

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

May 16, 1985

EVENING SITTING
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 70 — An Act respecting the Provision of Financial Assistance to Depositors of Pioneer Trust Company

Clause 5 (continued)

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, I had been asking you before supper — about on the amendment which would restrict the payment to Saskatchewan residents and exclude those from outside the province — for a list of the numbers of individuals who would fall within the category: residents, Canadian non-residents, and Americans, if you could. Have you got such a list that you could break it down that way?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — There's one uninsured non-Canadian. What we have is, and this is the best information that we can get from Touche, and there is some problems with the exact nature of it. I can't take credit for that. That's Touche Ross.

The numbers broken down by province is as follows: 1,288 from Saskatchewan; 216 in Alberta; 254 in Manitoba; 27 in British Columbia; 11 in Ontario, 7 in other Canadian provinces; 1 in the United States; and 27 that fall into the unknown category. And that's as best as we can get from them, and I guess that means that they haven't totally finalized yet for a total of 1,831.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I thank the Minister for that information. I wonder if you could at the same time, if you have on that list broken down into amounts of uninsured claims that would break down into those same categories. What I would like to do here is, on the basis of 1,288, for example, in Saskatchewan, 216 in Alberta, 254 in Manitoba and so on, break that down so that we can try to establish here in the committee exactly where the money was going to. And I think it's directly relevant when we're talking about an amendment moved by the member for Quill Lakes, that says "not make payment" to those who are not a resident of Saskatchewan, that we should have some idea of the amount of money that we are talking about.

I'd like a very close amount. If you could figure that out for us or give it to us, I'd really appreciate it.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We don't have that information. And the problem, and I hope that you can appreciate it, is that they're blended in with IAACs (Income Averaging Annuity Contracts), apparently. They're into this whole group, so where that IAAC sits, now if . . . The information that we went to search from Touche was this, and their view is that it's fairly rough.

Now I take it that you could come with this type of . . . It would be fairly close to this type of an analysis. And if you had, let's say, for the province of Manitoba 254 of the total 1,830, that they're probably fairly close to an average, and I don't think that would be off too far. And I think that gets you to your point, I think, that you wish to make. If the average deposit is 1,831 divided by 28,000 or 28 million, and then whatever percentages, you'd be pretty close to it.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — And that basically is just breaking it down and dividing the overall number and working it out that way. I guess then just doing it on those rough numbers we have about — this isn't exact — but about one-third out of province and two-thirds in province.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes, it's about that, two-thirds.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — And then . . . Well let's round it off to 30 per cent out of province. So we're looking at about, as I can closely figure, close to \$9 million going out of the province, 9

million out of province, and 18 in province.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — On a gross figure. If you boil that down to a net figure, you're probably looking about \$3 million in net terms would go out of the province.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I guess the trouble I'm having with this Bill is that we're . . . Well I don't want to say we're dealing in fantasy land, but we don't have any hard documents, no hard information. We don't have a list of the assets and an appraisal so that the committee can then say, yes, that property in Calgary or that property in down-town Regina, that looks reasonable. And if we could ever get to the point where the committee would have some papers laid on the table that we could then go through it and say, well we can now agree with the minister, that we'll be getting 50 cents on the dollar back, or 75 cents, or 40 cents, or 30. But we don't have any of that.

And when we're paying out the money, what I would opt to do as a member of the legislature is believe the money coming back in when I see it, because I just don't . . . We don't have any . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, the liquidator's got nothing to do with it. The liquidator has a job to do, and that's checking out what was there when he took over, after the doors closed. He cannot go back and check what happened and include in his statement, as I understand it from what I hear — and this again, business people who know the people in Touche Ross — they are not going back to the November period, the December period, and doing an in-depth investigation that will be then relayed to us.

And all of this is a problem for us as members of the opposition, because what we have here, and what we can deal with, is a Bill, and the Bill, we have said, will pay out 28 million. And we haven't even gone to the extent of writing that into the Bill. And there's a reason why we haven't — because we think that it might go over that. Otherwise you would put in an upper limit. And so I have to work, and when I'm working this out that we're paying the money out, and if we're lucky we'll get some of it back. But in doing business in the world that I live in — and I've lost lots of money and I've made a little bit — but I don't count on getting a lot back when I make a deal like this.

It's just not reasonable at this point in time to count on getting a lot of that money back, and I would tend in this case to err on the side of not getting as much back rather than raising the hopes of the taxpayers, saying we're going to get 75 cent son the dollar, and then end up getting 30 or 20. And you well know that in many cases when liquidation takes place that there are many other creditors who come in ahead — and I'm not now talking only about CDIC and the federal government, the provincial government. There obviously will be others who will come in ahead of us.

And what I'm saying here is this is an unusual position to put the Assembly in, and I personally am having a great deal of difficulty with this Bill because of that fact that we're not dealing with anything real and hard and concrete. We are saying we are going to take this person's word for it and that person's word, and we're going to trust this person and that person. But Mr. Minister, you have to realize that last November you wrote a letter promising \$27 million and then pulled it. And for you to say to this committee now, accept my word — and I'm not saying that you're not giving me what you think and hope will happen, but I'm saying that we can't count on it.

And what I'm saying is that \$9 million will be paid out to people out of province, and that's a lot of money. And I would like, if you could, to be a little more open about what documents you're filing with the committee, because you're saying we're not having a public inquiry, and this is then the only opportunity. This is the only opportunity that the members of the public and the opposition have to scrutinize this operation. It's our only opportunity. So if we appear to be holding on to this thing to demand answers from you, there's a good reason for it, because once it is voted on and disappears we will no longer have an opportunity to debate and to ask on the public's behalf what is happening.

This is a very important issue, and I must say that based on the facts and information we've been getting from you, and the closeness of your acceptance of our amendments, that this Bill becomes difficult. It's difficult for us to accept on behalf of the public because I don't think the public is getting a fair shake on it.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well here's the . . . To set out the problem, if you look at the legal notice . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, this is the legal notice in the court.

Further take notice that the said court has directed Friday the 28th day of June 1985 to fix as a date at which all those having or alleging claims against Pioneer Trust shall have filed with the liquidator of Pioneer Trust Company.

On and on. Now the problem that one has is that I cannot give that information. The only way that we can provide that information, if it's your wish, is to wait until the 28th of June or after that, and deal with it then. That's the only thing I can do for you.

Perhaps we can get a better read in a month's time. I take it what you're saying is that you don't want to pay out now quite a few of the depositors. And I guess that's really what the Bill is about.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well that's exactly what this amendment is about. What we're talking about now is 600 uninsured depositors, or close to 600 uninsured depositors, and \$9 million.

And I went through this afternoon my concerns on behalf of my constituents. And the minister gets up and says that this is being political. And I suppose if I'm being accused of being political in defending the taxpayers of my constituency then I'm proud to be political, because I think that's my job. I think that's why I'm here, and I think that in many ways that's why you should be here. And I don't think your role as finance minister is to protect those people at the top.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He is political, but he's on the other side.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — And as the member from Quill Lakes says, you are being political in defending one group of people, and that is the people who had over \$60,000 on deposit. And in our society it may seem to you, because of the people you rub shoulders with, that that's a massive number of people. But there aren't very many in our province who have to worry about this problem of having lost something over the \$60,000 mark that they have in one account.

And what I'm concerned about are those people who are paying the taxes and don't have any money, the people who are struggling along out there and are asking on my behalf — and believe me when I say that I've had a number of phone calls from constituents who say they cannot afford to pay taxes to pay for people out of the province who made a mistake. And some of them, it won't be the largest part of their life savings. For some of them it'll be the smallest part. For some of them, and I say again, from Winnipeg or Calgary, it may only be part of a million dollars that they have invested. And Mr. Chairman will know that there are many farmers out there who are having a difficult time accepting the fact that they should dig into their pocket and shell out some more taxes to cover those people off. And I don't see how that is being political any more than you defending those people over 60,000 outside of the province is being political, but in a different way.

And I just ask you again whether or not . . . As this Bill has gone along, I think we have been perfectly reasonable in introducing amendments that were reasonable. I haven't heard anyone say, why is the NDP being so unreasonable in introducing a limit of 10 million, introducing an unreasonable amendment of a judicial inquiry, introducing an unreasonable amendment that would not pay out money to people outside of the province? These are not unreasonable amendments.

And you have not accepted any of the major amendments that we have brought forward. And

what I'm saying is that you're not giving us much of an opportunity to support you. And, believe me, we would like to have the opportunity to debate this, and for you to accept some of our ideas in the defence of constituents who don't have money and are being asked to pay taxes to cover off these mistakes.

(1915)

HON. MR. ANDREW: — You indicate that the amendment not to pay Ross Sneath and Will Klein and several others is a minor amendment. You indicated, some time before that, that that was one of your key points that you wanted to get, was to make sure that Will Klein and Ross Sneath did not receive any money. That's what I understood you to say.

I simply go back and ask the question . . . Is to the *Leader-Post*, May 2nd, 1985, where it reads:

Opposition leader Allan Blakeney says he is pleased the provincial and federal governments have decided to come to the rescue of unsecured depositors with Pioneer Trust.

"I think they've made the right decision," Blakeney told reporters Wednesday, a few hours after the decision to help the shareholders was announced at a Regina news conference by Deputy Premier Eric Berntson and federal Minister of State for Finance Barbara McDougall.

Blakeney said he had a "small quarrel" with the government because he thinks the decision should have been made earlier . . .

And the reason it should have been made much earlier is that people were losing interest, about \$10,000 a day, the depositors are losing interest.

