

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 31, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. W.J.G. Allen (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, It's a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you and to the other members of the Assembly, a group of 23 students from McNab School in Regina Rosemont constituency. They're seated in the Speaker's gallery. McNab School is a school about a block and a half from where I live. Therefore I know in a personal kind of way many of the students and many of the parents of the students who go to McNab School. These students are accompanied this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, by their teachers, Mr. Burn and Miss Hoemsen. I'm sure all members of the legislature would want to join with me in welcoming these students to the legislature. We hope their stay here is enjoyable and educational.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I don't have guests to introduce; I only have one guest. I think it's a rather unique pleasure I have today. I never thought I would see the day when anguish would give me pleasure. However, the gentleman I was to introduce is my MP and the MP of some other MLAs in this constituency, Doug Anguish, who was recently elected in the federal election for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake. Would you stand and be recognized?

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the other members of the House, a group of students from McNab Park School in Saskatoon. Their member, Bev Dyck, unfortunately wasn't able to be here this afternoon and he asked me to give a personal welcome to all the students from McNab Park School. We hope your stay here will be interesting and that you'll have a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Quill Lakes): — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the House, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce 50 Grade 10 students from the Muenster High School. I just want to say my son Doug is present in that group. They are sitting in the west gallery. They're accompanied by their teachers, Margaret Vataman and Gus Yager and a parent, Mrs. Ray Timmerman. I understand the students have had a rather busy day already visiting the Leader-Post building and also the RCMP museum. I want to welcome them here and hope they have an enjoyable afternoon.

But speaking of Muenster, I think I might also take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to give further acclaim to the town of Muenster to recognize the high school boys curling team

made up of Warren Muyres, Craig Muyres, Colin Korte and Kory Komonoski which recently went through the high school boys' curling championship in Assiniboia with nine straight games undefeated. I might also indicate that the juvenile hockey team, C division (many of the boys present today in the Grade 10 class through Midgets played on the juvenile team) were runners-up for the provincial juvenile C hockey. I will meet with you shortly after question period.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I welcome to this House through you, (I'm sure all of the other members welcome) 16 junior high school students from the village of Goodeve. This is the little village where I got my schooling and where I got my high school education as well. They are here with their teacher-principal, Mr. Fred Bohay, and their bus driver, Orlando Klus. They've already had a busy schedule as many other students have had today. I know they're going to be very interested in the proceedings of this House this afternoon. On behalf of myself and the rest of the House, we bid them welcome and wish them a really good and beneficial afternoon here today and a safe journey back home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Quebec Referendum Vote

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I take it you're travelling to Quebec and my question to you is, would you agree Mr. Premier that perhaps the most serious challenge facing Canada, in the immediate future at least is the upcoming referendum in Quebec and the consequences that will flow from the vote on that particular area — a yes vote?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I regard that as a serious matter in the ongoing life of Canada, yes.

MR. ANDREW: — My question, Mr. Premier, is that yesterday you were reported to have said the policies of both the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party are leading us toward annexation to the United States. I take from that you would suppose, or by implication, that it's only the policy of the NDP that is going to save us. Mr. Premier, how do you square that with the fact of the apparent reversal by the NDP in refusing to join the federalist forces in the Quebec referendum campaign, the fact that the QFL (Quebec Federation of Labor), which is a political partner of the NDP, is now out actively supporting the yes vote and that several defeated NDP candidates are also out supporting a yes vote. I ask the Premier, how do you support that and how to you justify those actions as being supportive of Canada?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder what this has to do with the question period. I wonder why the Government of Saskatchewan is called upon to comment on . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't wonder — just answer the question.

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . I beg your pardon. The member for Moosomin will please either keep his peace or stand on his feet in accordance with the rules. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the question the hon. member asks is entirely out of order and he knows

it's out of order . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's right. Thank you and we will have an opportunity to discuss this. But I will point out a couple of errors in the premise. First, the QFL is in no way associated with the New Democratic Party.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take the next question. The member for Estevan.

Taxation Plan — Heavy Oil Development

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of Energy Minister Marc Lalonde's comments yesterday that they would no longer continue to support the world price formula as first formulated in the tar sands situation, could you tell us what effect, if any you feel in the future this could have on our heavy oil development as far as the government taxation plan is concerned?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would assume that any heavy oil plant established would have, as part of the basis of establishing it, a negotiation as to the price which would be obtained for the product. That certainly was the case with respect to the Syncrude plant and it was later applied to the Great Canadian Oil Sands (now Suncor) plant. The formula, which was applied, was world price. I gather from the news reports the federal government had an out in that contract to declare force majeure and to assert that they don't have to meet the world price, although it's not clear what price they're prepared to meet. I would expect this would not directly affect the establishment of a heavy oil upgrader but would undoubtedly affect the care with which any contract would be worded with respect to pricing, so as to know whether or not force majeure could be brought into play to change the pricing regime arrived at or to establish a pricing regime which was not subject to any unilateral change.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, with the hundreds of millions of dollars that are going to be invested in heavy oil and the . . . (inaudible) . . . method of recovery and everything, can you tell me if the Government of Saskatchewan has any firm, signed agreements as to how our pricing is going to be based in the future? Is it going to be based on world prices?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, we don't. The Government of Saskatchewan is not producing very much of that oil. SaskOil is producing some of it but the great bulk of it is being produced by other companies — most of it by Husky and they may well have signed agreements. I am not aware of them and the Government of Saskatchewan does not have them.

MR. LARTER: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, can you tell us how much Saskatchewan has invested in this heavy oil recovery at Lloydminster to date?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I wouldn't be able to give a figure offhand. Obviously, one has to define Saskatchewan. If you are talking about the Government of Saskatchewan and its agencies, it would be a considerable sum of money but I wouldn't be able to give a reliable figure offhand.

Dumping Ground for PCBs

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — A question to the Minister of the Environment. In light of his statement that Saskatchewan may become the dumping ground for PCBs for all of Canada, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister if he is really serious and has he considered that there may be some people in the province opposed to such a move?

MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know

where the member draws his conclusions from that I indicated that Saskatchewan would become the dumping ground for all of Canada. I believe that in any newscasts in which I have been involved the last few days. I did indicate that a federal-provincial study is being undertaken on a regional basis to determine the potential available sites in Canada of the disposal of certain chemical wastes, toxic wastes. Since that report is not out, I am not able to comment on whether Saskatchewan would become a potential site or not. With regard at the disposal of PCB material, there has been rather conclusive evidence that there can be complete disposal of PCB chemical by the use of intensive heat, something like 99.99 per cent of 98 per cent, and that intensive heat in the destruction of PCB materials is one of the potential site considerations of this regional study.

In addition to that, I made a comment with respect to the site which is proposed for the temporary location of the present PCB material at the Federal Pioneer plant, and that if we were constructing a temporary site (and the cost of that site would likely be in the \$0.75 million to \$1 million range) we may well consider the use of that site for the disposition or temporary disposition of other toxic materials.

I cannot agree with the member that I made any comment that we said we would, or Saskatchewan would, become the dumping ground for all of Canada.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, are you in favor that Saskatchewan be used as a dumping ground for the whole of Canada for PCBs? Are you yourself in favor?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think it really matters whether I am in favor of it or not. I think the point that should be made here (and the point I have attempted to make the members opposite and to the House) is surely as there are PCB contaminated soils and PCB materials liquid and otherwise, being temporarily stored in Canada at the present time, if we as a government, and if the other governments in Canada are to accept the responsibility for the proper disposal of this material, then obviously there must be a place somewhere in Canada in which this material should be disposed of. If the regional study now underway suggests that Saskatchewan might be one of those areas where either PCB or other contaminated materials should be disposed of, then when that report is tabled and if that is one of the recommendations of the report, certainly this government should accept its share of the responsibility with respect to destruction and disposal of waste materials in Canada.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure there are lots of people in Saskatchewan who do not want Saskatchewan to be the dumping grounds of PCBs and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Could the member proceed with his questions?

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Will you give this House a firm commitment that you will do your utmost best to see that Saskatchewan does not become a dumping ground for PCBs for the whole of Canada? Will you do your best, Mr. Minister?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, this government does its very best every time it deals with any subject that comes before it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Whether the members opposite agree with that point of view or not is really not a question for debate, it's question of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, indeed we will do our best. That doesn't mean to say that Saskatchewan may not at some future time become responsible for the disposition, of final disposal, of some waste materials in Canada. We will have to accept our responsibility as citizens of Canada in the disposal of wastes. Certainly there's no question about the fact that no province in Canada wasn't to dispose of its wastes. That's one of the difficulties, and no province in Canada wants to become the dumping ground (as the member refers to it) for waste disposal of certain wastes which occur within their borders. If we are to treat the Canadian taxpayer with some respect, I would suggest that there should not be a multiplicity of these disposal areas but that we should attempt to do it on the most efficient and proper basis that is available to us. We'll wait for that report, Mr. Speaker.

Disposal of Bottles

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Question to the Minister of the Environment. Each year there are about 15 million liquor and wine bottles going into the garbage and the ditches, roadsides, parks, lakes, farmers' fields, and so on. What is your department doing about the environmental problem caused by the product being thrown out like this?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, there are ongoing discussions. I believe that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has under act of review a possible solution to this in the establishment of certain depots and certain programs for a possible solution in this area. With respect to the Department of the Environment, we are not yet moving in any positive way — positive way meaning that we are establishing either a policy or a program for the collection of spirits and wine bottles — because the original program for pop and beer bottles was implemented it was not considered that wine and spirit bottles were a major pollution hazard. Most of them were used within the home and ended up in the home garbage and were taken to a disposal site. As we continue in the consideration of this issue, it maybe that we could also establish collection centre, or a collection program that would ultimately provide for their sale and their gathering up, and their disposal in some other way.

Employment for Handicapped

MR. SWAN: — A new question to the Minister of Social Services. In Alberta we find in the collection of liquor and wine bottles and in their depots in the handling of them, they've been able to provide employment for something around 150 handicapped individuals. Are you interested at all in providing employment in Saskatchewan for the handicapped people?

MR. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services): — There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we naturally are interested in the employment opportunities for people of handicapped abilities and indeed also social assistance recipients. I think that in Saskatchewan we have embarked on a very vigorous program, which offers opportunities to the handicapped people and also through the ESP (employment support program) in respect to the social assistance recipients.

Indian Land Entitlements

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — A question to the Minister of Environment. It's your government's stated policy that unoccupied Crown land will be used to satisfy the native land entitlements. Does unoccupied land bank land meet your definition of unoccupied Crown land for the purposes of these entitlements?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any land bank land that would be considered unoccupied. I don't know of any land that is considered to be unoccupied that would be held by the land bank. Secondly, land bank land would not be considered to be unoccupied Crown land in the sense that it is patented land. It is land which has been homesteaded and land which has been purchased and a purchase price has been paid for the patent or the title. Therefore, even without the consideration of the fact that it may not be unoccupied per se, that is it doesn't have a lessee who is immediately holding or leasing that land, it would not be considered unoccupied because of the fact that it is deeded or titled land. Therefore, the provision of the agreement negotiated in 1976 is that if lands of those kinds are to be used for settlement of outstanding Indian entitlements, Canada and Canada alone must be responsible for the purchase.

MR. BERNTSON: — A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the intention of your government or your department to withhold land bank land from posting, to withhold it from prospective farmers in Saskatchewan, to put it on the table for negotiations of Indian land entitlements.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can get a more accurate report from the land bank commission but my understanding is that as soon as lands are available for posting, they are in fact posted by the commission. I think that process likely has already gone on because we're passed the normal time for posting of land bank land. I will check for the hon. member to see whether there is any further posting to be done by the commission this spring.

