Mr. Speaker, and at no time have they done anything to improve the situations of westerners.

What we need to cure western alienation, what we need to solve the problems of Canadian unity is not speeches like the member for Nipawin gave. But speeches that say to people of western Ontario and to Quebec and Ontario, that here are legitimate concerns in Saskatchewan. Here is what we feel should be done on the national scene to help Saskatchewan and we should be able to say at the same time we are giving those speeches, that we understand in Quebec that you have a problem, and to the Atlantic provinces that you have a problem, and if you are prepared to listen to our concerns and to act upon what we consider is important, we are prepared to listen to your concerns and to help you with your problems. Nowhere, Mr. Speaker, did I find any sense of that in the member's remarks. Simply the same bitter, jealous remarks about what is happening somewhere else and supposedly how we are being ripped off in western Canada.

There are problems, Mr. Speaker. There are very serious problems; problems that have to be faced up to soon, not several years of months down the road. But the approach to

be taken is not the approach by the member for Nipawin. It is an approach that recognizes legitimate concerns all across this country for Canadian unity.

Mr. Speaker, the member also dwells on what has happened in Saskatchewan since there has been a Liberal government. I want to remind that speaker that prior to the Liberal government taking power, there was a Conservative government. A government that has the largest majority of any party in the history of Canada. A government that was headed by the member for Prince Alberta, Mr. Diefenbaker, a westerner. A government that had many westerners in its Cabinet, Mr. Hamilton and others. They had an opportunity to do many things in those years to help the people of western Canada to right some of the traditional wrongs of the people of Saskatchewan. They had an opportunity to put in things such as two-price wheat. Did they? The answer is, No. A Liberal government did that, Mr. Speaker. They had the opportunity to have such things as a grain stabilization bill. Did they do that, Mr. Speaker? The answer is, No, but a Liberal government did that, Mr. Speaker. Did they attack the problems of transportation in western Canada in those years? Again, the answer is, No, but a Liberal government is attempting to come to grips with those problems.

The list goes on, Mr. Speaker; hopper cars, record wheat sales, all of these things have come to pass, not under a Conservative government, not under Mr. Diefenbaker's government, and they would not have come to pass under a Broadbent government or a Douglas government, but they have come to pass under a Liberal government.

More things need to be done, Mr. Speaker. Much more needs to be done for western Canada and Saskatchewan, but from the record, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in Saskatchewan will believe that the Conservative government will do anything for western Canada. You are still a party that is dominated by the money interests of Toronto and Montreal. Nobody in Canada in their right mind would expect an NDP government to do anything in this regard, because their chances of success are remote, at the very best.

Mr. Speaker, this type of speech given by the member for Nipawin, is given strictly for political motives. He puts this resolution on the order paper on the eve of a federal election. He tries to use this opportunity to get up and rant and rave about so-called western alienation and the so-called evils of the Liberal government. If the member had the courage of his convictions, I would suggest that the appropriate place to give such a speech, is not here, it is in Nipawin, on some public platforms in rural areas in Saskatchewan and in the cities of Saskatchewan. I dare the member to go out and give such a speech for public consumption! I dare the member to go out and speak to the political audiences of Saskatchewan and give a speech in the manner that he gave in the Legislative Assembly this afternoon. I hope he does, Mr. Speaker, because if he does, votes will leave the Conservative party in droves.

Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal more to say about the resolution at a later date, and accordingly at this time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 4

April 25, 1978

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lane (Qu'Appelle) that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 4) showing:

The amounts paid by the Government of Saskatchewan to any real estate companies in 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977 to September 30, 1977 and the work done for each payment and the project for which the work was done or the transaction giving rise to the payment.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON: (Minister of Government Services): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to speak very briefly on the motion proposed by the member of Qu'Appelle, I guess it was. Yes. We are I think, prepared to supply the information he wants. He phrased his question however, in a very general fashion.

There are certain things, that traditionally, the government has refused to supply to the public. One of those things for instance which comes to mind is the amount paid on rent. We have generally not disclosed rents that the government pays on leases. The motion which is before you, Mr. Speaker, would be so broad as to include amounts such as rents paid on leases.

I propose to amend it as well so as to refer to the fiscal year rather than the calendar year. A reference to the fiscal year would vastly simplify the work of the staff of the government in answering the question. I think, with the amendments that I am going to read in a moment, we will be supplying all of the information requested by the member for Qu'Appelle, or at least, wanted by him and it will minimize the expense in answering the question and will cut out any extraneous information which we don't want to disclose and I don't think he really wants.

I propose to move, seconded by the member for Humboldt, that the motion be amended so as to read:

The amount of commissions paid by the government of Saskatchewan to any real estate companies in the fiscal years, 1975-76, 1976-77 and April 1, 1977 to September 30, 1977, and the work done for each commission and the project for which the work was done or the transaction giving rise to the commission.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a fairly full explanation and I will move it now, if I might, as an amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 12 — FREIGHT ASSISTANCE FOR LIVESTOCK EXHIBITS.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. Katzman (Rosthern):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to establish freight assistance for livestock exhibits to Canadian Western Agribition on the same basis as for the Toronto Royal Winter Fair — i.e. 75 per cent of the total cost of shipping.

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — I would just like to say a few words about this bill, in the end finally as an amendment to it.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Rosthern is so anxious to support an activity which is already under way in our department. I am sure that he will be supporting the amendment then which I will be proposing at the end of my remarks.