Now I understood that was the argument you're advancing, and I think what you're really saying is, we don't want to pay any depositor. That's really what I think you're coming to, because if you say, we don't want to pay anybody that has more money than I do or more money than you do, then really you're saying you shouldn't pay any depositor, or you should say, let's put a restriction on it; anybody that has a net worth over so much money we shouldn't pay. Now I suppose that's who we come to next.

And the question for that, and I think the question we have to address is that what are we really trying to do with this legislation? Are we trying to get into each individual case and say no, this guy can't have it, this guy can have it? Or are we trying to take the place of a situation where people that went to the bank and felt secure about putting their money in a bank should have the ability to feel secure? And that's really what we're talking about. That's the principle that we're talking about here, but you don't seem to want to recognize it as the principle. Do we want to have a system where people go to a bank, they can feel confident having their money in the bank, that they're going to be protected with those deposits? Quite different from the situation where somebody invests in the shares of a company, and that company maybe goes for naught, or maybe does well.

You've indicated yourself that you've invested in some that have done well; you made investments that haven't done so well. Now that's your risk that you take. And I agree with you — whether you take one or I take one, or Joe in the street takes one, he expects to lose by that. But if you have an account in the credit union or you have an account in a bank, or you have an account in a trust company, you have a sense that that money should be secure. And that's what we're trying to do here for those people — to create that sense of stability in our financial institutions.

Now either you support that or you don't support it. And I suppose we can sit here and argue

until we're both blue in the face, and the system goes on. So if you say you don't want to pay Alberta people or you don't want to pay Manitoba people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, or you're saying Saskatchewan taxpayers don't want to pay anybody. That's what you're saying.

Now I think what's happened is, on second reading this whole Assembly, everybody, agreed in principle that we should pay depositors; we should pay depositors. That was the agreement in principle. Now the representation that I advanced at that time was that the insiders would not be covered. You wanted further confirmation that the insiders would not be covered. The insiders are not in fact covered by the legislation as presented. The amendment has gone further. Now that's where we sit. So really if what we're talking about here is, do we pay depositors or don't we pay depositors, I suppose that we could argue till we're blue in the face. However, we can decide which way we're going to go.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister tries to say where we will be after this amendment is gone. You can ask the Chairman whether that's in order or not, but I'm sure if he were listening closely he would certainly find that you putting where our position will be after this amendment is voted off is not in order, because you have very little idea. We have not passed you any information to that effect. And obviously what we are talking about is the amendment here that says clearly that we are opposed to depositors getting tax money out of Saskatchewan who are not residents of the province. And that cannot be clearer that that is the intent of the amendment.

The minister says that we all voted on this Bill in second reading in the affirmative, and he's correct. And I believe that everyone who spoke in the opposition on second reading in their speeches said, and we want as well as paying out the money, a judicial inquiry. And there were three main points, and I will just refer to them: a judicial inquiry, a limit on the amount of money of \$10 million written into the Bill, and a third main point — that those who maybe got more money than they should have in the dying days, as Davey Stuart calls it, should have to pay. Now all of those three have been voted down. All three of them have.

The one that you accepted said that those people who may have, who were directors or in the executive offices of the corporation would not benefit from the Bill. That's the one you accepted, and I want you to be clear about that — that all the three amendments, the main amendments that we talked about in our second reading speeches, were defeated by your government: (1) the judicial inquiry; (2) the limit of \$10 million; and (3) that those people who were responsible . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Order. The question before the committee is whether the people outside of Saskatchewan should be paid or to. And that is the amendment. That is the amendment.

And I would ask the members to stay on the amendment.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, if you would have listened closely, you would have heard the minister referring to our amendments, not only our amendments that were passed, but amendments that we were going to pass. And you allowed that to go by.

You allowed him to talk not only about amendments that had been passed, but amendments that the opposition were going to pass. And I would like you to . . . You know, I don't mind you keeping me on the fine points of this bill and the amendment, but to allow the minister to speak on amendments that we might move in the future, to speak on amendments we might move . . . I think, if anything was out of order, you allowed that to go by and I have a little difficult time understanding how you're keeping us so close to the fine point of the amendment, when you allow the minister to talk about amendments that we might move at some point in the future.

And obviously, Mr. Minister, what I'm talking about is the amendment, and yet another

amendment that I believe that you're not going to accept. And I say that when we voted for this in second reading, obviously we had a belief in our mind that you would be looking at accepting some of our major amendments, and this being yet another one:

The Minister of Finance shall not make any payment pursuant to this Act to a depositor who is not a resident of Saskatchewan.

And obviously, what you're saying is that out of the 1,800 depositors, 1,200 are from the province and 600 are from outside, and that the Saskatchewan taxpayers should pay out \$9 million to depositors — uninsured depositors — and I want to make the point that these are not just any depositors. These are people who already have got \$60,000. These are the people who have over \$60,000 in their account outside of the province.

And I think that's an unnecessary expenditure of money, and I want to say again, Mr. Minister, I am referring to the people outside of the province, and for you to then come and talk about an amendment that we might move at a future date, I think is not accurate. And I would like very much, Mr. Chairman, if we would indeed stick to the amendment before us.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Now to say that you were not aware, I would refer you to May 13th, 1985, Leader of the Opposition referring to one Peter Braun of Medicine Hat. Now I was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I thought it was you, but it was the Leader of the Opposition. So it's really quite hard for me to appreciate that you say you didn't know there was depositors outside of Saskatchewan. Now when you said that when . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right.

The rationale of the argument, Mr. Chairman, was as follows: that the member from Shaunavon, in his latest remarks, said that we were unaware that there was anybody outside . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right, the member from Centre did.

The member from Regina Centre said we were unaware that there was anybody had deposits that were outside of Saskatchewan. Now the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. All members get all the opportunity they want to speak on this amendment, so I would ask if they would allow the Minister of Finance to finish his comments. All members on either side of the House will get all the opportunity they need to speak on this.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — . . . Mr. Chairman, is this. I would ask the members opposite to ask their leader if he was aware that there was people outside of Saskatchewan that had deposits that would fall within the uninsured deposit people.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I suppose on this issue I won't take a lot more time of the committee on this particular amendment, because I think I've made my point.

But I would say to the minister, I didn't say that I wasn't aware of any depositors outside of the province. And nor did I refer to any depositors, by name or otherwise, outside of the province.

And getting back to the fine point of the amendment, I want to put clearly on the record that I believe I speak for my constituents when I say I am opposed to paying out money that my taxpayers pay, to people outside of the province, whether they're American, or from Alberta, or from Manitoba.

Because I think that the people in my constituency cannot afford to pay out people who already have got \$60,000, and may have lost something over 60,000, because most of the people in my constituency don't have 10 cents that they can afford to give away. Most of them don't have a savings account. Most of the farmers can't afford to put their crop in. They're having a difficult time.

You can laugh about it, but I want to say that I'm not saying the farmers in my area don't have a lot of assets — some of them have a million dollars worth of assets in their land. But also, Mr. Minister, many of them have seen the price of their land, or the value of their land, if they have 20 quarters, go down by 30,000 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. The price of agricultural land is not on debate here. I would ask the member to stay on the subject.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, Mr. Minister, you will be well aware that there are many farmers in the province who have lost 400,000, 500,000 on their land in the past year. The government is not stepping in to protect them. And to rub salt into the wound, they are now being called on to help out investors from Alberta and Manitoba through their taxes, and they're phoning me and telling me that they don't want to.

And what my job is is to speak for them. And you may say that that's not the role of an MLA, and I'm not sure what the back-benchers' role is because we never see them. But I would like them to stand up and get involved, so we could hear what they think of paying out the 28 million. This is a committee that everyone should be involved in and we haven't heard from them.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Only to say . . . Mr. Chairman, the member opposite has argued and has taken a position that we should not pay the uninsured depositors outside the province. I responded as to why I think we should. I would just simply be repeating my answer.

(1930)

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, if I understand the figures given to us by the minister, of the approximately 1,830 or 31 depositors, understanding that some of those may be composite ones, maybe trust accounts which represent more than one person with a beneficial interest, some 543 are from outside Saskatchewan. By my rough calculations that is about 30 per cent. It's within 1 per cent of 30 per cent if my calculations are right. And I did it roughly without my calculator.

If this be so and if the deposits by the group from outside Saskatchewan are approximately equal to those inside Saskatchewan on the average, if the average deposit is the same, then we're talking about a gross figure of about \$8.4 million — 30 per cent of \$28 million is \$8.4 million. If it's a little over \$28 million, it may be \$8.5 million, on a gross basis . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, gross basis.

We acknowledge with the minister that some of that will come back, and I would believe with him that certainly half of it will come back. And how much more than that, we don't know. Likely some, likely some.

So at any rate, we're talking about, at the first instance, \$8.5 million, and one would hope that it would be reduced significantly from that. But it's not an insignificant sum of money to ask Saskatchewan people to pay out for people out side the province. And I again repeat what I said earlier, particularly with respect to the Alberta ones, although obviously I make no distinction between Alberta, Manitoba, and B.C., and Ontario, and the United States' ones.

Since a substantial amount of the losses were incurred outside the province, and since the particular deposits probably never even came into the province, it is a stiff price for Saskatchewan people to be asked to pay because of the decision to reimburse the depositors. And as I say again, I'm surprised that an effort would not have been made to get the other provinces to join.

I don't accept for a moment the argument of the minister that there is analogy between credit

unions in Alberta, or North West Trust in Alberta, or Canadian Commercial Bank in Alberta, and the argument which I understood him to put, that those people may well have had depositors from Saskatchewan.

