

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 31, 1980

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN VOTE 26 (continued)

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I'd like to call the committee back to order. We're dealing with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . for a minute. We're not totally familiar with DNS, but we have listened to the debates, I think, for five years. We've heard innuendoes and accusations — maybe some half truths, maybe some full truths — over the years; some of our members, and also some of the third party which used to be in the House, accusing DNS of somewhat less than a good management in northern Saskatchewan. I think, like most of the members of this legislature, we are all respected and elected a little bit on integrity and honesty in our various constituencies, and for the life of me I cannot figure out why the government member would leave a minister hung up the way they're leaving this minister hung up here tonight — something which was caused by the former minister of DNS, who was a part of the mismanagement of DNS since its inception. How the members on that side — after Judge Ted Noble made a statement — how you can honestly sit there and not go along in supporting this motion calling for a judicial inquiry.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is that why you fired him, Ted?

MR. LARTER: — I can't believe . . . I know there are going to be many NDP supporters throughout the province, in our constituencies, who are going to just shake their heads in disbelief that you won't let this completely out in the open and clear these people. You are casting a shadow on every member of DNS by not going along with this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — There are many hundreds of dedicated employees working for DNS and we know, from talking to these people over the past few years, they don't want to be part of anything shady. And they know there's shadiness going on, whether it's intentional or not intentional. It's still a very badly run Department of Northern Saskatchewan. And it's not just the people of the North we want to answer to. We want to answer to all the people of Saskatchewan because . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — . . . because our tax dollars are going into the North and I'm sure that as well as the people of the North, the people of the South don't want to be part of anything that is other than straight honest government.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very, very disappointed if the backbenchers don't get up and urge not only the minister of DNS, but also the Attorney General, to reverse their position on this issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I want to hear from Elwood.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I just wish to detract a little bit from the direction the debate has taken on the opposite side of the House and introduce a few facts to the debate, unreasonable as that may seem to members opposite, as unconcerned as they are about the facts. I'd like to point out that on Friday I said the matters which led to an investigation and subsequently to charges occurred in 1976. I did not say that an investigation occurred in 1976.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Boy, you said it.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — No, I didn't On page 1239, referring to what the member for Thunder Creek claimed the judge said, I said and I quote:

The member for Thunder Creek errs when he says the judge says something is happening. That is not what the judge said. He said, was at the time of the matter which resulted in charges being laid against several people — was. The date, the member knows, was 1976.

Mr. Chairman, the dates re important because of the innuendoes and allegations made by the member for Thunder Creek. I also read into the record today (and I think for a change the member for Thunder Creek was here for most of the day) that August 1976 was when the program, which resulted in the events, which resulted in the investigation, began. In September and October 1976 payments were made by CMHC for work at Cumberland House. Then in February 1977 the Department of Northern Saskatchewan began an internal investigation. It wasn't until the department asked in May 1977 that the RCMP became involved in the investigations and it was not until the fall of 1978 that charges are laid. I think it's important to recognize it was the fall of 1978 when charges were laid.

The member referred, if I remember correctly, to a grant made to Howard Thompson in the spring of 1978. Four charges had been laid. I want to say to him that that grant was part of a program — a program that the opposition has had an opportunity to examine in DNS estimates and in public accounts for at least five years. The program is entitled the fish transportation and price support subsidies in program. It has in it a total amount of \$500,000, which goes to a total of over 1,200 fishermen and is distributed on the basis on the amount of their catch of certain species.

Howard Thompson was, in 1977, a fisherman on Ile-a-la-Crosse Lake in addition to being a contractor. That year he caught 31,865 ponds of northern pike which were eligible for the fish support subsidy and he caught an additional 975 pounds of other species which were not eligible for the price support subsidy but were eligible for the transport subsidy. First, 31,865 pounds of northern pike at 2 cents a pound for a total of \$637.30. Total catch, including the 975 pounds ineligible for price support subsidy was 32,840 pounds at the transport subsidy of 2.5 cents a pound for a total of \$821. Together the total is \$1,458.30. These grants are shown and are included under the estimates and in the budget and in the public accounts are economic development grants.

Whether or not a fisherman was under investigation for something or other would not make any difference in whether or not he was eligible for these grants because at the end of the year the total production of each fisherman is added up and that total production times whatever the subsidy is, goes out to him in a cheque. No application is required. And to suggest that a fisherman under investigation is not eligible for final payments for his catch is equivalent to suggesting that a farmer under investigation

should not get his final payments from the wheat board. That's nonsense. That's absolute nonsense. At the time of the payment, he had not been charged. Although the members don't believe it, I do believe that our system of justice is correct when it says an individual is innocent until proven guilty . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

What I said was that the events which led to the investigation occurred in 1976 and that's when they did occur. I did not say any charges were laid in 1976. I said the events, which led to the charges, occurred in 1976. The charges were laid in the fall of 1978 (which I remind members I read into the record this afternoon). That they insist on refusing to deal with matters such as this particular grant which are matters for consideration in the estimates, which are matters included in the estimates proposed by the departments of this House. They insist on taking that grant, tying it to a judge's decision, which occurred two years later, and saying, oh there's a connection; that's evidence of graft and corruption. But the member refuses — the member dares not pick up the challenge of the Attorney General and place on iota of evidence of graft and corruption. He accused the entire department of graft and corruption. He says it is rampant throughout the department and yet has not one shred of evidence to support his statements. He dared not take up the challenge of the Attorney General.

I say, Mr. Chairman, and I continue to say, this entire exercise by the PCs is a smokescreen; a smokescreen to remove from scrutiny their own ineptitude, their own inability to do the research necessary to really examine the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. It was exemplified, most recently, by their leader, Grant Devine, this afternoon in Prince Albert. Their leader in Prince Albert claiming the budget for the department was \$61 million a year.

Now, it doesn't take a great deal of intelligence to open this book to find out what the estimates of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are. I say, that's an example on the part of leader of this Devine research group as the quality of research they are capable of doing and that reflects on the credibility. They continue what has to be done for an outstanding example of record-breaking shameful performance for an opposition in any legislature in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope the member across will mind their manners a little bit and listen for a change.

Mr. Chairman, today, this afternoon in particular, six different times, once from the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, five times from the Attorney General, I have heard an accusation from that side of the House, from those members, accusing us of wanting to deny certain individuals their rights.

Mr. Chairman, there isn't a member on that side of the House who should have the gall to talk about denial of the rights and freedoms of the individual. Not one single member should open his mouth on that side to talk about the rights or freedoms of an individual.

Mr. Chairman, there is hardly a piece of legislation in this province passed by that government which hasn't and doesn't, in one way or another, deny rights and freedoms of an individual.

Mr. Chairman, I could talk about just about every act we have in this province, but let's just talk about a few. What about labor legislation in this province? What about The Trade Union Act? Mr. Chairman, what about The Expropriation Act — the amendments to that act which were passed in this Assembly last year? Mr. Chairman, let's talk about The Natural Products Marketing Act this government has passed in this province where they will fine or put a farmer in jail before they give him an opportunity to defend himself. Mr. Chairman, let's talk about the telecommunications act, the way it stands and the way they want to amend it this year.

Mr. Chairman, let's even talk about, as the member for Wilkie has talked about in this House already this year, the rights of the individual. What about the rights of handicapped? He has been asking you to come up with a solution and an answer under the motor vehicles act. And what about the human rights commission in this province, Mr. Chairman? They want to talk about the rights of the individual. They have a lot of nerve and a lot of gall to talk about them. Even further than that, in every case, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about rights when charged under those acts, the individual has no right to appeal to a higher court because it denied him the opportunity under the acts I am referring to.

So, those people sitting across there should never, ever talk about anyone denying the rights and freedoms of any individual in this province, because those rights, those freedoms have been denied every individual in this province by this government. They have done a marvellous job today of deflecting attention from the issue that's before the House, before this committee. They haven't at any time defended their position the way they should have tried to defend it. The Attorney General has attempted in many cases, in many ways to change, to deflect, to misinterpret or misrepresent what was . . . in fact, just let me point to the motion itself.

The Attorney General has all afternoon referred to the motion the way it's been presented in this House. Well, if the Attorney General had been here Friday he would have known that the motion itself reads (and I will read it for him, because obviously he hasn't taken the time to read it):

That this Assembly . . . urge the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately commence a public judicial inquiry; that the public judicial inquiry be chaired by Mr. Justice Noble, into the operations of, and administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Where, in that motion, may I ask, does it refer to the individual we're talking about? Because although the motion was written differently, it was agreed by the members on this side, when the Chairman last Friday suggested that the motion was not in order, that there was a preamble and if the preamble was eliminated he would accept the motion. It was agreed. So the motion does not refer to the individual at all, Mr. Attorney General. Had you been here Friday or had you read what was in Hansard and done your homework on it you would have known differently.

The Minister of Northern Saskatchewan keeps trying to justify his position by talking about dates. Mr. Minister, the member for Thunder Creek asked you several times this afternoon to answer the \$1,450-some payment to the member in 1977-78 public accounts. Tonight you tried to justify those payments. You didn't make any mention of those payments this afternoon. You made no attempt to tell this opposition what the payments were for, because you thought this afternoon had nothing to do

with timing. By your own admission tonight you talk about the year being 1976. You refer to the paragraph where the date the member knows was 1976, but further down as self-declared well-informed expert on this case you will know that the individual from the department who was involved was dismissed in 1976.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Different individual.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, where before that are we talking about a different individual? You show me in that Hansard where you were talking about a different individual than the one the member for Thunder Creek was talking about. It isn't there. It is a figment of your own imagination. Are you trying to tell me now that the case did not start until 1977 or 1978, that you had nothing, that you had made no inquiries into it in 1976 when you are referring to it? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's what you said Friday. Get your facts straight. Once you have your facts straight and once you stop trying to mislead the members of this House, perhaps then we'll have some credibility; perhaps we'll be able to believe some of the statements you're making.

Mr. Chairman, I may suggest to the members of this House the way this motion reads (and I wish the Attorney General would take note of the way the motion reads) it has nothing to do with the individuals. We have repeatedly said in this House that we do not want to discuss the four individuals not brought to trial yet or the one who has been charged. We are talking about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan; we're talking about the mess the department is in; we're talking about the potential fraud and the potential mess that the whole department is in. That's why we want a judicial inquiry and if any member votes against that motion they'd be derelict in their duties.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, there are just a few comments I want to make on this. First of all to the minister who was so busy this afternoon telling us what questions we should be asking. I would say to you, Mr. Minister, the sooner you get on with giving a few of the answers that my colleagues have been asking for, the sooner we will be able to progress in this House. After all, our job is to ask the questions. Your job is to supply the answer and we are waiting for your answers at this point in time.

And to the Attorney General — I heard the Attorney General talk about, time after time, childish behaviour. I would like to remind you, Mr. Attorney General, that the first one to start the childish comments in this Chamber this afternoon was the man sitting right opposite who said to my colleague, will you shut up and sit down. Those were the first comments of a childish nature that were uttered in here today.

We want to find out something about the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Judge Noble has said that there was a bureaucracy which has run amuck. The Attorney General takes great exception to this statement. That's what I am interested in, Mr. Minister, and you can give me the answers for these questions. I understand that at one time you were an employee of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I want to know if you were a part of that bureaucracy which was running amuck. I haven't heard in this House yet how long you worked for that department, when you were let go and the reason for your dismissal. I'd like the answers for that now.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I worked for the department from approximately March 1972 until June 1973. I was let go because I was insubordinate not because I engaged in dirty tactics like the members opposite.

MR. TAYLOR: — That's fine. Insubordinate is quite a wide-ranging term. Would you go a little further and tell us about your insubordination to the department?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — No, Mr. Chairman, I will not.