The Canadian Western Agribition has enjoyed a spectacular growth both in quality and quantity, to the point that it is now the greatest show in North America, rivalling and even surpassing the Royal Agricultural Winter Show in Toronto. The Canadian Western Agribition was a co-operative effort of livestock producers, industrial contributors, civil leaders and prairie governments working together to achieve an annual show without parallel anywhere in western Canada. The dedication of many people, each contributing to a common goal has proven once again that the spirit of the West is far from dead. Our thanks must go out to those people who gave so much of their time and effort to this worthwhile achievement.

Because of the Canadian Western Agribition has reached the stature and indeed in many ways has surpassed the achievement of the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair, the time has come when this show should receive the same financial support by way of grants and exhibitor support as the enjoyed by its eastern Canadian counterpart. We have been successful in attracting entries from across Canada as well as from many parts of the USA which has led to the international reputation of the show. We would like to attract even more contributors from eastern and western parts of Canada.

To this point, the government of Canada has provided substantial assistance in the form of a contribution towards freight costs of exhibits moving from western Canada to the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair in Toronto. We are appreciative of this support and are anxious that it be continued. We do believe, however, that now that the Canadian Western Agribition has achieved the recognized status as the major livestock show in Western Canada, that reciprocal assistance should be made available for the many very good producers in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes who would also like to compete in our show, but find themselves unable to do so because of the high freight costs involved. Some six months ago, representatives from the Canadian Western Agribition began negotiations with the Minister of Agriculture in Ontario to develop a joint submission to the government of Canada which would be acceptable to both provinces and the national government. These proposals are being actively pursued at this time. We are hopeful that we will be able to announce a successful arrangement before the next show season.

I proposed, therefore, to amend Resolution No. 12 by deleting all of the words after 'assembly' and substituting therefore:

Commends the government of Saskatchewan for undertaking negotiations with the government of Canada to establish freight assistance for the livestock exhibits to Canadian Western Agribition on the same basis as for the Toronto Royal Winter Fair, i.e. 75 per cent of the total cost of shipping.

April 25, 1978

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all members will want to support that resolution.

Debate continues concurrently on the motion and the amendment.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, since I would like to have time to consider just what the amendment entails. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

MOTIONS

CAMPAIGN LEAFLET — MR. MERCHANT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Allen(Regina Rosemont):

That this Assembly regrets the action of the member for Regina Wascana in printing and distributing a leaflet containing a picture of that member taken within the Assembly in contravention of the rules of the Assembly and orders the member for Regina Wascana to return all remaining copies of said leaflet to Mr. Speaker forthwith and to apologize to the Assembly.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I asked the other day to adjourn this matter because I think it took us all somewhat by surprise, the statement by your Honor and perhaps more surprise the motion that was immediately introduced to the typewritten form by the member for Regina Rosemont. I have had some time to reflect upon the motion and why it was presented to this Assembly. There is only one conclusion that anyone can logically draw from the motion. I don't believe that the member who introduced the motion is particularly concerned about the rules of this procedure, for this Assembly. I don't think he is particularly offended by the fact that a picture was taken and that there was a political leaflet printed and distributed containing that picture, but I think what he perhaps is concerned about is the fact that the member for Regina Wascana, as he is presently known, is soon going to be the member for Regina East.

This particular motion is politically motivated and that is the only reason for it being brought before this Assembly. The members opposite, particularly the Regina members, are very sensitive about the fact that their two candidates in the federal election are looking worse every day. They are particularly sensitive about the fact that there have been two vigorous campaigns launched in those two federal constituencies by my colleagues in this Legislature, campaigns that in my view are first rate campaigns involving door knocking, involved handouts, involving leaflets, all of the traditional things that you do in a political campaign. What is particularly galling I am sure to the member for Regina Rosemont is that he knows that his colleague, the NDP candidate for Regina East simply can't match the campaign that is being run in that constituency. He knows that that particular candidate doesn't stand a chance in that constituency on a campaign fought on the usual political lines of a campaign, intensive door knocking, intensive canvassing, political pamphlets being handed out, advertising an all the traditional uses of political devices.

So what does he seek to do, well he knows that he can't win on that basis, so what he

tries to do is to slur the member for Wascana. He tries to drag him down into the gutter and fight a campaign that will be fought in the gutter, an area that seems to be very familiar to members who sit opposite from me.

That's the reason for this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, and it's the only reason for this particular motion, I say to the member for Regina Rosemont that this is a shameful motion for you to put on this order paper. I don't believe that you really believe in it. I suspect that somebody in the back rooms of the NDP insisted that some backbencher come out with this motion in a desperate attempt to try to embarrass the member for Regina Lakeview. Obviously it hasn't worked, obviously it's not going to work. I suspect that the members opposite would like to see this motion just disappear and go away, Mr. Speaker. Obviously that can't happen now because it has been introduced to this Assembly.

I say the motion, Mr. Speaker, is a spurious motion. It has nothing to do with the business of this Legislature and is simply on the order paper in a desperate attempt to build up the fortunes of the candidates for the NDP in Regina East. But, perhaps there is a serious aspect within this motion, Mr. Speaker, and that I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, is your involvement. A number of concerns have ...

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I want to caution the member and I'll ask him to make a retraction at the conclusion of this statement. I want to caution the member about what he is saying. The Speaker's actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any former proceeding except a substantive motion and I will ask the member for Lakeview to withdraw the comment made about the Speaker.