There was no pay-out of those depositors. Those institutions were shorn up — they were shorn up — and obviously if we had, if that had been the choice in this case, if you had gone ahead with your guarantee of the preferred shares, which is essentially what happened in the North West Trust case, then we would not be talking about this. We wouldn't even . . . There's no way to guarantee preferred shares on behalf of one group of depositors and not on the group of another.

So that question simply didn't arise, as to who was to be reimbursed in those cases, because there was no reimbursement. I am not familiar with the couple of small companies you mentioned who are in the life insurance field — Rocky Mountain Life or something — and whether or not Saskatchewan holders were reimbursed. They may have been. I frankly wasn't aware of it and again, I say that I don't know of any precedent of a provincial government reimbursing people who had money in a trust company who lived outside the province where the reimbursement was made.

There may be some, but we don't have it on Ontario, because there the institutions were propped up and no pay-out was made to depositors in the case of Crown and Greymac and Seaway. In B.C., as I recall it, there was a small trust company that went down there, and I don't think there was any pay-out to the uninsured depositors, so that doesn't give us any precedent. In Alberta, I'm not aware of any case where there has been a pay-out to uninsured depositors.

So as I say, I don't know where there's a precedent, and I think taxpayers may well ask why Saskatchewan should be leading the way in paying out uninsured depositors who are not residents of our province, and particularly when, as it appears in this case, a significant amount of the loss was not incurred because of anything that happened in Saskatchewan, but rather events in other provinces and in the United States.

As I say, I think that's a very reasonable question for taxpayers to ask, is to why we should be leading the way in deciding to reimburse uninsured depositors of over \$60,000 outside our province.

I underline that the people in Manitoba and B.C. and Alberta, whose deposits are under \$60,000, will be reimbursed, and we're simply talking about big depositors outside Saskatchewan. And the short question — it's not easy to formulate a convincing answer as to why Saskatchewan taxpayers should be reimbursing that particular class of uninsured depositors.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — You indicated, should an effort have been made to try to get the other provinces to join? An effort was in fact made. The first round of negotiations that I undertook was with Vic Schroeder, the Minister of Finance in Manitoba. His advice was that Manitoba would not be prepared to participate in that.

I think it would be unfair to suggest that, perhaps, Saskatchewan and Alberta somehow hook into this, Alberta's argument is that they have put up a lot of money for financial institutions. Many of those financial institutions have Saskatchewan depositors, and that they would want us then to pony up on that. And clearly we wouldn't be prepared to do that.

You know, you go a second question. That is that we initially were looking at putting \$30 million into this company. Our view, if it could have saved the company, in our view, we would have done that. But we found that it didn't. My view is that the \$30 million would have probably been wasted. And from that point of view we took the decision not to do it.

So I suppose we can argue that point. We've argued it for a while today, and I think that we're

probably repeating ourselves as to the arguments for and against.

MR. KOSKIE: — Talking on the specific amendment here, Mr. Chairman, we hold fast to the fact that only Saskatchewan residents should be paid. And I think the information obtained from the minister further enforces our views because there's 1,831 uninsured depositors, and has been indicated 543 of them are from outside of Saskatchewan, and maybe another 27 because they're unknown.

And when you look at the amount — he says, I want to just take an average; I just want to take an average of the potential 28 million. But what I'd like to ask the minister: in analyzing the losses of this company, Pioneer Trust, can you in fact indicate where the major losses were? Can you indicate the amount of loss in Saskatchewan, the amount of loss in Manitoba, B.C., Ontario, other Canadian provinces, U.S.? And will you detail as to the percentages or the amounts of the losses that were sustained by this company?

And here the situation that we have is we're asking Saskatchewan taxpayers to bail out all depositors. And we're saying, no, just Saskatchewan depositors because we maintain that the operation of this Pioneer Trust was essentially sound in its operation in Saskatchewan — relatively sound. And the big losses occurred, the big losses occurred down in the United States, and Denver, and Phoenix, and in Alberta, as the former member of the board.

So what I really would like to know is, can you give us a breakdown? We have 1,288 non-insured depositors in Saskatchewan, and 543 outside of Saskatchewan, another 27 unknown. And for the life of me, I don't know how they would be unknown, but you've classified them that way.

I guess what I'm asking then: can you break down, in dollar values, losses sustained by the company here in Saskatchewan, losses in Alberta, and well, the other jurisdictions?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Okay. I think the Leader of the Opposition was dealing with that question this afternoon in the sense of the write-down of the losses of Mr. Bell's affidavit, which the Leader of the Opposition was referring to.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, then, just to repeat it so that we understand it, and so do the people that are paying the bill, where would you say that the largest percentage of the losses occurred in the real estate transactions? Is it not true that it was in Alberta and the investments in United States?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That's clearly been the case, and that's clearly been public knowledge for a long time.

MR. KOSKIE: — Are you prepared to stand up and say then that the losses that took place in Alberta and in United States, that we in Saskatchewan, as taxpayers that had no interest whatsoever, didn't even have any dealings with Pioneer Trust, should be making contributions to bail out the depositors in those jurisdictions?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I think the question becomes: are we going to cover the uninsured depositors, but for the insiders, and that's exactly the position we take irregardless of where their residence is.

I indicated before dinner, before the dinner break, that you find yourself in a situation where the member from Shaunavon was saying, but we are prepared to pay some of them; give us the list and we will determine if it's a charitable organization, or if it's a hospital, or if it's this, or if it's that; we will cover that.

So that was the one. The second type of situation is: what do you do with a person that lived in Maple Creek most of his life, sold his farm, moved to Medicine Hat, or lived in Leader, or lived in

the Shaunavon area, moved to Medicine Hat perhaps six months ago? And that's the person that would be covered. The losses we indicated in the statement by Mr. Bell — that's the best information we have.

MR. KOSKIE: — In respect to the 1,831 depositors, can you give us a breakdown in respect to the magnitude of the losses? In other words, can you give us, out of the 1,831, how many there would be out of that which would have received \$50,000 under this package that you're . . . How many are there in the classification that would be getting \$100,000 under this package that you're proposing in the Bill? How many would be getting 200,000? How many would be getting 500,000? Can you give us a breakdown in respect to the 1,831 depositors? Because we want to know.

We want to make a decision here on basis of some facts. You know, if there are no Saskatchewan residents who are losing over \$100,000 and there are 3 or 400 out-of-province ones who are in the 3 to \$500,000 range of loss, I think it makes a lot of difference. And I would like to know in respect to it, because what you're doing here is saying, well, there's 1,831 depositors; our potential pay-out is \$2,800. So let's take \$43, that's 30 per cent, and 30 per cent of the 28 is around 9 million. That's what you said.

(1945)

But you know what? The size of the deposit of those outside of this province could be very much larger. They may represent 30 per cent of the 1,831, but they could represent as high as \$18 million instead of \$9 million of the total loss. And you refuse to give us that information. We want to make a decision on respect to this. And with the lack of information that you have provided, we are going to stick, I'm telling you, to paying Saskatchewan residents depositors. Because if you give us the facts, the 30 per cent, the 543 could represent . . . You know, sure it's 30 per cent of the total depositors, but the 543 could represent in total dollars, it could represent 20 million of it.

Because you say, where are the big losses? Down in Alberta, down in the States. Not in Saskatchewan. And so what I'm asking you, where were the big investors? Can you give us a breakdown in respect to that?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What you're saying first of all, or what members of your party are saying is, we don't want to cover anybody outside of Alberta, or outside of Saskatchewan. Anybody in Manitoba, anybody in Alberta, should not be covered. Now what you're saying is that, well, give us a list and maybe we'll let the guy with the 200,000 one or the one with the 40,000 or the one with the 10,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well that was the basis of your argument.

MR. KOSKIE: — I'm going to ask you again. And I'll tell you, don't put words into my mouth, Mr. Minister. Because you've been skirting around and you're so sensitive on this issue, you're so locked in on it. You won't produce any documentation to this committee, and the reason is that you don't want to get locked in, in case that the public demands a public inquiry. What I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, is in respect to the . . . Out of the 1,831 depositors, 1,288 are in Saskatchewan, and I'm asking you not to take that as a percentage of the total. What I'm asking you is, do you have knowledge of what amount the Saskatchewan depositors represent? What total dollars, losses by Saskatchewan residents, represent out of the 28? Not because they're 30, or 70 per cent of the total depositors and you're going to pay out 28 and therefore it's 70 per cent. That doesn't give you the amount, because 70 per cent in Saskatchewan could be relatively small amount over the 60,000, and you could have 543 outside of the province with huge amounts invested, or it could go the other way. But we'd like to know. We take our chances, but certainly before the people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayer, pay out, they would like to know what amount of the total pay-out represents paying out depositors out of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I can try to give you from the . . . (inaudible) . . . information, from the information that we have received. Our best figures — and the problem with them is they don't total up, and it's the information from Touche Ross. But if I could go through it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just hold it.

We would have — on the unknown category that I gave you, all right? — that there is \$430,000, all of which are IAACs, or Income Averaging Annuity Contracts. Now I don't know how much that we'd be responsible on that, but we're a very small part of IAACs totally, so it's not broken down that way.

The United States accounts, the indication is that none of that would be covered by this Bill. But the other information from Touche Ross is that there could be one, and that hasn't been determined yet.

Other Canadian provinces other than Ontario, B.C., Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, are \$161,000, of which 152,000 is in the terms of an IAAC; and therefore, there is \$9,000 that would fall under this Act. In Ontario, they're all Income Averaging Annuity Contracts, so there's nothing paid out to Ontario. B.C. is \$134,000 would be covered in B.C. deposits; \$3 million in Manitoba; \$3.2 million in Alberta; and the balance is in Saskatchewan.

