

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
19th Day

Tuesday, March 21, 1972.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to the Members of this Assembly through yourself 56 students seated in the east gallery from the Lumsden High School. I should like to take the opportunity of thanking the students for the attractive ash tray they presented to me before the sitting this afternoon. They are accompanied by their teachers, Gordon Barncosky, Tony Koral and Joe Tuescherer. We certainly welcome them. I hope they have a very enjoyable stay and I hope a very educational afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a very warm welcome to two schools from my area. The first being from St. Andrews' Separate School in the Douglas Park vicinity. They are accompanied by Mr. Phil Halter, the principal there, 53 students in Grade Eight. I want to extend a warm welcome to them and I hope their stay will be a pleasant one. I might say these St. Andrews' students are seated in the west gallery.

We also have a group from Miller High School in the Speaker's Gallery. My record shows that Mr. Garth Schuett is accompanying them. I don't know if there are any other teachers or not. They are Grade Eleven and Twelve students, 40 in number. They come from a separate high school which has won awards for its architectural design and structure throughout Canada. It is one of the best equipped schools in this country with equipment for teaching the use of computers. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome them as well. We hope that the proceedings here will be of great interest to them all.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce through you and to this Assembly a group of elementary students, 66 in number, from Prince Philip School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Nickel and Mr. Unrau. I believe they are seated in the east gallery and in the west gallery. I hope that they have a very informative afternoon and an enjoyable one.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you a group of girls in the Speaker's Gallery who are not students but were a short while ago. They are the wives of some of the branch heads in the Department of Natural Resources who are having a meeting

in the city today. I would ask them to stand so that you would be able to view some of our better natural resources.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SCHOOL GRANT FORMULA DISCRIMINATORY

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). After listening to the Minister of Education make a great speech about . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Once again the Hon. Member is prefacing it with a statement. I wish he could get right to the question because the rules are quite plain that questions cannot be asked with a lead up nor can they be answered that way either.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I think it is time we sat down in the House and reviewed this policy of questions because, as you know, Sir, it is very difficult to ask a question without prefacing it. And I think it's time that we reviewed some of the questions that have been a precedent in the House. Sir, I should like, with your indulgence, to read a question that was asked by the Opposition a year or two ago.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! If the Member wants to debate the rules of this House you know the channels through which the rules can be debated. We cannot debate the rules of the House when the Hon. Member rises to ask the Premier a question. If the rules of the House should be changed, that's fine, but it must be done in the proper manner.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, certainly on a Point of Order I should be permitted the right, Sir, to express the concern of this side of the House about the limitations of the existing rules that are in the House. All I wish to do, Sir, is to read you a precedent, a question that has already been put before this House by another Opposition a very short time ago and to give you an example of the kind . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! If the Members on either side of the House don't feel the rules are right there are ways and means by which the Assembly may change the rules of the House. I cannot permit this, to change the rules. It may be a question asked some time before and it may have been out of order and it may have not. I don't know and I'm not judging that.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, there is no question about changing the rules, Sir. I think the question is this, in a Point of Order that it has always been a proper precedent in the House to give some brief preamble as to the nature of the question. And this is the point that you, Sir, suggested should be changed.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like you to remember that I have referred you on

the past several occasions to read page 147 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition and I think you will see that questions either orally or written must not and along with other things be a speech however short nor be of unreasonable length. At the present time our House makes no provisions for oral questions. We do it by toleration but there are no provisions for oral questions. We have done it as a courtesy. I hope that we continue in this line.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I will try and keep my comments as brief as possible. Has the Government designed in its new grant formula for education a discriminatory policy in relation to separate high schools or separate systems and the public systems? In other words, are there two grant formulas, one for separate school systems and one for the public school systems?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is No. There are not two grant formulas, one for the separate system and one for the public system. One of the phase-in provisions of the grant formula does have some regard to the disparity in the educational offering of systems which have coterminous boundaries. There is no separate or public element to it but where there is a large disparity the approach to equality is being phased in, in a way similar to what is happening in a good many of the rural units as well.

SCHOOL GRANTS

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just one more question to the Premier and the Minister of Education. Listening to the Premier, first of all he agrees that the grant policy as announced is really not new, it's a continuation, but I wonder, Sir, when we could have the tentatively approved grants for the various school jurisdictions in the province so we could decide for ourselves.

Mr. Blakeney: — I am not able to answer for the Minister but my understanding is that they would be available probably tomorrow. I know that they seem to be in hand. I got some rough figures yesterday for Regina.

FUTURE OF THE REGINA BURNS PLANT

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson). I believe he is aware that Mr. Child of Burns Food has indicated a willingness to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We've voiced a Point of Order.

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, if I understand your ruling correctly about questions, the verbal ones should be like the written ones, not prefaced with a long preamble or statement.

Mr. Grant: — This isn't a long preamble, what's he talking about?

Mr. MacDonald: — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, Surely, Sir, you can't make the ruling and the Minister can't make the ruling until the man has had the opportunity to ask the question.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, that wasn't a Point of Order or Point of Privilege or anything else and I ask you to keep them in order until I ask my question and then let them have the floor. Now, the question is this. Is he or has he done anything about accepting Mr. Child's invitation to go to Calgary and talk about the future of the Regina Burns plant? That's what I wanted to ask him. I can't make it any shorter than that.

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member's question I want to assure him that my officials of the Department of Industry and Commerce have been in touch with Burns Foods Limited and I have been in touch with Mr. Child. It is my hope that we shall have an opportunity to meet with each other at a very early date.

Mr. Grant: — Supplementary question. Has that contact taken place within the last two days?

Mr. Thorson: — I have not been in touch with Mr. Child in the last two days, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

AGRA INDUSTRIES EXPAND IN NIPAWIN

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I would if I might, pursuant to the first reading of the Athabasca Pulp Mill Project Bill, table a series of documents which I think will assist the Hon. Members in the consideration of that Bill.