MR. ANDREW: — A supplementary question to the Minister of Environment. If I understand your statement, Mr. Minister, any land that has been homesteaded or any land that has been purchased at some time in the past does not qualify for Indian land claimed land? If I'm correct in that assumption, the Indian land claims made claim on some property at Winton, and I question you on that.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the selection by an Indian band to fulfil an outstanding entitlement does not necessarily mean transfer in the first instance. Simply because a selection has been made does not guarantee transfer. The indication that we would place on the table for selection purposes, not only unoccupied Crown lands, which is part of the transfer agreement of 1930, but because of the limited unoccupied Crown lands in the province, we would place on the table for selection purposes provincial Crown lands providing the federal government would do that same, technically correct with respect to title, some of the PFRA lands were homesteaded in the original instance and then the titles went back to the municipalities and were subsequently turning over to the province. Purely and technically speaking with regard to your question, those lands are now federal Crown lands but they were lands, which back in 1905 and during the settlement process were patented or titled lands. While these lands are now on the table for selection purposes, they are not considered to be patented or titled lands; they are occupied Crown lands.

SGI Rates on Heavy Equipment

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Mr. Minister, it has been brought to my attention that individuals of northern Saskatchewan who have purchased large equipment in excess of \$100,000 have to pay insurance rates for SGI or 100 per cent more than what line companies charge for insuring the same machine. What is your department doing about trying to provide more competitive rates through SGI to the people of Saskatchewan and especially the people of northern Saskatchewan who are trying to develop the North?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the member's assumption is a correct one. I will take that as notice.

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Mr. Minister, I give you an example and question. A Komatsu cat worth \$137,000 costs through SGI 4 per ten of the total purchase price plus a 10 per cent deductible. Through Western Underwriters of P.A. it costs 2.25 per cent of the total price only a \$1,000 deductible. Do you not agree, Mr. Minister, that at this time if we didn't have this expensive propaganda by SGI throughout the whole province we could have lower insurance rates through SGI for the people of northern Saskatchewan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, no, I do not agree because the assumption is incorrect. I said I would take it as notice.

Sunset Laws

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you are no doubt aware that sunset laws are either in place or being considered by many governments in Canada. In view of the fact that sunset clauses require governments to evaluate the performance, the financial and social effectiveness of their legislative programs, will you tell this House if this government is planning to introduce sunset provision in its programs?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the idea of sunset provisions is by no means new. Sunset law as are a piece of window dressing in this country. In the United States they are understandable because of the nature of their electoral and legislature system. In this country I would hope that every government reviews all of its programs to see whether or not some programs can be eliminated and some statutes can be repealed. That is a very common practice of all governments. I now the Government of British Columbia repealed some bills recently and included an extra one, which didn't quite call for repeal. We, from time to time, also will simply disestablish agencies — I think of things like the core services of the energy secretariat which we've had from time to time and which we have amalgamated with other departments. Statutes are constantly being repealed. I doubt whether very much would be added by attempting to formalize that process by having some sort of formal sunset provision.

MR. TAYLOR: — Surely, Mr. Premier, there must be things that come out of date and probably when enacted were of value, but times change. Will you commit yourself to study sunset provisions and report to this House upon the possibility of their implementation in this province.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I was busy reporting and I report again that I'm

unconvinced that formal sunset provisions of the kind we hear about in the United States have really any benefit in Canada. I'm not saying that they may not serve a purpose but I am yet to be convinced that having formal sunset provisions, get another statute to say that you're going to review statutes is likely to achieve very much in lessening the number of statutes we have. There will be someone the order paper and during this session — statutes to repeal other statutes. We are constantly repealing regulations and substituting for them, and, as I say, we disestablish agencies from time to time. If during the course of any of the discussion on the estimates, people can bring forward instances where sunset laws in a country such as ours have been helpful, we would certainly look at them. But we would want to see some examples again, not of the sunset process which we follow with a good deal of diligence, but with formalizing a process by statute in which idea we do not see much merit.

Bids on Gas Transmission Line

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Premier, in the Leader-Post there was an announcement today that Trans-Canada Pipelines, should they receive National Energy Board approval, is going to spend approximately \$120 million a gas transmission line in Saskatchewan in 1980. Can the Premier tell us if IPSCO is bidding on Saskatchewan and other portions of this line and do we have to do any renovating or improving of the plant in order to get contracts?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the announcement. I'll take notice and see if we can further information for the member.

Rural Programs

MR. BERNTSON: — To the Minister of Agriculture. The Financial Times of Canada recently published statistics showing that rural population rose 8.8 per cent across Canada while in Saskatchewan rural population, in fact, decreased. Can you indicate to this House whether you're going to be bringing in programs that will enhance the lot of rural Saskatchewan rather than your centralized idea of suppressing them and keeping them back to the boonies so that they can't get ahead?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it is property for me to go through the programs that are already in effect in terms of strengthening rural Saskatchewan. I will just mention two or three — FarmStart and land bank — the efforts by this government to deal with the transportation problems that Saskatchewan producers face, the efforts that we will be following through on with respect to strengthening the marketing procedures in this country to strengthen the rural base.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Congratulations to Curling Rink

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House an event of great importance which occurred in New Brunswick yesterday. This time I will get it right because I would hope that you will not be interrupting me as you did the last time.

As you are aware, yesterday the Rick Folk rink, which plays of Saskatoon, won the Silver Broom which is symbolic of the world's curling champions. We in Saskatoon and I'm sure all members of the Legislative Assembly would want to commend the Rick Folk

rink of Saskatoon for bringing such honor to Saskatchewan in this year, Celebrate Saskatchewan, 1980. I want to mention the players on the Rick Folk team and they are as follows: Rick Folk as skip, Ron Mills as third; Tom Wilson who plays second and Jim Wilson, lead. I am sure that all members will once again join with me in commending this most popular victory which occurred yesterday.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of the official opposite I would like to join the member for Saskatoon Centre in the conveying our message of congratulations to the Rick Folk team. I am glad to see that he has his team back in order. A lot of us had the opportunity to watch the game yesterday. I think you will all agree they are worthy champions. They have brought the Silver Broom back to Canada after an eight-year absence.

I would once again like to suggest to the Premier that a special invitation be sent to all of the curlers who have done so well. By my suggestion it has probably been done, but I would like to bring it up just once more and have them brought in to be honored at a convenient time.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Congratulations — Provincial NDP Curling Playoff

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, this event is a provincial curling playoff and it may not be world-wide, but nevertheless it was very a very important playoff held in Moose Jaw over the weekend.

I know that members of the House will all join with me in congratulating the Moose Jaw North rink — skip, Scott McKenzie; third, Michele Murdock; second, Harry Smutylo; lead, Cathie Cannon — in winning the NDP provincial curling championship.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to join the member for Moose Jaw North in congratulating the winners of the NDP for their accomplishments over the weekend. But I would like to suggest we would like to challenge the NDP at any time to a curling game.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN — VOTE 26

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. When the committee adjourned last we were dealing a motion, moved by the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck), that the committee urge the Government of Saskatchewan to immediately commence a public judicial inquiry chaired by Mr. Justice Noble into the operations and administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Chairman, I think the first thing that is rather obvious with this motion is it was necessary because of the irresponsibility nature of the present Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and his apparent inability to answer the questions which were being put forth by the opposition. That argument was being put forth rather responsibly; the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan did not think so. We were of course proceeding to question the minister responsible as to the department's involvement in a reported allegation of fraud, as a result of a contractual employee being convicted and sentence be in passed and brought down by Justice Ted Noble.

We felt that certainly the comments made by the judge in bringing down the decision were, to say the least, a bad commentary on the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. It was suggested that the department as a bureaucracy has run amuck and that staff member led the fraud through their involvement with this contractual employee and that they in some ways actively assisted him. It won the basis of that particular commentary that we were led to that line of questioning — it certainly led us to be suspicious, even more so than we are and were before the decision was brought down, of the department's ongoing auctions in northern Saskatchewan.

Certainly we felt, Mr. Chairman, it was the minister's responsibility to respond to those questions. He attempted to avoid that particular line of questioning by saying it was still before the courts, that there were still other cases to be heard and subsequently he was not prepared to comment.

Mr. Chairman, the particular sentence we were asking him to comment on in fact has been complete, so that is not an argument. We feel it is incumbent upon the minister responsible to answer our questions. I think in speaking to this motion I want to make it clear, very clear, that we intend to pursue this line of questioning. We said, speaking on this matter Friday last, that if the minister was not prepared to answer the questions, then possibly the Acting House Leader — the present House Leader was not in the House at the time — might bring someone in who could answer on his behalf, which led us, of course, to call for the present minister's resignation, not based on his involvement particularly, or at all for that matter, in the case that had been brought down, but for his reluctance to answer the questions in the House, Mr. Chairman, that's why we proceeded to call in this Assembly for the resignation, or for the present House Leader at the time to get somebody in.

The Acting Minister of Northern Saskatchewan at the time these actions had been taken — criminal actions as it turns out — was here just prior to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan estimates. He left, went out the door. I'm sure he could have been brought in. We were, I thought very reasonable. We said that we were prepared to give you some time, to take 15 minutes recess in order that you might confer with the former minister of northern Saskatchewan. I think we might even have a measure of sympathy for the present minister, that he has to answer to charges that we brought down at a time when he was not minister of northern Saskatchewan. By now, Mr. Chairman, he has tied himself directly into the former minister of northern Saskatchewan by refusing to answer. The fact that he is the minister responsible now is clearly why it is his responsibility to answer the questions of the opposition. So that's a point that we want to make very clear. We are not prepared to be stonewalled on this particular issue. We do not have the interests of northern Saskatchewan residents at heart particular issue. We do have the interests of northern Saskatchewan residents at heart. That is the issue. If your department from time to time is involved in a fraudulent way, or in a way that is not just, then certainly, we as an opposition on behalf of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Before we proceed any further on this, members will be aware that I was away on Friday . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sure you did. Order!

What I want to get perfectly clear in my mind are a number of points before I think this discussion should continue. Number one, has someone been charged? Number two, is that person convicted? Number three, is it under appeal? Another question: has anyone else been charged? I think the Chairman who was here on Friday outlined to the committee problems we have dealing with questions that are before the courts. I think if something has already been decided, there's nothing under appeal, then it's fair to comment. If something else is beforehand I want to get that perfectly straight.

MR. THATCHER: — I think it's all very clear in the Hansard. I think it's clear in Friday's Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I wonder if someone, perhaps the Attorney General, could outline this for me. Order, order! This is a very, very serious business. And if you don't think it's serious then you shouldn't be here. I'd like to call on the Attorney General. I can't stress to the committee how serious a matter it is for the legislature to discuss something in it before the courts. I want to find out from the chief law enforcement agent of Saskatchewan what is, or what is not, before the courts. I would like to have you come if you could. Order!

MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Chairman . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, I'll deal with your point of order in a minute. Call on the Attorney General. Order. I've raised the point of order on which I want to get clarification. I'll deal with your point of order next. Call on the Attorney General.

MR. LANE: — Speaking to your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Sit down.

MR. LANE: — You go and ask the Speaker what your position is, not the Attorney General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Sit down. Call on the Attorney General.

MR. THATCHER: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman, point of order. I demand that you hear the point of order from the member for Qu'Appelle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Are you challenging my ruling?

MR. THATCHER: — You'd better believe it.