MR. MALONE: — Well, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to make a motion. I didn't think I did anything critical. If I did, I certainly withdraw the motion: I refer to you involvement. I didn't say anything critical towards your position or to you personally. If I did, I withdraw that comment, but what I'm trying to get across to you, Mr. Speaker, and I intend on moving an amendment to the motion that's before this assembly and perhaps it would be appropriate for me to read the amendment at this time, so members know what I'm going to be leading up to. So with leave, Mr. Speaker, I will read the amendment right now. The amendment goes as follows: that all words after the word 'action' in the first line be deleted and that the following be substituted therefor. And if the amendment is accepted, Mr. Speaker, the motion would then read:

That this Assembly regrets the action of Mr. Speaker in permitting the taking of still and motion pictures from the public galleries on opening day without authority from the Legislative Assembly and directs, Mr. Speaker, to disclose to the Assembly —

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I find the motion out of order and I refer the hon. member for Lakeview to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms fourth edition 1958 on page 62, citation 72 'the Speaker's actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except a substantive motion' and I will tell the member to withdraw what he has said with regard to an alleged amendment he is moving to the motion.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, you put me in the position obviously where I have to withdraw and because you put me in the position, I withdraw. You have requested me to withdraw a motion or an amendment to a motion which in my view is not in any way critical of you and if you feel that way, Mr. Speaker, then obviously I must withdraw to

keep my position in this Assembly and to speak to this particular motion.

What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that let's go back to the day that this matter arose. Mr. Speaker came into this Assembly and he read a statement. Now I understand that the member for Regina Wascana had been approached by you and advised that a certain telephone call had happened and that you were looking into the matter. You read a statement, and I think all of us on this side were quite prepared to accept the statement. We didn't know what it was about but immediately upon that statement being given within minutes, the member for Regina Rosemont stopped moving a motion, a motion dealing with the facts that you put out in your statement. A motion that was not hand written, a motion that wasn't sort of put out on the spur of the moment, but a motion was typed dealing directly with the matter you raised in this Assembly. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a coincidence which we believe just did not happen.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I am going to caution the member again and I am not going to caution the member any more. This is the last time I am going to caution the member for Lakeview.

What the member for Lakeview is saying is quite clearly the citation that I have made to him. It is in contradiction of the citation I have made to a member from Beauchesne's (Parliamentary Procedures). It is not my citation; it is a citation developed over years and years in this jurisdiction and in other jurisdictions and it is used by the members of the House for their own protection and for the protection of the Chair. The words that the member for Lakeview is saying are in contradiction of that and I will not allow the member for Lakeview to continue in that vein.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, the vein on which I have been continuing is not critical of you. I simply said there was a coincidence; I said nothing about your office.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The member is now debating my ruling. The member is not permitted to debate the Speaker's ruling and that is quite clear because I cited it the other day in a ruling I gave before the Assembly.

MR. MALONE: — Let me go on, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker's statement indicated there was a phone call or some communication to you. Now, a motion followed after your statement. We are now debating that motion before this Assembly.

In order for us to properly debate that motion, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we have to have in our possession all of the information surrounding the motion, surrounding your statement. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we want to know who phoned you. We want to know the date such a phone call was made. We want to know, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the answer will be very, very simple, a 'no' answer, whether there was any communication between the member for Rosemont and Mr. Speaker in Mr. Speaker's office. We want to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there was any communication between you and other members of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I will ask the member to give me a moment or two...

Order. I have repeatedly warned the member for Regina Lakeview about the comments and I made the citation that was necessary for me to cite at this time in order to support the ruling. I refer the member to Rule No. 25 in our rule book and it says. Subsection (2) on 25.

Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the Assembly of the Committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition, either of his own argument or the arguments using by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech and if the member continues to speak Mr. Speaker shall name him, or if in Committee, the Chairman shall report him to the Assembly.

Now I want to warn the member that he has been repeatedly warned about linking the Chair in any way whatsoever to his remarks and I have given him the citation. I think I have given the member all kinds of warnings and opportunities to withdraw those kinds of remarks.

MR. MALONE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to accept your ruling. Obviously I am unable to say anything about yourself or the Chair, and of course when I say yourself I do not mean personally. I mean the office that you hold.

Let me then, if I cannot talk about that particular incident, talk about, again, the motion. Mr. Speaker, for us to properly debate the motion, I have to move an amendment. I am going to move the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to let me move it; if you find it to be out of order, that is your decision. I will move, Mr. Speaker, an amendment to the motion by the member for Regina Rosemont:

That all words after the word ‘Assembly’ in the first line be deleted and the following be substituted therefore,

And directs Mr. Speaker to disclose to the Assembly:

(a) the name of the person who brought to Mr. Speaker’s attention, the fact that the member for Regina Wascana printed and distributed a pamphlet containing a picture of the member taken within the Assembly;

(b) the date the pamphlet was brought to Mr. Speaker’s attention;

(c) the date and nature of all conversations, if any, between Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for Regina Rosemont regarding the pamphlet which resulted in the hon. member for Rosemont introducing a motion immediately following Mr. Speaker bring the matter to the attention of the Assembly;

(d) the nature of all conversations, if any, between Mr. Speaker and other hon. members regarding the pamphlet:

(e) an explanation by Mr. Speaker for his actions in permitting still and motion pictures to be taken from the public galleries on opening day without authority of the Assembly and in contravention of the established practice of the Assembly.