MR. KOSKIE: — I wonder if the minister — obviously has some documents — I wonder if the minister would file that document with the . . . in order that we can make an assessment in respect to this the amendment that we are dealing with. And it's almost impossible, Mr. Minister, to deal with you because at one time you say, I have no information. The next time you say, I maybe have some information. The next time you get together with your officials and come up with some figures. I'm telling you what we're asking for, Mr. Minister: can you in fact table the document substantiating the payments that you want to make under this Bill and indicate in respect to the information that we are addressing here in the resolution?

(2000)

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What I can undertake to do for the hon. member is: the information was provided from Touche Ross, and it was provided on a confidential basis. We will go back to Touche Ross. We will have Touche Ross provide as much information as they can, as detailed as they can, with regards to the breakdown by province, and the breakdown of what is Income Averaging Annuity Contracts and what are the other certificates, and provide you that tomorrow morning.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well obviously we are going to have to hang around here till tomorrow morning because you know the thing is, really, the total incredible situation that we face is here we've got the Minister of Finance asking for \$28 million. We say just pay the Saskatchewan depositors under the . . . and we say give us some justification. He's sitting there diddling with figures from Touche Ross. And he says, I can give them out in my interpretation. That's where you got it from, because you said you got it from. Now you're saying, because you're in hot water, we are going to go back and find out whether we had it on a confidential basis.

Well look at this. I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, this isn't good enough — that you can take a document which you said is information from the liquidator, give us your interpretation on it; when we say file it, you say it's confidential; I can only give you my interpretation. What a performance.

And you're asking us to lay down and give you 28 million bucks, and not protect the taxpayers. I'll tell you, this is the most incredible situation that I've ever seen.

I guess what I ask you is: tomorrow morning can you undertake to indeed provide us with a

complete list of information relative to this matter so that we can at least have an opportunity to review, discuss with our caucus, and know whether or not the taxpayers are getting a deal, whether or not it's simply a pay-off to your political friends, a cover-up? We've got to know, Mr. Minister. Nobody in his right mind comes before the legislature and asks to pay out \$28 million and has no details, no facts.

And he picks it up and he says, this is from Touche Ross, the liquidator. And then I asked him to file it and he says, well I can't; it's confidential. But he has just taken what he wanted out of it. Now he says, I got to go back and ask.

When are you going to come clean, Mr. Minister? When are you going to lay the information before this House so that we can get on with the business of this session? That's the problem that you are presenting.

I'll tell you where it started. It started with your letter and your \$27.5 million guarantee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. The question before the committee is the amendment to section 5 of the printed Bill, and I would ask the member to keep his remarks to that amendment.

MR. KOSKIE: — My simple question: Mr. Minister, being responsible, do you believe that in order to make out any payments under this Act that we are being irresponsible in asking you to produce some documentation which will verify the positions that you have been putting out to the public as to the amount that has to be paid out and the calculations that you're making based on no facts, that it may be only \$10 million?

I mean absolutely you have come to this legislature and you have put no documentations here forward.

And there's no doubt, Mr. Minister, that you and your officials checked the books. You had a former Tory candidate check them. And you could lay before this legislature, but you're denying it. And it has to be a cover-up. Otherwise, you would have.

I ask you again: do you think it's unreasonable for the opposition to be demanding some documentation of proof of the losses, and where it was sustained?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What your question was, was this: can I, can I give you the breakdown of how many of the uninsured deposits are going to be in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and other provinces? Okay?

No claim can be proven until the 28th of June, as I read to you in the legal notice. So until that time no claim is going to be seen as proven.

Now what I indicated to you, to the Leader of the Opposition, is that he wanted a rough breakdown. I said it probably would break as to this many deposits, because that was the basis of your amendment. He wanted to know how many were in Alberta, or how many were outside of Saskatchewan. Okay? And you wanted to ask how much money. So the figure I gave to the Leader of the Opposition was on a 30 per cent ratio, was about \$8.4 million.

Now the information I just provided to you . . . And what I undertook to do, what I undertook to do was to go back to Touche Ross, and Touche Ross will file. We have no objection with Touche Ross filing that information. I've got nothing to say that how many deposits were in Alberta, and what the amounts of them were, in ranges.

I would object to providing information as to who those people are, and I don't think that the Assembly wants that information, but I've got no break on that. I tried to provide you with the information that shows about \$6 million, \$6.5 million of it, is outside of Saskatchewan. Now,

could be — that's slightly less than the 8.4, which would work out to 30 per cent.

What I will undertake to do is go back to Touche, see if they will provide us their most up-to-date estimate of what that will be. Now I can't give you that information. If Touche will provide that information, I will perfectly be prepared to present it to the House. I've got nothing to hide there. That is Touche Ross's information, and if they're prepared to file that, I will pass it on.

If you wish, you can phone Touche Ross yourself.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, I just want to reiterate what my colleague said, that this really is an incredible performance.

I understood, Mr. Minister . . . You, Mr. Minister, are as slap-happy and careless in presenting this Bill as you have been throughout in dealing with the guarantee. This really is some sort of a high-water mark for a minister who has proved himself pretty free with other people's money.

Mr. Minister, you want to give away some 28 million bucks, a portion of which is going out of the province. You came unprepared — with no information, no facts as to where it was going, to whom it was going, to where it was going, and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. I am saying, when I say "to whom," I mean to whom in the province that moved out of the province.

I perhaps was not speaking with great precision but, Mr. Minister, I thought I heard you say earlier in the day you thought there were about 100 in Manitoba and about 100 in Alberta. I thought I heard you say that earlier today, that was your assumption. What is surprising, Mr. Minister, is the size of these figures.

I say, Mr. Minister, you are altogether too free with other people's money. I know this is going to be a difficult point to make with a minister who has run up a deficit of \$1.2 million in three years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. The question before the committee is the amendment to section 5 of the printed Bill. I would ask the member to keep his comments on that amendment.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The issue, Mr. Chairman, is this minister's sense of responsibility when he's dealing with other people's money. I was simply making the point that it is a pattern of conduct we've seen with this minister. He has proved himself pretty free with the taxpayers' money on every occasion, on every time he's been given any opportunity to do so. I make the point, Mr. Chairman, that he brought in three budgets with huge deficits . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. The budget isn't under debate. The debate is on the amendment to clause 5 of the printed Bill and I would ask the member to stay on that amendment.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, without transgressing, without trying the patience of the chairman, suffice it to say you're acting according to pattern when you give away some \$6.5 million. Let's assume it is.

I agree with the member from Quill Lakes. You are asking us to take a great deal on faith. You gave us some figures that — maybe some of them are, maybe some of them aren't one in the U.S. — maybe he or she is, maybe he or she isn't. You didn't give us the size of it just in case it is.

Mr. Minister, the facts upon which you are asking us to vote this is just simply inadequate, and your preparation for this Bill has been utterly inadequate, just as your preparation for dealing with the guarantees which got us into this mess in the first place was wholly inadequate.

Mr. Minister, I say you are too free with the taxpayers' money. You make the same mistake that,

in fact, the executive officers and the directors of Pioneer Trust. As Mr. Sykes said, they forgot that they were dealing with other people's money and not their own. You seem to make the same mistake, Mr. Minister. You seem to forget that you're dealing with taxpayers' money and much of that money is hard to come by these days.

When the member from Shaunavon refers to a farmer who is having difficulty getting a crop in and he's got to pay taxes, I say you ought to ask yourself where that money's going, and you ought to be a lot more careful, and you ought to give us a lot more information.

Mr. Minister, I ask you to go back to the days when you had to sign pay cheques, when you ran an office. Supposing the secretary or the bookkeeper brought a cheque to you. They said — let's reduce the figures so it's perhaps a little more manageable — here's a cheque for 280 bucks, or 2,800. Use whatever figure you want.

And you say, what's it for? And the bookkeeper says, well, I'm frankly just not quite sure; I can tell you if you like how the mess arose, but don't ask me where the cheque's going because I haven't got that information. You wouldn't sign it; you wouldn't sign a cheque when you don't know where the thing's going. That's what you're asking us to do.

Mr. Minister, I remain unconvinced that there is a great deal of merit in paying 25 per cent of this money outside the province.

You admitted earlier, after a lengthy discussion, and I'll put it no higher than that, that you didn't have any commitment to pay people outside the province. What you said, Mr. Minister, is you think that's what the federal government expects of you. That is as high as you can put your case. That is what you believe the federal government expects of you.

I say, Mr. Minister, you didn't get elected as a provincial government solely to do what the federal government expects of you. Life is more complicated than that, even when both the federal and provincial levels both wear the same stripes, Mr. Minister.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the fact that the federal minister may expect of you that you would pay all the depositors is really scarcely relevant. You admit you have no commitment. You admit you have no commitment to them.

Mr. Minister, what is surprising about the figures is the number of out-of-the-province depositors. Frankly, members of this side of the House had no idea we were dealing with as much money as we are.

I did a rough calculation. It is 6.52 as I calculated it. Heavens to Murgatroid. That could be out by 3 or \$4 million. I mean these are just preliminary figures, Mr. Minister. We don't know, Mr. Chairman, a great deal about this, and yet we are being asked to vote a very sizeable sum of money on the sketchiest of information.

Ask yourself, Mr. Minister, what would happen if a minister came in to deal with their estimates with the kind of information which you've brought into this House. Trying to get information out of this minister, Mr. Chairman, is like trying to drag a bed sheet through a keyhole. It really is something else.