MR. W.J. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont): — Mr. Speaker, during the committee of finance, a point of order being under discussion in the committee, a second point of order was raised by the member for Qu'Appelle. I ruled that the Chair would deal with the first point of order first. The member challenging my ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. The Chairman of the committee's ruling has been challenged. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chairman of the committee be sustained? It is the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt that motion? Those in favor of sustaining the ruling of the Chairman say aye. Those opposed say no. I believe the ayes have it. The ruling of the Chairman is sustained. When there is a request for a recorded vote, call in the members.

Order, order. The ruling of the Chairman has been challenged. Those who sustain the ruling of the Chairman in committee of finance, please rise.

Ruling of the Chairman sustained on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 27

Pepper	Gross	Tchorzewski
Allen	Shillington	Cody
Bowerman	MacMurchy	Prebble
Romanow	Mostoway	Johnson
Snyder	Kaeding	Thompson
Robbins	Hammersmith	Poniatowski
Baker	Kowalchuk	Lingenfelter
Skoberg	Byers	White
McArthur	Rolfes	Solomon

NAYS — 13

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

MR. LANE: — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. LANE: — I would like to raise the point of order of the Chairman of the Committee of finance raising a point of order of his own volition, and secondly asking for direction on that point of order from the Attorney General of Saskatchewan instead of referring the matter to Mr. Speaker.

MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, point of order. Speaking to the point of order — I'm speaking to the same point of order — the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has inadvertently mislead the House when he says the Chairman of finance has requested me to give him guidance on the point of order. He did not. The record will clearly show that the Chairman of finance called on me as Attorney General of Saskatchewan to give what he wanted" facts surrounding cases of which the subject matter was the point of order, not on the question of whether or not the point of order

was or was not valid. I want to make that record absolutely clear.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order! This is all very interesting but it's not within my jurisdiction to rule on the matter. I'm sure the members will . . . Order, order! Yes, as soon as I get done you can get on our feet if you have a point of order. Order! I was stating, before I was interrupted, that it's not within my jurisdiction to rule what happens in the committee. The committee members decided that among themselves. That's along standing rule of the British parliamentary system. Now if the committee cannot decide an issue upon itself or they want to refer back to the House, they'll do what they have just done and they will call the Speaker back to the Chair and he will settle the matter at that time. Otherwise the committee will be governed by the rules that normally govern the procedure of the committee which are essentially the rules of this House. But when the committee is in session the Chairman of the committee and the members of this committee will be the ones who raise points of order and decide them. When they are out of committee I will do it. So, therefore, I rule the point of order not valid.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. LANE: — Which point of order?

MR. THATCHER: — . . . in speaking to your ruling . . . Mr. Speaker, may I ask to which point of order you are making reference because the record will very clearly show that the Chairman of the committee of finance raised the point of order himself . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — All right. I will clarify that. The point of order I was referring to that was invalid was point of order that was just raised while I was in the Chair by the member for Qu'Appelle. I explained why it was invalid. And I take the trouble now to quote to you from Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, which says:

Procedural difficulties, which arise in committee, ought to be settled in the committee and not in the House.

I think clearly what the member for Qu'Appelle was raising was something which arose in the committee and it is not within my jurisdiction to decide on it.

I take it that satisfies the member for Thunder Creek because I've told him what point of order I was ruling on. Anything further?

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

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

MR. LANE: — In committee of finance — and this is what the vote was just about — the Chairman of the committee made a point of order so we could hear the Attorney General. How can he raise a point of order, one of his own volition (and that's what the vote was) without referring it to Mr. Speaker and instead going to the Attorney General? Surely it should be a matter, if it's a point of order, to raise with Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — It's not within my knowledge what occurred in the committee and therefore I cannot rule on it. It's up to the committee. I thought I got that point across to the member for Qu'Appelle when I rose before to rule on whether his point of order was

valid or not. I found it to be invalid because what he is raising is the subject matter of what happened in the committee. I am not prepared to make a ruling on that. It's not my responsibility to do that.

MR. THATCHER: — May I speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — No, you may raise a point of order if you wish.

MR. THATCHER: — All right, a new point of order. I suppose I will have to ask this question out of ignorance. Why are you here then, with all due respect? Why are you here?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think we are getting to a point where the members are asking the Speakers questions and that's not the purpose of the Speaker being here to answer questions from the members. I think the Speaker is here to apply to rules and one of the rules is that when the committee is in a situation, as it found itself in, it calls in the Speaker of the House and he takes the vote. The vote simply is: shall the ruling of the Chairman of the committee be sustained? We decided that and it was sustained.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN — VOTE 26 (cont'd)

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The question, because I think it is important . . .

MR. LANE: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to question your . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Wait a second. Look, I'm trying to do the best job I can in this committee. I'm trying to do it according to the long-established rules of this House and other British parliaments. One of those rules is that a person has the right to a fair trial, and if anything goes on in this committee that would impinge on that right (and I am the Chairman) I have to take the responsibility for that. So I want to know and I want it on the record I want it on the record what the case is and then we'll deal with the motion and I will deal with your point . . .

MR. THATCHER: — A point of order, Mr. Chairman. May I point out to you that it is well one the record? It is on the Hansard record and the precise case, that it is, is on the record from Friday. The motion is on the record of Friday. And with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could return to the Chairman who accepted the motion. He was fully cognizant of it on Friday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order!

MR. THATCHER: — I expect that you didn't do your homework and that you are holding this whole Assembly up because you didn't do your work before you took the chair. You are trying to blame it on the opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You are in contempt of this committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Come on Billy, let's get on with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would like to call on the Attorney General to clarify for me . . .

MR. LANE: — A point of order. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what right you have, on a matter of clarification or otherwise, to interfere and cut off the speech of the member for Moosomin? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you have no right to cut off a member except on a valid point of order — just to hear a speech from the Attorney General is an abuse of the process in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you making a speech or are you participating in this debate?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Shut up and sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't tell me to shut up and sit down. I'm asking you if you are participating in this debate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would ask the Attorney General to sit down just a moment, please.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . (inaudible) . . . the Attorney General would tell anybody to shut up and sit down.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's not very parliamentary, boy. I would certainly not applaud you . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I want to say to this committee, and I hope you will take it in the seriousness . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . (inaudible) . . . when the Attorney General would tell anybody to shut up and sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! Are we all school children here or what?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He is the one who is saying, shut up and sit down, not us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would ask the committee, as a personal favor if nothing else — and realizing the seriousness of what we are dealing with here — to help me clarify the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's already on record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I've red it. I want it on the record now and I want to deal with it on the record now.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why? You're not participating in the debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm not participating in the debate.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, might I respectfully suggest to you that you are exceeding your authority as the Chairman of the committee of finance, in interrupting a member who was speaking on a duly moved and seconded motion — a motion that was accepted on Friday. If I am not mistaken, the member for Regina Wascana was in the chair (and I'm subject to correct but I believe he was). He was in the chair, it was accepted, there was a debate on it, and Mr. Chairman, I suggest you are getting into that debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I am not — this motion is perfectly in order — I'm not having problems with the motion. I'm having problems with the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Was I out of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I want to have it clear in my mind what I'm dealing with here. There is no problem with the motion. I want to know the facts of the case. If we can take two minutes to get the facts of the case, I'll deal with everybody else's problems.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . (inaudible) . . . have to put off the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'll call on the Attorney General. I'm not . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is he participating in the debate?

AN HON. MEMBER: — No.

AN HON. MEMBER: — As what? As a speaker in this debate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. He is rising on a point of order.

MR. LANE: — Whose point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — His point of order. I heard you call point of order and I gave you the opportunity to speak first.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order and I'm very sorry to see the childish and shameful performance opposite. My point of order . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — We've never seen a cover up or closure like this. A Christmas concert is better rehearsed than that.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, my point of order is very simple. Mr. Chairman raised, on his volition, sometime during the course of the remarks from the member for Moosomin, a point of order. That is what the standing vote and bringing in Mr. Speaker was all about. Did he have that right or did he not have that right? And the standing vote was accepted on that basis. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say with all due respect, your ruling has been sustained. Let's get on to the next issue. Let's get on to the debating the motion and get on to the debating operation or get on to the information that you, as Chairman, request of this House. Surely, that will not prejudice any of the opposition or any of the government side for a full and frank debate on this whole operation. That's my point of order. The point of order and the ruling have been made and I would ask the members of the House through you, Mr. Chairman, to allow the information, if that's what you so request, to get out and get on with the debate on the motion.

MR. LANE: — Did you in fact raise a point of order of our own volition? That is what I asked earlier. Would you clarify your position?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, I did. I raised one because in my view there is a rule of this House and a rule of all British parliament that deals with question that are before the court. In my view, it's my responsibility to ask the chief law enforcement agent in the House to outline what is before the courts and what is not. He was not in the House, and I understand on Friday, as I want not. Before I continue, I want to have that perfectly clear because I view it as my responsibility to see that things which are before the courts are not discussed in this committee.

MR. LANE: — Speaking to the point of order. Mr. Chairman, do you believe, as Chairman, that you are setting a highly dangerous precedent by asking the Attorney General on your point of order instead of Mr. Speaker? That is the tradition in this Assembly, and a long-standing one. You check with Mr. Speaker as to your position. You don't ask for information in debate of committee of finance. That then is a matter of debate. If you have a matter of privilege that you want to raise, then check that with Mr. Speaker. This is a point of order which has no relevance whatsoever to committee of finance debate. And I think you are out of order, Mr. Chairman, in the procedure you follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, that's your opinion. It hasn't been sustained by the House. I'd like the Attorney General to tell me what's before the courts and what isn't.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I shall give you in 20 seconds what I understand to be the situation. And then I'll look very much forward to the debate.

MR. LANE: — No, you cannot, Mr. Chairman, speak on a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They're going to walk; that's what they're going to do. Let them walk out.

MR. LANE: — You were asking him a point of order. If you were asking the Attorney General for information, that is debate. That is not a point of order and he will lose his place to speak and . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor or do I not have the floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. The Attorney General has . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We are in committee. You can rise on this motion 150 times if you wish . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — No you can't, not on a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, you can.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You can't interrupt someone speaking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You can, according to the rules of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's closed debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You don't close debate in committee. I'll send you a copy of Beauchesne for something to read in your spare time. I call on the Attorney General.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Let's call this a presidium instead of a legislature.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised by my department people that in addition to the charges . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who? Name names.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Make a full statement or don't make one . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . against Mr. Howard Thompson, the following other people have been charged as well and that is Mr. Mel Lafreniere, Mr. Allen E. Flamond, Mr. Roger Gruending and Mrs. Corine Lafreniere. The names arising out of this incident, the Howard Thompson case: Mr. Melvin Lafreniere, former employee of the DNS; Mr. Allen E. Flamond, a businessman; Mr. Roger Gruending, a businessman; and Mrs. Corine Lafreniere, wife of Mr. Melvin Lafreniere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — These four people have been charged?

MR. ROMANOW: — The situation is that trials re to be held for Mr. Lafreniere, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Gruending and Mrs. Lafreniere. Trial has been held from Mr. Thompson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — And Mr. Thompson has been found guilty?

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — O.K. Just for the clarification of the committee, as I have said before, I haven't found anything the matter with this motion at all. I would caution the committee that if they're dealing with Mr. Thompson there is no particular problem but I would ask them to leave out discussion of Mr. Lafreniere, Mr. Flamond, Mr. Gruending, and Mrs. Lafreniere as people. If you want to talk about the department that will be find but ask any comments . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . but I just wanted to make that perfectly clear . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . State your point of order.