MR. TAYLOR: — That's just typical of the kinds of responses. You said you were insubordinate. I am asking you to tell me in what you were. Why don't you tell us this? Come on. Answer the questions. You told me a few minutes ago you would.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, again I must point out to members of the House how childish and absolutely lacking in substance this questioning is. The member has told the minister 1972 to 1973. I believe the rules of the House on estimates are that we are dealing with the year's perspective and generally thought to be the year retroactive the most immediate prior to this year. This gentleman wants to go back to 1972-73. I ask again, Mr. Chairman, what relevance has this to the issue of the department's spending estimates? I repeat again, this is indeed a very poorly researched caucus and very childish indeed.

MR. TAYLOR: — I can't believe what I'm hearing. This man is the minister of that department now and he was let go for insubordination. You say it has nothing to do with it; I can't understand that. And also it is my understanding that on subvote 1 we can ask wide-ranging questions and we are not held to the year under review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think that the point raised by the Attorney General is a good one. I ask you to try to confine your remarks to questions under the year under review, last year, the motion that's before us. I think that the questions of an individual member and what he was doing in 1973 aren't really particularly germane to this committee.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — When you are talking about year under review, you are referring to the Crown corporations. Would you mind telling me when and where the rule is that says we have to discuss and stick with the year of the estimates that are being discussed in this assembly tonight? Because the estimates we are discussing are the estimate for the year 1980-81 and for the last two days the members opposite have been talking about a case that goes back to 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I said in my remarks that the thing we are really discussion here is this motion. When we deal with this motion, we can move on. Pardon? We are dealing with the estimates of the department. We generally deal with this year's estimates, how they relate to last year. I have not been ruling it particularly out of order. I think that on this particular motion what we should be dealing with is this motion and if you can relate it to the motion, fine.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, what's that got to do with the year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, I'm not going to go into a long explanation.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I can't see this when on the other side of the House they're talking back to 1975 and 1976 and all of a sudden, the ruling is we should be on this year under review and this man was an employee of that department. It's stated by a judge that the department was running amuck. He was part of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and I want to know why he was let go. I want to know what your reasons were, why you were put out of that department.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What are you doing back in it now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I've already ruled that question out of order.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments I'd like to add to this debate. We are only asking, not for that much, just to have the true facts forward. We're asking for an inquiry. The Attorney General happens to think it's a big joke. I'll tell you what's the biggest joke. The performance the Attorney General put on in this chamber this afternoon could have aired on Sesame Street and the kids would have enjoyed it. But the parents, the taxpayers, would not appreciate it. The people of Saskatchewan want the facts. We want the facts.

We're just talking about the motion, O.K., and I'll go back to what I had stated the other day. Justice Ted Noble said, in passing sentence, he would have sent — and the one thing I will not do in this Chamber is bring up names as the Attorney General did this afternoon — Mr. X to jail were it not for the involvement of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in the fraud. Now, Mr. Attorney General, nowhere in this House, at no time did we bring the names forward. You brought them forward. You started going in the back alleys of politics again. You started doing the number on the people. It wasn't the PC Party. You're at fault.

Mr. Attorney General, and Mr. Chairman, and especially, Mr. Minister, what do you think gave your department the right to break federal regulations? And just so that you don't say I'm reaching for pies in the sky, I'll quote Justice Ted Noble again, "broke regulations." Noble also said the department broke federal regulations by paying for the work before it was completed, and I would like to stop right there.

Never in a business, and this Saskatchewan government should be starting to be run like a business, do you pay for a job before it's done. He questioned why cheques made out jointly to the Cumberland House owners and Mr. X were cashed without the homeowner's signature. Now, Mr. Chairman, we're talking about making out cheques, cashing cheques without the authority of the people to whom the cheques pertained. We're asking for an inquiry. We're presenting our case and the Attorney General is trying to skate on the facts and change the direction of where our debate is going. You know that for a fact, Mr. Attorney General.

My colleague from Regina said about the rights of people, Mr. Attorney General, that we're concerned about all the people of Saskatchewan, even the handicapped people, who, Mr. Attorney General, I don't think you're concerned about and you know what I'm talking about.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Thunder Creek was very kind to you, I think, this afternoon when he talked about what was out in the pasture. I want to make a little comment to make the Attorney General smile again, because he knows his government is buried on this situation. Well, the Indian people of Saskatchewan, the very fine Indian people of Saskatchewan, who the PC Party happens to believe in and their rights, have a word for it, Mr. Attorney General. It is tatashame and that is just what we are getting from this government, a government which is trying to hide the facts and keep the people of Saskatchewan from finding out. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the motion:

That the committee urge the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately

commence a public judicial inquiry, chaired by Mr. Justice Noble (a man who has already been reviewing the facts) into the operation and administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Attorney General, I have heard you stand up in this House and spout off that the PCs are on a witch hunt. Do you know who is on a witch hunt in this House? It is the Attorney General; that is the fellow who is on the witch hunt.

Then it was brought up this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, about the PCs trying to get off the issue; we were trying to change the topic. It wasn't the PC government which runs the shoe box administration in Department of Northern Saskatchewan; it's the present NDP government. What does surprise me, Mr. Chairman, is when a former employee is let go or fired from DNS is elected (and how he got elected is beyond me) and is now the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. I would like to know who started this corruption? Was this his to start and now he wants to skate out of it? No one wants to give us the answers; yet the Attorney General is ready to stand up in the House and come down on the members, the PC members, and drag their names through the dirt, through the back alleys of politics. The Attorney General knows what I am talking about. But yet when the lights and the cameras are rolling, the Attorney General is performing. I tell you this, Mr. Attorney General, you are ready to throw dirt on the PCs and our new leader, Grant Devine. I will tell you one thing, he does believe in God and the family; I wonder if you can say the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking for too much; we are only asking for a public inquiry to get the snakes from underneath the rocks in DNS.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for Thunder Creek, while he is about ready to get up to speak, would be kind enough to give the House the full particulars of his allegation this afternoon that there was graft and corruption in the department? I wonder if he is prepared to give the evidence upon which he bases that statement, before the House? He has had the supper hour to consider this. This is a very serious allegation, for that matter repeated in an indirect way, although I dismiss his as being not serious, by the member for Wilkie when he talked about corruption. I do want to ask the hon. member for Thunder Creek if he would be kind enough to indicate to us where the graft and the corruption is located in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan/

MR. THATCHER: — Act four, scene three. Well, I think as I commented from my seat as my colleague for Wilkie was making reference to the Attorney General on Sesame Street, I think I indicated kids are a little smarter than that.

Mr. Attorney General, you are the one who has had two hours and so has the minister over there had two hours. And honestly if all I could do in two hours, with access to all those officials, all those people up in La Ronge, all those telephone calls which I am sure went to La Ronge in those two hours, I would do one of two things: I would (a) fire my officials making those calls and giving me advice, or (b) I would resign. Obviously you haven't done either. That is the best that you could come up with in two hours. Then the Attorney General got up and said, where is your evidence?

Well, Mr. Attorney General, if you would like to me to step outside this House and make this statement, same statement that I made in the Assembly, that if you hold an independent public inquiry there will be graft and corruption exposed in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, (you bet it'll be exposed and if it's not exposed I'll resign my seat), I'll say it. I think they'll quote me anyway so I don't think it's

necessary. You better believe it because that explanation of the \$1,500 was the most pathetic, horrible, ridiculous explanation I have ever had the misfortune to hear. In fact, it was so bad I know now why the Minister of the Environment, the former member of the DNS, fired this minister. I would have fired him too with a performance like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — ... his explanation as to why this guy was paid \$23,000 — that one, my goodness, that one. Then the minister takes out his Hansard and he points bravely to page 1239 and talks about how he's misquoted. Honestly the member knows the date. This is the minister talking. He says — the date the member knows was 1976. What more can we say. And, Mr. Attorney General, do you want to hear the chapter and verse? Do you want to hear the evidence. You hold that judicial public inquiry and you'll have all the evidence you want. Except there's only one problem, you people will have to call an election and you'll be out there. You won't be the one who is doing it. You won't be the one who is doing any prosecution.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know where the former deputy minister is, the present member for Regina Lakeview. He's the guy who was there in 1975. I noticed it in some of the public accounts I've had occasion to peruse. I have been interested in some of his comments as he explained things like a \$600,000 overpayment in Buffalo Narrows. How 50 per cent of the population in one town — I'm not sure of the town — had access to an overpayment of 50 per cent. That was in the 1975 public accounts. I would like to know where he's been in this debate. He knows quite a bit about the DNS. He comes in., he makes some comments from his seat and then he sneaks out. I'd like to know where the former minister — the minister who was in charge when all this business, when the whole thing blew up, the one who fired the present minister — I'd like to know where he's been. I'd like to know when he's going to get up to debate. I'd like to see where the rest of the artillery is. I'm not really interested in hearing about the small fry from Regina North-West or you know. . . I'd like to know where the normal heavy artillery is. Why they are not in here backing up a minister who is being hung out to dry. I'll tell you why they're not here, because they know you're in trouble in this one. They know doggone well we're dead right and you're dead wrong. You can rail as you want. You can play your Sesame Street performance all you want — but not only on this side, everybody over there knows full well that if you call that judicial independent public inquiry you boys are game over, because there's a horror story in the DNS. There's such a horror story there your 45 seats aren't worth the powder to blow them up. You're gone. It was an independent public inquiry and that's why you won't do it.

Mr. Attorney General, you can get up and you can make all your assertion for evidence and I'll repeat it again. If you want me to go outside, I'll say it. We have done this bit about walking outside once this week and nothing came out of that one. I don't think much would come of that but let me tell you, you can call that thing if what I say isn't true I'll resign my seat. On the other hand, if it is true, let's see you resign yours. Let's see you pick one up for a change. Let me see if you've got the guts to call it, and you won't call it. You won't call it because you know darn well what's there. The Minister of the Environment knows what's there. That's why he's not getting up in this debate. The present minister — he knows what's there and that's why he's going in circles.

Mr. Attorney General, you're feeling a little sheepish today because the Chairman pulled you into a bad one. You had something rehearsed and the Chairman blew it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! There's no question whatsoever to the Chairman on the

rulings in this House.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, it is respectfully withdrawn. Respectfully. The Attorney General blew it. You had to stand up and you recited some names. You blew it the moment you did and the moment you did it you knew you'd blown it. Because you know darn well what everyone of those four people are coming to trial . . . their defence lawyer is going to be screaming prejudice! They're going to be screaming in advance that their . . . Nonetheless, Mr. Attorney General, you know darn well it's going to affect something and you blew it there. You don't need to be an expert on law to know it. And now we've had to listen to some of these performances because you blew on in your official capacity as the chief legal officer.

I want to say to this government again, and I want to say to that minister over there, you know what's there — it's a horror story. You haven't got the guts to call an independent judicial inquiry because you know you're done if you do. The only way you'll do it, if we ever do force one, is if it's rigged. That's the only way you'll do it, and I doubt if you'll do it then. But to do it independently, to get in a chief justice and give him the proper powers in accordance with the British parliamentary tradition — you're not going to do it, 44 seats or not. You're done if you do it. That's why you won't and that's why the Attorney General is trying to deflect it. And that's why this new rookie minister stayed in his chair for the past two hours this afternoon. And honestly, when we talk about \$1,500 in '77, \$23,000 in '76 — with that amount of time and that many people consulting you, that many phone calls to La Ronge — I'm sure that's the best you could come up with. If that isn't a bureaucracy running amuck — Mr. Justice Noble was right on. He was completely right on it's almost scary. It's almost scary.

And now I want to hear from the former minister who was the minister in charge. I'd like to see him get up on his feet and talk to this. I'd like to see the former deputy who was there. I want to see the member for Regina Wascana perhaps sneak from the back room and take his seat and have him get up. He's not a bureaucrat. No, he can talk.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Lakeview. Lakeview.

MR. THATCHER: — Alright, Regina Lakeview, excuse me. Pardon me, excuse me. I want to see that minister, that supposedly highly-rated minister that's whispered to be the successor to the Premier. I want to see him get up on his feet.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Coax him a bit.