I so move, seconded by Mr. Merchant.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): —Mr. Speaker, on a point of order...

MR. SPEAKER: — What is your point of order?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, my point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the proposed

amendment must surely be out of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, my argument is that it must be out of order, clearly on the basis of the recitations that your Honour has given to the House already about bringing the Speaker into the source of the debate directly or indirectly. I will close my argument if your Honour allows the amendment.

Presumably, the debate on the main motion and on the amendment would continue concurrently and one can only but imagine what the natural direction of the debate would flow from that point of view and I think, flying clearly in the face of the dictates and the precedent of Beauchesne and May and every parliamentary practice going, so I argue, Mr. Speaker, that it must be out of order.

MR. MALONE: — Clearly the amendment, Mr. Speaker, does not in any way hold you to ridicule, contempt and so on. It simply asks for information.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I am going to declare the amendment offered by the member for Regina Lakeview out of order and the basis on which I declare the amendment out of order is the citation which previously cited from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, 1958, Page 62, Citation 72:

(1) The Speaker's actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except a substantive motion.

An amendment to a motion is not a substantive motion; therefore it is out of order.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to this motion at some length.

First let me refer to the words that you used when you brought the matter to the attention of the House, followed very precipitously by the motion. The operative words, Mr. Speaker, that you used were:

The appearance of this picture (etc.) is an embarrassment to me because I had, prior to this time, denied a member of another caucus a request to have his picture taken working at his desk to this Chamber.

In the sense, Mr. Speaker, that it may have caused some embarrassment to you for that reason, I did not seek to cause you any embarrassment and said so to you in your private office. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think that had the matter been handled in the way that Mr. Speaker thought it should have been handled when you brought the matter to the attention of the House, it would have ended there. Indeed it would be clear to anyone on a fair reading of what Mr. Speaker said, that Mr. Speaker did not consider the matter to be a particularly serious breach of the practice.

Of course, as members will know, very likely half the members of this assembly did not know whether that was the practice or not, prior to Mr. Speaker rising to make comments that you made that day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that members remember that it is not contrary to the rules but contrary to what you described as the practice. I also think it is important that members remember that in that self same statement you said that it was up to the House to have control over the use of photographs and the taking of photographs, though I noticed, that, Mr. Speaker, in exactly the same statement admittedly that you had allowed photographs to be taken on that opening day without, as far as I know, any authority or authorization from the House.

Mr. Speaker, what could be more natural, I suspect, in the minds of the public than to see a photograph of a member of the Legislature, a member of the Legislature who tends to be at this desk a fair amount, actually at his desk. Indeed, I noticed that even the member from the national house, from Regina West, chose to have picture taken of himself at his desk. Of course, Mr. Speaker, he chose to have the picture taken that depicts that he is a thousand miles down away from Mr. Speaker, at the very back of the House and nobody was there. He looked liked he showed up on a Sunday and perhaps had the wrong day. But even, Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina West, with the little political experience that he may have, realized that it was natural for people to see him working at his desk.

Mr. Speaker, I also suggest to you in relation to this part of my remarks that I don't know how I would have had any way of particularly knowing that you would have found some embarrassment because you had previously denied to some Conservative the right to have his picture. Well, Mr. Speaker, indicated to me in our private conversation that is was Conservative.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think the member is attempting to drag the Speaker into this. I did no such thing to the member in private. I said a member of another caucus, exactly as I said in the statement. I would prefer if the member would keep me out of his debate for whatever reasons he is bringing me into it.

MR. MERCHANT: — It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to keep you out of the debate when you so deliberately . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will ask the member to withdraw that statement because he is criticizing the chair.

MR. MERCHANT: — I withdraw that statement. Mr. Speaker, it seemed to us, no small coincidence, that the motion followed so quickly. I am satisfied, perhaps, that it was a coincidence I suspect, however, that for members of the public bearing in mind, as I am sure they do, that you are not only an NDP member of this Legislature, but also a former Cabinet Minister, that one motion following upon the other . . .

MR. ALLEN: — Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MERCHANT: — Are denying that he is a former Cabinet Minister? I see, I see. Well if you choose to deny that he is a former Cabinet Minister that is up to you. I thought he was a former Cabinet Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The subject matter before this House is a resolution which was tabled in the House before and it is this:

That this Assembly regrets the action of the Member from Regina Wascana in printing and distributing a leaflet containing a picture of that Member taken within the Assembly in contravention of the rules of the Assembly and orders the Member for Regina Wascana to return to all remaining copies of said leaflet to Mr. Speaker forthwith and to apologize to the Assembly.

That is the subject matter of the question and if the Member for Wascana insists on discussing other matters and not the subject matter of the motion before the House then I am going to have to rule him out of order.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, when I was addressing to myself to actions that surrounded the taking of that photograph and things that were said and done on that day, is that not germane? Now if Mr. Speaker finds that what I was saying . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, the member is now criticizing my ruling. I did not say anything about what the member was saying now. I was making the point of order with regard to the statement the member just made and the record will show that the member was discussing something that was not in the motion.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, when I was, when I sat down, I was discussing the perceptions that people in the public will have of this particular motion and the perceptions that people in the public will have as a result of what I am sure will be . . . oh, you will decide everything.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Let the public decide.