I wonder if I also might, Mr. Speaker, announce to the House that Agra Industries Limited has today announced an expansion program for that company's rapeseed oil processing plant in Nipawin. The proposed expansion is subject to a confirmation of a DREE grant. Subject to that it is scheduled to begin immediately. It will involve, firstly, the doubling of the Company's present edible oil refinery capacity of 50 million pounds to approximately 100 million pounds per year. And secondly, the Company will install a complete margarine packaging plant to process its refined oil and package it into final packages for retail sale. This will be the first margarine packaging plant in Saskatchewan. the proposed increase in refining capacity in the establishment of the margarine packing facility in Nipawin will cost an estimated \$900,000 and should ultimately provide jobs for an additional 50 people at the Nipawin plant.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment briefly on this announcement. I certainly welcome it. I think that probably the main credit for this expansion . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — Point of Order,

Mr. Speaker. If we are going to stick to the rules of the House on questions and oral comments, I should like to ask you, Sir, to restrict the comments to one from each side as per the rules.

Mr. Speaker: — I think that all Hon. Members will agree that the Member in whose constituency the industry is situated in whether it be yours or whether it be one of your Members, I don't think we would object, but I would object to Members all over.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, this is certainly a complete change of the rules as we have ever known them in the House before and a violation of the rules that were decided upon the Rules Committee about three years ago. This has never been done before, Mr. Speaker, and if we are making a change in the rules I certainly want to bring it to your attention. I doubt very much whether it would be a change for the better.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't consider it a change of the rules. I just consider it a courtesy extended to the Member by the House.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, this side of the House would welcome the comments from the Member from Nipawin. We just want to point out, Sir, that it is a diversion from the rules.

Mr. Speaker: — It is not a diversion from the rules, it is just a courtesy that we are extending.

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, I think the main credit for this expansion can go to this Government which has introduced legislation which will remove the color ban from margarine. I am sure the people of Nipawin would be most interested in the fact that the Members of the Opposition did not want to have this expansion commented on.

Mr. Speaker: — Keep your statements to what is before us and do not create an argument.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 2

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 2 showing:

- (1) The names of all individuals who were provincial candidates for any political party in the election of June 23, 1971, in the Province of Saskatchewan, and who have been appointed since July 1, 1971, to any Saskatchewan Government Board, Commission, Committee, Agency, enquiry, study or Advisory Group, or any Saskatchewan Civil Service position or who have been employed in any capacity by the Saskatchewan Government, giving the position to which appointed.
- (2) The date of any such appointment and the duration of

the appointment.

- (3) The amount paid to each such individual for all purposes including salary, expenses and allowances.
- (4) The political party such candidate represented.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I know that the House will be glad to have the information asked by the Hon. Member for Milestone about the fate of the unsuccessful candidates in the June 23, 1971 election and I know that they would also want to have it with respect to previous elections. Accordingly, I am going to move:

That the word “election” in the second line of the motion be deleted and there be substituted therefore the words “elections of April 22, 1964 and October 11, 1967.”

And just before I put that motion, I will indicate that I am also going to move a further motion to add “or were appointed Crown prosecutors” among the list of people who may have ended up in various locations. The purpose of this motion, Mr. Speaker, is to provide for, shall we say, a gazetteer of what happened to unsuccessful candidates in the last three elections and which of them ended up as employees of the Government, corporations or as Crown prosecutors. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move the amendment in line 2 as earlier indicated and that the motion be further amended as follows:

And that the words “or who have been appointed as Crown Prosecutors,” be inserted after the word “Government” in the 7th line. (As it appears in Votes and Proceedings)

I so move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the amendment of the Premier. But seeing that we are going to get down and find out about all of these candidates that have participated in election campaigns of the past, I should like to make a further amendment, Mr. Speaker. You may have to give me a moment, Sir, to write it out, I have just received the amendment from the Premier:

That after the words “elections of April 22, 1964 and October 11, 1967” that we continue on the elections of 1960, 1956, 1952, 1948 and 1944.

Then, Sir, we'll have a complete record of all those people who actually participated in the election campaign and then worked for the Civil Service of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to say that the Hon. Member for Milestone, he was the mover of motion No. 2 and he would not be able to make an amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, the point made by the Hon. Member for Milestone is still very valid, and if you will give us just a moment, I will move that sub-amendment if you like, Sir.

March 21, 1972

Mr. Speaker: — We have a sub-amendment moved by the Member for Wilkie. Do you have a seconder?

Mr. McIsaac: — The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to advise the Hon. Member that I shall not rule on that account, it is on the wrong form, since this is a Notice of Motion form.

Mr. Steuart: — Maybe the forms should be supplied there, where they are supposed to be.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I am must saying that there isn't, I agree with the Member, there isn't a place on this form for a seconder and that's why I was drawing it to his attention, but I'll accept the Member for Moosomin as the seconder on it and I'll insert his name.

Mr. McIsaac: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The debate continues on the sub-amendment as moved by the Member for Wilkie and the Member for Moosomin.

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I am permitted to speak to this I presume. We are pleased to have it on record, on the record of this House that the Premier has willingly offered to provide us with information that goes back seven years. He did this with no question from our side and we certainly welcome this precedent, because we may have questions in the future asking for information back four, five or six years, and seeing that the Premier has generously offered to provide information of this type, we are certain that he won't deny us this information at other times when we ask for it back to 1964.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.L. Cowley (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the Members opposite in keeping with their new look and their new Leader are now asking for information that goes back to the time before when some of the Members of this side of the House were born.

Mr. Blakeney: — I simply want to assure the Member for Moosomin that we certainly like to provide all the information we reasonably can. This will be another aspect of this Government which will be new.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If the information going back is as easily obtainable as the information which this motion and amendment provides for, then we will certainly support any request for such information. I can't say the same for information which is asking us to go back 25 to 30 years. I think there would be some very

considerable difficulty in digging that out, and a large amount of expense. I think perhaps the information would not be of too much interest. I doubt whether the year 1944 has much more relevance than 1938 in the political life of most of us in this House.