MR. THATCHER: — Yeah, you know we never see him. We've heard a lot of rhetoric about how great he is. He gets up on some simple questions, but let's hear him get up. He was there. They're not going to get up. They're not going to get up because every one of them over there knows that they're in trouble on this one. You know what's there if you call it. You know exactly what's there if you call it. You haven't got the guts to call it. What more can I say?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of points as result to the hon. member for Thunder Creek. Yes, I'm going to challenge him to say what he said — outside the legislature. And this is a challenge which I will take up on — to hear his words exactly outside the House. I also say to the member of this House that it's incumbent upon every member who makes an allegation of criminality — that is what graft and corruption implies, allegation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about fraud?

MR. ROMANOW: — And fraud. The same thing, that's criminology.

MR. THATCHER: — I'll stand with Mr. Justice Noble any day.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'm saying to you, Mr. Chairman, I'm saying to that man, talk about guts. You phony up the facts if you've got the guts. You tell us what your facts are. Don't get up and make sweeping statements, trying to bring in all kinds of people. You get in here and you tell us what the facts are. And I want to tell the hon. member what I said this afternoon, that when criminal charges are being involved, the proper way to do this relates to the criminal investigation, the police the judge and the decisions. If, after that, a public inquiry is warranted and evidence of which, you say will be there, is or isn't produced, your words are going to be on this record.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You bet.

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, you bet. I say to you, not one of you has the decency or the guts or the honesty to get up to give us one single shred of evidence of the kind of blanket accusations you're making. The member for Estevan got up earlier today and said we're casting a shadow on every employee. Who's casting a shadow on every employee? Who's casting it? Who presented this motion? Whop resented this motion after all of these speeches about the cases? Who presented it? I'll tell you what the motion says. On page 1257 the motion says:

I would like to move, seconded by the member for Thunder Creek:

That this Assembly being advised through a report of a judgment in the Court of Queen's Bench that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan actively and passively co-operated in a fraud . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. State your point of order.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General is intentionally misleading this House by quoting that motion now. That motion, as was stated after, was a preamble to the motion and was withdrawn by this side. What is the motion as it stands on the books today? What is it, Mr. Attorney General?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I think that's a question of debate. He's merely saying what he thinks.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I was saying in my remarks and I repeat again this motion I was about to read was placed on the order paper on Friday.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not the preamble?

MR. ROMANOW: — No, no. They don't want the preamble now. It was placed on the order paper Friday precisely for the reason I say. Look at the Friday debate and read it. I have read everything about the Friday debate. Since the hon. member for Kindersley got up and started to put his Canadian Press story together (which by the way I might add is what the member for Wilkie today interchangeably referred to as the judgment by Mr. Justice Noble and it is not, it's a Canadian Press report) . . . If you read the report on

Friday, all of the speeches, it culminates with the very last piece of business — that motion which has been presented. It's true the Chairman says drop the preamble. The preamble may or may not have been dropped. But that does not detract from my proposition. My proposition is that the motion is rooted and predicated in the Thompson case of which the Canadian Press has made mention and rooted in the allegations of malicious and active participation in the fraud operation. And you know it. If anybody is intentionally misleading the House, it's the hon. member opposite and not myself. I want to tell the hon. members opposite that when you people don't have the guts to stand up and give us facts; when the member for Thunder Creek, this so-called self-styled fighter who stands on principles of man, doesn't have any facts whatsoever to put before this legislature, I say shame on you and shame on the PC opposition opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — You're the one. The record will show tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, You'll have an opportunity to respond. You're out of order. Call on the Attorney General.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I was saying that tomorrow . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, do I have the floor? Mr. Chairman, I am saying tomorrow when the transcript of what the hon. member for Thunder Creek is printed, I'll guarantee the hon. member for Thunder Creek made an accusation about the employees.

MR. THATCHER: — I'll say it outside the House; sue me!

MR. ROMANOW: — You say it.

MR. THATCHER: — I'll say it. You can count on it.

MR. ROMANOW: — You say it outside the House and I want you to tell me . . .

MR. THATCHER: — And I want you to sue me tomorrow. Personally, not the government, personally.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member opposite, you repeat outside those allegations, you show the press the degree of facts which you put in there. I tell you it will be a joke, just like you guys are laughing here. You people are treating this as a joke. The fact is you are playing this cavalierly with four or five people in court. You are absolutely treating it in the most cavalier way.

I say, Mr. Chairman, to the members of this House, I have been around for 13 years. Yes, I have been and I have seen some arguments and some debates — even the shoe box debate, so-called — and I have never seen the kind of despicable performance of an opposition I have seen here tonight in this kind of an operation. Not once! I have never seen, Mr. Chairman, repeated yelling from opposite the floor, as I just did from the Rosthern, trying to shout me down, pure and simple; as the member for Thunder Creek has been doing all afternoon; as all of them have been doing, standing and pounding paper. I have never seen it like this before, Mr. Chairman. Why? Because the Royal Canadian Mounted Police has been in here doing a full job . . . Oh, the hon. member for Indian Head says, here we go again. You tell us what you would have better than the RCMP; you tell us what you would have better than the courts of

Saskatchewan; you tell us what your alternatives are.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I would like to caution the members to try and keep a little bit of decorum as we are going on here, and let the Attorney General finish his remarks at a sensible noise level and then we'll call on the other side of the House.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of thing, on Friday, which I think is despicable. The member for Wilkie says: Mr. Minister, do you have any control in that department? — and if you are not willing to discuss and support the issue right now and leave the personalities out of it — we are not bringing the personalities into it; we are bringing in the corruption in DNS. That kind of a word — corruption.

The member for Kindersley likes to think of himself as some sort of a new modern reformer in rules and regulations. What have you told your caucus about words like this? What have you told the member for Thunder Creek about corruption and graft? Where is your sense of fairness and decency in that regard? I ask you, where is it? Where is your legal training, when an accusation is made against a government or a minister, or an official, as has been made repeatedly? Where is your sense of fair play and decency that the facts be set forward?

I challenge the member for Thunder Creek; I challenge him for the sixth time to lay before this House; I challenge the member for yet the seventh time, to tell this House what evidence he has and the details of his evidence. And if he won't tell me, I ask him to go down to the assistant commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and tell him. If you don't want to tell me, the Attorney General of the government, I challenge you and I will ask you on Wednesday or any other day whether you have done that to the RCMP. You give, any one of you in the caucus, the information you have, which allows you to draw the conclusions like the member for Wilkie has done, draw or which allows you to the kind of conclusions and sweeping allegations you have; you lay it all out on the table to the assistant commissioner of the RCMP. Will you do that for me? Will you do that? Will any of you get up and tell me you will do that? Don't trust me or the government? All right, you tell the assistant commissioner of the RCMP. Will you tell me you are going to do that? Will any of you get up when I take my chair, right now, and tell me you will take your evidence to the RCMP and then let it go through the operation?

I ask the member for Kindersley. You are a lawyer; you are a fair-minded person in that caucus — at least you present yourself to be that way. Will you tell the RCMP all you know in this matter? Will you do that?

MR. ANDREW: — I wonder if the Attorney General would take the question back, I think perhaps we are getting off the subject. Now, the Attorney General makes all this to-do about the RCMP and the evidence it has brought before the court. My question to the Attorney General is basically this: the evidence obtained by the RCMP was advanced in the Crowns case in this particular trial, but I suggest to the Attorney General the evidence that involved the judge making about DNS was not the evidence of the Crown. Quite the contrary, it was the evidence called by the defence, several witnesses. That prompted the judge to make the comments about the department. It had nothing to do with the charge before the House.

Now I say to you, is that the evidence advanced by the RCMP, or is that the evidence advanced by former employees of DNS or former contractors with DNS. Is the RCMP

involved in that? The RCMP obviously advanced the evidence to prove the crime. But we're not dealing with the crime in this particular case. We are dealing with what the court said. I think we go back to a man defrauding the Crown of about \$3,000. The judge said, I would have sent that man to jail but instead of doing that I will give him a \$250 fine and restitution. The reason was not the evidence advanced by the Crown but the evidence advanced by the defence — which is our evidence.

I am saying there's a lot of evidence out there, maybe. That's the stuff we had better address. I say to the Attorney General, don't get it off the subject. Don't put up our man of straw (the RCMP or whoever it might be). The question is, there has been a serious accusation made by a judge. That accusation has been that the department is in a lot of trouble. I think when that accusation is made we have to give some serious thought to investigating it. You say, now what evidence have you got here, what evidence have you got there? That's what the inquiry is for — to find that stuff. That's what we want to find. So, Is ay to the Attorney General, would you not agree the point advanced by the judge is not the evidence of the RCMP but the evidence of the defence?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this point. First of all, I have not had a chance, and so far as I now my department has not had a chance yet, to review the transcript. I am advised it is being typed and being prepared. In due course we will have an opportunity to examine the transcript.

I don't know whether or not the judge's comments were based on the evidence of defence witnesses. The hon. member may or may not know that. The hon. member asked from his seat would it make a difference? The answer is, it may make a difference. I know of cases in other areas where a judge, having heard all of the evidence, will make a comment and then say to the Department of the Attorney General, but I want you to get the police or somebody else to investigate this aspect of the evidence tendered. Now that may be the case with respect to the evidence of the defence. But that was not the directive, so much as we can tell, by the judge. There was no coupling of that by the judge with a directive to the Department of the Attorney General or the police to carry out further investigations. And you have to strip down and that's exactly what happens.

The department is checking the transcript to see exactly what the evidence was and what words are made by the judge. The member has had this happen to him., I'm sure, where the judge will say in the course of a hearing. I find the accused guilty but I want this investigated or I find the accused innocent but I want this investigated because there's something about the evidence that doesn't take place. Of course, the hon. member, if he denies that, is absolutely not being fair about this, because that's the fact.

I come back again to the point I tried to make this afternoon which is germane to your point. The judge's comments are stripped into two categories. There is the one category which implies, if not suggests strongly, criminality. That's the one part. That has got to be determined by the police judicial process. The other part is an observation the judge has made based on one case of a bureaucracy running amuck. I say that is not evidence enough to warrant a judicial inquiry . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you give me the evidence. When we set up a judicial inquiry. There are two arguments against the judicial inquiry at this time. There are four others who are coming up for trial. They are related in some way or other to the circumstances. those can't be denied. And you can't substitute the criminal judicial process by a public hearing process in that regard. That's point number one.

Point number two — on the other issue, which is the question of running amuck, you'd

have to have more evidence. There needs to be more evidence; that's all there is to it. That's why I keep on saying to the member for Thunder Creek, give us the evidence. When we set up the inquiry into wilderness camps (the wild-haired accusation from the member for Qu'Appelle on wilderness camps) there were no criminal charges to be laid. The investigation had been completed and they had been dismissed. Therefore, the public inquiry was set up to look into the operations of the wilderness camps. And on that basis a public inquiry can go ahead.

Now, there may very well be a public inquiry when this matter is completed. I don't know. We'll see what evidence and transcripts and other comments may or may not be made. But to set it up at this time is irresponsible — I repeat that argument — irresponsible. I simply say to the hon. member for Thunder Creek. I am pleased to note that he has made his offer in perpetuity to resign in case the public inquiry does not substantiate his comments of graft and corruption.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — You know, Mr. Chairman, we've had a rather shocking misstatement of legal procedure from someone who supposedly should know better — the only way we're going to have an inquiry is if the judge had said, I think particular matters should have been investigated. As if in every criminal trial that goes down the chute the judge says, oh, I think this should be pursued. You know better. I think what you've done is a discredit to yourself and your office with the politics in your statement and your assessment of the judicial process. Never in my life have I heard an Attorney General trying to politicize a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench of a judgment of a court of this province. Never have I seen a political interpretation being placed on a judgment. That's precisely what you're doing and I think it's a shameful act that you're perpetrating tonight.