MR. MERCHANT: — Yes, I will and I also suggest to members of this House what the public will think when you use your steam roller majority. And I have the full right and will exercise that right to philosophize, if you like, about what I think the public will think and what the public thinks now of the way you constantly use your power as steam roller power in this House.

Mr. Speaker, on the day in question members will recall, there were, I would say, 20 to 25 various people in the public galleries, in the three galleries, taking photographs of one sort or another,

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not when this picture as taken.

MR. MERCHANT: — How do you know when that picture was taken? There were people taking photographs with lights; there were people taking photographs in all of the galleries — members of the public. I estimated that there were, I don't know, 20 or 25 people taking photographs.

One of the things, I suspect, that members would be interested in knowing is whether any or all of those photographers were authorized to take the photographs that they were taking. It certainly gave the appearance, Mr. Speaker, that for whatever reason on that day, all photographs were allowed. It was permissible for whatever reasons on that day to have the various photographs taken. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, may recall a conversation with the hon. member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) after that day, when the hon. member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) after that day, when the hon. member for Lakeview said in essence to Mr. Speaker, as the person presumably in charge of the House, what happened today that so many photographs were taken and that so many people were taking photographs in the House?

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that this party, at least, thought it would be of interest to members to know who the matter came to the attention first, of the House, and how the matter first came to the attention of Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague for Regina Lakeview . . .

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Certainly wasn't on opening day.

MR. MERCHANT: — It was on opening day.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It was on opening day?

MR. MERCHANT: — It was on opening day, or it was on Budget day. That was opening day, the same day. It was the same day.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should break off into little committees to discuss the day, eulogy day.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Regina Lakeview began to discuss the motivation for moving this motion and I think that members, before they decide how they will cast their vote on this motion, should consider the motivation. I suggest to you that the whole thing is a little contorted play of political games playing. We do a whole, almost performance, in this House.

I heard Mr. Speaker say the other day, of himself, that he holds some near quasi judicial function. We, as members, quite rightly treat Mr. Speaker with all sorts of deference of one sort of another, but as I was saying earlier, nobody — and I suggest no member of this House — ever forgets that Mr. Speaker, is, himself, an elected politician elected to one party and facing re-election in one year. We talk, Mr. Speaker, about members' privileges and the member for Rosemont raised this matter as a matter of his privileges, as though he takes offence. And that is the reason, he says, that he raised the matter.

I ask the members of the House whether that is very likely to be believed. My colleague behind me talks about him as the Assembly tattletale. Twice in three years that member has appeared in print. That is the kind of service he gives to Rosemont. Twice in three years he has been reported as even being a member of this House. Once making an accusation against the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) and now making an accusation against me.

Mr. Speaker, what purpose . . . yes, the highlight of what may be a short career. What purpose I ask, Mr. Speaker, would be the motivation for presenting this motion to the House? What purpose, indeed, is the motivation for a series of political gainsmanship that we've seen from members opposite against this party and against the Conservative Party. In this case, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's because the hon. member for Rosemont has some dream of growing into a political hatchet man. He worked as a political hireling, that was his job, he was a political hireling and then when he got elected he couldn't remember that now he had constituents to represent and matters of importance to deal with and he can't seem to remember that now he shares in part the responsibility of this province. Instead his aim is to go on being a political hatchet man that he was when he took money from a political party to do the bidding of that political party. It's quite an aim in life to be a political hatchet man. I say to the hon. member that as long as he

thinks of himself as nothing more than that political hireling, as long as he is incapable of raising his perception of himself then no one in public and no one in this House is going to raise their perception of him either.

Well, Mr. Speaker, whatever motivation the resident Legislative tattletale may have had in bringing up this matter, what about the merits of the hurt to the House. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you will seldom see a matter brought before you that grasps more furtively almost at trying to make a mountain out of a molehill. The pamphlet doesn't even say that it is taken in the Legislature. It's a picture that the public would say, what could be more natural than to have a photograph of the person doing the job that we elected him to do. Yet, members opposite, Mr. Speaker, would drag that down like stinky little alley cats down into the gutter where they can deal with it. It's sort of a boring and stupid motion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the motion itself. You know, I think members will want to think about the motion. Some members may want to think about the motion before you cast your vote in the flat political way that I am sure you will. Well, first, Mr. Speaker, the motion in the fourth line says, 'in contravention of the rules.' Well, of course, it's not in contravention of the rules. I notice that you, Mr. Speaker, were in no great rush to spring to your feet to correct that but it is not in contravention of the . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I will ask the member for Wascana to retract that statement about the Speaker springing to the defence of the member for Regina Rosemont. Order! I will ask the member for Wascana to retract the remarks that are on the record, that he just put on the record. Order, order! I will cite the citation:

The Speaker's action cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except a substantive motion.

The member was criticizing the Speaker's actions or lack of actions and I will ask the member to immediately withdraw that statement that he made.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I will hear from the member for Wascana. The record clearly shows what he said.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, having given an example of what I mean by springing to your feet, I ask you what you want me to withdraw and I'll repeat what I said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — If the member wishes I will get the record and I will make a statement in the House and the member can make the withdrawal then. Otherwise he can make the withdrawal right now. All right, I'll check the record and the member will make the appropriate move then.

MR. MERCHANT: — I will withdraw at that time, Mr. Speaker, anything that I am directed to withdraw. But I say to Mr. Speaker that I did not accuse Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The member may go on with his statement. He may not deal with the point of order now because I have already said I will look into the matter.