We've spent all day at this process, Mr. Minister, and we have got, finally, after spending the best part of the afternoon, we get an admission out of you that you're not committed to paying the money. That, Mr. Minister, without a word of a lie, took almost two hours.

(2015)

We're back in here this evening, Mr. Minister, and we get another admission — after about an

hour, I would guess — finally got, Mr. Minister, a statement of how much is going out of the province. And it is a much larger sum of money than any of us anticipated when we drafted this amendment, I can tell you that. None of us anticipated that we were dealing with a sum as large as we are, that fully 29 per cent of the uninsured depositors would be outside the province, and 23 per cent or thereabouts of the money is going outside of the province. And as I say, Mr. Minister, that is on the sketchiest of information.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, if it was your money and you were signing the cheque on your own account, would you sign this for a bookkeeper, an accountant who brought this cheque to you and couldn't tell you where the money is going? If you had any brains, you'd fire an accountant who has no more competence than that.

Mr. Minister, if you were in the opposition, would you be satisfied with a minister's estimates who came in with this kind of sketchy information? I say to you, Mr. Minister, this has been wholly and completely inadequate. We need the documentation which you have on your desk. And if you don't have permission from Touche Ross to give it to us, then I suggest we adjourn consideration of this Bill, we'll pick up estimates and we'll come back when the minister has an adequate amount of information to deal with the Bill.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I want to respond in two ways to the member from Regina Centre. One, we're talking about a principle here, as I indicated before. We're talking about a principle. Are we going to provide protection for depositors or are we not? And that's the principle — inside the province or across the entire country. Now if the principle is worth anything, if it's 4 million, you can vote for it, but if it's 7 million you can't vote for it. That's hardly a principle.

And now the member from Regina Centre seeks to lecture me on \$4 million, Mr. Chairman — on \$4 million, Mr. Chairman. The same people that took \$600 million in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order. I would ask the member to keep his comments onto the amendment of clause 5 of the printed Bill.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member indicates that somehow you should not be able to . . . that we are asking here for some money without details, for the money to be spent without details. Now he's saying that's what we should do.

Now I just want to go back, Mr. Chairman, in history a ways and advise this Assembly about how money was, in fact, spent without coming to this Assembly. That's why I say, Mr. Chairman, he talks about that. He talks about that, Mr. Chairman. He talks about the same government that committed \$600 million of Saskatchewan . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. This is a very narrow amendment. I would ask . . . Order, I would ask members on both sides of the House to keep their comments to the amendment.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before, and I indicated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, a man who spent almost five years of his career as a premier of this province dedicated, Mr. Chairman, dedicated to try to build some more sense as to what this nation was — as to what this nation was, Mr. Speaker.

And what they're asking for in this Assembly with this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is as follows. What they're asking for is this: it's okay for Alberta; it's okay for Manitoba; if they have a failure of one of their companies, it's okay for them to help the depositors of Saskatchewan. It's okay for Alberta to put in money to bail out credit unions. It's okay for the Government of Alberta to put in money to bail out North West Trust, who have deposits and depositors that live in Saskatchewan. It's all right for the Government of Alberta to put money into Canadian Commercial Bank to keep that going, who has depositors in the province of Saskatchewan. It's okay to ask Alberta taxpayers to do that and, in so doing, help depositors and citizens of our

province. But no, don't ask us in return to help them. That's what they're saying: don't ask us in return to help them.

Or if we want to build, and the Leader of the Opposition in the first day says, we must again build some trust companies in the province of Saskatchewan. And what is he asking? Make a separate set of rules for the people here, but make another separate set of rules for the people outside this province. And then he says, build some confidence with a trust company in this province; build something in this province. Good luck!

Good luck, Mr. Speaker, because what they're talking about here, what they are talking about here, Mr. Chairman, is this, and what this issue is about, Mr. Chairman, is this: it's more about what this country stands for. It's more about how we deal between governments and governments.

We go down to the government in Ottawa and ask them if they will help with these depositors. And after some negotiations they say, yes, we will help the uninsured depositors that are covered by the income averaging annuity contracts. And that covers everybody across the country, and that it must. That it must, Mr. Chairman. If we in turn will pick up 2, \$300,000 on the top end of it to go over \$60,000 . . . That, while we would have liked to have more, was a concession. That was better than nothing. That was \$10 million for the people of Saskatchewan that were better than nothing — that were better than nothing, Mr. Chairman.

And in return they said, well what are you going to do? And what are we going to do? We will help the rest of the depositors that are uninsured, because we don't think it's fair for people to put their money in a bank and then it's gone. It's different than a share; it's a deposit, and it's a sacred trust.

Now the NDP opposite say, now the NDP opposite say, Mr. Speaker, they say something different. Let's go back to the *Leader-Post*. Let's go back to the *Leader-Post*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Order. Allow the Minister of Finance to finish his comments.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — They go back to reading the *Leader-Post* of Allan Blakeney: glad depositors of Pioneer Trust are rescued. That's what Allan Blakeney says.

Opposition leader Allan Blakeney says he is pleased the provincial and federal governments have decided to come to the rescue of unsecured depositors with Pioneer Trust.

That's Allan Blakeney's statement. "I think they've made the right decision," said Allan Blakeney. I think they made the right decision.

A few hours after the decision was announced in Regina by Eric Berntson and Barbara McDougall, "Blakeney said he had a 'small quarrel' with the government, because he thinks a decision should have been made earlier" . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well now, here's the member from Regina North West. You know, I get a chuckle out of this, Mr. Chairman. Here we have the Leader of the Opposition. He takes his position, he takes his position, and now we have the other 7 wonders of the NDP caucus. And here they sit back in their caucus room and they say, you know, boys, we haven't been doing very well; we haven't been doing very well in last session. We haven't done very well in last session, Mr. Chairman. How should we deal with this? How can we handle this problem? Well they sat back and they scratched their head for a while and they say, you know what? We got to take a lesson from the member from Regina North West. He can sit in the House, and he can bellow and holler, and he gets the media coverage. He's not very smart, but he gets the coverage.

Why, instead of being like our leader . . . why follow our leader? He's not the guy to follow in this situation. Let's act like Billy Sveinson. And that's the way you get the media. Boy, that's the way you get people to listen to you. And that's exactly what's going on today, Mr. Speaker. And that's exactly what's been going on in the last three or four days, Mr. Speaker.

They want to tie their wagon to the tactics of the member from Regina North West.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I hope, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to be allowed free rein to discuss my view as to what has gone on inside the Tory caucus for the last two weeks. I trust it's in order now. The minister did it. I trust I'm also able to use first names, because the minister did it. I distinctly heard the name Billy Sveinson. So I assume there's some new rules, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have been, I think, co-operative with you in your interpretation that this is a narrow section. But I'll tell you, the rules aren't being fairly applied.

The minister got a great deal more latitude than we have. If you are going to be strict with us, Mr. Chairman, you have got to do the same with both . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it's not a sermon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the member proceed to his question.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well I want to say, Mr. Minister . . . I want to say, Mr. Minister, that when a number of those comments were made about supporting the Bill, no one had any idea, no one had any idea what we would be going through this week. No one had any idea that we would be told at 2:30 that there were 100 or so in each province. At 7 o'clock we find out that 29 per cent live outside the province. We had no idea, Mr. Minister, that you would come in as poorly prepared to deal with this Bill as you have.

Mr. Minister, I cannot imagine a Premier who is doing his job tolerating a minister who came in as poorly prepared for his estimates as you have. I recognize what . . . It is a very similar process. You're asking this Legislative Assembly to vote a sum of money. It is a very similar process. It may be committee of the whole rather than committee of finance, but the function is the same. The function is the same. You are asking, Mr. Minister, this Assembly, you're asking this Assembly to authorize the expenditure of money.

I say, Mr. Minister, you owe us, and you owe this Assembly, and you owe the public, and I think you owe yourself, a better explanation than what you've come forward with today.

After an afternoon's effort, four hours, we get some sketchy information which, you're quite right, it doesn't add up because it's not all figures. One section, the U.S., was maybe there is and maybe there isn't, and there was no dollar signs attached at all. The same thing with the other. The same thing with the unknown. I think we have a right to ask: who is the unknown? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, what money are we sending to Mr. or Mrs. Unknown? Mr. Minister, I say this: the information you've given us is completely and wholly inadequate.

And I'm not sure what this caucus is going to do on third reading, but I can tell you on second reading we never anticipated that you would be as difficult to deal with as you have been, and we never anticipated that the information would be as sketchy — that you would provide us with nothing, nothing.

You haven't got the Premier's sense of humour, often twisted, or you might have said, trust me, because that's what he said in a similar situation when we asked him for some information we

were clearly entitled to, and he said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well if the comments about what happens inside the NDP caucus were in order, so I assume that it's in order to suggest, Mr. Minister, that if you had the premier's sense of humour you'd say trust me, because that's virtually what you're saying.

You have given us very, very little information. And I never anticipated that dealing with this Bill would be as difficult as it has, or that you would be as reticent as you are to provide information. Some of the information you have refused just makes no sense if you assume that you have nothing to hide.

It makes no sense to refuse to give us the letters of agreement that were exchanged between your officials, if you've nothing to hide, as you did this afternoon. It makes no sense for you to come in and give us this mishmash of information if you've got nothing to hide, Mr. Minister, and perhaps you don't. Perhaps you're just as poorly unprepared and incompetent in dealing with the Bill as you were in dealing with the guarantee. That is quite possible that you're being consistent.