MR. THATCHER: — My point of order is those names have never been raised in this Assembly until today and they have only been brought up at your insistence. We made reference repeatedly on Friday that we had no interest in those cases, no names of individuals were ever used. I think it has been deplorable and disgusting that at your mistaken use of your power you have somehow . . . if you have granted . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order.

MR. THATCHER: — . . . somehow arranged for an appeal for these people. If they are found guilty then it is a disgrace and I hope to goodness that you have some retribution coming. Those names were never used till you guys forced it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Debate continues on the motion. Is the committee ready for the question on the motion?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, may I state a point of order? While I was making my comments on the motion before us did I say anything that would lead you to bring me to point of order? On a point of order moved by you?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He is not obligated to answer that question . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is that your answer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Look, I've made my rulings. You challenged the ruling; I've been sustained. Can we continue with the motion? Is there any further discussion on this motion?

MR. BIRKBECK: — I would like to raise another point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Fine. Raise your point.

MR. BIRKBECK: — You stated in discussion that were moving quite quickly back and forth, that the motion before us could be discussed one hundred and some odd times. Are you telling me that I can speak as many times as I like on this motion? And that everybody in this House can speak as many times as they like on this particular motion?

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . even if he moved it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. O.K., are we ready for the question on the motion?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, after such an unfortunate interruption in my remarks, naturally . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — For what reason . . . unseemly muckraking display . . .

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General is making comments that we have mucked — a muckraking display on this side of the House. I might read it into the record, Mr. Chairman, that it was the Attorney General that stood before this House and brought other names to the Assembly — not the opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — We have a motion pertaining to one particular case. He chose to bring in other cases that are not before the record. If anybody should have raised point of order it should have been somebody on the Attorney General. Mr. Chairman, we have a very serious situation before us and that is a commentary by a judge that there is in fact an involvement by this Department of Northern Saskatchewan in fraud. It's certainly enough reason for the opposition to want to know what involvement that is, if any. And if there is not, well, then stand in our place and tell us. Those are legitimate question and I say that specifically to the Attorney General. Those are surely reasonable questions for the opposition to be asking.

As I was saying before all this erupted and as the Attorney General summed it up as he rose in his place, let's get on with the debate. After, Mr. Chairman, this government attempted to cover up this issue and tried to stop it coming before this Assembly, as they did last Friday when we had this motion on the floor, they didn't want to vote on it, so the Acting House Leader rose in his place and called it one o'clock. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the motion is of substance. Mr. Chairman, what we're talking about today is government involvement in what has been commented on as fraud — passive and active involvement. That is why we are asking for a judicial inquiry into all affairs in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman, if I were the present minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan, I would want a judicial inquiry. I would want it to clear up the mess that apparently had been left by the former minister of northern Saskatchewan, so that I, as the new minister, could proceed in the interests of northern Saskatchewan residents. Now, Mr. Chairman, that should be the position taken by the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan, not a position that's being outlined by the central part of that government who are telling him no, we're not going to give those answers to the opposition about what areas your department is involved in; we're going to cover it up

as best we can; we're going to stop that opposition from getting that information.

Mr. Chairman, I say the taxpayers are the people of Saskatchewan and those people have a right to the information as it relates to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Chairman, I suspect surely today the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan is going to stand in his place and is going to attempt to give us some answers. As I said earlier, we are going to proceed and continue to proceed to get information as it related to all matters affecting northern Saskatchewan — we're going to do it through your estimates, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I think another very valid point that needs to be made is that this isn't the first time we have asked for an inquiry into northern Saskatchewan affairs. We asked for it on March 3. We suggested we should have an inquiry into northern Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the central issue. Is there or is there not involvement by this government in an unjust way in the affairs of northern Saskatchewan and those of the residents and the people of northern Saskatchewan they are supposed to be representing?

Mr. Chairman, those are the comments I have to make at this point in time and I would be most anxious to hear the remarks from the hon. minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I call on the Hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I'm seconder, Mr. Chairman. Does a seconder of a motion get a chance to speak?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We've had lots of speakers on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Points of order, points of order. This is debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, there aren't any seconders to motions in committees to start with. It was discussed on Friday. I'm gong to get you right after he speaks. I promise.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Before I begin I would like to introduce a number of people. First of all, in the Speaker's gallery are the instructor and students from an adult education class in Sandy Bay. The instructor, Roy Morin, and his wife are with us this afternoon, as well as Norman Nateweyes, Billy Linklater, June McDonald, Mary Ballantyne, Bob Charlotte, and Ron Merasty, who I think are in the west gallery. We welcome these residents of northern Saskatchewan to this House and welcome them to witness the performance by the members opposite. I'm sure members opposite will attempt to be on their best behaviour in this debate in view of the fact that they are being closely observed by residents of northern Saskatchewan. I ask all members to join me in welcoming these people to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN — VOTE 26
(Continued)

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Chairman, before I begin some remarks with respect to the remarks made by the member for Moosomin. I would like to now relate to the House a number of things that I asked on several occasions that the members ask, so that I could relate them. They refused them to ask and they refuse now. I'd like to review a chronology of major events so that the House can be aware of the department's actions in this matter.

In August of 1966 Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation began accepting RAP applications including a contractor for the work with four households at Cumberland House. In September and October of 1976 payments were made by CMHC for work at Cumberland House after the payments had been approved by an employee of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

In February 1977 the program supervisor was made aware for the first time of a problem with work not being completed at Cumberland House. In March '77 the contractor was asked by department officials to return to Cumberland House to correct deficiencies, without success. In March and April of '77 an internal departmental review was undertaken. In May of '77 an employee responsible for the program was dismissed. In May of '77 senior management of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan requested a full-scale investigation through the Attorney General's department. In August and September of 1977 there was agreement of CMHC and DNS to joint system's audit of the RAP program. Beginning in June of '77 (between June and September) the DNS housing branch was reorganized and new management was appointed.

In January of 1978 CMHC and DNS task force released a report on RAP program system audit and departmental act to implement recommendations. In the fall of 1978 charges were laid against five individuals. Just recently one of those individuals was brought to trial and convicted, resulting in sentence being passed by Justice Noble and the comments by Justice Noble which led to this motion being placed before this committee on Friday last.

It should be noted and repeated by the House that one of the persons charged was employed by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan at the time the event occurred which led to the charges being laid. This person is still awaiting trial. It is reasonable to take the position that the passive and active co-operation by DNS, which was alleged by Justice Noble, could very well refer to the alleged involvement of the person still awaiting trial. Consequently, it is likewise reasonable to take the position that the

matter is still before the courts and consistent with the ruling for Beauschesne:

Members are expected to refrain from discussing matters that are before the courts or tribunals which are courts of record. The purpose of this sub judice convention is to protect the parties in the case awaiting or undergoing trial, and person who stand to be affected by the outcome of the judicial inquiry.

That was read into the record on Friday last by the Acting Chairman. It is also reasonable and correct for the minister responsible to take the position that this is not a matter on which eh can give an opinion or make any comment.

I can, however, inform this House as to what changes have taken place in the administration of the program since the time of the vent which led to the initial DNS investigation, the subsequent RCMP investigation and to charges being laid.

There have been changes in branch organization structures to separate programs and financial aspects where DNS acts as a contractor. There are two managers involved so that one does not control the entire process.

Final inspections on houses are now performed by the independent building inspectors and property management branch before final payments are approved. assistance is provide to grant officers in preparing estimates by trades personnel and estimators. Firm procedures have been established to review estimates with the applicant, ensuring that the latter realizes that the estimate is not bidding. There has been an introduction of a back-pile system regarding each appreciation and work in progress.

The grant manager must review RAP (regional assistance program) documents prior to forwarding to CMHC (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation). Improvements RAP filing system regarding control of documents, check lists and access control have been implemented. Detailed job descriptions for all employees have been established with authorities and responsibilities clearly spelled out. A post-completion review of each RAP loan is carried out by the grant manager. Separate cost accumulation accounts are now kept for each Rap application handled by DNS.

The record will show that on a least five separate occasions on Friday last I asked the members opposite to move into detailed consideration of the DNS estimates. The record will show that on page 1250 I specifically asked them what administration systems were in place in 1976? What changes have been made? What systems are in place now? They refused to do that. They refuse to do that today In spite of several requests from me, they refuse to consider the details of the program. They chose instead, Mr. Chairman, to engage in a two and one-half hour political harangue. They knew full well that it was inappropriate for me to comment on a matter before the courts. They had the pertinent and applicable ruling read to them by the Chairman but they clearly and wilfully chose to ignore the rules of this House, rules agreed to by all members, rules that apply in all British parliaments for the benefit of all members and in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — They chose to ignore those roles and ignore the interests of the people of Saskatchewan whom they are sent here to serve. The member for Moosomin got to his feet today and repeated that it doesn't matter what the rules say;

we're above that. We will continue to raise matters that are still before the courts. They are above the courts in their view. They are above the judicial system. They did more than ignore, they chose to attack the rights of individual citizens to a free trial and a fair trial! They chose to ignore the rights of individuals before the courts. They persisted and they persist today, even after having been informed that such comments are inappropriate in insisting that a minister of the Crown comment upon such a decision of a justice in Queen's Bench Court and comments on matters still before the courts.

This was the second time in two days that we witnessed this kind performance from the members opposite. On Thursday night the member for Regina south persisted in attempting to make the case that the Minister of Labour should insert himself between an individual and that individuals' right to see redress in the courts. The very next day, several members opposite, led by the member for Thunder Creek, the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Kindersley, insisted that the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan should use his office to debate the opinion of a Queen's Bench justice, should use his office in such a way that it could very well jeopardize the individual rights of four people to a fair trial. They continue to show no regard for the rules of this House, no regard for the rights of four individuals to a fair trial. In fact, they show contempt for the rules of this House, contempt for the rights of individuals and contempt for the judicial system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Why, Mr. Chairman, do they continue to insist avoiding discussion of the real issue? Why do they insist on a strategy which flaunts the rules of this House? Why do they insist on tactics which would deny any individuals their rights in the courts? Surely they can't claim they don't know better, although that's attempting explanation. They have lawyers in their midst who surely know better. They had the rules of this House read to them and read into the record. Certainly they know better. But why do they persist? I say they persist for the reasons which the Attorney General states in this House on Friday, March 21. They persist in these tactics because they know (and they know that the public knows) their credibility is gone; what little credibility they had is gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — They know they are on the way down and they refuse to debate the issues, Mr. Chairman. They refuse because they know, and the public knows, they have no credibility on the issues. They have no concrete positions on the issues. They know it; we know it; and the people of Saskatchewan know it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — They have no desire to discuss the programs, the policies or the estimates of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, because they know that overall the record of that department is a very good record and the record speaks for itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — They know they have yet to put forward one positive, concrete, alternative. They know their research team has produced nothing concrete. They must rely on others for information. They rely on the press; they rely on reports on the wire

about a decision handed down by a judge. But they do no research on their own. They are embarrassed, Mr. Chairman. They are embarrassed by the fact that they have nothing but platitudes and rhetoric to place against the very specific and very solid achievements of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

What are those achievements they wish to ignore? What are the specifics which they prefer to deny? What are the specific achievements they refuse to enter into debate on? Well let me tell the House about a few of them. Between 1972 and 1978 the average annual wage in northern Saskatchewan doubled. Between 1972 and 1978 welfare dependency was reduced from 47 per cent to 16 per cent. The average income of fishermen went from \$1,300 a year to \$2,800 a year. The average trapper income went from \$581 a year to \$1,468 a year. The percentage of people served by local government was only 63 per cent in 1972; in 1978 it was 100 per cent. Grants to local government in 1972 were \$31,000 in total; in 1978 they were \$4.3 million. Northern employment in mining was almost nil in 1972. In the Amok project alone northerners have received \$3.7 million and \$8.7 million in contracts. And the story goes on and on

It is clear why the opposition would not want to discuss that, why they wouldn't try to avoid any discussion of the specific achievements in the North. Instead they attempt to create an issue where there is no issue. They return to their tactics and their charges of filthy hospitals and of torture camps. People know full well what the Tory position is. They wish to avoid drawing attention to the fact that since the department of the member for Nipawin to the U.S. they have become a rudderless ship and they are embarrassed by the department of those two members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — They are embarrassed by their new leader. They wish to avoid focussing attention on their fears and their new leader's fear at the prospect of putting their new leader to the electoral test.