MR. MERCHANT: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I was commenting on the fact that the motion reads, 'in contravention of the rules', and clearly this is not in contravention of the rules and I think that's important for hon. members to remember. As I said earlier, it may well

be in contravention of a practice but it is not a practice that I suggest all hon. members were even familiar with, never mind knowing well enough not to fall foul of on a day when members were blinking from cameras going off in all of the galleries.

Now, the other thing, Mr. Speaker, is the request that all of the pamphlets be returned. Well, Mr. Speaker, fortunately in Regina East we have a great surplus of workers. We have good pamphlets and we have a lot of workers and I'm afraid that all of the pamphlets have been distributed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared just out of kindness and charity to the hon. member for Rosemont to give him some maps and lists where all of the pamphlets are because I can give him directions where he can go up and down the alley ways and to and from all the houses, about 26,000 of them and he can get all the pamphlets back. You know, I say to the hon. member, I'll bet a lot of them were in the garbage can until this stupid motion came and probably most of them have been retrieved and are better off than they ever were then, much better off then.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I in the spirit of brotherly love I'm even prepared to knock on some doors with the hon. member for Rosemont in his attempt to recover these pamphlets provided he asks for the pamphlets and I get to give the political speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier I'm sure that members opposite when this matter is finally resolved, will use their majority to pass whatever motion they decide. I some suppose of their supporters will be stupid enough to think somehow they scored some kind of a victory, but surely those supporters are scoring a very hollow victory. They think that in some way the little picky misinterpretation and twisting of these rules will have some effect on the outcome in Regina East, because people who are apt to see that I should be elected in Regina East are more apt to think I should be elected in Regina East if that crew decide that they should go out on some personal attack and then get at me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as this election approaches provincially, you watch because in the next year people will be watching you and judging this kind of stupid attack and they will watch the kind of things you have been doing in the last year because Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this motion taken with the half dozen similar kinds of motions that have come before this House in the last year or so, the motions, Mr. Speaker, which, with respect, have often times not by your intention embroiled you in things which you should not have been embroiled. Those kinds of motions and those kinds of attacks and ignoring the things that this province should be thinking about those kinds of things are doing more to demonstrate the NDP as tired old government and all of their policies and all of the stupid legislation they bring forward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — Everything in this House need not be political. Everything that members opposite in the government do need not be motivated by the kind of cheap politics that they demonstrate with this motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that you feel that the amendment is out of order, sorry, because there is further information that we would have said the public is entitled to have before they can judge the conduct in this case, before they can judge whether showing a member doing what he does

for the public, speaks in this House, represents them in this House and perhaps showing the member for Rosemont doing what he does for the money he gets from the public and then he acts like a political hatchet man. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the public would have been interested to compare those two things. The public would have been interested to have the information to decide but, Mr. Speaker, I know that the public isn't going to get that information because like the great steamroller that it is now and won't be after June of next year, like the great steamroller that it is now, members opposite will use their majority to pass whatever they like, whether it's clearly wrong because it says rules, or clearly stupid because it invites return of a delivered pamphlet.

I repeat that I apologize in the sense that I may have caused you some embarrassment. I think that it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite didn't have the good sense to leave the matter as Mr. Speaker put it, to leave the matter in the gentler hues, the gentler tones that Mr. Speaker used in saying that you had been embarrassed and in explaining how you came to be embarrassed. It's unfortunate that members opposite always decide, always think they can take anything, twist and distort it into some great political victory. You know, you don't win elections scoring little petty political victories, you win elections giving good government and I know that would be harder for you and I know you think you can eke it out with the little petty victories, but it won't wash. You haven't been washing, it won't wash in Regina East and it won't wash in June of 1979 when you next go to the polls.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, I want to address some very few comments on this matter. I had some doubt in my mind until I heard the last speech. I may say I found it outrageous, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I find it outrageous because I hear the suggestion coming from the wounded, from the member for Wascana who is wounded by these comments. I thought I heard the member for Wascana suggesting that that picture was taken on Budget Day. On a day when the place was full of people, on a day when there was — I did not see cameras going off but they may have been. I, Mr. Speaker, took a look at the picture and it seems to me that Budget Day was March 7 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know. I see the comments on Page 10 of March 6. The member for Wascana was suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the picture was taken when the Assembly was full of visitors, when the Assembly was full of people taking pictures. That wasn't in fact what happened, as the member well knows. That picture was not taken when this chamber was full of people with cameras, I noticed that when I saw the picture, because there are no chairs in the picture. In any case, the member did not speak on Budget Day. He spoke on March 6, the opening day. On that day the place was virtually deserted . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If I hear one more person get up and suggest that that picture was taken on Budget Day when the place was full of people, I am going to start calling them a liar. Because it was not taken when the place was full of people.

Mr. Speaker, it is actually irrelevant when it was taken because no one, by this motion, has condemned some innocent person who may have taken a picture not knowing the rules. What we are suggesting by this motion is, that it is most improper of the member for Wascana to use the picture; never mind when it was taken, The members of the public may not know whether or not they should take a picture on Budget day . . .