Mr. Grant: — 1905.

Mr. Blakeney: — 1905 has been a suggestion. I think it is about as reasonable and sensible as the suggestion contained in the sub-amendment and I accordingly propose to vote against the sub-amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, on the sub-amendment I think that it would be of great interest to the people of Saskatchewan to hear precisely what has happened to all the candidates since 1944. The party opposite has for a long period of time stood up with a holier-than-thou attitude and told the people of Saskatchewan they didn't ever appoint political candidates of their party to public office and we intend to bring to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan precisely what they have done because their attempts to try and hold that holier-than-thou attitude to the people of Saskatchewan is nothing but absolute and pure nonsense and we intend to show by moving this sub-amendment exactly what has happened to all their candidates since 1944.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the remarks of the Hon. Member. Certainly if that was the information that they wanted then why didn't they ask for the information initially. The Hon. Member has submitted a question asking for the period since the last election and we are prepared to provide the information. We are also prepared to provide a little more information so that they are better informed. Why didn't they submit their question initially going all the way back to 1944 or 1905. Certainly it is logical and reasonable for us to vote down the amendment or the sub-amendment as was proposed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, the Member who took his seat may talk about logic and reason but I don't know where he is going to get his because he certainly didn't present any in the brief speech that he made. Neither did the Premier of the Province. For heavens sake if he is prepared to give us the information for 1964 why isn't he prepared to give it for 1960. There is only one reason, Mr. Speaker, he is treating this question on a purely political basis instead of in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I will only make one comment in this debate; the Member who just took his seat and who made that statement, I will want to note for the record, said it was an absolutely straight face.

Sub-amendment negatived.

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I will move, seconded by the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) a sub-amendment that the motion be amended by adding:

That the word “provincial elections of 1956 and 1960” be inserted after the third line of the amendment. (As it appears in Votes and Proceedings)

Mr. Speaker: — The vote on the sub-amendment which we just voted on which the House has rejected has rejected 1960, but 1956 was not mentioned in the sub-amendment, but 1952 and 1960. This is to all intents and purposes the same as what the House has made a decision. They have made a decision on 1960.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, surely it is not the same amendment at all. The Premier in his remarks as I recall them, part of his remarks, said to go back to 1944, to 1948, to 1952, was irrelevant, a long ways back and would prove very costly. Surely if they can ask to go back two elections when we were the Government, it is not unreasonable to go back two elections when that particular group were the Government. The fact that they turned down the larger motion I don't think precludes or should preclude the opportunity of this House to vote on the two years 1956 and 1960.

Mr. Speaker: — I will agree with the Hon. Member that it is a narrower sub-amendment than the first one was. But the rules plainly say that the House cannot make the same decision on the same thing twice. They have decided on the words 1960, but they didn't decide on the year 1956. This sub-amendment for that reason I will have to say is out of order, and I will have to so rule.

Me. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could reconsider that in this light, Sir, that the first sub-amendment proposed which was defeated, asked the House to consider in a block the four elections, 1944, 1948, 1952 and 1960. It was the total block that was being considered, not any one election at a time. This motion put by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked consideration of two specific elections, in other words, the total block again, being a smaller block. I don't think that the negating of the first motion would rule that one out of order, on that point.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to read to this House in Beauchesne Parliamentary Fourth Edition, on page 164, rule 194. It says:

A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again, but must stand as a judgment of the House.

It goes on to deal with other topics, but that is the main

part dealing with what we have before us here. The House has made a decision to negative that sub-amendment. Under Beauchesne Section 194, I will have to say that the motion is out of order.

The debate continues on the amendment.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to this particular motion, the Premier stood up and with a smirk on his face said, we have another difference now, this Government will give the Opposition information. About 27 seconds later he indicated to his followers that he intended to vote against our sub-amendment which asks for some information. I can't understand his reasoning, if he was prepared to give us the information, as he boasted then, why not give us the information. Obviously what he is trying to hide is the record of the Government of which he was a Member. To recall the record, he was brought out here as a civil servant and later became a member of that Government so he obviously knows something that we don't know and that the public doesn't know, and obviously doesn't want it to be made public. This is the first opportunity we have had in the House since this Government was elected to debate Motions for Return and this is the second Motion for Return we have asked for and I want it noted very clearly that the Government has turned down a reasonable request of the Opposition in their negative vote of our sub-amendment. Speaking for our side, we will not oppose the amendment because we have nothing to hide, if we . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . if there were some people elected or candidates in the 1964 and 1967 election that received jobs, fine. All we have ever tried to prove in this House and to the people of this Province and we'll keep on trying to prove it, until we do prove it to the majority of them, is that this Government, the NDP, talk one way and act another.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. Snyder (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, just in reply to the last Member's remarks I don't know how in the world the Leader of the Opposition can assume the position that he has in suggesting that we are somehow denying them information when we are in effect providing the answer to the question that was asked and adding some additional information. Whatever came about after that was an afterthought, a shot out of the blue from a colleague of yours who sits to the left. We have added a few additional comments, some additional information. In essence we have provided exactly what you asked for and have provided something additionally. If you can by any way stretch your imagination to suggest that we are somehow denying you information I think you are stretching your imagination a long, long way.

Mr. Speaker: — I think I want to establish right now that the House has already decided on the two sub-amendments. The motion before us now goes back to April of 1964 and then of 1967. I hope that we won't get into the debate of what the House has

decided on the two sub-amendments. I think for both of the last two speakers, I allowed a little too much latitude.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, just a Point of Order there, Sir, the House didn't decide on the two sub-amendments, it decided on one. I believe, Sir, you decided and ruled the other one out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to tell the Member that the House has decided, because the House makes the rules not me, I can only enforce the rules. The House has decided not me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — If a motion is out of order it is not my fault. I am not responsible for that. The motion before us now, is the amendment moved by the Premier.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, if the House has made the decision then the Opposition will put in another question where we will go back to the years 1944, 1948, 1952, 1956 and 1960, and we will then see if they want to give us this information or not.