Their new leader promised research; he promised they could come forward with positive alternatives. But we have no evidence yet, Mr. Chairman, no evidence in this House of the results of this Devine research or this Devine guidance. They have nothing but shallow rhetoric and unfounded charges to offer to the people of Saskatchewan.

They are afraid of the challenge. They are afraid of the challenge of the 80s, the challenges as they related to the North and the challenges as they relate to Saskatchewan as a whole. So they create a diversion, a smokescreen to hide their ineptitude, to grab at headlines, to make some cheap political shots. They think they will hide their embarrassment and hide their lack of leadership and hide the lack of unity which prevails on that side. In order to do that they are prepared to ignore the judicial system, to ignore the rules under which the parliamentary system must operate, to ignore the rights of individual. It's a shameful performance, Mr. Chairman, a shameful performance. But it's an enlightening performance. It's an enlightening performance. It's enlightening for this House and it's enlightening for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — It's enlightening because it allows us a glimpse of what might be expected should those members opposite ever have the opportunity to govern. They

would place themselves above the rules of the House. The member for Thunder Creek says the rules don't apply to him. The member for Qu'Appelle says the rules don't apply to him. They would place themselves above the judicial system of this country. That doesn't apply to them; they're above that. If they were cabinet ministers, they would put themselves above that and they would place themselves — and this is most important, Mr. Chairman — about the rights of individual citizens. They would attempt to do all that; to deny people the right to a fair trial, to place themselves about the rights of individual citizens in the wake of a leader who they were all loyal to just for short months ago — gave him a standing ovation — who has now declared his desire to dismantle this nation and join part of it with the United States. They are embarrassed by that. They are embarrassed because that leader can grab more headlines still than they can. They would do all of this as the followers of a leader who hasn't the courage to face the electorate with the disorganized, inept, and rudderless group opposite.

I say they have not proved their case; they cannot prove their case. They are totally unwilling and unable to deal with the real issue facing the people of Saskatchewan, particularly the people of northern Saskatchewan. They are unwilling to face those issues, unwilling to trust the courts, unwilling to abide by the rules of this House, unwilling to place their leader and his position (whatever it is and wherever he may be) before the electorate. I say, Mr. Chairman, this smokescreen they call a motion should be resoundingly defeated by this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the member for Prince Albert- Duck Lake roll on and on about what was basically a repetition from last Friday. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, now maybe the rookie for Regina North-West, while he's in the process of learning a few things in this Assembly, maybe it would be best if he's going to come up to the front row in committee, if he could be silent just for a moment. When you learn something, then by all means come up here when you're appointed, but I would suggest you have quite a few days to stay in the back row.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we've listened to the member for Prince Albert-Duck lake make quite a thing here today out of depriving people of due process. The member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake was in this Assembly on Friday, and I think he's fully aware the names of no individuals were mentioned. I think it was made very clear on numerous occasions that we had no interest in the specifics of the cases. I think we said over and over again our only interests were on the comments of Justice Noble after he had heard the evidence at a trial, and the comments he made in light of things which apparently came out at that trial.

The minister responsible for the DNS made quite a thing about the fact the future court proceedings against four other individuals may be prejudiced by what has happened in this Assembly, and I believe that he should be concerned. I believe he should be concerned. I'm not an expert on law and I wonder if the Attorney General is either because, frankly, I was shocked when it was read into the records the names of four people who are about to be brought to trial on charges relating to DNS activities. And I want the record and I want everybody clear that those names came out as a result of the NDP government.

If there is an appeal on those cases, if these people are found guilty — and I don't know whether they are or not. I don't know anything about that aspect — but if they are found guilty, I'm going to be awfully surprised if the defence attorneys for those four

individuals aren't crying foul before you even start the preliminary trial. I'll be very surprised if the defence attorneys aren't crying foul tomorrow. Certainly in many countries you would already have prejudiced those cases. I want it firmly pointed out that those names are in the record solely by the actions of the Chairman of the finance committee and by the Attorney General . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well now, to the member for Moose Jaw North, I'd like to suggest — I wish we could get every question that we ask from our seats across the floor. All of a sudden they're going to be read from the record - come on, Mr. Member, you know better than that.

But the issue, Mr. Minister, is simply this. The DNS has had a very rocky and questionable history going right back to its inception. Mr. Minister, you're a former employee, as I understand it, of DNS, and we have a former deputy minister and we have former minister here. There have been problems in DNS since its inception. If you read public accounts, there are not very many years — I think its inception was about 1972 — where there have not been questions of overpayments, \$500,000 in shoe boxes, over and over.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that those same problems are there. The DNS is a department far removed from scrutiny in Regina. Mr. Minister, I've got something you may want to hear in a moment if you're going to leave. It is a department that has been fraught with difficulties. Let's face it. There's only one reason why this government doesn't want an inquiry into the DNS: because you know what will show. You know that many of the horror stories that have been emanating beneath surface are true. You know very well that an independent public inquiry could shake this government right to its foundations. Let me just give you one little example while the Attorney General is smiling.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'm laughing.

MR. THATCHER: — Well, while he's laughing. Mr. Attorney General, you pointed out to the Assembly today that the gentleman who had been found guilty was a contractor by the name. I believe you used the name Howard Thompson. This Howard Thompson, according to the minister, was under investigation in 1975, 1976, and was ultimately charged — if I am correct, Mr. Minister, in the comments you just made — sometime in late 1977. That is the name used by the Attorney General. That is the name referred to by you, Mr. Minister.

Now, Mr. Minister, after the Attorney General brought forward the name of Howard Thompson, I went into public accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978. Looking under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, grants for economic development — bear in mind this is ending March 31, 1978, one year ago — by the minister's own comments in this Assembly, he indicated this Howard Thompson was under investigation from late '75, '76, and was finally charged in 1977. If that is true, Mr. Minister, I think it's a very valid question to ask you while your departmental people are there, exactly what Howard Thompson had done to qualify for a grant from the economic development of the DNS for \$1,458.31. It's quoted on page 325 of public accounts.

Mr. Minister, that in itself right there is an indictment of your department. You're getting a note right now, Mr. Minister, so hopefully you can respond to it. That in itself, Mr. Minister, calls for a public inquiry. And, Mr. Minister, you know full well with an independent public inquiry, horror stories like that will shake this government to its

boot straps. The DNS is full of it. Mr. Minister, the DNS has had problems. It's a new department and far removed from Regina. It's not unusual to have difficulty controlling large bureaucracies. It's not unusual; lots of governments have it. The federal government has always had trouble controlling its bureaucracy and you're having trouble controlling that bureaucracy in the DNS. And to this particular minister I want to say it's not completely your fault. You're inheriting a department that has been poorly run, atrociously administered since its inception, primarily by the previous minister. You're the one that's having to account for it and I have some sympathy for your position. Mr. Minister, I have no sympathy for your position when you suggest we have no right to raise this because there may be future prosecutions. That one doesn't hold any water. It didn't hold any water on Friday it holds no water today. I want to say to you again, your department is a mess. The horror stories that emanate from your DNS should be cleaned up. You can do it very clearly. Start from square one with an independent inquiry.

MR. ROMANOW: — I should like to say a few words on this debate, if I can. Basically it stems from the last remarks made by the member for Thunder Creek. I was not in the House on Friday, although I have had the pleasure, if that's the word, to take a look at the transcript of Friday's proceedings. What I want to do, Mr. Chairman, is to point out what I believe to be a basic contradiction — fundamental contradiction — in the argument of the opposition advanced by the member for Thunder Creek as to the true motivation of what this exercise is all about.

The hon. member says, just now finished say so, he and his caucus have no interest in the specifics of any particular case. Then he proceeds to say in the very next breath — our interest is rooted to the comments of Judge Noble on one particular case, which I believe is the case of Howard Thompson as it pertained to the DNS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not read those remarks by Judge Noble but I was given a copy of a press report, reportedly saying what Judge Noble said, on Friday before I left for Vancouver. I know it's reported in the paper as well where the judge — and I'm quoting now from the paper . . . I don't know if this is the judgment but the paper says:

The judge described the department as a bureaucracy that has run amuck and that some department staff members led the contractor to commit fraud and in some ways actively assisted him.

And, Mr. Chairman, if you note what the motion before this House says, it says precisely the same thing; 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 — identifying, I think it can be said fairly clearly what is being referred to — and that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan would break federal regulations and that the bureaucracy of the department has run amuck. Again, Mr. Chairman, these can be very specifically rooted to the Thompson case which was reported and was the subject of the debate on Friday. Then it urges the Assembly to get into the question of a public inquiry.

My point, Mr. Chairman, on the fundamental contradiction, I think, is self-evident by now. The member, on the one hand, says that he has no interest in specifics but on the other hand, the interest in the comments of Judge Noble can only but do one thing and that is point to a discussion of the specifics. There's no other conclusion, Mr. Chairman, because of the words that are used - he direct relationship to the Thompson case and the direct relationship to the other individuals who are charged.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the judge says, in his opinion, that some of the actions of the DNS employer/employees are at issue. The member has told us that a former employee is on trial. What would the members of this House have us do, Mr. Chairman? What would the member so this House have us do if this motion was passed? Mr. Chairman, what it would do is get into the details of “actively and passively co-operated in a fraud”; I’m now referring to the quotation from the motion. I say that cannot help but lead to one conclusion and that is discussion of individuals who are suspected or at least now face trial on criminal charges. That is evidence which you requested and received this afternoon before the House started. The effect of that, Mr. Chairman, would be that total abrogation of individual rights. It would be the wilful denial by this Assembly of the right of people to be heard in a fair trial with all of the facts in the cases before it. And not only that, Mr. Chairman, but take a look at what the motion would have us do. The motion would also have us have an inquiry set up and chaired by whom? None other than Justice Noble. They want an inquiry, presumably into the full aspects of active and passive co-operation on a “fraud” (at least, a suspected fraud up to now because the cases are not all completed). They want the inquiry to be conducted by a judge who seemingly already has some opinions or some statements to make on this particular matter. I think, Mr. Chairman, one really has to ask the question whether or not that, indeed, is the best approach to take.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one last point I want to make is that this matter has been fully investigated by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I think members will know that in the session last year, I was asked a couple of time, I think, primarily by the very aggressive member for Qu’Appelle, about the status of this case of the RCMP in various ways. The record will show this. The names of companies were mentioned at that particular time. Mr. Chairman, I, for one, do not believe that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are or have been or ever will be the part of any cover-up by any individual and that any person who has, indeed had to face charges will, indeed, have faced the charges. Mr. Speaker, I think those are the facts. The facts that I seek to make are simple. They are three.

The passage of this motion can do nothing else but of necessity get into the details of those individuals who now face trial and ought to have the right to advance the trials.