MR. CAMERON: — On opening day!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am using the words of the member for Wascana. I ask to be excused if I listened to the member for Wascana, because that is where my information came from as to when he thought it was taken. He said he thought it was taken when the Chamber was full of people and it wasn't. It was taken on a day when this Chamber was virtually deserted. Mr. Speaker, I have hoped that we would hear the member for Wascana get up and say he wasn't aware, he wasn't familiar with the rules, he wasn't aware it was against the rules to use the picture, and that he wouldn't use the pamphlets and he wouldn't use the picture again. Of course we haven't heard that, I suppose in part because the member for Wascana has not got the kind of humility to admit that he made a mistake. Instead having no defence, the hon. member for Wascana goes on the offensive; tried to attack the Speaker when not blunted by the rules of the House, not the practice, but the rules of the House, and then went on to attack the member for Rosemont. That is an easy way to argue, Mr. Speaker. It is easy to attack the person rather than his idea. It is very easy to attack . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He is suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it is proper for a member who knows the rules to flagrantly disregard them. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the member would get up and say that he did not know any better, he would apologize, he would invite us all to his bonfire for the pamphlets he would not use. I noted, Mr. Speaker, that he never suggested that those pamphlets were all handed out before he knew it was a violation of the rules.

MR. MERCHANT: — Yes they were.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well you did not say that on your feet, when it could have gone in the record. I would also liked to have heard from the member for Wascana an undertaking that that picture would not be used again. I did not hear that in his speech.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to drag into this debate a lot of extraneous material . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Don't press me for it, (laughter) I don't want to drag into this debate a lot of other matters that have irritated me. I just want to say to this House that I am bothered by the flagrant disregard of the rules which we have seen.

At the last session, Mr. Speaker, it was the members of the Conservative Party and I have to say, in deference to the members of the Conservative Party, they seemed to have cleaned up their act this session. They are much better behaved this session. I say to the member for Prince Albert that they are a little closer to deserving the mantle of John Diefenbaker than they were at the last session. Now we seem to see the same sort of flagrant disregard of the rules from the members of the Liberal Party, of the practice of the House, Mr. Speaker, the member for Wascana suggested that somehow this was being done in the House of Commons. I do not know the rules or the practice of the House of Commons. I saw one and it was Mr. Benjamin's and the member was right, I suspect it was taken on a Sunday. I suspect it was taken on a day when the House was not in session. That is something very different than using apparently a picture of the member when the House is in session.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't the rules that make a society civilized, it is the respect for those rules. I am bothered, as I was during the last session, when I saw a lack of respect from the members of the Conservative party. I am equally bothered when I see the members in the Liberal party show such a flagrant disregard for the rules of this House as to take a picture, apparently knowing it was wrong. He never said to the House that he though he had the right to use that picture, distributing all the pamphlets, then coming and attacking first yourself, Mr. Speaker, then the member for Rosemont. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion because I believe that the members of this House have to respect the rules. If we don't respect the rules, basically we don't respect the House. I say to the member for Wascana when he knowingly disregards the rules and takes those pictures and uses them, my guess is that other members of the House might also use pictures of themselves in here if it were allowed. My guess is the member for Wascana isn't the only one who wants to do it. If they disregard the rules, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me they disrespect the House and that's what I find objectionable in the conduct from the member for Wascana.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments in regard to this motion .I don't want to take too much time. I think that what we are engaged in this afternoon is what has become, unfortunately in the last year and a half in this Legislature, an emphasis more on what political points we can score rather than what our responsibility is as MLAs in this Chamber. Here we are wasting a couple of hours on a private member's day for something really that I don't think should have been brought up in the first place. First of all, let me say that there has been no rule whatsoever broken. This was mentioned in the motion. I looked through Beauchesne. I looked through our little green book. I could find nowhere in either of the records of rules by which we guide ourselves in this Assembly, as to what rule has been broken. There has been no rule broken.

What has happened is that a practice which over the years has been a custom in this House, has been put into question. Why was that practice there? Why is no one allowed to take pictures in the galleries? The reason why most members of this Assembly have not allowed those pictures to be taken is for the fear that a picture may be taken by an opponent and used in a campaign against that particular member. That's basically the reason for the stipulation that is there, not a rule but an agreement by members in this House.

What has happened in this case here? I could certainly see us as MLAs getting excited about someone taking a picture in the gallery, for example, if a member has taken a picture of Mr. Merchant and showed him a very difficult way that would be embarrassing to his constituents, and then was using that particular picture because of political gain out on the hustings. That, Mr. Speaker, and members of this Assembly, I think is something that we should get ourselves involved in and concerned about. But that's not the case. That's not the case. A member has taken the use of a picture of himself and he himself is using that particular picture in the campaign and throughout the province. So that particular picture is not breaking any kind of an agreement or stipulation or . . . not a rule but a feeling that this House has in regard to protect other members. He is using it of himself, and I might mention as well, that I am sure that he has received the agreement from the member for Shaunavon, agreement from the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg to also appear in that picture. I am sure that if those two members were aggrieved by that particular picture being in that paper, they

would have possibly taken strong exception to it and might have raised a motion similar to the one from Mr. Allen, or had stood up in this debate and spoken in support of this particular motion.