Mr. Guy: — I guess it's too late to question your ruling but I disagree with it. I am completely at a loss why the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) would stand up and make the statement that he did. There is just no doubt that when they voted against that amendment they were doing so to cover up their own sins of the past. If they had nothing to hide they would have gone along with it. There is no doubt about it and it's all fine for him to be holier than thou and stand up and try to put the blame on us but there is just no doubt in my mind and no doubt in the minds of other unbiased people in the House here that they are ashamed to disclose what took place prior to 1960 or whatever the period was. They're ashamed to go back to 1944 and 1948 and I must remind the Hon. Member that he is not fooling the public. I just hope the news media gives good coverage to this because the Government is ashamed to tell us about it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I am unimpressed with the arguments that are being presented by the Members of the Opposition, it is just a matter of 8½ months since they were in office. The kind of information they are asking us to provide now was available to them and they had the resources of the whole government for a period of seven years so I would presume that they had that information. I think what they are trying to do by asking these questions is to play games.

Mr. Speaker: — I think we are getting out of order, we are going back debating the sub-amendments and what is before us is the amendment. If there was any debating on the sub-amendment it should have been done at that time.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amendment agreed to.

RETURN NO. 27

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 27 showing:

Whether there were any acute care hospitals “temporarily” restricted to Out Patient services only during the period July 1, 1971 — February 29, 1972. If so the length of time and location.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, like in the previous debate I think it would be wrong to just provide part of the information. I think it would leave the impression that the only time that any temporary closures of hospitals occurred is at July 1st, and I am sure that that was not the intention of the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park to ask that kind of a question. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, so that he has all the information including the information for the period he was in office, in case he doesn’t have it, I should like to move this amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Wood (Swift Current):

That all the words after the word “the” in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

periods: (a) July 1, 1970 — February 28, 1971; (b) March 1, 1971 — June 30, 1971; (c) July 1, 1971 — February 29, 1972.

If so, the length of time and the location.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) — Mr. Speaker, it appears that Members opposite are desirous of providing just some of the information on these motions instead of the full story. What we are trying to do really is save them embarrassment by not going back any further than what we do. However, if we want to get the full story I would then move a sub-amendment, seconded by Mr. Boldt (Rosthern):

That the motion be amended to include (d) the years 1962 and 1963.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I’m not sure what the Hon. Member is trying to drive at. It seems to me that the information, the amendment that I moved provides information for slightly better than one year. I don’t know what relevance 1962 and 1963 has. Certainly they were in office, as I said in an early debate, a few months ago. I’m sure that that information was available to them. It seems to me that this doesn’t have any bearing in relationship to this question of any significance and I would ask the House to vote down the sub-amendment that was proposed.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, if what the Hon. Member says is correct that it’s of no relevance he shouldn’t mind his colleagues supporting it. I can assure him that it has no significance the fact that we weren’t in office. I just want some additional

information even though I doubt that they were only too happy to give us more information than we asked for. Since they are in such a generous mood I should like a little more information still so that I can make a comparison.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might add a note. The Member for Whitmore Park has asked for hospital beds temporarily restricted from July 1, 1971 to the end of February 1972. Now we suggested that it would be reasonable to have a comparable year and we provided the previous year from July 1, 1970 to the end of February 1971, which is surely the best comparison. It was simply in order to put the information in context. There is now a suggestion that we go back and pick out the year, and it is a very significant year that was picked out, 1962. I think I remember something going on in 1962 about hospitals. And I think I remember some of the people who promoted what happened in 1962 about hospitals.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And they suggest that somehow it is a fair comparison whether or not beds were temporarily restricted in 1962. They suggest this is somehow a fair year to compare. We suggested that we take July 1, 1971 to the end of February, 1972 and take the preceding year of precisely the same number of days and set it up for comparison. There is no suggestion in anybody's mind that to revert back to 1962 and the events of 1962 could provide a fair comparison with any other year, when it comes to hospital beds being temporarily restricted.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I don't mind the Premier interpreting his own thoughts but please don't interpret them for this side of the House. If we want to ask for some information I want you to note, Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in four motions that he has refused us information. All we are saying, Mr. Speaker, if we want some information it is up to us to evaluate why we want it not for the Premier to tell us. His decision has to do with whether or not he is going to give us that information and it is the legitimate request of the Opposition to request information about any year of that Government and so we are asking that information now in addition. The Minister of Health wants a comparison, we should like to have a comparison also. We should like to have any comparison that they want to make but it is up to us to decide what information we want and for what reason we want it. The Premier is not to judge why we want that information but the fact that he is refusing it and that's it.

Sub-amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 15

Messieurs

Steuart	Coupland	Loken
Guy	Grant	Boldt
MacDonald (Milestone)	McIsaac	Gardner
Weatherald	MacLeod	McPherson
Lane	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)	Wiebe

NAYS — 42

Messieurs

Blakeney	Dyck	Meakes
Wood	Smishek	Romanow

Messer	Snyder	Bowerman
Kramer	Thibault	Larson
Kowalchuk	Baker	Brockelbank
Pepper	Michayluk	Byers
Thorson	Kwasnica	Carlson
Engel	Tchorzewski	Richards
Owens	Robbins	Matsalla
Cowley	Taylor	Faris
Cody	Gross	Feduniak
Mostoway	Comer	Rolfes
Lange	Hanson	Oliver
Feschuk	Kaeding	Flasch

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 4

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 4 showing:

- (1) The number of unemployed in Saskatchewan as of (a) July 1, 1971; (b) October 1, 1971; (c) January 1, 1972; (d) March 1, 1972.
- (2) The number of jobs created by the Government of Saskatchewan since July 1, 1971 in the Public Sector.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, the motion asks for the number of unemployed in Saskatchewan as of July 1, 1971, October 1, 1971, January 1, 1972 and March 1st, 1972. I think it will be known that unemployment estimates are released monthly by Statistics Canada and they relate to a date which approximates the midpoint of the previous month so accordingly no data is available for the first of each month as is referred to in this particular motion. Additionally January, 1972, the mid-point of January, 1972 is the most recent statistics available in this connection. Additionally I propose to amend the motion to provide a more representative view of the annual unemployment trend and I propose to include the period mid-January, 1971. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture):

That all the words after the word “of” as it appears for the second time in the first line, be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

1. (a) mid-January, 1971; (b) mid-July, 1971; (c) mid-October, 1971; (d) mid-January, 1972, as reported by Statistics Canada.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the second part of the question asks for the number of jobs created by the Government of Saskatchewan since July 1st, 1971 in the public sector which I think is a

question relatively impossible to answer. Accordingly I am asking that the motion be amended also in the second part to:

The number of jobs created since July 1st, 1971 under each of the following programs:

- (a) Federal-Provincial Winter Works Programs; (b) Federal-Municipal Winter Works Programs in which the province is participating by matching Federal subsidies; (c) Provincial-Municipal Winter Works Programs; and (d) Other provincial programs.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, we certainly welcome the amendment. We would like to go back to January, 1971 and the only reason that I didn't put it in the original motion was that I didn't wish to embarrass our friends opposite. We all know that in January, 1971 the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan was considerably lower than it was in January, 1972 and for that reason I didn't wish to embarrass our friends opposite but we are certainly happy to have that information. I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan will be happy to have that information. It shows exactly how terrible their performance has been in creating employment since they became the Government more than eight months ago.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — We've all of a sudden come into a very interesting time in this House that now we are no longer going back and comparing years of Government now and then, but there seems to be a sandwich period, which seems to be the years when the Liberal Party was the Government of Saskatchewan.

And really to get a fair analysis of the record of the two types of political parties and really the political philosophies that are represented by each side of the House, I should think, Sir, that it would be very advantageous for the people of Saskatchewan to have an overall view of what happened in the '60s and what happened, first of all immediately prior to 1964, Sir, in relation to the creation of jobs and the unemployment, particularly when industry and industrial development is such an issue in Saskatchewan today and then to analyze that period from 19645 to 1971 and then analyze also the period immediately following. I think then it would give the people of Saskatchewan a real overview of exactly what has happened in the area of industrial development in Saskatchewan, in job creation, the number of young people walking the streets of Saskatchewan unemployed.

Therefore, Sir, I should like to move the following sub-amendment to the amendment introduced by the Minister from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) and seconded by Mr. J. McIsaac (Wilkie):

That the words "for the number of unemployed in Saskatchewan as of January 15, 1961, 1962, 1963" be added after the word "Canada".

And I think, Sir, then that would certainly give us a real overview of what has really happened in unemployment in Saskatchewan in the last 10 years.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — In light of the remarks made by the Member for

Milestone and the proposed sub-amendment, I'm wondering if I might ask leave to adjourn the debate so that we can consider the question.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 5

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 5 showing:

With respect to trips made by Saskatchewan Cabinet Ministers outside of the Province from July 1, 1971 to March 1, 1972:

- (a) Name of Minister (b) Date, duration and purpose of trip (c) Destination and intermediate points visited (d) Names of persons accompanying him (e)(i) Costs of travel (ii) expenses of Minister (iii) expenses of accompanying persons.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have what I hope will be regarded as a purely technical amendment and it really combines 5 and 6 and the facts are that on some occasions a Cabinet Minister will have gone outside the Province with the Legislative Secretary and it gets fairly complicated if you split them. What I have, therefore, done is suggested that the motion read, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General):

With respect to trips made by Saskatchewan Cabinet Ministers and Legislative Secretaries outside the province from July 1, 1971 to March 1, 1972: (a) Name of Minister; (b) Name of Legislative Secretary; (c) Date, duration and purpose of trip; (d) Destination and intermediate pointed visited; (e) Names of persons accompanying him; (f)(i) Costs of travel, (ii) expenses of Ministers where applicable; (iii) expenses of Legislative Secretaries where applicable; (iv) expenses of accompanying persons travelling at government expense.

The only thing I have added is to combine them to make it easier to answer and I have left everything else in, except at the end I say; "expenses of accompanying persons travelling at Government expense." On a couple of occasions a wife did go with a Cabinet Minister to a convention and the wife's expenses, I think, are probably of no particular interest to the House but we will disclose everything that is charged to the Government.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 7

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 7 showing:

- (1) The number of Public Service positions over \$6,000 per year that were filled from July 1, 1971 to March 1,

1972.

- (2) (a) The number of these positions that were not advertised publicly; (b) The number of these positions that were not advertised within the service.
- (3) The name of the candidate who filled each position, including his qualifications and salary.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, the particular question the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has asked, I will be moving an amendment shortly and hope that he will find agreement with the amendment.