You take a look, and don't try to be too political with this, Mr. Attorney General. You know full well you have a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench saying that Thompson perpetrated the fraud with the provincial department's passive and active co-operative. It's a pretty shocking statement; I think you know that. How do you have an allegation of criminality against a department? Do you know how wide-ranging that is? Do you think the judge is irresponsible, that he is going to taint several hundred people with a brush of criminality? And you sluff that off? What kind of an Attorney General are you that you take that so lightly? I ask you to look back again, see the statement and see what that judge said. How you can, in all good conscience, take that lightly and loosely and glibly is beyond me. I'll tell you, you're bringing the judicial process into discredit with your approach, and I think as well you're bringing our office into discredit, because you have been up here for four hours today trying to defend the actions of a department when in fact, as the officer of the Crown responsible for the enforcement and administration of justice in this province, your response should have been that you're considering an inquiry. That is the proper response for the office you hold.

I'm going to make a suggestion. You've attempted to politicise the statements of a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench. Let's see if you're astute enough and, I suggest, man enough to try and let the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan start to defend his department. I think you've dragged this down often enough. The fact is a very serious charge has been laid against the department. I think it's the first time in Canadian history where a department is charged with passive and active co-operation in a fraud. Not individuals, not name names; you're the one who named the names today and you have the audacity to stand up to try and politicise this statement. I suggest to you if you were honorable in your position and took seriously in this issue your position as being the officer of the cabinet responsible for the administration of justice you would have

called for an inquiry as soon as this came across your desk. That is your proper course of action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I want to say that using the yardstick of the member for Qu'Appelle, I would acknowledge politicisation because I will never ever follow his yardstick in the administration of justice. I can say to the member for Qu'Appelle, thankfully it doesn't look like he'll ever have a chance to apply his peculiar brand of justice to the Department of the Attorney General. Because, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member here would do is throw out the window the rights of four people.

I just asked this person, this same person who sought to lecture me on how to conduct the office, to read back his words of Friday last on the evidence of the four people on the cases which are tied up here. I could go on to these to read these into the record. That's how much respect that lawyer and that MLA has for the rights of four people who are tied into this operation.

You want to tell me about politicalization? You want to have a judicial inquiry when supposedly the statement in the CP release said the judge has indicated there is an act of criminality to commit fraud, leading Thompson to commit fraud? The way to handle that is by way of a public inquiry? That's what an Attorney General should do? That's your position? I tell you that is not my position and you can categorize that as politicalization but it is not my position; it should not be my position; and I am shocked it is your position.

My position is if people are accused of criminality the criminal law system will look after them. We have the finest criminal law system in the world; we have the finest police force in the RCMP; we have the finest prosecutorial system in western Canada, if not Canada. If this allegation says people should be charged, if there are officials who have led Thompson or other people to commit fraud, the approach is to take that to the criminal courts so that person has his day in court and not so you can make cheap political statements at his expense and at my expense and at the Minister for of Northern Saskatchewan's expense. That is the position I take and you say that's politicalization. You can call it whatever you want but I tell you my position is that the Department of the Attorney General will look at that transcript and if it warrants further investigation and charges those will be fully pursued. If after all the charges are finished there needs to be a public inquiry that will be fully pursued. But I tell the hon. member I will not ever agree to a situation where a public inquiry is set up on the unsubstantiated allegations by you, the member for Thunder Creek, the member for Kindersley, unsubstantiated charges you don't have the guts to table in this House. You don't have the guts and you don't have the facts.

The Justice Noble cases are before the courts. I tell the hon. member they are before the courts.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's over with and you know it.

MR. ROMANOW: — The hon. member says it's over with. I tell the hon. member, I repeat again, I challenge you, you give me the facts to back that up. You give me the facts or you go outside that House and you say that outside the House one more time. I ask the hon. member to do that; I ask all of you to do that because you all have no respect for the

judicial system. None of you know how it operates or if you do are basically thwarting respect for the system. You are carrying on an attack when you ought not to be. I tell you it is in line with what the member for Regina South said the other night in the case of the Department of Labour estimates.

Now, I say to the hon. members opposite, there are court cases . . . What was it? You urged the Minister of Labour to interfere in the semi-judicial process . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, you did, the semi-judicial process of The Trade Union Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I did not.

MR. ROMANOW: — You did so. The record is clear. And that is the same in the case of your colleagues, the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Thunder Creek, who are indirectly saying the same thing.

I'm saying to you again, what more can be done? The RCMP have had access to all the files in the investigation. Five people were facing the criminal laws, one of who has already gone through. There may be an appeal; there may not be an appeal. Four more have a right to their day in court; for more have a right to mount their defences; four more have a right to be able to say whatever they've got to say legally, without a political environment or without a public judicial inquiry which is not a legal process. That is of a different category.

Sure it is not unreasonable to say the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan had done all he can do. Surely the position has got to be that's the only fair and proper way for it to be done. Anything less than that, I say, indicates the PC opposition is acting in the highest degree of irresponsibility without an understanding of how the due process of law works and in my judgement regrettably, offers nothing to the people of Saskatchewan but mud, mud and more mud.

MR. LANE: — I would just like to say to the Attorney General . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's the worst I've ever heard you, honest.

MR. LANE: — . . . very, very interesting and very pointed. The Attorney General refers to three or four other people only he has named, but very pointedly ignores the allegation against the department. He very pointedly ignores the allegation and he admits it. The reason of course, is you don't want a judicial inquiry into the department because you've been spending time here today stonewalling and stopping the opposition from attempting to question the minister on the operation of the department, which is precisely what estimates are all about . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no. I'm taking your comments. You very pointedly said, in due course, whenever the investigation against the other people, whom only the Attorney General has named . . . But he very politely ignores any questioning of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan which is under a pretty severe cloud as a result of the statements of a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench. And that is something the Attorney General, for some strange and unfathomable reason, seems to ignore — the strange and some strange and unfathomable reason the Attorney General doesn't want an investigation into the expenditures and operation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I wonder why. Well, I hate, Mr. Attorney General . . . we know he is irrelevant to the process, but the member for Moose Jaw North says, continue on with estimates. He's missed a lot of debate over the last couple of days when we have been attempting to question the minister. He seems to have missed it.

I must say though, the minister has answered for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan as well as could the member for Moose Jaw North, which indicates the sorry state of the situation. I would just like to say though, to the Attorney General, if you have nothing to hide on the DNS, if you don't subscribe to the views of Mr. Justice Noble, if you accept him as being factual, if you don't believe, if you don't accept — then why not have a judicial inquiry? Let it vindicate the DNS now so it can get on with its work. Let it go ahead. I'm sure they will co-operate; I know they will co-operate.

Judicial inquiry, as you well know, doesn't have anything to do — we've managed to debate here for just about two days without mentioning these four other people. The opposition has managed to do it. The only one who seems to have brought them in is yourself. I say if you really believe that Mr. Justice Noble is in error, you don't agree, you don't like what he says and you think he's wrong — let's get on with the inquiry. Let's give the minister responsible for DNS a chance to give his evidence. Let's give the former minister a chance to give his evidence. Give them their day in court. Let them do that before the judicial inquiry. You're satisfied with the actions of the other judicial inquiries you've set up. You just said you were. Why do you fear this one? I suggest to you that you really have no alternative if you're going back to your position and your responsibility as the officer responsible for the administration of justice.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make one point. I do not fear a judicial inquiry. But I repeat again to the member opposite that when there are four cases outstanding the call for the judicial inquiry on the motion, which I read and the member for Regina South took such umbrage at, would be wrong and an inappropriate thing to do. After the cases are out, a full inquiry or a full discussion of this matter may very well be warranted. I don't think there is any argument about that. But to do that now, I think is irresponsible. One last point I want to say to the member for Qu'Appelle, not to provoke him even further, this is the kind of thing that I do not object to. Here is page 1245 of Friday's debate:

MR. LANE: — Let me remind the minister that in fact this matter is concluded (referring to the one case).

MR. ROMANOW: — And here's the word in the sentence that I find is bad.

One the evidence of one case alone (and not these words if it's an accurate reporting) the judge has found an act of co-operation in a scam, in a fraud by your department.

MR. ROMANOW: — I didn't know that that was what the judge had found . . . the transcript of the judge's remarks aren't down yet. I don't even think that's what the judge has implied in this regard. Well maybe there is an implication —actively assisted him. That's fine. That may be. All right, it may be a point of implication. But the member for Qu'Appelle has gone from implication to a finding of fact. He has said: "the judge has found an act of co-operation in a scam in a fraud by your department." He works on that basis to continue the argument for the need of an inquiry. I simply say that that is wrong. It is factually wrong and it's a smear. That's the kind of generalized smear, which does nobody any good let alone the member for Qu'Appelle of the PC opposition. I really say, fellows, you've got to try to get it. It's a smear on the whole process. Talk about politicizing the judgment I mean again let's see what the judgment says. But I'll be awfully surprised if the judge has found that conclusion. If there is a finding of that conclusion to any officer or officers of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, I can

assure this House the department will take appropriate criminal action. That's where a scam . . . not an inquiry, an appropriate criminal action.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How about the rest of them? Are you going to leave a doubt on all of them?

MR. ROMANOW: — If you have any evidence of anybody we've overlooked or the judge has overlooked, please tell the assistant commissioner of the RCMP. Tell him. We'll take the action. The police will be in on that. Surely you can trust the RCMP. Surely we can trust the judicial system.

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Chairman, I say to the press corps, I wonder what they think of today's activities. It's another sad day in Saskatchewan. It is. Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that when something comes up on the government side that is dirty, that is not right, they reverse it on us all the time. They try to say we are the bad ones. Why have we not got the right? Why are you, Mr. Attorney General, taking our right away from us? If I was the Attorney General, I would be calling this inquiry myself. I would want to clear it up. I can't believe it. I also feel sorry for the Attorney General. We have 15 people here jumping to try to speak. The poor Attorney General has to speak for 43 robots over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And one minister.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — How do you know, Mr. Attorney General? If you had called this inquiry it might clear those people. Those gentlemen sitting behind the minister you're down on them right now. I am saying if maybe he called an inquiry, he might prove the innocence of these people. And what about the Minister of the Environment, the past minister of northern affairs. Maybe it would clear all the statements against him. Mr. Attorney General, I say to you what have you got against us asking for facts? You reverse it on the member for Thunder Creek. You said, come up with your facts. WE want them from you. What do you think we are calling an inquiry for? If we knew what the facts were to ask, we wouldn't be calling for one. We would go to the press and go out there and tell them. I am telling you right now when he goes out to make the statement tonight he has another member from Arm River standing right beside him. I'm sure there will be 13 or more. Are you telling us you, as the Attorney General of this province in addition to all the things you have taken over in this province, have now decided you are going to take over the judges of the court and tell the people of Saskatchewan the judges are all wrong and you, the Attorney General, are right?

I've always understood it is the Attorney General's duty to see justice is done. In my opinion, justice has been done. But Mr. Attorney General, it would appear the only time justice should be done for a public issue is if it doesn't affect the government. Well, I want to throw a challenge out to you, Mr. Attorney General, now. Stand up and say you will or you'll not agree with the inquiry. You've always said to me, I admire the man from Arm River, he's a good fellow. I say the same thing, I admire you. You are a man. Yes he is; he's a man. He has to be or he wouldn't be elected and in this House tonight. But now you've got the chance to prove whether you are a man or not. Stand up, say you will go with this inquiry, if you do not, I have to make this remark to you, Mr. Attorney General, my regard for you as a man won't be the same as it is as I'm standing here right now. Yes he did; he always said this. I admire this man. I want him to stand up and say we will have an inquiry or not.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the Attorney General bobbing up

and down since the minister in charge of DNS decided he was going to go into semi-retirement and turned the situation over to the Attorney General. I have been sort of amused on this side as I recall some of the more shall we say vociferous debates we've had over the years, because when you people have something going for you, the front benches are up. You know, the heckling, and the desk thumping, and your heavy artillery is up, and you guys can come on pretty heavy when you think you have a cause going. But watching you since Friday, you sit there like a group of bumps on a log. You see the minister who created all the problems — he has a lot to say from his seat in the front benches. But as far as getting up and taking part in the debate, as far as getting up and telling us why he fired the present minister when was an employee — no. But he's got quite a bit to say from his seat — quite a bit of heckling.