(2030)

But I say, Mr. Minister, that this information is just simply not adequate. And I don't intend . . . I'm quite sure that the taxpayers in my riding, most of whom work darn hard for their tax dollars, unlike, I suspect, many of the people that this money's going to. I suspect, Mr. Minister, that taxpayers in my riding aren't going to want me to commit them to their \$110, or whatever it comes to per person, without a bit more information than this, Mr. Minister.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, you owe us some more information, and there is a very serious question as to whether or not — I figured it out as best one can with this information — 25.7 per cent of the total funds will be going outside the province.

That's assuming these figures are accurate, and you'd have to have the faith of the angel Gabriel to believe these figures. Some of them aren't even figures. There's one unknown to whom no figure was attached at all. It may or may not have been, Mr. Chairman. It might have not have been money going to this person, but we don't know. After all, what the heck. So we don't know. So there's a few hundred thousand bucks. So what? Easy come, easy go; deficit problem.

As anybody who's gone through 1.2 billion that you haven't raised in taxes needn't flinch at 10 million bucks. But I say, Mr. Minister, my constituents flinch at 27 million bucks. My constituents, Mr. Minister, flinch at putting out 100 bucks, or whatever it may be per person, for people who have a great deal more means than they do.

I can guarantee you one thing, Mr. Minister. Don't think any of my constituents want insured depositors. I doubt, Mr. Minister, that the farmers in Shaunavon and the businessmen in Shaunavon are uninsured depositors. I doubt very much, Mr. Minister, that uninsured depositors live in the riding of Athabasca. Regina Elphinstone maybe overrun with uninsured depositors, but that would surprise me.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that by and large members of this caucus represent people who come by their money darn hard. And to give it away in the cavalier fashion which you're suggesting to this Assembly is completely unacceptable. You have got to give us more information. You have got to come clean. You've got to file these documents, and you've got to start pretending . . . and you've got to start treating members of this Assembly as if there was more than one adult. You behave, Mr. Minister, as if you're the only adult in the room — every one else are a bunch of children who should accept your word on faith. Given your history of dealing with this, Mr. Minister, I say you have to be either a fool or the angel Gabriel to do that.

We are adults. We represent adult taxpayers who work a lot harder for their money than the

people who are going to get this money. And you owe us a fuller explanation. You owe us documentary evidence of what you suggest. And then, Mr. Minister, we'll make a decision as to whether or not 25 per cent of this money should go outside the province.

I don't have to take a poll of my riding, my constituents, to tell you what they think about it. I suspect most of them feel that their money shouldn't be going outside the province. It's one thing for the Saskatchewan government to look after Saskatchewan people, but I'll bet you this soul — it's been suggested it's Dick Collver; I don't know that, and I'm not making that suggestion but it's one soul in the U.S. — I'll bet you he'll be thunderstruck to get a cheque from the Saskatchewan government.

I say, Mr. Minister, there's nothing self-evident about the proposition that Saskatchewan . . . the Government of Saskatchewan has an obligation to make good the loss of depositors wherever they may live, whether it be in the U.S., in B.C., or wherever. There's nothing self-evident about that proposition. There's nothing — to put it mildly — there's nothing self-evident about the proposition that a government should automatically, automatically insure every depositor everywhere. There's nothing self-evident about that proposition either.

In fact, Mr. Minister, I have an advantage that a lot of members in this Assembly don't. I live in my riding whether the session's on or off, and I'm back there two or three times a day. And I'll tell you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you're not back in your riding two or three times a day as I am. I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, my constituents aren't urging me to vote in favour of this Bill.

Now that is not the be-all and the end-all of a member's responsibility, to do whatever the public may think at the moment, but I'll tell you, if I voted as my constituents are urging me, I sure wouldn't vote in favour of handing out \$27 million to a lot of very wealthy people. We may make the decision to do it, or we may not, depending on what happens over the next few days, but I'll tell you my constituents most certainly are not urging me to cough up 6 million bucks — 6 million bucks for people who live outside the province.

Mr. Minister, in the heart of my riding some of my constituents think they could find something else to do with the \$6.5 million that you are shovelling out to wealthy people outside the province. I got a food bank in the middle of my riding which, Mr. Minister, does not have enough money to function. That's another use for the \$6 million, Mr. Chairman. I'm just saying that this government claims money is very hard to come by, and therefore . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The first commandment of any government is: feed thy people. This government is not doing that, and yet they claim . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would ask the member to relate his comments to the amendment to clause 5.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well I say again, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, I was doing that. And I say again, I did not think the minister was, in his lengthy dissertation where he preceded me.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that you have got to give us the documentary evidence, and the information has to be complete. We have to know what you're sending outside the province, or it is not fair to ask us to vote in favour of this. You wouldn't do it if it was your own money; you wouldn't do it if it was your own business. You wouldn't tolerate a minister who came into the Assembly to deal with estimates and brought in such haphazard information. I say, Mr. Minister, you are being unfair to ask us to vote in favour of this legislation with this information. We may well not.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The member opposite indicates that his constituents don't want any money going outside the province of Saskatchewan. That's the first thing he says. The second thing he says is his constituents really don't want — if you're to read what he said — really don't want any money to be paid to depositors at all. That's precisely what you said. There's other uses

that they think it should be used for.

Now, how do you square that with your leader, who says in the *Leader-Post* at his first opportunity to speak on this particular legislation, “I totally agree with what the province is doing. I totally and categorically agree with what the province is doing, but for one thing.” But for one thing, Mr. Chairman. They should have done it far sooner. They should have done it far sooner. That’s the words of the Leader of the Opposition. I endorse this 100 per cent. You should pay these depositors.

In fact, prior to the announcement, prior to the announcement, Mr. Chairman, here was the sanctimonious NDP saying, this government has got to cover those uninsured depositors; it’s mandatory that they cover the uninsured depositors; it’s the policy of the NDP that you cover those uninsured depositors. That’s before the deal was struck with the federal government. That’s before the announcement was made. Then the announcement is made, and immediately we have the Leader of the Opposition standing up at a news conference, or at a scrum after the announcement, saying, I think they made the right decision. I think they made the right decision. Those aren’t my words, Mr. Chairman. Those are the words of the Leader of the Opposition, the same day that it was announced that we were going to deal with the uninsured depositors. And it was at the request, if you are to read the paper and read the media, they lobbied — you should cover them — right after February the 7th. What was the position of the members opposite: you must cover those uninsured depositors. Cover them; it’s your responsibility. They should be covered.

Then the announcement is made, the deal is struck, and there’s the leader saying, I think they made the right decision, but for one thing — but for one thing: they should have made this decision earlier. They should have paid these depositors off earlier.

But now what are the troops saying behind him? I’m not sure we should pay anybody. I don’t think we should pay anybody. No, I think that we should go the other way. There’s better things to do with the money. We should give that money to somebody else. Give that money to somebody else, Mr. Chairman; that’s exactly what the member from Regina Centre is saying. No, I don’t agree with my leader. I think he made a mistake. I think he was saying things the wrong way, but no, I don’t think we should do it. I don’t think we should pony up money.

And then if you went back to just before lunch, just before the dinner break, a little before the dinner break, and here was the member from Shaunavon saying: well, it’s okay if you pay some to the people of Alberta, and I don’t believe in universality; he got into that. But he said, it’s okay if you pay some to the people of Alberta, but before we do that, you got to show me the list of all the people that live in Alberta, what their names are, what they do, how much money they’ve got, and then maybe we’ll go through that list, and we’ll say: yes, Jones, from here, he doesn’t look like a bad guy; yes, this group, it’s a hospital, that’s okay, we’ll let that one go; this guy, well, he just retired six months ago from Saskatchewan, we’ll let that one go. And through the list.

And then, Mr. Chairman, where do they go next, where do they go next? I’ll tell you where they go next. The way they’ve always gone. Their next question, Mr. Chairman, their next question, Mr. Chairman, and their next amendment, Mr. Chairman, I know what it is. I know what’s coming. It’s going to be: let’s see the list of those people in Saskatchewan. Let’s have a look at that, and how can we figure out an amendment that says, so and so Brown, we shouldn’t pay him because no, he’s a Liberal or he’s a Tory, he’s not an NDP, so we shouldn’t pay him.

That’s exactly what they’re proposing when they get into this. They’re not saying . . . If you go back in *Hansard*, you go back in *Hansard* to just before the supper break and look at the statements made by the member from Shaunavon and square that with the statements made by the member from Regina Centre. Square those two. Because what he said was this, what he said was this: well I don’t think that we should . . . I don’t think we should cover Alberta — well, maybe we can cover some. But you have to show us the lists. And then we’ll go through it and

determine whether this guy could be handled or that guy could be handled or the next guy could be handled. That's what they're trying to say, Mr. Chairman. That's what they're proposing to say.

But now what are they saying? Now the member from Regina Centre says, I'm not sure that I'm even going to vote for this Bill on third reading now; I don't think I'm going to vote for this Bill on third reading, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly what they're doing. That's what they doing, Mr. Chairman.

And I say to you, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, they're moving away from the tactics of the Leader of the Opposition. They say he's too fair. He's too intelligent. We've got to follow the direction of the member from Regina North West. Boy, that's the way we're going to get coverage. That's the way we're going to get our stuff across. That's the way to do it. That's the way to do it. And that's the strategy they've done. That's the strategy they've done, Mr. Chairman.

What they are saying is universality. I don't believe in universality. That was the very statement of the member from Shaunavon. You heard that. I don't believe in universality — that's what he said — but if I can look at these individuals and determine who they are, then maybe I'll let this one go, or that one go, or the next one go.