Note that the first part of his question asks for the number of public service positions over \$6,000 per year that was filled July 1, 1971 to March 1, 1972. At the moment I don't have that figure but there is considerable, as he can well appreciate, there are many vacancies that occur within the Civil Service. The jobs are advertised and employees apply within the Service. Just for his information any employee who is a Clerk 3 or a Clerk-typist 3 or a Clerk 2 Steno, Statistical Clerk 2, an Accounting Clerk 2, a Machine Operator 3, is now in the category of over \$6,000 per year. It will take a good deal of checking with the various departments to get this information. My guess is that there would be between 400 and 500 employees who would be involved since there is a constant movement of employees who apply from one job to another. However, we are prepared to provide that information to him. There is one aspect of his request which I believe he would really not want to see, namely to have that kind of information made public and I refer to the qualifications. I'm not particularly worried about the public having knowledge of it, but the amount of work that would be involved in going through employee files, as many of these employees have been in the Government service for many years. Employees that were hired by the previous administration, employees that were there prior to that and have moved from one position to another. There would really be reams of material to duplicate or to get Photostat copies of. In the Department of Public Health there are also recruitments of various professional people, there are certifications on their qualifications, there are also recommendations from other people that are requested on their qualifications. I really question whether it would be in the public interest to publicize this. So, with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Hon. Member will go along with the amendment that I propose, I therefore move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):

That all the words after "March 1, 1972" in the second line in item (1) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

- (1)(a) in the Unclassified Division.
- (b) in the Classified Division.
- (2)(a) The number of these positions publicly advertised.
- (b) The number of these positions bulletined in-service.
- (4) The name of the candidate who filled each position,

and his salary.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the Minister of Health. I have reviewed this, I believe this is basically the information that the Opposition was after in this regard and we'll accept this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 8

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 8 showing:

(1)(a) A list of all reports and studies commissioned by the Government, Crown corporations, Boards, Commissions, or any other Government agencies since July 1, 1971 to external consultants. (b) The names of consultants and estimated cost. (c) The number of preliminary or final reports received and actual costs.

(2)(a) A list of all reports and studies undertaken within the government service since July 1, 1971. (b) The number of reports or studies received. (c) The number of reports or studies pending.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in respect to this motion, I will be making an amendment that pertains to sub-section (2) of Return 8. If I can put the position this way, Mr. Speaker.

You will note that sub-section (2) is divided into (a), (b) and (c) and says that it wants information with respect to all reports and studies undertaken within the Government, the number of reports, the number of reports of studies pending. Mr. Speaker, I frankly feel this question is too sweeping in scope for an answer. It's too vague in its direction to help in the Government giving the answer. If I can, to give you an example, in my Department, I almost daily ask for a report, what I call a report at any rate, with respect to a police action or a police position. Almost daily or it seems that way at any rate, I ask for reports on clemencies, people who write and want remissions of penalties with respect to overweights, impaired driving or whatever. We get something like 30 or 40 letters a day. Almost invariably there are letter that go to a departmental official asking for a report in the memo, a study of the officials. The same thing applies with studies. In my Department we have a study, for example, on the business of .08 legislation. Is there some way that we can use .08 as applied to clemencies to make it more just and equitable? But it's an inter-departmental committee meeting. Now, part of the problem of the Government is what is a report and what is a study. If you compounded my problem with all the other problems the other Ministers have, you could see here, as I said at the very beginning, without being critical of the Member, a question which is really so sweeping as to have no real meaning or effect.

The first part there is no problem to because it says "Reports commissioned by external consultants". We know who the external consultants are and we can give the report on that basis, so I'm informed by my officials. So there is no

problem to that. But I do think that Hon. Members would agree with me that sub-section (2) is just too wide in its present form. Perhaps if the Hon. Member has a specific study, or a specific report that he wants a copy of, or whatever, we could consider it in that light.

Accordingly I should like to move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood):

That sub-section (2) be deleted.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I know from what we have seen here today that regardless of whether I agree with the amendment or whether I don't the power of the Government will not make these reports and these studies available. I will also admit that the Attorney General does have a point regarding the numbers that are involved in his interpretation although I think that maybe he is trying to interpret it much more widely than I anticipated. But I should like to point out to the House that there is seldom a day goes by that we don't pick up the newspaper and we read where this department or that department in government is doing a study. When delegations come to the Government they are invariably told that the Government is doing a study. I think that the public are entitled to know what these studies are, who is doing them and the amount it is going to cost the people of Saskatchewan to have these studies carried out. We have seen the Premier set up a branch known as the Research and Planning Branch in the Government costing almost a half million dollars a year. Surely if these people are carrying out studies and they must be doing something to earn their money I would hope, these studies should be available to the people of the province and to the Opposition. It isn't as if the carrying out of studies is being done at no expense to the taxpayer. We have seen almost every department include a research and planning branch and we have seen this over-all major Planning and Research Branch that I referred to earlier made up of some 14 people that cost a half million dollars. They are continually, according to press reports from our Ministers opposite setting up studies, and they are not loath as you well know to make as much political hay out of reports and studies that are being done. Surely to goodness the Opposition are entitled to know how many of these reports are being done, how many studies are going on, and what it is going to cost the taxpayers of this Province. I am not satisfied with the Attorney General's answer but I suppose I will have to accept it because it will come to a vote and they will vote us down. We shall be attempting to find perhaps a little narrower manner in which we can ask this same question because we do feel the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know what studies, what reports are being carried out when they're paying such a high price for them.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment proposed by the Attorney General. I would hope that the Hon. Minister would reconsider. I could agree in large part with some of the points he made earlier but in looking at section (2) of the proposed motion of my Hon. friend from Athabasca, I think the point that bothers the Attorney General is the line that states, "a list of all reports and studies undertaken." One can see that a strict interpretation of this could mean a dozen reports to each minister each day kind of