Mr. Chairman, we have more important things to do than to talk about something as ridiculous as this. Another point is that particular day, the opening day of the Legislature, not Budget Day, the opening day of the Legislature is when that particular picture was taken. As was said, there were about 25 camera in the galleries that particular day. What position would I be in as a member if my picture was taken that particular day and it appeared in the Leader Post? I am sure that there were some pictures that appeared in the various papers throughout the province on opening day. What would have happened then if I would have used a picture that appeared in the Leader Post in one of my campaign pamphlets? Would I be dragged before this Assembly as Mr. Merchant is today? Would I be ridiculed by all members of this House, not for breaking a rule, but because I happened to take a picture that appeared somewhere else and used it in campaign material? This just shows how ridiculous this entire debate is and how ridiculous that motion is. No member's privacy or no member's honor has been hurt by that particular picture being used. Had it been used in regard to what all of us hold as the reason why we do not like to see pictures in the gallery, I would have no objection to supporting this particular motion. But because of the light in which it is presented, because of the fact that there really is no rule that has been broken and I defy the next speaker from the government side of the House to quote to me what rule has been broken. I think we're wasting an awful lot of the taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN ((Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments about this at some future time and beg leave to adjourn debate.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 10

Malone	Wiebe	Merchant
Penner	Cameron	Anderson
Stodalka	McMillan	Nelson (As-Gr)
Clifford		

NAYS — 30

Blakeney	Thibault	Bowerman
Smishek	Romanow	Messer
Snyder	Byers	Baker
Robbins	MacMurchy	Mostoway
Banda	Whelan	Kaeding
Kwasnica	Dyck	McNeill
MacAuley	Feschuk	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Shillington	Vickar
Skoberg	Allen	Koskie
Johnson	Thompson	Lusney

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I'm sure the members opposite will appreciate how flattered I am at your vocal request for my continuance in this debate. I know that if you hang on the edge of your seats waiting for my every word and it certainly doesn't surprise me that you could have left the situation pass for a few days until I might better prepare myself. Once again, I thank you for that and it is as well a pleasure to respond to all those happy smiling faces across the way. I don't particularly know what went on in your caucus lounge while the bells were ringing but whether you all became diseased emotionally or physically, I don't know. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I never considered this supposed breach of practice to be very serious. As a matter of fact, when I initially saw the pamphlet after it was brought to my attention by the Speaker and the member for Regina Rosemont, I must say I was rather impressed with the picture of the member for Regina Wascana. It's a picture that I'm sure many of the backbenchers on that side of the House would never have the opportunity to have taken . . . because so few of the members participate in debates in this Legislature. And I'm sure if the member for Rosemont as a result of this debate ever decided he'd like his photo snapped in the Legislature that he indeed, would have to get a quick camera man and in fact, I'm sure the member would have to get a touch-up artist to remove the tears that are so generally on his face when he rises in his chair and to fix up the scowl that is generally on his face when he gets up to make these hard-hitting points such as the motion that he has put on the blues. I would like to ask members of the legislature as well, it is no surprise to me that members on that side of the House only come to their sense on rare occasions. It is like a bolt of lightening, you can be expected to be hit by it once or twice in your lifetime if you stand under a tree in a thunderstorm all the time. It is no surprise to me that members on that side of the House have only finally realized that, in fact, they are having photographs taken of members of the legislature on more than one occasion. I would bring to the attention, well I am glad to see that you have all finally awakened, I was hoping that we wouldn't have to wait until seven o'clock this evening to get your eyelids open and your attention back in this legislature. The bells woke them perhaps and that is an encouraging sign because many, many times previously that has failed to do the trick.

I would like to point out to members of this Legislature that while we are on the midst, at least the government is in the midst of trying to politically steamroller one member of this Legislature with this 39 vote majority or 38, I guess we shouldn't count the Speaker in this attack. I wonder if they wouldn't consider approaching some of the other people that have been involved in picture-taking sessions, sordid picture-taking sessions of this Legislative Assembly while members were in their seats. I refer specifically to the member for Saskatoon Eastview who has been badly done by, by members of the photographic gallery in Saskatchewan when he, in fact, and I might add, mind you at this time I am much younger and sprightlier looking than the member for Estevan.

In 1975, November 13 opening up the Legislature when people in Saskatchewan, probably professional photographers, and I am sorry to say, then certainly those members that were absent on that day can be exonerated from any guilt associated with having your picture taken while you are in your seats. In fact, Mr. Speaker, members of this Legislative Assembly have on many occasions previously had their pictures taken while they have been in their seats, pictures that have honestly been shown in public publications. Circulations that have not only gone to my seat and your

seat but the seats of the member for Rosemont, etc.

I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a situation which I find even more horrifying. That undoubtedly, without your knowledge, someone has snapped your picture at your desk in this Legislature and is currently handing that picture out down at the front desk in this Legislative Assembly office and I know that those few members on that side of the House who are currently awake will find this situation just as bad as the situation that surrounds the member for Wascana. I am not sure if there is a of authority needed. There seems to be some serious question about what exactly the practice is with respect to taking pictures in this Legislature. According to the Speaker, whose rule this side of the House will never challenge, there is no such thing as a rule preventing members of the Legislature from having their pictures taken in their seats. The Speaker said that decision is to be made by the Legislature as the whole. I am sure no one was breaking the rule when they snapped the Speaker's picture at his chair in this Legislative Assembly. The Speaker's office promptly had that picture blown up into a calendar to be handed out at the front desk . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I would remind the member that that is not the subject that is before the House for discussion at this time. I would also remind the member that the Speaker's actions cannot be criticized, incidentally in debate, or on any form of proceeding, except a substantive motion. I would ask the member to acknowledge that and abide by that particular rule.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.