This is an inquiry, which I think is ill timed, given the nature of the matter of the cases before us, and I think, frankly, is totally politically motivated. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is with respect to the RCM Police. This is something which has been turned over to the RCM Police.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, we have seen today I think a very shameful and childish performance by the members of the Conservative Party opposite. Mr. Chairman, we still see it now with the hon. member for Thunder Creek in particular continuing to push and to interject in a very objectionable, in my judgement, offensive way about all matter related to this issue. I suppose that can be easily explained for a number of reasons. I don’t know whether or not the member for Thunder Creek was one of those who stood and gave the former leader of the party a standing ovation — whether he was or wasn’t. I don’t know whether has to atone for it. I don’t know what the situation is. I suspect, Mr. Chairman, what it has to do with is some press publicity here. I think the Conservative Party . . . By the way, may I say, Mr. Chairman, in reporting on the debate in this House this report on page 3 of the Leader-Post is, in my view, again of questionable quality. I report, Mr. Chairman, the words written by one Peter von Stackelberg — “the government stonewalling on the issue infuriated the Tories and prompted demands.” I appreciate that to be an object report — (stonewalling) as

opposed to an opinion judgment called by a reporter. Then I turned down on the next page. That very same reporter switched his reporting hat and put on his analyst's hat. Then his analyst's hat proceeded to say — NDP members did little help. I suspect that as much as anything, this show of childish misbehaviour, this show, Mr. Chairman, of contempt for the rules, is prompted by that kind of journalism, that kind of an approach. Really in reality, Mr. Chairman, I am shocked the Conservative Party would so flagrantly violate, dare to violate, the rights of individuals who are facing trial. I am shocked by this. Not totally shocked, because I think, as the hon. member has pointed out, the hon. minister has pointed out, the hon. minister, a lot of it has already taken place as a result of the member for Regina South wanting us to interfere in the labour relations board hearing and labour relations board cases.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the hon. members opposite their performance today has been one which unfortunately is a very sorry day for the legislature, one which has exhibited a lack of parliamentary respect in its extreme, and I've been here for 13 years, Mr. Chairman, it is the kind of situation which in my 13 years I have only witnessed but once and that was two years ago when they were also desperate. The example is when the member for Qu'Appelle got tossed out by the Assembly in disgrace for three days. That kind of an action — five days — the hon. member is proud of it and the hon. member for Thunder Creek. I think if they continue with their tactic of trying to obstruct and of trying to name call and question the Chairman's integrity, they may yet succeed one more time, Mr. Chairman, may succeed one more time in doing the operation. No, I am not threatening., I am commenting on your total childish, lack of mature attitude you have displayed to this House. That's what I am commenting on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — At some point, the Attorney General is going to have to talk about the particular issue. He's avoided it for the last 20 minutes. Perhaps he wants to give some explanation why he's not talking about the motion and why he's afraid to talk about the motion . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, as I was saying before I was rudely interrupted by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I have never seen such a childish display as I've seen by him and by the member for Thunder Creek. I have never seen such an unruly display in the courts of debating since the days when they were tossed out of the Assembly for five days for the height of unruliness two years ago. I say, Mr. Chairman, this is a party which is devoted to muckraking. It's a party which does not have anything to do on policy whatsoever. It is so devoted to muckraking, Mr. Chairman, that it would deny the basic rights of an individual facing trial right now. That's what the situation is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I say, Mr. Chairman, the Assembly ought to hang its head in shame at this kind of a display given by the Conservatives. I didn't what it is. Whether it's because of the fact their leader is not in the House or whether it's because they lack some direction of some approach. But I sat, Mr. Chairman, if you sake a look at this motion, if you take a look at the words, the words being directly rooted to those of Justice Noble, those can not be other but interpreted to be rooted to the actions of people who are about to face trial. That is a shameful performance indeed by the Conservatives opposite. The House should not tolerate that. Mr. Chairman, I ask the members of this Assembly to defeat resoundly this kind of a tactic on this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: — The Attorney General, of course, in his normal way tends to put up his man of straw so he deflects the issue. What we're doing here, what we're involved with here is a very serious accusation. That serious accusation comes not from the political people and not from a reporter — we are not of substance, apparently — but from a Queen's Bench Court judge. That Queen's Bench Court judge is saying, we have a case here where a man has committed a crime and we think perhaps normally we would have sent him to jail. Normally I would have sent him to jail but for . . .? And that's the serious thing — but for? — the fact the Department of Northern Saskatchewan passively or actively encouraged him to commission that offence. We aren't concerned about the actively encouraged him to commission that offence. We aren't concerned about the man on trial. The judge went on to say the bureaucracy has run amuck. That is a very serious comment with regard to a department, a very serious comment. The Attorney General seeks to say, well, the PCs are talking about something, they're unruly in the House or something else. The question is that this government has been accused of condoning fraud. They have been accused of having a department that has run amuck. And what does that mean? The member for Thunder Creek has recited situation since the history of this department indicating it has been in hot water year in and year out.

Now we have a judge of a Queen's Bench Court making a very, very serious commination against that department and against that government. So, what do we have the members opposite saying? Well, we investigated, the Attorney General says. We investigate and we got all the facts. We'll give those to you fellows after two or three years when the whole process gets done. And then the minister of DNS stand up and says, ye, and we've remedied those facts and believe us. We know what the problem is and we've brought in the remedies. And now everything is O.K. So the next time something happens, the same process happens. When are we going to come to realize there's something wrong up there. When are we going to allow . . . We're not suggesting at this point at this point in time it be us or out in the open. We're suggesting a judicial inquiry. We want something to get up there. We ask the questions. We only get the information you fellows over there are prepared to give us. If it's a sensitive piece that might help us, oh, you think that comes out? Not on your life. So, we debate not with the facts but with the facts you boys are prepared to give us. Judicial inquiry on the other hand is going to go right to the bottom of it. They will call witnesses. They will force people under oath to give evidence. Then maybe we're going to find what exactly did happen up there. And that is the issue. It's not the issue of "a" or it's not the issue of the four boys the Attorney General wanted to raise today. That's not the issue. There has been a damnation against that department and against that government. You boys are going to say, no, we don't want to do anything. We had better not to anything with this because there's something in court. That's nothing argument.

I go back to Ottawa, in an analogy of this particular case, where the Auditor General of Canada made a similar damnation about the government — he was deeply concerned that parliament had lost control of the public purse. What did Ottawa do? They came out with a report — a royal commission. They investigate because that was a very serious charge; they recognized it as a serious charge. I think in any jurisdiction in this country they would recognize this as a serious charge today and be prepared to do something about it because with that commentary, every person who works in that department has to be suspect. That's the normal reaction of the public. When you say the department perpetrated a fraud, then every time there is a question as to how much money is being spent, is that money being spent properly? Oh, I can just see the Attorney General now standing up and saying, there the boys go again, trying to

muckrake, trying to muckrake!

What is the function of an opposition? What is the function of the opposition when you have something as serious as this? It is not being said by a member of the press but said by a member of the judiciary/ You boys want to turn your back on it — no, we shouldn't get into that. Wait two or three years, then we'll get into it. I say that is an example of government which is at the height of secrecy, which wants to cover up, which wasn't stonewall everything. I encourage all members of this Assembly to support that motion; get something going; let's get to the bottom of this whole matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I want the members of the House to carefully consider what the member for Kindersley is saying. He is saying a judge in a court case has stated words to the effect (these may not be the exact words) that some employees actively and passively co-operated in a fraud. That's what he said. That is a serious operation. Now look, the words about the department run amuck —quite frankly, for the purposes of law, I'm not sure that much can be attached to that. That's a man's description . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Serious

MR. ROMANOW: — It may or may not be serious. But I tell you the question of a charge of actively and passively co-operating in a fraud can only lead a person to a possible conclusion that there may be a criminal charge of criminal charges pending. If you agree to that, because it's actively or passively co-operating a fraud, the next question is, where should that be best heard?

You are trying to tell me that it should best be heard in a judicial inquiry. You have it in your motion. I am saying to you, it's best heard in a court of criminal law where a person has a right to defence counsel, where a person has a right to bring in defence testimony. When you ask the Hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan to come in to give his opinions on those related matters you are asking him to either take a stand for the prosecution or a stand for the defence. That's what you are doing. That's exactly the situation. The allegation is actively and passively co-operated in a fraud.

If I accused you of that outside, I would be accusing you of committing a criminal act and you would be doing it libellously. I don't care whether you did it or who did it; that's not the issue. The issue is that the allegation is being made — the allegation you are saying should be got to the bottom of, by a judicial inquiry. I say that's what we have the criminal courts here for; that's what we have the RCMP here for; that's why the investigation has been going on for a year (or whatever the length of time was; I don't know the length of time) — not to judicial inquiry.

Now if you strip that from the allegation you are left with the words: run amuck. You are saying that's the basis of a judicial inquiry — words used: run amuck. Look, a judicial inquiry should not substitute for the legal process. A judicial inquiry should supplement the judicial process. It may well be that after the cases are down and the evidence is in, a judicial inquiry may or may not be warranted. I don't know.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Three years.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, you say three years. My information is these people are to

come to trial. They were to come to trial in the fall of 1979 except for the dispute which took place (the labor dispute which tied up some of the courts) and they are not there. It may or may not be three years. I don't care how long it takes.

The principle involved here is a principle of whether or not you, me, or the member for Thunder Creek, has the right to be heard in court without political pressure in a political forum. And you're telling me I don't have that right. You're telling me that these five people don't have that right. You're telling me that I'm going to debate it here all day Friday and I'm going to debate it here all day today. That's what you're saying. You're saying the RCMP are part of a cover up. That's what you're saying . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. you get up on your feet right now and you make the specific allegation of a piece of information, any information, which has been held back. You tell me one area which has not come to the courts in this matter. When I take my chair I challenge you, or anybody on that side, to tell me where the RCMP have failed to do their job. You tell me where — your or the member for Thunder Creek. Either one of you get up and you tell me.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that's what you look at when you look at this motion. You take a look at that motion and that's what is being said. I'm saying the answer is in the normal criminal way. Whoever is responsible gets charged and gets dealt with, with full rights and defences and the full obligation and penalties of the law.

They don't say that. The PCs don't say that. They say they want to set up a judicial inquiry notwithstanding the fact people are on trial. They want to deal with allegations of active or passive acquiescence in a fraud. That's what they want to do. I'm saying that is a sorry day for the judicial system. I'm saying this is a sorry day for this House. That is muckraking. I say that is attempting to make political gain, in a political forum, on an issue which is very serious, as Mr. Chairman said at the beginning, and an issue which should be decided by the criminal courts. And then whatever the inquiries of the condemnation should take place, if required, at that stage of the game. And surely you are not arguing otherwise. Surely you are not arguing otherwise that people who have been accused of potential criminal conduct by a judge should be tried by a public inquiry. I want to hear the Conservative caucus tell me that's what they're arguing.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You've just witnessed act 3, stage 1.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Attorney General, was there ever any doubt DNS is rotten? You've just confirmed it. I've heard you in this House since 1975, on many occasions. Usually you don't get up until 4:50 and then you kill the clock. But that's about the weakest I've ever heard you. And if there was ever any doubt that the department needs to be turned inside out by an independent body — upside down and looked at from every aspect — you've just confirmed it.