thing, I agree. I wonder if the Attorney General would consider another amendment deleting the words 'of all reports' and say instead, 'a list of all studies undertaken', because I think this is the point, Mr. Speaker, that is being made by my Hon. friend, the mover of the motion, the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). This is the point that is of interest and of concern to us, the number of these studies, the extent of them, how many reports have been received indeed how many are pending and what is going to take place and what is going to happen as a result of these numerous studies undertaken and announced by my friends opposite.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — I was just thinking, Mr. Speaker, that in this regard, with regard to what the Hon. Member (Mr. McIsaac) who just sat down has just said that studies and reports are almost synonymous. You can't separate one from the other if you have set up a study, sometimes it's a pretty small study, sometimes I ask the deputy to look into something for me and he brings back a report. From time to time, maybe the Minister of Highways and Municipal Road Assistance Authority are asked to get together and work out something for us and I know personally that I'd be pretty hard put to tell you or to find out how many of these sorts of studies that I have asked and received reports on since I've been a Minister this last time. I do not think that the Hon. Member from Athabasca is being quite fair when he says that he can prejudge that this would be turned down because of the attitude of the Government. I think we are being quite reasonable in taking this position because I think it would be very difficult to answer this thing. I should like to go a little further and say if these reports are in the paper as has been indicated, if there's mention of them, if the Opposition was able and wished to pick out certain reports, certain questions, I am sure that the Government would be glad to answer them. I believe that the Hon. Member indicated that possibly the question could be rephrased in a narrower area. As this is worded I do declare it is too wide to be answered.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Attorney General might accept another sub-amendment to his amendment or maybe I could suggest an amendment to him. I want to say to you, Sir, that of all the questions that have been asked here today, this is the most important one. We have watched a group of people take office in this Government on June 23rd or July 1st and they have stood, and daily and weekly, they have used it as an excuse for inactivity, they have used it as an excuse for change, they have used it as an excuse to break agreements and contracts, they have used it as an excuse, Sir, to plan major changes in the future and now, Sir, they don't want to give us that information of these studies and concerns that are made as a result of these changes. Sir, there is no question that what is on this Order Paper today is of more vital issue to the people of Saskatchewan because if we have any group or any government in the Dominion of Canada that is governing by socialist planners it's the Government of Saskatchewan. And, therefore, Sir, what I should like to suggest to the Attorney General, that he re-word his amendment to "any reports and studies by the research and planning divisions of each of any and all departments in the Government." Then that would exclude the individual Minister from asking for a selective report on an

individual item which we may not be concerned with. We are interested in the research and planning people that have been hired by this Government and that they are using these people as an excuse for change and as an excuse for inactivity in various departments. We think, Sir, that this is a very vital and important question and we register a very major complaint if they refuse to give us this information.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 10

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 10 showing:

The name of persons and position held in the Department of Public Works, or any government agencies, boards or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Public works: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Public Works, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Public Works, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, again my comments with respect to question 10 are to a large extent repetitions of what I said with respect to 8 and that is that our officials have looked at this and it does appear from a number of interpretations that it is just simply too wide and too sweeping and the information sought or what I think is intended to be obtained by the Opposition will in effect be denied if the question is allowed to go and ordered in this way. To give you an example, the question of the word “terminated” in line four. What is terminated? Is a transfer a termination, is a resignation a termination? Does this refer only to dismissals? There are a number of problems with respect to the meaning of the word termination. I think what the Opposition obviously wants to know is those who have been terminated by dismissal as of June 28th to March 1st, those who have resigned from the service with the Government in any of its agencies showing the date of the resignation and the amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal. I think this is really what they want to know. They want to know how many people the Government has in effect fired, how many people have left the Government since we have taken over to March 1st and what arrangements we made with them. We are prepared to provide them with that answer but I think the question has to be, if I can term it correctly, I think it has to be more carefully worded in order to give the answer that the Opposition wants. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) that Return No. 10 be amended:

That all the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

On a full time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Public Works, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Public Works, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I was a little surprised to hear the Attorney General's comments with regard to the word "terminated". I have on my desk Return No. 1 from the 1971 session, the Special Session, last summer, wherein the question was asked, names of those persons whose employment etc., have been terminated since June 28, 1971. The answer came back saying nil in that particular department and it was under the signature of the Provincial Secretary, the Attorney General, so he obviously knew what "terminated" meant at that particular time. However, Mr. Speaker, the amendment as given by the Attorney General does give us the information that we request so we agree to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 11

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 11 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of Labour, or any government agencies, boards, or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Labour: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971, to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Labour, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Labour, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons, I would move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 11 be amended by:

That all the words after the word "held" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

On a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Labour,

or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Labour, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 12

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 12 showing:

The names of person and position held in the Department of Mineral Resources, or any government agencies, boards, or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Mineral Resources: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Mineral Resources, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Mineral Resources, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — I would move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 12 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Mineral Resources, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Mineral Resources, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government, in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Speaker, might I ask for clarification from yourself. Is there any way that if Hon. Members wanted to speed up the procedure that we could take the amendment as read or not?

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think that we should do that because a lot of Members may not be aware of what the amendment is.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 13

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 13 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of Municipal Affairs, or any government agencies, boards or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Municipal Affairs: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971, to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Municipal Affairs, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 13 be amended by:

That all the words after the word "held" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Municipal Affairs, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 14

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the

Assembly do issue for Return No. 14 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of Natural Resources, or any government agencies, boards or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Natural Resources: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971, to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Natural Resources, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Natural Resources, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 14 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Natural Resources, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Natural Resources, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 15

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 15 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of the Provincial Secretary, or any government agencies, boards or commissions under the administration of the Provincial Secretary: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971, to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Provincial Secretary's Department, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Provincial Secretary, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: Mr. Speaker, I Move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 15 be amended by:

That all the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of the Provincial Secretary, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Provincial Secretary, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 16

Mr. Lane: — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 16 showing: (See votes and Proceedings) Amendment by Mr. Romanow:

That all the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Public Health, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Public Health, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 17

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 17 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, or any government agencies, boards, or commissions under the

administration of the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) rather than the Minister of Health that Return No. 17 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development, and

(a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.

(b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.

(c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 18

Mr. Lane moved an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 18 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Executive Council or any government agencies, boards or commission under the administration of the Premier: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who has resigned from the Executive Council, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Premier, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, my friends at the back here and my colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Brockelbank) suggest that I speed it up.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 18 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word "held" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

On a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of the Executive Council, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Premier, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who has resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 19

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 19 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Treasury Department, or any government agencies, board or commissions under the administration of the Provincial Treasurer: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Treasury Department, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Provincial Treasurer, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 19 be amended by:

That all the words after the word "held" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Treasury Department, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Provincial Treasurer, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.