And the minister himself — I'm trying to recall; there must be a case which escapes me — never before have I seen a minister, when his departmental estimates are up, stay in his chair the way this one has. Instead, we witness the spectacle of the chief law enforcement officer in the province attempting to turn this into a courtroom. We've heard him put forward his challenges and he's received his challenges, and I think he's received more than he's put out.

He's taken exception to virtually everything from this side, and the reason he's taken exception is pure and simple. You're losing on this one. You know you're losing on it. You guys know you're losing on it and everybody out there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and there is the same minister again who hasn't the guts to get up but he's got a lot to say from his chair — the one who created all the problems in the DNS going right back to 1972. He's got a lot to say from his chair but hasn't the guts to get up, just as the Attorney General hasn't the guts to call a judicial public inquiry. And why won't he call it? Because your 44 seats go down to about 14. That's why you won't call it.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Noble has referred to fraud, perpetrated fraud, with passive and active co-operative. The Attorney General refers to that as unsubstantiated allegations. We have a situation where a federal justice has heard evidence in a trial where a great deal of the testimony has come from people either directly or indirectly related to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. He heard the testimony for however long that trial went on and after he heard it, he went so far as to say, I'd send you to jail, I would send you to jail if it weren't for the active and passive co-operation of members of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan in perpetrating this fraud. That's what the Attorney General terms as unsubstantiated allegations.

In fact this same individual, by the minister's admission, was viewed with suspicion by the department as early as 1975. In fact according to the minister on Friday on page 1239 of Hansard, in 1976 he was under investigation and in 1977 actively charged. Despite that, in 1976 the department saw fit to give this individual some \$23,500 in payment and year later they chose to give him almost \$1,500 in grants. But of course in the Attorney General's terminology, that is a completely unsubstantiated allegation.

Mr. Attorney General, I'm not completely sure what it is I'm supposed to say outside the Assembly but perhaps it is words to this effect: if you ever have the nerve, if your government has the nerve to call an independent judicial inquiry and if, as a result of that inquiry, there is not — well, if the findings of Justice Noble are not confirmed pertaining to fraud and graft and corruption, yes, I will resign my seat. If that is what you want me to say outside of this Assembly, out in the corridors, I will be happy to say it. I don't know whether these fellows really want me to say it in the corridors. If you find that so dramatic, Mr. Attorney General, after I say it out there, if it is that dramatic, I trust

you are going to sue me tomorrow. I trust that I can presume I will be hearing from somebody that you are going to sue me as a result of saying it.'

I will repeat once again — you people haven't the guts to call that inquiry. You won't call it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, we are hearing from that minister again, that minister who hasn't the nerve to get up. He has a lot to say from his seat, but he hasn't the nerve to get up — the one who is sitting in front of the present minister, who doesn't get up on his feet, who has turned over the responsibility of his department to the Attorney General.

Somehow, I wonder if we are seeing a practice which is going to become common when a minister gets into a little bit of trouble to can't handle his department. Is the Attorney General going to take over the estimates throughout this entire committee of finance?

Mr. Attorney General, I say to you again, you haven't the nerve; you haven't the nerve and if you have, blow me out of the water. I challenge you! If it is not there, blow me out of the water. But do you know who is going to get blown out of the water if you call it? You boys are gone. That is why you won't do it. You know the horror story that is down there. I want to hear from you other guys over there. I want to hear from that minister, the former minister. I want to hear what he has to say. I want you to call in the member for Regina Lakeview, the deputy minister in 1975. He was here a little bit earlier. I want to hear from the member for Regina Lakeview who was the deputy minister. I would like to hear his version of what happened. I would like to hear it from the Premier.

The Premier was in for a little while on Friday and then, boy did he get out of here in a hurry. I would like to hear from the Provincial Secretary. He was in here a little bit earlier. The Provincial Secretary was here; he is one of your heavyweights. Why hasn't he got into it?

You know we have heard a lot of comments from the member for Moose Jaw North. Why don't you get into this? Why don't you stand up and let us hear your version about it? We have heard some real great speeches from you; we have heard some real dandies from you; we really don't need one of your classics from here. We would like to hear from anybody. We are sick of hearing from the Attorney General. We are sick of hearing about his threats. We are sick of hearing . . .

MR. LANE: — Tell him ministers usually took their own estimates through, in the old days.

MR. THATCHER: — My colleague for Qu'Appelle is suggesting that in the old days, the old-fashioned days, a minister used to take his own estimates through the House.

Mr. Attorney General, once again, we challenge you to call an inquiry, but you won't. We challenge you! No guts.

MR. ANDREW: — I wonder if the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan would permit a couple of questions?

Question one is this. Do you accept, as Minister of Northern Saskatchewan all the statements of the Attorney General today, and do you accept his statements as being the same as your statements?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — If the member would wish to refer to which specific statements of the many made today, I will answer his question. Which statements specifically is he referring to?

MR. ANDREW: — I take it that there are only some that you would agree with and some you wouldn't agree with. Is that what you are saying?

I will be quite specific, Mr. Minister. The Attorney General I think has said quite clearly that there may well be reasons for a public inquiry. Do you agree there may well be reasons for a public inquiry on this matter?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I don't think that's what the Attorney General said. He said that when all the cases have been heard and when all the evidence is in, that at that time it may very well be that there is sufficient evidence to make the decision whether or not there should be a public inquiry. We don't know what the decision will be until all the evidence is in, and I agree all the evidence should be in before that decision is made.

MR. ANDREW: — Do you agree that a public inquiry is clearly a possibility in this particular case?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody said it was clearly a possibility. What was said that it was impossible to determine until all the evidence is in whether or not a public inquiry would be warranted, and at that time it should be possible on the basis of the evidence to clearly decide whether or not a public inquiry is warranted. But in the meantime, the related matters are before the courts and the rights of four individuals to a fair trial are at stake . . .

MR. ANDREW: — Now what you are basically telling me, though, is that it is possible we can have a judicial inquiry into this depending what happens. Now you have left that option open, haven't you? That option is open — is that not right? The judicial inquiry option is clearly open in your mind?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I think, Mr. Chairman, such a decision will be made on the basis of the facts, and all the facts are not in. It's clearly always an option on a variety of matters, should the evidence and the facts warrant it, to have a public inquiry, a judicial inquiry.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, if I could just continue in that particular line of questioning. Does the minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan agree there can be specific circumstances whereupon a department of government can come under the scrutiny of a judicial inquiry?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Well, I think there are other situations: the trumped up torture camps situation, where there were no individuals before the courts and where it was agreed that a public inquiry would be held. I think it's entirely possible that evidence, the complete evidence after all the matters before the courts have been dealt with, will give us an indication as to whether or not a public inquiry is warranted. But I think we don't have that evidence and we don't have those facts at this point.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, Mr. Minister, I was not referring to this specific case necessarily. I was asking simply this question — in your opinion, is it possible in your mind as the minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, for

your department in particular, since you are minister of that particular department, is it possible there could be circumstances that would require a judicial inquiry to your department?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Chairman, the member refers to some hypothetical situation, some hypothetical set of circumstances, and I can only say that at this point the facts that are available and the evidence that is available do not warrant a public inquiry. I can't answer his hypothetical question that when all the facts are available I think that such a decision can be made — and if he insists on dealing in hypothetical situation, he can get no specific answer.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Then, Mr. Chairman, I would direct the same question to the Attorney General. Is it possible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan as a department to come under the scrutiny of a judicial inquiry for a set of circumstances? — and yes they are hypothetical. But is that a possibility? Can that happen? Are there the legal provisions for that type of judicial inquiry? That's all I want to know.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, we did have a judicial inquiry related to the unfounded charges relating to northern camps under DNS. That's an example of a judicial inquiry.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Then, Mr. Chairman, I would take it the minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and of course the Attorney General would disagree with their Premier, a Rhodes scholar, who in his comments on this very matter states the allegation or comment by the judge is that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was involved. Obviously the department as an entity is involved only, and can be involved only, by its employees. Departments don't exist so far as doing business except by their employees. Accordingly, what the judge is saying is that employees of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan were involved. Obviously the Premier, in his comments, disagrees entirely with the Attorney General's comments and your comments in reply to my question.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — No, Mr. Chairman, I think if the member would complete reading the statement he would find there is no disagreement. If he would recollect what I said this afternoon, I said it should be noted one of the persons charged was employed by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan at the time the events which led to charges being laid occurred. That person is still awaiting trial, even though charges have been laid. It's reasonable to take the position the passive and active co-operative by DNS which was alleged by Justice Noble could very well refer to the alleged involvement of the person still awaiting trial. You can't deal with the alleged involvement of the department without dealing with the alleged involvement of individuals employed by the department.

Consequently, it's likewise reasonable to take the position the matter is still before the courts. I think that's perfectly consistent with what the Premier said. He said, you can't deal with the department. How can the department act except through its individual employees? If one or more of those individual employees, or X employees, are facing criminal charges still before the courts, it's impossible to talk about the involvement of the department without prejudicing the case of those former employees or employee. I think the position is perfectly consistent.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I understand what the Premier was saying with regard to our discussing this matter in relation to the employees, about how it was difficult to

discuss one or two or three employees, or rather how to discuss all of those departments without referring to one or two or three employees of those departments. I understand what the Premier was saying in that regard. But I also detect very clearly in his remarks that he was attempting to remove the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and if he could remove the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, he could remove any department of government because they in fact, as separate entity, were nothing more than employees. Therefore they could not be charged with anything or held accountable to anything or held accountable to anything. That's the way I read the Premier's remarks. I leave that with anyone to peruse the remarks of the Premier, in particular on page 1255 in Hansard.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you, your department and you in particular as the head, are responsible for those employees. If those employees are involved in matters that are not just matters with respect to northern Saskatchewan then I feel it's incumbent upon your department and you as minister to answer to those charges. If you cannot answer to those charges, then you have responsibility to resign in this House. You have that responsibility. You have the former minister of Northern Saskatchewan sitting right in front of you and he has refused, absolutely refused, to say one word on this debate since its very beginning, although he has consistently had lots of to say from his seat without standing and taking his place. Mr. Chairman, I feel it's absolutely incumbent upon the former minister of northern Saskatchewan to come to the aid of the now Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, to assist him in answering these particular questions, we, as an opposition, are asking. Now would the former minister of Northern Saskatchewan please stand up on his feet and address himself to this particular issue?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Chairman, the member misinterprets, perhaps accidentally, what the Premier was saying. His point was that it was the opposition which was claiming one could separate the Department of Northern Saskatchewan from the individuals employed by the department. The opposition takes the position that they don't want to discuss the department. The point made by the Premier and the point I made today, is you can't discuss the department without discussing those individuals. Those individuals who were employed or an individual who was employed, and has had charges brought against him is awaiting trial. To discuss that matter before the trials have been completed would prejudice the right of those individuals to a fair trial.

The department, as I outlined today, acted responsibly when, as soon as problems and complaints with regard to the RAP in Cumberland House and allegations of wrongdoing were brought to the attention of the department, it conducted an investigation. As a result of that internal investigation they requested the Attorney General to ask the RCMP to carry out an investigation. The RCMP did that and after having full access to all the information brought criminal charges against five individuals. I think the department has acted responsibly. The record is not yet complete. And I think that position is perfectly consistent with what the Premier has to say.

MR. THATCHER: — I'd like to direct a minor question to the Minister. Mr. Minister, would you agree that some years ago if the Americans had accepted your logic when the Watergate crisis was on, if they had accepted the logic you are putting forward on behalf of the Premier, would you agree President Nixon would probably still be president today?

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I can't answer that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THATCHER: — Tell me what the difference was. Are you trying to say that had they gone in that way, the way you are suggesting (you have to assume individuals are the department) there would have been no Watergate and Nixon, if he had lived that long, would still be the president, wouldn't he? Your logic does not hold up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I have a lot of trouble figuring out how the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan would be able to answer for affairs of the United States government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They both have the same power. And it's an analogy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, at least don't expect him to answer the question.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, we're down to the crunch point of view on it now. We're going to let this come to a vote. Your logic doesn't hold up. You've done a rotten job in here today. The way you've turned over the responsibility for your department to the Attorney General and let him speak for you and let him orchestrate you. The final insult had to be, I suppose, for you anyway, when you looked to the Attorney General for direction before you answered the question about five minutes ago. The performance has been bad. It's been a disgrace.