Mr. Attorney General, this case was first brought up in the question period way back on March 13, 1978. It was brought up by the minister's predecessor in this Assembly, the former member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake. Let me read you some of the answers from the Minister in charge at that time:

I can't give the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake a positive or clear statement with respect to the involvement. The matter is being investigated and is still, I believe, in the hands of the Attorney General department. Therefore, I have no further answers to give. (He's asked to table some documents.) I'm not prepared to table any document.

That was the answer a year ago. Case is over. Decision is down. Judgment has been rendered. We've listened to the Attorney General waving his hands, raising his voice, trying to change this issue into things like the RCMP. Well, Mr. Attorney General, we know full well what the issue is. It's the issue of a department which has simply gone and run itself for the past several years. It's a department which is run by the bureaucracy totalled insulated from any control. Mr. Attorney General, I asked you from my seat on many occasions while you were talking to tell us about the \$1,458.31 that this individual was given. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, isn't that a case of a department going amuck as Mr. Justice Noble says? On one hand they're charging him and taking him to court; on the other they're giving him a grant of almost \$1,500. Isn't that a department running amuck just a trifle? More than just a trifle? I notice, Mr. Attorney General, you didn't get around to really addressing yourself to that particular one — the most classic example of a department not knowing what its other arm is doing.

Mr. Attorney General, you weren't talking with a great deal of conviction; as you started defending the RCMP so passionately, we were on our team. I don't think anybody's going to argue about the RCMP. The issue of this thing, pure and simple, is one of a department which has had difficulties from square one, which is running itself up in Lac La Ronge. You're not running it; this minister's not running it; the previous minister didn't run it. You know there are horror stories up there that will be unearthed in any independent judicial inquiry. I want to say categorically that you're absolutely and completely afraid of it because you people, far more than us, know what's there. I'm not sure you know everything that's there but you know a heck of a lot more about it than we do, and we know far too much a sit is, because we know there's a horror story there. You're afraid to do it. Once again I want to point out what Mr. Justice Noble said when he referred to the department running amuck. If running amuck isn't charging a guy and then giving him a grant of almost \$1,500, tell me a better terminology for it.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I say again, I don't know the details of the \$1,400 grant which came up just today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fine, it's all right., it's public accounts. The minister I'm sure will have a word or two to say about that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm in the debate right now, if you don't mind, and I'd like to say a word or two about this and specifically the display that you people are putting on. I'm trying to make my point, my argument, and I think there are all sorts of reasons why you're putting on that display. That's been articulated by the hon. member and I'll continue on tonight. I'll continue on tonight as well; there's no 15 minutes or otherwise.

I do say with respect to the \$1,400, Mr. Chairman, one point very briefly and that is one will have to know what the date of that grant or that financial payment was. The date will also have to be related to the dates of charges if any. The Hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan can make a comment on that if he chooses later on, and undoubtedly he will become it's a specific question. Yes, I'll let him if you guys won't shut him down as you've been doing all day today — if it was anything like that yesterday — shouting him down in an absolutely childish display. It's too bad you don't have the member for Nipawin as your leader because he gave you a nice lecture on the routine. But I say, Mr. Chairman, that the important thing is the date — the dates of the grant, the dates of the charge, the dates of the conviction. I don't know how the hon. member operates in his view of the world, but I operate in my view of the world that a person is innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt under our criminal system. The hon. member for Kindersley may smile and the hon. member for Souris-Cannington may smile at that proposition. I happen to believe that proposition. I don't know whether the member for

Thunder Creek does or doesn't believe that proposition. The names — all you have to do is go down to the court house in Prince Albert — they're public record those names, always have been. Don't tell me that about prejudice; anybody would know that. I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that is what has to be done. You see again the tactic the member for Thunder Creek is using. He doesn't care about the dates; he doesn't care about the information; he spits off in response to me about this being proof (this \$1,400) of the department running amuck. He doesn't give a doggone about the facts. He doesn't care whether there has been a charge laid or not yet, at the time. I don't know the dates. I could be the most embarrassed guy going.

Mr. Chairman, I say this member opposite and this caucus opposite are absolutely denying any kind of a concern of any kind of a commitment to individual rights. They are doing this. They're doing it by virtue of this ongoing attack. The hon. member for Kindersley is very hot to trot to get on his feet and I'd like to get him on his feet because I want to engage him on his concept of criminal law and the administration of justice — clearly for the record. Maybe that member for Kindersley would get up and tell us how he thinks questions like this should be dealt with — whether by judicial inquiry or otherwise.

The hon. member for Thunder Creek obviously didn't want to say so. The hon. member didn't want to do it. No, I know your style. You would say anything because you have no respect for anyone. I know your style. You will say it inside the House and outside the House because you have no respect for anybody, including yourself, as the number one person involved. You have distinguished yourself in this House by accusations of a personal nature and only that.

And I say to the hon. members opposite you ought to hang your heads in shame; your heads in sorrow for that. Look, I know you are stung by the fact that two of your caucus left. I know there may be others there who are out. I know that to be the case. But surely to goodness there are some basic principles. Look, just as there are some basic principles of reporting — this reporter who says, a major scandal, \$500,000 — it may or may not be a major scandal, but that is the subjective opinion of the reporter. Just as there are some standards in journalism there are surely some standards in this House. Surely there are some standards in this House, and one of the standards of this House has to be respect for the administration of law. Do you not accept that, member for Kindersley? Have you thrown that out to the wind in your haste to try to get this whole thing diverted somehow? Where are the ground rules of decency which exist?

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this is a sorrowful display by the Conservatives opposite, and those who support them in this operation.

MR. ANDREW: — The Attorney General would wish us to deflect again the issue and I wish to state the point again. The point is this, Mr. Chairman, there has been a commentary about the department, about a department which has been under suspicion since its inception. We have a department under suspicion since 1972, and now what we see, now what we hear is what we are calling for. And what this side of the House is calling for is this: let's have an inquiry; let's air the dirty linen; let's find out what is behind there — all the problems behind that department. But no, the Attorney General wishes to narrow it down to the present case before the courts. And what does he say to us? Oh, we'll hear the evidence there. All the evidence is going to come out in defence's case. How stupid does he think the people of Saskatchewan are?

All the evidence you are going to hear in any criminal trial is the evidence advanced by the Crown, can that is not what we, as an opposition, are after. We are interested in that total department. This is just one case. There has been 100 before, or there's been 50 before, lots before.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Name one.

MR. ANDREW: — Name one, he says — \$500,000 in a shoe box! Not a problem, not a problem., no administration problem here. Is somebody over there going to stand up and tell me that \$500,000 in a shoe box doesn't create an administrative problem? Oh, yes, but I'm sure what they have said is, oh yes, we patched that one up, don't put the money in the shoe box anymore. So we're going to narrow it down, we're going to narrow it down to one little issue. We're not interested in that, people; we are interested in that total department. A judge of Queen's Bench Court has said — you have lots of problems there and so we better investigate it — that's what we're saying. We better investigate that department. No, no you boys say no, we're just going to look at the narrow evidence of this case.

Who, Mr. Attorney General, wants to put this down to the particular individuals charged? I suggest it's you because that's how narrow you want to limit this whole investigation, just to the trial. That's all you want to limit it to and what we're saying is we want to look at that whole department, because there is trouble there. If you say no, then you're doing nothing more than hiding information — stonewalling. So I say to you, Mr. Attorney General, you have to do better than that. The evidence we want is not the evidence you have just given. I'll give you that — I won't give you this.

What's the difference whether it's in Crown corporations or something else — it's the same old story. You don't give information unless you want to give information. And that's why we need an inquiry, to look at the whole department, not just at one trial or five trials. We want to look at the whole department and I say to you — if you are to deny the people of Saskatchewan after this, and after other things in the past, then you are indeed stonewalling. Then you are indeed saying to the people of Saskatchewan that no we're not accountable; we don't have to be accountable to you; listen to us we'll tell you we're doing a good job.

The DNS ministry says — yes we're doing a good job; the boys voted for us back in '78 so we must have been doing a good job. Some accountability, some accountability system, we have. I say to you that we're going to stand here and we want that information, we want that investigation. You're not going to narrow it down to one little case or one little trial and say no, we're not having it until then; we'll stay here until the sun comes up.

MR. ROMANOW: — I hope the hon. member does stay until the sun comes up. I challenge the PC caucus to stay here until fall because I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I've been sitting here now since 2:30 and I haven't heard one question related to the policies of the administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan — even relating to grants. The hon. minister told us what happened on Friday. He asked for two and a half hours for that same kind of question and he didn't get it except once. I say, with the hon. member of Kindersley is saying is false; it's untrue. That's not the main motivation behind the questions. He says that the department has been under suspicion. I say, Mr. Chairman,, suspicion by whom.

There are two kinds of suspicion. You can have suspicion by political bodies, this

legislature, by the members opposite if you will, dealt with by the ordinary channels: public accounts committee, committee of finance, however you want to call it. If he says there is suspicion on that category, he doesn't have to convince me. Ever since I've been a minister of the Crown, the Liberal and the PCs have always been suspicious of DNS. They've always attacked it; they've always argued it. that's one side of suspicion. But there's another side to suspicion and that is whether or not there is a suspicion of criminality that's what this motion is rooted in — a suspicion of criminality . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, you worded the motion, don't tell me that I know. You and your legal friends rooted and worded the motion. You did it with a purpose. You did it on the basis of the Howard Thompson case. You didn't come in here before the Howard Thompson. You didn't come in after Howard Thompson and put in a general motion on the general administration of the DNS. You rooted it to the words of Judge Noble in the Thompson case and you used those words specifically and you rooted it to the criminal suspicion. And now you say that the way to handle it is through a royal commission. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that is denial of democratic and fundamental legal rights of the highest order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I want the hon. members of the Conservative Party to stand here until the cows came home and say that they won't care who is to be involved and whose name comes out in this operation. I want the hon. member for Arm River to get into this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I want the hon. member for Arm River to get into this. I want the hon. member for Arm River to bring out all of this grubby little mucky facts about the cemeteries. I want the hon. member for Arm River to get all of his grubby, mucky facts of what he alleges about C.M. Fines. I want the PCs to be rooted right where they are — in the mud. Because I say Mr. Chairman, that's the only position they are in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — They don't have one idea what to do about DNS. They don't have one idea what to do about northern development on uranium. They don't have one idea what to do about northern development uranium. They're stuck in the mud. They don't want to follow the policies on the legal principles. No they don't. They say there is a suspicion but by whom? A suspicion by whom? And I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, that kind of a situation spells only one thing — a political witch hunt, a political fishing expedition, a bankrupt political party which is not to be tolerated by anybody, Mr. Chairman, in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Chairman, I would just like to return this debate to where it belongs.

MR. ROMANOW: — Get off. Get off the one I made.

MR. THATCHER: — Now calm down, Mr. Attorney General. Calm down. Just because you blew it today; just because you prejudiced the case of four people about to come to court (and you know you blew it and you know darn good and well there are going to be repercussion), don't blame us for that. You did that all by yourself. You did that out of sheer rank foolishness. As the Attorney General you know there are ramifications so calm down.

You know, Mr. Attorney General, you're getting pretty sanctimonious about things. You know it certainly didn't bother you to make reference (and your colleagues) when there was a court case involving a certain MLA for Nipawin some time ago. It didn't bother you to comment on that when he had a civil case. Go back into the record and there are umpteen of them. It didn't bother you a bit. Go back into Hansard. It didn't bother any of you fellows one bit. But now when we are into something (and we're talking about a government department) . . . Don't bother getting it for him. Heavens, don't waste your time; anything to change the subject. We're talking about graft, corruption, complicity; we're talking about a department that a chief justice says has engaged in passive, active corruption. The issue on this one is pure and simple and, Mr. Attorney General, out on the ranch we have a terminology for your comments. The issue is pure and simple. Make no mistake — you have a problem that is best with difficulties. It is a department that has had internal problems. It is a department which has been alleged by a chief justice or a justice to have committed fraud.