(2045)

That is a dangerous precedent to undertake, Mr. Chairman, but that's what they propose to do. That's what they propose to do And their next amendment is going to be, we cannot vote for this legislation until you provide the following information: I want a list of every individual in this province, every individual in this province who has an uninsured deposit. I want to go through that list. I want to see if it's Joe or Sam or Frank or Fred, and that's what I want to see. That's what I want to see, Mr. Chairman. That's what they want to do. That's their next move, Mr. Chairman. You vote for this, and there's the next place you're going. There's the next place you're going.

To the member from Regina Centre I say this: you stand up and say, I don't believe, and my constituents don't believe I should cover and I should vote for this uninsured deposit. That's exactly what you're saying. You stood up before and said, yes, I support it.

Well I say, Mr. Chairman, I say to the member from Regina Centre, Mr. Chairman, you listen to what your leader says and you would be a whole lot further ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I say, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Chairman, this is not a time for the half-crazed ravings of the Minister of Finance. This is a time for far more sober comments than that.

Mr. Minister, I stated earlier it is not self-evident that we ought to pay people outside the province. And I will readily admit my constituents don't want anyone paid. It doesn't necessarily mean that I'll follow them on every issue. I think it was Edmund Burke who said, "You owe the electorate your judgement but not your obedience."

But I say, Mr. Minister, it is not self-evident that we ought to pay \$27 million. It is even less self-evident that we ought to pay, at a minimum, \$6.5 million outside the province.

The first commandment of any government is to "feed they people," and you aren't doing it. There's a food bank in the middle of my riding which is running short of food, and I say, Mr. Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. Order! Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to speak?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister of Finance talk at length about the next place the opposition is going. I trust you will allow me to speak at length about the next place the government is going. And it will be every bit as relevant — every bit as relevant, every bit as long — but I won't abuse the committee that way, because I want to call the minister to task about one or two of the things he said.

He said we're talking about the principle of the Bill. We're not talking about the principle of the Bill. We disposed of that, and we voted for it. We voted for it on first reading to see the Bill. We voted for it on second reading to adopt the principle.

We are now talking about the details of this Bill, and we are trying to get the details. We are trying to find out what justification the minister puts forward for paying out \$28 million. He has totally refused to give any documentary evidence. He's talked about agreements with the federal government, which do not exist. He has talked about examinations by his staff, which do not exist on paper. We are now talking about payment to people outside this province. He says he has lists, but they are not available.

So we have agreements with the federal government which are not available, examinations by his staff which are not available, and now lists of depositors inside and outside this province — and that's what we're talking about — which are not available.

We are talking about those details, and we are not getting any facts from the minister. The minister attempts to equate government action to prop up a business with payment out of cash from the provincial treasury to depositors, and that's what we're dealing with. He would have us believe, he would have us believe that if someone props up Massey-Ferguson, they're somehow helping creditors of Massey-Ferguson who may be all across the country. And this is an argument for paying out to depositors who may live in the United States — and he's verified that — taxpayers' money of Saskatchewan to depositors who live in the United States. Well, that doesn't convince me as an argument. It certainly doesn't.

He has then said — and I come now to what specifically he did say — that we on this side want to go through lists and pick out people who will get the money and people who will not.

The Bill which we have before us allows the minister to do that. The Bill we have before us says that in his discretion and subject to any terms and conditions that he may prescribe, he can pay out to anybody he likes. That's what his Bill says. And he now says that it is totally improper for anyone else to apply any standards, even so coarse a standard as to say, pay Saskatchewan people, but don't pay United States people.

He says that's grossly unfair. Well I doubt whether the taxpayers of Saskatchewan will see it in that light. He says it's grossly unfair to say we would only pay Saskatchewan citizens and allow other governments to pay their own citizens. He says that's grossly unfair and not in keeping with the constitutional structure of Canada and the like.

When I asked him earlier to give us a single instance of a province paying to uninsured depositors of a trust company outside their borders, he couldn't give one. For the very good reason that we are leading the way. We are leading the way. Once again, once again we are leading the way in Canada — but leading the way of taking taxpayers' money of — Saskatchewan taxpayers' money, and paying out to uninsured depositors in various provinces of Canada and in the United States.

I don't think, as my colleague from Regina Centre says, it's self-evident that that's what the taxpayers are calling for. No, I don't think it is. And I think the minister has given himself the power to do that, to pick and choose. He's given himself the power to pick and choose, in his words, as between Conservatives and Liberals and New Democrats. He has given himself that power. Then he accuses us of arguing for that power when we are making no such argument.

Our amendment, which we are specifically discussing, is totally geographic. He has the power to choose on political grounds, and he's given himself that power. We are simply asking that some guide-lines be drawn on the basis of residence; that we don't think that a resident of the United States has the same rights as a resident of Saskatchewan for getting the Saskatchewan taxpayers' money; that we don't think that a resident of Quebec, or Alberta, or Manitoba, for that matter, had the same call upon the taxpayers' money, the Saskatchewan taxpayers' money, as a Saskatchewan resident.

Now obviously, there will be some hard cases if anyone can raise them, anyone can raise them.

But it seems to me that it is reasonable to say that Saskatchewan uninsured depositors should be paid by the Saskatchewan government, and the Alberta, Manitoba, Quebec, Ontario, B.C. uninsured depositors might be paid by those provincial governments. That doesn't seem unreasonable to us.

The minister scoffs at us. He says that that's not in keeping with confederation. We ask him for examples; he gives none. He gives none because he can't give any. There aren't any. And I say that he ought to look at this. I say he ought to look at this and talk again with his colleagues in other provinces.

And once again we hear this argument that, if you prop up a business firm like the Canadian Commercial Bank, you are somehow in the same category as paying out cash to residents of the United States, simply because there may have been a United States depositor in Canadian Commercial Bank. That strikes me as a totally invalid argument. And not only that, I think it'll strike the taxpayers as a totally invalid argument.

And if the minister has got any examples that this has ever happened before, any example of any trust company — and there's been a good number of them in trouble in Canada — any trust company in Canada that has gone down the drain, and a provincial government has paid uninsured depositors to non-residents of that province, I'd be happy to have it. I don't know it. I don't know it.

And I say again that this is not unreasonable. I grant you that the minister has some arguments on the other side. It's not all black and white. But I say, looking at it on balance on behalf of Saskatchewan taxpayers, it's a reasonable amendment. And I ask the minister, and the Premier, and others, to consider it.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Two points. The member from Shaunavon, before the dinner break, said: we're prepared to pay some of the people in Alberta, or we're prepared to pay some of the people in Manitoba. That's what he said. So it's not a principle that should apply to everybody, it should apply to some here, some there, some the next place.

Now the Leader of the Opposition says: well Alberta bailed out Canadian Commercial Bank, but that didn't put a benefit to us, and we shouldn't be into that.

Now let's go back to the last time . . . He was in a similar situation with Co-op Implements — sitting in the province of Manitoba, a factory in the province of Manitoba, jobs in the province of Manitoba. He didn't come here to this Assembly to ask for money for that. No, he went ahead and put the money into it, into the province of Manitoba — in to the province of Manitoba of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money. He invested in that venture, and that venture went down. And the people's of Saskatchewan's money went down with it, and it went down with it every bit as much money going out of the province in this as went out in that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And what is the difference? What is the difference to the member from Regina Centre? What did the people of Regina Centre, who want a food bank, what did they gain by the Leader of the Opposition, when he was premier, pouring money into Co-op Implements in the province of

Manitoba? What did they gain by that? What's the difference of what they're talking about here? It was okay to put the money into Co-op Implements. It's not good enough to help out the depositors across this country.

Mr. Speaker, they're hypocrites. That's exactly what they are. They're hypocrites, and the Leader of the Opposition is the biggest hypocrite of the works.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I find it surprising, Mr. Minister, that a person could fall so far from grace so quickly with the benefit of simply a single speech. You were saying something else.

As I was saying, when I was so rudely interrupted about ten minutes ago . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. First of all, you were not interrupted. I did not call anything. I was merely thinking about it and reaching, and when I reached for the button your conscience told you that you were off the topic, and it wasn't necessary to interrupt you, so you were not interrupted. It was your leader who interrupted you so I take no blame for that, and I think you should examine yourselves on that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am so civilized and so totally possessed of manners, Mr. Chairman, that the moment you reached for that button, I sat down. I'm just so well-mannered when it comes to this House.

As I was saying, Mr. Minister, the first command of any government is to "feed thy people," and you people claim you haven't got enough money to do it. You haven't got enough money to do it. There's a food bank in my riding that's run out of food, and some of the food that's given out is not of high quality. I couldn't get my kids to eat it.

I say, Mr. Minister, in light of that — in light of that lack of money and lack of funds, you want to shovel out \$6 and a half million outside the province. It is not self-evident to my constituents, a good many of whom need a square meal, that you people claim you can't provide. It is not self-evident, the \$6 and a half million.

(2100)

Ask some of the members. I say to the member from Maple Creek, ask some of the members of your caucus who attend church now and then, where the phrase comes from. Mr. Minister, I say to you — Mr. Minister, I say to you — I say to you, Mr. Minister, it is not self-evident to my constituents that we ought to pay \$6 and a half million to relatively wealthy people who don't live in the province.

You can make an argument, Mr. Minister, that there is some obligation — you can make an argument, Mr. Minister — but given the fact that this mess is partially of your creation — and I'll put it no higher than that. You gave the guarantee without looking; you withdrew it without any consideration.