I want to repeat, you people know what's down there in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. You're going to vote against us; you're going to stonewall it; you're going to sandbag this judicial inquiry because you know what's there. You know what it will do. You know what kind of a horror story is there. And the two individuals who maybe know better than anyone else are the one who sits in the front row, one who has quite a bit to say from his chair, and the other is the Deputy who just sat down — he's had quite a bit to say from his chair too. Those two, better than anyone else in this Assembly, know what's there. They know what kind of a horror story is there. Yes, we're going to let it come to a vote. You are going to outvote us and there's going to be no judicial inquiry. And we know why. Let's hope that the people of Saskatchewan will know why too.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's right. They will.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Chairman, I don't think ever, at least in my recollection of legislatures in this province, has an opposition asked so many questions on the same subject and got so few answers. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the response by the Attorney General and the response by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan are clear indications of their guilt in this whole matter and of their reluctance to let us have a public inquiry into matters affecting northern residents through the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I feel that's a very fair position for us to take.

There are a couple of points that I want to clear up. The Attorney General made reference to the opposition's position with regard to the judicial system, with regard to the RCMP. I would make this comment — I have a brother who is one of the commanding officers of the RCMP in Toronto. Naturally, I have a high degree of respect for the RCMP; naturally I have a high degree of respect for our judicial system. Certainly, I would not have called for nor would our opposition have called for a judicial inquiry into this matter had we not had faith in the judicial system. Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General, again in making comments with respect to our supposed lack of respect for the judicial system, should refer himself to his own party leader's statements, the Premier of the province where he said in opening his

comments upon questioning on this subject. While we would obviously be interested in the judge's views on whether or not the administration of a particular agency was good or bad . . . Well, I might just stop there. He said they would be interested; that means you the government would be interested in the judge's views on whether or not the administration of a particular agency was good or bad. I take it right there that your Premier would be interested in having a judicial inquiry. I mean he said it. That's what he says here. If he said he wasn't, then yes, he's very inconsistent in his remarks. He says, "I am sure the judge would be the last to hold himself out as in any sense an expert in that particular area." Well, I suggest that he is very subtly taking a crack at Judge Noble as to what his comments are."

Well, I'll reply to the Government Whip and I'll tell you that your Premier's remarks are in Hansard. You'd do well to read something once in a while. It would be nice to see you have enough intelligence to stand on your feet and speak on the matters that come before this House. All you have ever had time to do since the day I came into this legislature is sit over there and make your wisecracks across to this side of the House, a completely useless contribution to this legislature, completely useless. That's correct, I agree, Mr. Chairman, that you should call those members into order.

So, those are the Premier's remarks, not entirely disagreeing with what we are asking for he said he would like to hear what the judge's comments were, although on the other hand he questioned whether his comments would be worth anything or not.

I would like to clear up another point as well. The Attorney General, earlier today, in his tirade on the opposition, was suggesting that in fact we knew about this all along and it was all orchestrated and planned to be a political move to gain political points in some way or another. I challenge the Attorney General to make those comments anywhere he likes and repeat them because I in fact as critic for northern Saskatchewan did not know of this particular case when I started out on my estimates on Friday. I did not have any idea whatsoever with regard to the opposition's position on an inquiry. It was well laid out as of March 3. I quoted it today out of the Hansard for the clarification of the Attorney General. I'll lay it out one more time and date it back even further as it goes back to March 3. It's on the front page of the Melville Advance, among other papers, and it continues on the back page. What does it say in concluding? March 3 — you just take notice of that; we have it here:

In closing Birkbeck said he strongly urged a full-scale public inquiry into all operations of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan as soon as possible.

That was March 3 so, you know, we had the idea. We wanted the inquiry so we could clear up a lot of matters in northern Saskatchewan, before we got into this debate today, before we got into it on Friday. That I feel, Mr. Chairman, very clearly points out the Attorney General is completely false in his statements in the House today in that regard. So, Mr. Chairman, with those few comments I would conclude by saying once more we have every right and reason to call for a judicial inquiry, a public inquiry into the operations of northern Saskatchewan. The complete reluctance of your government and you as minister responsible to northern Saskatchewan, the complete reluctance of the former minister of northern Saskatchewan to say anything on the matter, leads me to conclude you're guilty of something, that there's something wrong in northern Saskatchewan. I have to conclude that. If there isn't then it's incumbent upon you as minister and this government to order a public inquiry. Mr. Chairman, obviously there is no use in asking any further. Those are my remarks.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 14

Berntson	Taylor	Katzman
Thatcher	Rousseau	Duncan
Birkbeck	Pickering	Andrew
Larter	Garner	McLeod
Lane	Muirhead	

NAYS — 30

Blakeney	Mostoway	Cody
Pepper	Banda	Matsalla
Bowerman	Kaeding	Lusney
Romanow	Hammersmith	Prebble
Robbins	Dyck	Johnson
Baker	MacAuley	Thompson
Skoberg	Feschuk	Engel
McArthur	Byers	Lingenfelter
Gross	Rolfes	White
MacMurchy	Tchorzewski	Solomon

Debate continues on Item 1

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, before we got into the subject of the government's involvement in the unfortunate situation with respect to northern Saskatchewan, I was in the process of outlining policy directives that we as an opposition feel are warranted in northern Saskatchewan. We want to take those policy initiatives to northern Saskatchewan residents and we intend to do so over the course of the next year in consultation with people who live in northern Saskatchewan. We want to know what their feelings are with respect to these policy directives (if I may refer to them), what their position is toward those directives. If there are any agreements on those policies then we want to adopt them, certainly as a party, and present them here in the legislature to you as minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan. We would hope that changes would be forthcoming

As I have said there are many things about to happen in northern Saskatchewan. Unfortunately it would appear that maybe too many things already have. But I was talking about potential that exists in northern Saskatchewan. I feel this government (and we as an opposition want to work with government if you will allow that; we think it is incumbent upon you in terms of respecting the parliamentary system) can work toward developing the potential that exists for northern Saskatchewan and therefore allow the northern Saskatchewan residents to be the benefactors of that great potential.

In order to do that, I think we need to have some understanding of all of the many factors that affect the development of that policy — a policy of maximizing and developing the economic potential that lies there. There is of course more uncertainty facing the world economy in 1980 than at any other time since World War II. For the first time in nearly 40 years forecasts can no longer be based primarily on financial and economic criteria. The international arena has so deteriorated in the last year that political factor and the potential for military conflict are as important in predicting world economies as are inflation, growth, unemployment or foreign exchange. Those are some of the factors on an international basis that are going to affect our development as a province here in Saskatchewan and of course our development in northern Saskatchewan — outside factors we are going to have to contend with.

Many economists fear governments and central bankers will go too far with their interest-rate war and with competitive currency revaluations. Central bankers and government officials always think they can manage the economy despite a very sorry record. Those are some of the facts that exist. Governments have a tendency to feel they are at all times in control of economies and unfortunately as history has shown, many, many times they in fact do not have control over the destiny of particular economies whether they be provincial or federal, whether they relate to this country or other countries. A country's economic potential and its base, the sound foundation it must work off, are determined by international factors now more than they ever were in our history. I think that is something. Mr. Minister, that you and I in looking at the development in northern Saskatchewan are going to have to take into consideration, we're going to have to recognize those particular factors. An expected slowdown in world trade also clouds that economic outlook.

We'll go a little further to say much strain that develops among the major industrialized countries depends to a great extent on how sharply their economies slow. I don't need to tell you how the OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) nations have had a drastic effect on our economy as a nation and, of course, kicking it back to our economy as a province. I only draw those observations for the benefit, at this particular time, of northern Saskatchewan residents. I think those are the kinds of things that unless we can have that kind of vision rather than looking it in a narrow scale just from this Legislative Assembly here . . . We must look at those other factors in the international markets, the different international economies as they affect development in northern Saskatchewan.

That would bring you of course to uranium development. There have always been many charges made by your side of the House, Mr. Minister, and by your Attorney General in particular. And of course, the media is always anxious. They know what the government's position is. The government's position (and I will restate of course what your government's position is) . . .

MR. PREBBLE: — What is your position?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, well that's right. Now there's the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland who makes the comment, what is your position? Well, I don't mind. I'm glad he asked because I'm going to give you our position tonight. Now with kind respect for the member for Kindersley I am going to get into that. The government's position clearly is to invest multitudes of taxpayer's dollars in uranium development. That has been done. You have taken the position you're going to develop uranium in Saskatchewan at

any cost. When I say any cost, that cost is to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. You're also going to do that with your blinkers on to the international economies I speak of, the international markets that affect whether or not you should proceed with uranium development.

Our position very clearly has been stated. That position is not that complicated for anyone to understand, even your side of the House. It is simply this: we, as an opposition, and then you have to take that further to say we, as a government, feeling very strongly at this point in time we do not want further tax dollars invested in uranium development in the province of Saskatchewan. We're on the record as having said that. I think that's reasonable position at this point in time. We say that, of course, on the basis that we not have any understanding at this point in time where we're secure, where we feel comfortable going to our constituents and saying yes, uranium development is safe to proceed with, we have all of the answers and all the controls in place.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, I had remembered and I did forget. I was going to bring a copy of Maclean's magazine into the Assembly so I could quote a few lines out of that, but I would just bring it to the member's attention. There was an article in Maclean's (I believe it was the last edition) where it was clearly outlining the government's position. It was saying the province of Saskatchewan, in other words the Government of Saskatchewan, has some of the regulatory measures in place for the control of nuclear hazards and uranium development hazards. That was what the article stated. I would very much like to know on what basis the writer made those comments. I would like to know on what basis your government makes those comments with respect to safety standards you have in place, supposedly, for future uranium development. We have asked those questions. We have got those answers. We've asked for them to be tabled here in the legislature. We have asked the Premier of this province to table his market studies for uranium. We do not have those tabled in the legislature. That's what I was talking about when I was talking about the development of northern Saskatchewan. How many tax dollars should we invest in northern Saskatchewan to develop the potential there, whether it be resources in the non-renewable or renewable sector.

Mr. Chairman, those were the comments I was making. That is what I was talking about. Now, I remember very clearly the Premier when I asked him a question. Mr. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, one day when you were not in the house, whether in fact you shared his views. He stood and said, yes of course, more or less you shared his views. In other words, he as the Premier and you people over there as the government would not proceed with any development of any description without of course having the approval of the ministers. Now, he may have included the ministers but he did not include the backbenchers, obviously. The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland does not agree with the Premier and his desire to go ahead and develop uranium, and invest taxpayers' dollars. He does not agree with that. Now, he's made many speeches in this legislature but he will not come right out and say there's a position required on his behalf to force your government and his government to stop future uranium development. That has not been his position.

I find that interesting, that we as an opposition are being charged by the government, being charged by the media to give our position on uranium, when in fact one of our own members, one of your backbench members, is not prepared to stand and give his firm position on uranium development, except to stand and give us that long list of dangers involved with uranium and nuclear development.

I would expect that if that member for Saskatoon-Sutherland has such great sources of information with respect to uranium, your government must have just a massive source of information by which to base its judgment on proceeding with uranium development in the province of Saskatchewan, with the investment of \$300 million and a proposed \$0.5 billion of taxpayers money into the development of uranium. Mr. Chairman, if that's the government's position, and our position conversely is to say, no more tax dollars going into uranium development until such time as this government tables in the legislature: (1) its studies on safety for development of uranium, (2) its market studies to insure that once it has been ascertained it's safe to proceed with uranium development that in fact there are going to be markets for uranium — and that follows, certainly it follows. That makes sense to me and it should make sense to you as minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan.