Mr. Attorney General, I'll go even further than that. I think it's a department, if you have a judicial inquiry that will be shown to be full of corruption on a sale previously unknown in the province of Saskatchewan. Have an inquiry and stuff those words down my throat if you wish. But I think it's a department that is just riddled with it and I challenge you to have an inquiry. Be we know darn well you're not gong to have one because you know what's there and you can get up and you can rail about side issues all you want, but it comes back to exactly what you know the problem is. That department is riddled with corruption. I'll say it again for you. I invite you to stuff those words down my throat with an independent judicial commission but you won't because you know you can't. You know exactly what it will show. I've been waiting since about 3 o'clock when I asked you about the \$1,500 or close to \$1,500 that went to Mr. Thompson the same year he's being investigated. You talked about dates. The minister indicated the investigation was in 1976. Your comments in Hansard tomorrow I believe, will show you indicated department people knew something was wrong as early as 1975. We'll check Hansard for that. None the less, you've got 1976 right here — page 1239, yesterday.

You tell us, I want to hear about a definitive statement from you right now. You know, I notice you haven't been up for about an hour. You've been letting the Attorney General get up and rant and rave. I want you t tell us about that \$1,500 or \$1,450. I want you to tell us what it was for . . . to that individual the same time you're charging him.

Make no mistake. The issue of your department is what's at stake. Is it clean or isn't it clean? We've got our opinions over here and we've stated them. Mr. Attorney General, you can get up and try to deflect the issue all you want. We're not interested. We're just coming right back to it. Now let's get on to it.

We want an independent public inquiry. If you have it and you're vindicated, you can blow us right out of the water. But the things of it is, you're not going to have it because you know it will blow you out of water. You haven't got the guts to have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I smile at the hon. member for Thunder Creek saying we can stuff his words down his throat. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, it makes no difference. We've stuffed his words down his throat like we have the member for Qu'Appelle on at least two or three instances since I've been the Attorney General and a member of this government on issues ranging from torture camps in the northern

wilderness to the Regina regeneration, to the dirty, filthy hospitals allegation. All of these have been fully investigated in some form or other. We stuffed the words right down the hon. member's throat — so far down you couldn't see those words. It doesn't stop them one bit whatsoever. It doesn't stop them one bit whatsoever from going ahead and repeating these wild allegations again, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't stop them one bit at all. They just simply get up. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell us about the \$1,500.

MR. ROMANOW: — He'll tell about the \$1,500 in a few minutes. But now, -Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Thunder Creek, said we're dealing here with a case of pure graft and corruption. Those are the words he used. That's what we're dealing with. I want to ask the hon. member for Thunder Creek to tell me what evidence has of that. The second thing I want the hon. member for Thunder Creek to do, because he's made the accusation, is to tell me where the PC caucus stands on whether or not pure graft and corruption should be dealt with by the RCMP and the courts or whether it should be dealt with by some other forum. I want the hon. member for Thunder Creek who said we're dealing here with a pure matter of graft and corruption, to give me, to give this House, the evidence to back that allegation. Now, you give me the evidence right now.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General in reply to the member for Kindersley, said we were asking for a judicial inquiry — I want the Attorney General to hear this because we have the record here — as it relates to four or five particular cases, four that are yet to be before the court. The Attorney General knows full right well that is not what we're asking for. We're for a judicial inquiry into the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Now, he says we didn't ask for that. The Attorney General might be well advised that during Friday's discussions, on page 28, and I quote my comments.

Mr. Minister, there is a great deal of misunderstanding and distrust on the part of many in Saskatchewan about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. The responsibility falls directly with the current administration of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now I won't go any further. Now then, if you'll just turn the page and go over to page 1235 about a third of the way down, you will see that I stated:

The costly and bureaucratic failings of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan are obvious and a full-scale inquiry into all operations of this department is necessary.

So your arguments that we were, in fact, perpetrating a judicial inquiry as a political motive are completely unfounded and the record will provide it, because had that down in the record before we moved that motion. So that's further evidence. Mr. Attorney General, that you don't know what you're talking about in defence of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, and further evidence that the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, and further evidence that the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan can't stand in the House and defend himself and his own department. Now, Mr. Chairman, that's the point I wanted to make with the Attorney General. The Attorney General on behalf of the whole government is making a weak attempt of defending their involvement in this corruption in northern Saskatchewan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. I've been going back and forth. I'll call on the Attorney General. Order, order. No, I recognize the Attorney General. I'll get back to you.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Will the Attorney General permit a question?

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes I will, right after I finish my remarks. Yes I will.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why don't you do it now? Why don't you accept the challenge?

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes. I will be finished in one minute or maybe two minutes and I will be asking the member for Thunder Creek to make his specific allegation and charge and I would ask him also if he would be kind enough to make it inside and outside the House. I'll ask him to do that because I'll tell you I don't intend to be a party of somebody who gets up and makes a blanket charge of criminality against either one of my colleagues or me and who does it under immunity without going outside the House. I'm going to invite the members of the press to put that question to you specifically because I, for one, will not take that. If you have the evidence you're going to have to bring it up. I'm going to ask you to tell me the evidence of pure graft and corruption and I'm going to ask you to do it when I sit down momentarily. I'm going to ask you to repeat it outside the House because I will not ever allow myself to be involved in that kind of political game. And if there is pure graft and corruption we'll all pay the operation on that. And I want to say to one member here, in response to his comments on the question of the inquiry, it's true that his statements on the inquiry came up on pages 1235 and 1237. He was neatly and conveniently and I'm sure totally surprised to the hon. member for Moosomin, followed by the member for Kindersley. He didn't know anything about it, did he? The hon. member for Kindersley was going to raise the Thompson case four and one-half pages later. Oh no, this is purely innocent, and also it's purely innocent . . .

Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear myself think because of that person's yelling and I want to say . . . Mr. Chairman are you going to call this House to order or not? I want to finish making my point and my point is that on page 1237 he immediately makes this comment (and even if he didn't know as he says he didn't) . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, now you're backing up . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — I accept your word. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Thank you.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . that you didn't at page 1237 but why on page 1257 did you introduce the motion rooted directly to the Thompson case? Why did you do that? Now you tell me that? I don't hear much yelling now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh no, you don't have much yelling. The point is, my proposition is that you knew, you knew from the very time you walked into the House that the member for Kindersley was going to do it. You knew you were going to make these blatant accusations and you did it for one reason only — political reasons. Notwithstanding what you're saying . . . absolutely the case . . . that's the object . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . Now, member for Thunder Creek, I want you to lay before this House your allegation of criminality, pure graft and corruption.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Attorney General, without any guidance from you I'll lay out

what I choose to lay out in this House and I really don't need you to lay it out. No, Mr. Attorney General, I think if you'd care to quote me correctly, I said words to the effect that an independent judicial inquiry into the Department of Northern Affairs will show graft and corruption because, goodness sake, Mr. Justice Thompson is using the terminology — a fraud.

MR. ROMANOW: — Don't be flustered, Colin.

MR. THATCHER: — I'm not flustered at all, Mr. Attorney General.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'm pushing you right against the wall.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Attorney General, this is the worst I've ever heard you.

Since the minister in charge of the DNS has chosen to leave this debate and since you have now taken over as the attorney in charge — and goodness knows he needed some help — over the dinner hour, when you're checking out the \$1,450 that at the same time Mr. Thompson was being prosecuted you were giving him as a grant of \$1,458, perhaps you could check another little item for me.

This is from the public accounts. On page G96, tell me why one Howard Thompson was paid \$23,669.58. This is for the year ended March 31, 1977. The minister is on record in this Assembly as saying the investigation (while they knew something was wrong in 1975) was intensified or begun in 1976 — that year you're passing him \$23,669. Could that possibly be what Mr. Justice Noble was suggesting — a department which has run amuck? You're investigating him. You know something is wrong and you're paying him \$23,669. If you want me to read public accounts to the people up there I'll be happy to do it but I think they're quite capable of reading themselves. And then tell me, after the dinner hour, why the next year he gets an outright grant of \$1,450? Could that possibly be a department run amuck?

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's that? To pay the cost of the investigation?

MR. THATCHER: — Now, Mr. Attorney General, you call that muckraking if you want. You call that character assassination if you want. That is out of your own figures. Mr. Attorney General, you can rant, you can rave, you can rail; but you know and everybody else over there knows the DNS has severe internal problems. You're tried it with two ministers. You've tried sending your bright boy up there as a deputy minister and he couldn't solve the problems. You know you have internal difficulties and you haven't solved them. You have a problem up there. Face up to it and let's get at it and let's correct it. If you call that muckraking, goodness knows, I feel sorry for you I call it being a responsible opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. members will have to do a lot of desk pounding in order to stop me from saying a few words before 5 o'clock. I want to say this to the hon. members, yes, I do call that muckraking and I tell you why I call it muckraking. The hon. member goes to public accounts and identifies an individual as having received payments for . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You identified him today.

MR. ROMANOW: — The naming does not matter. You had the Howard Thompson case. It was on a CP press report. You got it, you shipped over a copy to me and to the hon. minister; so don't give me that. That's not the issue. I'm not arguing with you now on the question of the revelation of the names. I am arguing with you on the question of how you are arguing this point. You pick up a public accounts document. You see in the back of that public accounts document the name of Mr. Thompson and a figure attached to it. You then immediately, either specifically or impliedly, attach that to the words of a justice during the course of a criminal case, saying that is evidence of at least implication of something running amuck. That is exactly what you have done. I am saying that statement from there to there without any specific evidence from our point of view or without anything as to the timetable as to when the investigation of the RCMP started, or when the charges were laid, is muckraking because it pays no attention to the facts. It makes no attempt to get at the facts. It simply picks up the whole Thompson argument and then tries to balloon it out. Now, you say you will choose to give your evidence in your time. I don't care. They don't believe you. Your guys don't believe you. But I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you how much I believe you. I will only believe you when you give me, in this House at 7 o'clock, the specifics of your allegation. I'm going to ask you, and if it doesn't come today, I'm going to check the transcript. I am going to ask you to give me the specific information. You give me the evidence and I'll consider the inquiry. You give me the evidence instead of muckraking. I say to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, he ought to be ashamed of himself being a lawyer, conducting the names and activities of this House on that basis . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I did. And I'm saying you are asking for a public inquiry . . . Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear myself because of that man's yelling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. To tell you the truth, I am having a little trouble with the yelling on both sides of the House. I happen to be in the middle. So if we could all kind of conduct ourselves in about half the volume that we have, we'll just keep rolling along.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, it is not 5 o'clock. I want to make the point about how the member for Qu'Appelle has acted in a way which I think does him no credit as a member of the legal profession. I say the hon. member who makes these kinds of wild allegations of criminality . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Listen to what your member says. Graft and corruption — that's an allegation of criminality. I say to you that if you tell me it ought not to be conducted in the criminal process, that is doing a disservice to the way I think you honestly believe a judicial system should be operated. I say to you that your colleague . . . The onus is on you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, the onus is on the accuser to put the facts on the table. You put the facts on the table. Don't go through childish histrionics. Don't act like a person who is going into a catatonic fit. Put the facts in front of me now. Put the facts before this House coldly and calmly. Otherwise, we know for all that this party of Grant Devine's is a party stuck in mud.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to call 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.