You know, Mr. Minister, I'd love to know — and I never will — I'd love to know who gave you the advice to bring forth this Bill in the manner and the fashion you have. I frankly cannot believe it is the professional people who sit on either side of you. I suspect this is more advice from Al Wagar. I suspect this is something else you got across the coffee-table in your office. I cannot believe that the professional and competent people who sit on either of you advised you to behave in this fashion.

Mr. Minister, you jumped into a guarantee without getting advice from these professionals. You obviously withdrew it without getting their advice. I suspect this is more of the same. This is more half-witted, half-baked, and thoroughly unprofessional advice on which you're acting when you're bringing this forward.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, if you can't look after the Saskatchewan people, if you can't give them a square meal, what are you doing pumping \$6.5 million out of the province?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Sanctimony doesn't suit you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister . . . No, it may not suit me. But I'll tell you what doesn't suit me either, is having as many constituents as I have who need a square meal. If the minister and if the member doesn't believe that . . . I recognize that I should not be addressing questions . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. As I've ruled earlier in the day, the Department of Social Services estimates will be on in a few days, and we can get into those questions. We're not going to go into food banks or welfare or those kind of things. Could you stick to the Bill, then, please.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, as was said from these curtain calls, we're talking about a priority in spending. If money was as free as this government has pretended it is, I guess, Mr. Minister, we wouldn't object — if money was no object, if you could shake an endless amount of it out of the trees, the way this government behaves.

This government came into office in the very beginning as if they had a money tree and they were not subject to the ordinary rules of economics. The law of mathematics and algebra just doesn't apply to these people. They invented some new rules when they came into office.

I say, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, these rules do apply to this government. They're subject to the same limitations as everybody else. And it is a question of priorities. And if they put 6.5 million bucks — if that's what it is . . . Others may believe that figure and may take it on trust. I'll tell you, I'm from Missouri when I'm dealing with this minister. I really am from Missouri.

I say, Mr. Minister, I want to see some more documentation for this, and then I want you to tell me why you should be paying \$6.5 million out of the province to relatively wealthy people when you can't feed the people in my riding? If you don't believe there's people in my riding who need a square meal, then Mr. Minister, I'll take you on a tour. And I'll show you those hungry people. I saw them last summer, and I was genuinely shocked.

And I am shocked that you want to pay \$6.5 million out of the province, as if money were no object. Mr. Minister, you'd think this was the early '70s when governments did have bucks, both here and elsewhere. You'd think this was a different period.

I recognize there are conservatives in office everywhere who have got this country thoroughly fouled up and on its knees. And governments don't have the revenues they once did. So it behooves us to spend each penny carefully. And you, Mr. Minister, are being a spendthrift. You're shovelling \$6.5 million out of the province when you can't look after your own people. And I say that is a very distorted set priority.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I just simply go back, Mr. Chairman, to the point I wish to make before, when he talks about we shouldn't send money out of the province. What we're talking about here is in the neighbourhood of 6, \$7 million that would go outside of the province. He says, well what's that? Five million dollars is what went into Co-Op Implements in Winnipeg out of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. That same taxpayer he talks about in his constituency. That was \$5 million, Mr. Chairman. A hundred and sixty two million went to Mr. Landegger in New York for P.A. Pulp. Six hundred million went into uranium mines. That's what we're talking about, Mr. Chairman. That's what we're talking about.

And he says, well, what's that do for us? What's that do for the taxpayer? Or they speculate what, another couple, \$3 million in Nabu Corporation — bought 10 per cent of a high tech corporation in Ottawa? Not one, not one employee in the province, not one. Not one. All the

money lost. All the money lost.

The money into CCIL, all the jobs in Manitoba. And the member from Shaunavon supports money into CCIL; that's okay to spend that over there. All of it lost. All of it lost, Mr. Chairman. And that isn't even part of it. Six hundred million dollars into uranium, that they want to close down — people of Saskatchewan's money.

Now you start adding that up, to the folks, add that up to the folks in his constituency. Add that up to the folks in his constituency and how much that's going to cost each of them. Ask what that's going to cost each of them? Or his investment in P.A. Pulp Mill. Same thing, Mr. Chairman, same thing.

With the CCIL, the Co-Op Implements, money — Saskatchewan taxpayers' money — over to the province of Manitoba. Same principle, Mr. Chairman, same principle. Dollars from Saskatchewan invested in Manitoba, lost in Manitoba, down the drain in Manitoba. And the people of Saskatchewan paid the bill. The people of Saskatchewan paid the bill, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The difference, Mr. Minister, was that during the '70s, there was a government in office which believed in the Saskatchewan people and were prepared to invest in it. We did, and we got rich returns back.

I'll tell you, Mr. Minister — I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, there was nobody going hungry in Saskatchewan during the '70s. Mr. Minister, the former government came into office on a promise and an undertaking to develop the economy. We did.

We put money into potash; we spent 40 days in this legislature while you and the other old-line party, the Liberals, fought that Bill. We passed it after 40 days of obstructionism by you people, and that potash company made money when we were in office.

Mr. Minister, the same with oil; it was at least a 40-day session. The member from Quill Lakes and the member from Athabasca were here then. The Minister of Finance was not. It was at least a 40-day session getting the oil Bill passed while you filibustered that — while that was filibustered by the Liberals. We spent all of December and most of January getting that Bill through. That company has made nothing but money since we did.

The difference, Mr. Minister, is that we believe in the Saskatchewan people. We were prepared to invest in this province and in the people, and it returned rich rewards. It returned rich rewards.

This country, Mr. Minister, went through two recessions — one of them severe in the '70s — but not Saskatchewan. Those recessions passed Saskatchewan by without the Saskatchewan people ever knowing they existed. Why? Because we had a government in office which believed in the people, were prepared to work with them, and believed in planning. And we did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I've allowed a little . . . Order, I caution the member from Shaunavon. If I have to caution him again, I will report him to Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Will the member from Shaunavon come to order? Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's your ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I've allowed . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's your ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Will the member from Quill Lakes come to order? I want to know if the member from Quill Lakes will come to order?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Will you give your ruling, he said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I called for order. If I do not receive order, I will have to make it in other ways. Is that clear?

Now, the ruling is . . . Do the members wish to continue the debate? Then we'll have a ruling. Now the ruling is that I've allowed a fair amount . . . Order. I am warning the member for Quill Lakes for the last time that if he does not come to order, I will report him to Mr. Speaker. I hope that is perfectly clear.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He lets the Minister of Finance go on, and then he sits Regina Centre down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Now . . . Order. I am also warning the member for Shaunavon for the last time that if he does not come to order, I will report him to Mr. Speaker. Now the ruling is: I've allowed a fair amount of leeway on discussion related to the spending of the taxpayers' money.

The warning is in, and if I hear any more disorder from those particular members, it will be necessary to report their conduct. Now the ruling is: I've allowed a fair amount of leeway in so far as the debate relates to the spending of . . . I will call in Mr. Speaker in order to report the conduct of the member from Shaunavon.

(2115)

CHAIRMAN'S RULING

Challenge to the Chair

MR. SCHMIDT: — Mr. Speaker, as acting chairman of the committee, I must report that, while I was in the process of making a ruling, the member for Shaunavon persisted in disorderly behaviour. I repeatedly warned the member for Shaunavon; however, he refused to come to order. I gave the member for Shaunavon a final warning that I could not give my ruling unless he would come to order. He still refused to come to order. The refusal to obey my ruling to come to order prevents me from giving my ruling, and I ask Mr. Speaker to correct this conduct.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. The House cannot operate if the rulings of the Chair are not obeyed, and if the warnings are given and the members do not respond, then the House will break out in chaos, and we will not accomplish anything here.

I listened very closely on television throughout the whole debate. I've watched every second of it, and I believe that the point that the member raised is very valid.

I'm going to ask that the member from Shaunavon apologize to the Chamber for his conduct in the Chamber.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would just say one point: that during the committee of the whole on this Bill I found the rulings of the chairman to be unfair at two or three points today where the minister was allowed. I have no intention of apologizing. And I feel the chairman was completely out of order, and I do not accept the ruling that I should apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: — Since the member has refused to apologize, I have no other route that I can go

except to name the member for Shaunavon, Dwain Lingenfelter.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 70 — An Act respecting the Provision of Financial Assistance to Depositors of Pioneer Trust Company

Clause 5 (continued)

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think . . . The light is out, but I must be heard.

In any event, the ruling I was giving prior to our brief adjournment was that I have allowed a fair amount of latitude on the debate, and I have allowed it so long as it pertains to the taxation of Saskatchewan citizens and the expenditure of their money. But there has to be a line drawn somewhere as to how far the latitude can go.

And my ruling is that the latitude cannot go as the taxation of oil and other matters 10 years ago, as not being relevant to the debate today. The ruling is that we can discuss expenditures of taxpayers' money outside of the province, but it has to be some way related to this Bill or other examples of expenditure outside of the province.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, I was responding to some comments made by the minister.

I frankly don't understand how a debate can be conducted if one side can make comments about the economic program of the former administration, and that is in order, but when I go to respond to that, it's out of order. I frankly don't understand, Mr. Chairman, how a debate can be conducted with rules such as that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Well the debate should not be conducted with the chairman, but in answer to your question, the question was raised for examples of expenditure of money outside of the province, because that was the answer of the minister giving examples of the expenditure of taxpayers' money outside of this province.

If that is why . . . Order. Could the member for Quill Lakes please come to order.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I might.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well would the member for Quill Lakes decide right now if he's going to come to order or not?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if . . . in fact, I would move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I believe the rational thing for us to do would be to adjourn the House. I believe the mood of some of the members is such that that would be the right thing to do at this stage. So I move the House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:26 p.m.