Let's take it a little further. What is our position? First, we said, no tax dollars. As a government, we would undertake to proceed and find out from whatever sources, although I don't know what all the sources are. That's why we've asked the Premier, what are your sources? What is the information you've based your development on? Table it so we can review it. We as a government would proceed to do that and once we were very secure in our position, that, (1) it was in fact safe, (2) there were markets then we would be prepared — not as a government involved directly in the business — at that time to let, yes, the private entrepreneur, the private sector, develop uranium. Now you will argue that. You will argue that and I don't blame you. That's your position and I respect your position on development of resources as a government. You feel, as a government it's best to proceed in that way. We have felt — and I think we have a right to our position — very sincerely that we would like to see the private sector develop resources. We feel very confident, Mr. Minister, the proper tax schedules could be put in place as you have done in Bill No. 47. You didn't take over the oil industry back in 1975, that you could put proper tax regulations in place that would give a good return to the province of Saskatchewan without massive investments of tax dollars into the resource sector.

So, it follows, Mr. Minister, and I find it interesting to note that our government would still sit there and say, what is your position with regard to uranium? You should know what our position would be.

1. Once those two factors had been very clearly concluded and we were agreed on them, to let the private sector develop uranium and we, as a government, would be a regulatory body.
2. We, of course, would put the proper, not only incentives for them to develop, but tax regulations in, to return a reasonable share of the resources to the people of Saskatchewan.

When I say, reasonable, I say a share which would be the maximum we could tax those private companies without having to go out of business. No, if they were not prepared to accept that tax regulation we would put in place and they said no, we won't develop uranium if you aren't going to let us make any more money than that, then I suppose, if that were the case after having agreed it was safe to mine uranium, after having agreed that in fact there was a potential there for marketing uranium on a long-run basis, we would be forced into a position of having to mine uranium as a government in the same way you are proposing — either in a partnership with the private sector or as a sole operator, as you do in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Those would be the positions we would have to take. I think those make sense. I put forth a pretty reasonable position. I put forth a fair position. It is a position the opposition, our party, believe at this point in time. It is certainly subject to change as we, on this side, feel we can change. If we see we have gone down the wrong road it is not beyond us to say, whoa, we've gone down the wrong road here. We are going to back up and we are going to take another run at this and we are going to look at a clear avenue. We leave that right and that option open.

Mr. Minister, I don't find that difficult at all, as an MLA, as a critic for northern Saskatchewan. We on this side of the House don't find it difficult in our critical position on something and a month or two down the road, if conditions change, change our position. It would be nice if you, as a government — not only nice, but it would be very beneficial to the taxpayers of this province — would place yourselves, as a government, in that flexible position so you could bend with the wishes and the desires of the Saskatchewan people return a maximum potential of the resources that exist here in this province to Saskatchewan people.

So, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, what I am saying is I have put forth to you a fair and reasonable position on behalf of the opposition on uranium. You have been asking for this. You have been saying, what is your position? Well, you have our position. And not only that, you should have known what our position would be. And if you think it is a sell-out . . . The white knight speaks up and he says, it sure is.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I say it is not a sell-out. The province of Alberta can make arrangements with the private sector. I don't like to use province-by-province comparisons. I rarely do. I don't go for the argument that much — Alberta this or Ontario that. I rarely do. I don't go for the argument that much — Alberta this or Ontario that. I say we live in Saskatchewan and we have a responsibility to the taxpayers of this province, not Alberta, not Ontario, not Manitoba. And if there were an NDP province I would say, not that NDP province either. There isn't one fortunately. I say they have put money away in their heritage fund that we can't imagine here, in Saskatchewan. I have said many times that this province, in my view, has more potential than the province of Alberta and we have not capitalized on it either by working with the private sector or as a government. We have not capitalized that tremendous potential that exists here in the province of Saskatchewan.

So I would ask, Mr. Chairman, at this point if the minister would respond. And, at the risk of getting into another long debate, I would ask him to leave as much politics out of it as he can. I left the politics out of it when I started out on my estimates. I have, in getting back to the real estimates here after having had an unfortunate interruption (I say unfortunate, on your part, certainly not ours) and I would ask that you reply in a responsible way. Don't come back at me with politics because if you want to play that game we'll be here all night and we won't get anywhere.

But I would like you to reply. If you can see some measure of responsibility in terms of our position as an opposition in regard to uranium development the question of maximizing the economic potential that exists in northern Saskatchewan, and if you can see anywhere at all where you and I could work together, maybe you and I could sit down to discuss some of these matters and together come to a better understanding so that the residents of northern Saskatchewan will benefit in a real way from a responsible legislature. And that's our right here, that you and I are part of. So, Mr. Chairman, I'll take my place and just allow the minister to respond.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member for Moosomin again in his totally objective and non-partisan way suggests that the opposition is willing to put forward some specific alternatives and that he's prepared to discuss those with me. I repeat that I'm always prepared to sit down and discuss those with anyone who has specific positive alternatives. But I want to comment first on some of the matters he dealt with and then I want to come back specifically to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and that department's involvement in matters related to uranium development in northern Saskatchewan.

First of all, he wants to know specifically what the environmental and worker health and safety measures are. I would advise him in case no one has previously that there exists in the library of this legislature a copy of the surface lease for the Amok mine at Cluff Lake. It has the environmental protection measures and the worker health and safety measures spelled out in it and the conditions under which the company must operate to retain its surface lease.

He seems to take the position that for the government, with the heritage fund, to invest through Crown corporations in resource development is something with which he disagrees. That's not surprising. That's the position the opposition took when the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan got involved in the potash industry. Presumably, by his line of argument, that should have been left in the hands of the corporations who at that time wouldn't pay their taxes. The corporations were largely foreign-owned and presumably, taking his line of argument, it would be more acceptable to him to have private corporations owning the entire industry and, I remind him, mainly foreign-owned corporations not paying their taxes — although he says he would work out a deal and they would pay them. So let's say they would pay them. But that would still leave in last year's operations alone, \$78 million — the profits of the Potash Corporations of Saskatchewan — that would go out of the country. And, if I understand his proposals, he would apply the same logic to development of the uranium industry. Well, I can only say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, I recall reading the debates in this House, and the position of the Conservative Party with regard to the investment in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I recall listening to their position in a 1978 provincial election. We've heard them talking about buying empty holes in the ground; those empty holes in the ground that have now paid all their taxes and royalties to the people of Saskatchewan; those empty holes in the ground, that returned a profit of \$78 million to the people of Saskatchewan — they said was a bad investment. We said it was a good investment. And we say the investment in the uranium industry is a good investment. We can, through the Crown corporations, work with the private sector to the benefit of all the people of Saskatchewan, to the particular benefit of the people of northern Saskatchewan, whether that be through joint ventures or through the royalty system.

He holds out as a model, and his leader has held out as a model, Alberta. I remind the hon. member if we were to apply the same royalty structure to oil that Alberta does, we would accept approximately \$200 million a year less. We would leave an extra \$200 million in the hands of the oil companies. That seems to be the position he advances. I can't agree with that position.

He talks about the heritage fund and how they would operate the heritage fund. He refers to Alberta, which presumably means they would, in oil alone, put \$200 million a year less into the heritage fund. I can't help but recall the position of the members opposite and of the Conservative Party when the decision of the Supreme Court was

handed down. Their position then was the government is too greedy. The government was taking too much money on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. The government was putting too much money into this heritage fund. Their position now, Mr. Chairman, seems to be the government isn't greedy enough.

On the one hand, they're out completely distorting the resource policies of this government, and on the other hand saying they would collect more. He objects to the participation of this government in the potash industry, in the oil industry through SaskOil and the uranium industry through the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation. He holds out as a model the government of Alberta. Presumably he is equally opposed to their participation in Syncrude and is equally opposed to their ownership of an airline in Alberta and another airline in Manitoba. That's his model. I say there is too much lack of consistency in his position. He has attempted to lay out a position on uranium, a position which really means it should be left entirely to the private sector. It should be left entirely to the friends that the party opposite may have such as Denison Mines, those great protectors of the public interest. I say that's not a credible position. I say we can do both. The public sector can be involved in the industry. That does give us a window on the industry. There's room for the private sector, and there's room for joint ventures. I would point particularly to the mine at Cluff Lake, which is owned 80 per cent by Amok, 20 per cent by the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. The proposed mine at Key Lake — Key Lake Mining Corporation — is owned 50 per cent by the provincial Crown corporation, SMDC; one-third by Uranerz and one-sixth by the federal Crown corporation, Eldorado.

He talks about benefits for all the people of Saskatchewan but again the problem is that there are no specifics. There's a generalized argument that the party opposite, in government, would do all good things to see that benefits accrue to all people in Saskatchewan and in particular the people of the North. I want to refer to something specific to benefit the people of the North and that is the utilization of the surface lease with Amok at Cluff Lake. The major features of this lease will be used as a base-line model for future surface lease agreements and they include such things as northern employment features — at least 50 per cent northern employees by 1982. However, as a result of that position by the Government of Saskatchewan the company has already exceeded 50 per cent minimum.

The other feature that is of specific benefit to northern communities and has resulted in access to employment at that mine that wouldn't otherwise be available to a lot of people, was the establishment of a computer program so that people from northern communities can live at home and work at the mine. So they spend seven days on the job and return to their home for seven days. There are five commuter pick-up points in the northern administration district. The agreement provides for employment of northerners at all levels; provides for a scholarship program for northern students to attend universities and technical institutes; provides for apprenticeship enrolment where applicable. It provides for a monitoring committee to review all aspects of agreement fulfilment.

Goods and services features of the agreement provide preferences for northern businesses and Saskatchewan businesses. The company produces a business development plan in consultation with the monitoring committee. It establishes a northern bidders' list for tendering of items that can be contracted locally. Contracts are broken down to sizes that can be handled by local and Saskatchewan firms. It has established an information and liaison system.

The preparation of future surface leases, should other mines come on stream, will follow this general model and the Department of Northern Saskatchewan established a manpower secretariat in June of 1979 to assure that northern mining development will bring maximum benefits to northern people. The secretariat conducts manpower planning and developments to see the maximum direct economic benefits and employment accrue to northern residents. The secretariat negotiates, monitors and co-ordinates provincial involvement in employment agreements with the mining industry.

I just want to relay to the member that it is projected that in 1980, 400 jobs in exploration will be created for northern people; 200 jobs in mine and mill construction; 1,165 jobs in mine and mill operation; 300 jobs in road construction related to uranium mining development — a total of 2,065 jobs for northern people. Those are just the direct mine and mill related jobs. A great deal of other employment is created by spinoff benefits and the developments of northern businesses. At Amok, of heavy equipment operators, 95 per cent are northerners, 100 per cent of the trainees are northerners; the clerical staff, 100 per cent are northerners; certified nursing assistants, 100 per cent are northerners; personnel officers on the site, 100 per cent are northerners; ore samplers, 100 per cent are northerners. I think, Mr. Chairman, that's an example of very specific direct benefits accruing to northern people as a result of this government's policy on uranium development and the participation of northern people in that development.

The member refers for his model to Alberta and I can only repeat the results of a week before last when the native outreach program in Alberta held their annual meeting. They gave an award for the employer who had the best record employing native people. The award went to Alberta Gas Trunk, a company which has a total of 1,700 employees. Out of those 1,700 employees, 78 were native people — 4.5 per cent, and that's the best performance. That merited a major banquet and an award. Amok has over 50 per cent and it's only one of the companies in northern Saskatchewan which has over 50 per cent of its employees being native northerners. That comes as a result of direct action on the part of this government. Now, the minister responsible for native affairs in Alberta was at that native outreach conference and he said, we don't believe in direct action to assure native people get the jobs. We believe in the ripple effect. We believe that when a development comes into place, it's like dropping a little pebble in the water; all the waves rippled out from it; all the people are caught up in the benefit that accrue from this ripple effect. That's fine theoretically except the results are only 4.5 per cent (with the best employer) benefited and were caught up in the benefits of those ripples.

I have to say to the hon. member if you are saying, don't use Alberta, don't compare us to those guys, if you are saying we have a different approach, I would be interested in hearing what your specific proposals are to assure northern people, particularly northern people of native ancestry who make up two-thirds of the population in the North, would be assured of the jobs, would be assured of the business opportunities, would be assured of the spinoff benefits from the development using your model. I would be interested in the specifics of that.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan. I want to first make it clear we on this side of the House have some concern, I think understandably, with the massive amounts of money, taxpayers' money, being invested into resource development. Taking a look at that, \$2.6 billion in to the potash industry and \$300 million into the uranium industry, taking a look at those massive investments of taxpayers' dollars which are mortgaging future

generations here in the province of Saskatchewan and taking that amount of money and relating it to a return on that particular investment, when you talk about the amount of money that is going into say the heritage fund from resource development, it should be noted that the former premier of Saskatchewan, Ross Thatcher, when he left office, left more money in the liquor board fund than there is in the heritage fund. I have to question naturally the amount of money accruing to Saskatchewan people in relation to the amount of money which is invested in resource development supposedly to be a front. We're going to use the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to fight multinationals. Now, I can understand we need to have, and I appreciate the government's concern, a measure of control on foreign investments, whether it be in the resource sector or the land base of wherever that investment of foreign money may be.

Of course, it's also noted your government was very quick to move down to the United States to borrow money from those terrible Americans to buy into the resource sector. That was what was done by your government. When the first annual report came out of PCS it did not show the interest on that borrowing as an expense. It did not show the difference in the Canadian and American dollar at that time. Borrowings that are still continuing on markets, foreign currencies that are declining. It should be understood, and talked earlier this evening, about the long-range implications of the international economic market.

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — What does that have to do with the estimates that we have?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, what I am saying is unfortunately far above the head of the Minister of the Environment, so, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if he would just retain his remarks while I try to put forth a position on behalf of the opposition with respect to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan estimates.

Mr. Chairman, those are factors that have to be considered. Say a government were to borrow a lot of money from a country whose currency was low, and over a period of 5 or 10 or 15 years (keeping in mind that governments borrow money on quite a long-range basis) were that country's economy to improve and the value of their particular currency to increase, then in fact you might be called upon to pay back not the original sum but two or three or four or five times the amount of money you have borrowed. Those are long-range economic factors, that kind of scare me with my understanding of economic matters, which affect the development of resources in this province and in particular, as we're discussing DNS, the development of uranium in northern Saskatchewan.

All I have said, very simply, is that I am concerned for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan who have been called upon by your government to invest massive amounts of money to buy back non-renewable resources that are already theirs. That certainly, Mr. Chairman, I feel is a reasonable position to take. The minister put forth the argument that we need to be more specific in how we would proceed with policies to allow northern Saskatchewan residents to maximize their benefits from the potential resource development, whether it be renewable or non-renewable. Certainly, Mr. Minister, you would have to consider the kinds of jobs available, 10 years down the road. You would have to put in place programs to educate northern residents for those particular kinds of jobs which would be upcoming with future development. Certainly that would be a position of the opposition. When you say northern Saskatchewan residents are getting great benefits from this future development, I have to question that. I think I have some reasonable argument in that particular regard when I look at a

news clipping, and I would draw it to the minister's attention, "La Loche awaits word on meeting with Department of Northern Saskatchewan." I'm going to make comment on this. Possibly the minister could tell me if in fact at this point in time he has gone up there and had a meeting with the people or he hasn't. But it says —and this is taken from the Star-Phoenix:

The mayor of this community, La Loche, which is plagued by an 80 per cent jobless rate, is still waiting to hear whether cabinet ministers will meet here to discuss northern unemployment.

It goes on to say:

Gordon Balon, a Prince Albert lawyer who acts for the local community authority, said about 150 people came from neighboring communities and Indian reserves on Monday to meet with the assistant deputy minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and Fred Thompson, NDP MLA for Athabasca.

Now, here we have a town with an 80 per cent jobless rate which is concerned, and what do you do? What does your government do? It sends the member for Athabasca to meet with these people, when they in fact want to meet with your department, when they want to meet with a cabinet minister.

So, yes, we as an opposition have some concern whether or not you are going to be sincere when you say you want to give northerners those jobs. Certainly that is our position and we will agree with you if that is your position. We will agree, in any way we can, to help bring it about.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the article goes on to say:

The promised government sawmill will only employ 25 people in the mill and another 25 in the bush, said Balon. This will not meet the needs of the 2,600 people in the La Loche area, three quarters of whom are under 16 years of age. They are not anti-nuclear; it is just things are not as rosy up here as the southern press make them out to be.

These people don't want welfare. Most of the people are Chipewyan and they are a very proud people and they want to work. Meanwhile in Regina the Minister, Mr. Hammersmith, said he was not aware the people of La Loche wanted to meet with cabinet ministers. As far as he knew the Monday meeting was solely to discuss a feasibility study for a sawmill.

Now, I find it interesting to note that minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan did not know these people wanted a meeting with him. Well, maybe there is some explanation for it and I am sure there is and the minister is going to get up to give us an explanation. If there is a reasonable explanation, then I can accept that. But this is taken from one article alone, just one, and there are others. I am not going to waste the time of the Assembly in going through a whole array of press clippings which point to the irresponsibility in many areas, Mr. Minister, you have been placed in — not placed in, I think you have moved into it of your own volition, obviously.

So, Mr. Minister, when you talk about northern jobs, northern employment,

northerners being able to benefit from northern resource development, I have to question whether you are sincere about that. I have to question that, Mr. Minister, when I see many reports to the contrary. And you ask us, what would our position be?

If I were the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan I certainly would have my officials make it very clear to me where I was supposed to be and where the needs were. I would be there to meet with those people and to tell them precisely what our position would be as a government.

So I would work, Mr. Minister, as a minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, as a Progressive Conservative government would, to ensure through regulations or whatever means you could employ as a government . . . I have to say I have never been part of government, I don't know what the mechanism would be, but we certainly would enshrine regulations, and firm regulations. We would guarantee jobs for northern Saskatchewan residents in the industries that would be operating in their own part of the province.

I think, Mr. Minister, that's very important. I think that we have to remove the term jack pine curtain, if you like, the northern administration district boundaries. If I were a northern Saskatchewan resident I would want to think that I was part of Saskatchewan and not just part of a particular part of Saskatchewan that more or less wasn't part of the rest of Saskatchewan. I suggest that it might be in the interest of northern Saskatchewan to remove that boundary as I have suggested and allow a normal local government autonomy to grow and proceed in northern Saskatchewan. Then southern Saskatchewan can grow into that great potential that exists in northern Saskatchewan and they in northern Saskatchewan can feel a part of this whole province and be a part of its potential and grow with it. So, Mr. Minister, I think on every count so far you have asked me for specifics and I have replied with specifics exactly what we would do as a government, what I would do as a minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the member finally moved out of international arena to consideration of the DNS estimates and the policies and programs of DNS. I was a little concerned for a while that he might be on another tack to avoid discussing the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I would like to begin first of all with the last matter that he raised, the matter of the Star-Phoenix report on La Loche. I have to assume that is the source of much of his information and his primary research source, the one article in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. I would like to relay to the member and to the House that on March 3 in Buffalo Narrows I met with the Mayor of La Loche, Leonard Larson. We agreed that on March 17 at a meeting which he would call specifically to discuss forestry development and particularly a sawmill, Mr. Alwarid, the assistant deputy minister responsible for economic development, resource development and municipal services, would be in attendance, the MLA for Athabasca would be in attendance, and one person from my office would be in attendance. That was agreed to between Mr. Larson and myself two weeks before the March 17 meeting referred to in the article.

Prior to that I had met on two separate occasions in La Loche with Mayor Larson and his council and we had discussed many of these matters. The meeting of March 17 did take place. The entire discussion, regardless of what the Star-Phoenix article may say, surrounded the development of identification of forestry potential and the possible development of further forestry activities. I might remind the member or inform the member that there does exist in La Loche an operation called the Metis Co-op, which is

a post cutting and marketing operation that was assisted many years to get established and started by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

At the meeting on March 17, it was suggested by the local community authority and Mayor Larson and agreed to by the department, that they would like to hire their own forestry consultant to study the forestry development potential on their behalf and to work out the feasibility and the details of establishing a sawmill in the area. They have since been allocated a grant of \$40,000 to hire the forestry consultant, they will hire the person and he will be their employee. In addition, they were informed at that meeting that under joint federal-provincial funding through the special ARDA program an application that they had put together with the assistance of the department some weeks earlier requesting a full-time economic industrial community-development worker for their local government had been approved and that they would proceed with recruiting that person and putting him on staff. That's what happened at the meeting. That's what the meeting was about.

I should say, in addition to that I talked to the Mayor of La Loche on the phone on the night of March 17. He was entirely satisfied and happy with the meeting. I talked to him again just this past Saturday night. He informed me that they had completed the community planning study they had done with funding from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. They had hired their community planning consultants and they have developed their long-term community plan.

The member referred to some other matters, but I want to relate that to him lest he retain the impression that the department has somehow not been involved with the community of La Loche over the last few years. In 1975-76, there was an airstrip upgrading program at a cost of \$48,000, employing mostly local people. In 1975-76, the sewer and water system was completed at a cost of \$975, 945; there were 8 more connections done that year at a cost of \$12,021; 30 connections plus 13 fire hydrants in 1976-77 at a cost of \$50,000. Street construction from 1973-77: total cost \$37,403. A well in the Poplar Point subdivision in 1975-76: \$8,000. Internal power distribution system in the community extended between 1974 and 1977 at a cost of \$26,449. Ten trailer sites developed between 1974-75 at a cost of \$66,411. Northern housing compound completed 1976-77: \$66,307. Five-room prefab multiplex school installed at Poplar Point 1974-77: \$43,625. Thirteen teacherages completed 1975-76: a total of \$174,174. Sewer extended to main school 1975-76: \$9,000. School renovated in 1976-77, multipurpose gymnasium auditorium in 1975: \$757,000. New school consisting of industrial arts, home economics, business and typing, science and resource centre and 12 classrooms: a matter of over \$700,000. Fire hall completed in '77: total funding from DNS \$90,000.

Construction will commence in approximately two weeks on the 1979-80 allocation consisting of 10 housing units. Work is presently under way with a firm of consultants on the preliminary design for 10-suite senior citizens' apartment which should materialize in early spring of 1980. All of this is at the request of, and under direction from, and with the co-operation of the local government; and all of this employing in the majority, northern native residents of that community.

The member went on to refer to a lack of training for northern people. I want to relate to him the training programs that will be delivered in the coming fiscal year: truck driver training: Green Lake 8 trainees, Beauval 8 trainees, Pinehouse 10, Buffalo Narrows 12, La Ronge 12, the east side 12 trainees; heavy duty equipment operation: on the Dillon road 24 trainees, Key Lake 30 trainees; and it goes on, Mr. Chairman, into training for

mill operators, training for welders, for auto mechanics, for heavy duty mechanics, for commercial cooks, pilots, carpenters, wood harvesting, small business management, community health workers, preventive maintenance, sewer and water training, municipal equipment operators, firefighter training, typing, accounting, business machine operating, diamond drillers, conservation officer training and construction trades training.

I say all this in response to his suggestion that there was nothing happening in the area of training and in the area of employment. I'm pleased to hear his comments on training and on education, because I'm sure he will be pleased that in these estimates there is provision for an increase in spending of 27 per cent for adult and vocational training, an increase of 16 per cent for operations of the K to 12 schools, and an increase of 31.8 per cent in spending for school construction. I take it from his comments those are the kinds of ideas he was proposing and the kind of ideas he would support.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General, as it's getting about that time of the night. I would like to ask the Attorney General if he feels his comments today in referring to the names of the other people who will be coming before the courts will in anyway affect the decision which will be rendered in their particular cases.

MR. ROMANOW: — No, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe anything like this should have any effect. The names are all public record. If anything should affect the decision of the cases it will be the unfortunate tactic of the PC Party in raising this thing for two days in the style and tenor which has done them and this parliament a great disgrace.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 p.m.