(b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.

(c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 20

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 20 showing:

The names of persons and positions held in the Department of Industry and Commerce, or any government agencies, boards, or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Industry and Commerce: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Industry and Commerce, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowance paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 20 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Industry and Commerce, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and

(a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.

(b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.

(c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 21

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 21 showing:

The names of persons and positions held in the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department, or any government agencies, boards, or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who has resigned from the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of Minister of the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 21 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Department, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 22

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 22 showing:

The names of persons and positions held in the Department of Education, or any government agencies, boards or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Education: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Board of Education or any government agency, board or commission under the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Minister of

Agriculture (Mr. Messer) that Return No. 22 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word "held" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Education, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Education, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 23

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 23 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of the Attorney General, or any government agencies, boards or commissions under the administration of the Attorney General: (a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of the Attorney General, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister, the Attorney General, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) that Return No. 23 be amended by:

That all the words after the word "held" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of the Attorney General, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister, the Attorney General, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date

of said resignation.

(c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 24

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 24 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of Highways, or any government agencies, boards or commissions under the administration of the Minister of Highways: (a) whose employment and/or service have been terminated in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Highways, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Highways, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) that Return No. 24 be amended by:

That all of the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Highways, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Highways, and

(a) Whose employment has been terminated by dismissal in the period June 28, 1971 to March 1, 1972.

(b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.

(c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 25

Mr. Lane moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 25 showing:

The names of persons and position held in the Department of Agriculture, or any government agencies, boards or

commissions under the administration of the Minister of Agriculture.

(a) whose employment and/or services have been terminated in the period of June 28, 1971, to March 1, 1972; (b) who have resigned from the Department of Agriculture, or any government agency, board or commission under the administration of the Minister of Agriculture, showing the date of said resignation; (c) the amounts of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Mr. Romanow: — I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) that Return No. 25 be amended by:

That all the words after the word “held” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

on a full-time basis, (excluding temporary, casual and labour service appointments), in the Department of Agriculture, or any government agency, board or commission whose employment procedures are regulated by The Public Service Act, under the administration of the Minister of Agriculture, and

- (a) Whose employment has been terminated with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (b) Who have resigned, from service with the government in any of its agencies and departments, showing the date of said resignation.
- (c) The amount of severance pay or allowances paid to each person on resignation or dismissal.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 26

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 25 showing:

- (1) A list of the boards, commissions, committees, task forces, probes, thrust groups or other similar agencies established by the Government since July 1, 1971, with date of establishment.
- (2) The names, addresses, qualifications of each of the members presently serving on each of the aforementioned.
- (3) The individual, annual, or other salaries, wages, allowances, expenses, or honorariums paid to each member.
- (4) The Secretariat and other staff required for each (1) above.
- (5) An estimate of the total annual cost for each of (1) above.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to ask this side of the House at least to oppose this motion.

It is not that we object to giving a list of the boards and commissions we mean discernible boards and commissions which have been formally established. The next word ‘committees’ is an absolute crusher. I wouldn’t have the slightest idea how many committees have been established nor would I know when a committee was established. If I ask three of my Cabinet colleagues to get together and bring in a report, I don’t know whether I have established a committee or not. Of course, there are all manner of public servants who come together in various configurations to give information to the Government.

‘Task Force’, I suppose, is a little more formal term. ‘Probe groups’ and ‘thrust groups’ are just fancy names for committees or task forces. So if the request were confined to boards, commissions and task forces which have as members outside the Government for example so that we could hang a hat on them. Similarly with respect to the name, address and qualifications of each of the members presently serving on any of the aforementioned. If you are asking for people who are not public servants, then that’s fair game. But we could not give the information with respect to public servants on boards and commissions. “Individual, annual or other salaries, wages, allowances, expenses or honorariums paid to each member.” Again that’s not fair game for board and commissions and for any other committee which have people external to the Government. “Secretariat and other staff required for each of (1) above.” That again in respect to any of those who have been formally set up, fair enough. But with respect to a vast number of information committees, and probe groups if you will, that’s not easy to separate out. Similarly, the “estimate of the annual cost of each of (1)”. That would be simply impossible for the many of the interdepartmental groups or the simple department groups. The Minister of Health has got a half-dozen probe groups. He would need a separate probe group if he had to find out what the annual costs of the six existing ones are since he would have to try to allocate time and the rest.

Generally speaking, therefore, since we think the information requested is just too vague for us to be bale to come to grips with — and to the extent that it involves us trying to parcel out how much time a public servant spends on this work, and that work, and the next work — it was wasted effort. We would have to oppose it. Again if it was resubmitted in a form which talked about boards and commissions or committees which have other than public servants on them we would acknowledge the desirability of the Hon. Members having this information if they wish it and we would try to supply it.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — On a Point of Order, is it possible to move an amendment after the Member closes the debate? Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I want to just say a word on this. First of all, Mr. Speaker, if it’s all right for the Ministers of the Crown to get up and announce publicly thrust groups, like the Minister of Health and make great speeches and great political dissertations around the province about how he has established

thrust groups in the Department of Health and then he is going to turn around and govern by public announcements about thrust groups and probe groups and so forth, then certainly the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know who those thrust groups are. As long as Ministers of the Crown are going to establish these kinds of groups, announce them publicly and committees and make pronouncements about what they are doing on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, then certainly the Government should have a major responsibility to turn around and announce them in a public fashion. If this Government as we indicated, the same with studies, if there has ever been a government in the history of Canada that is governing by thrust groups and probe groups and studies and commissions, and it has been a vast expenditure of public funds, it has been a vast expenditure of public time. Certainly then we have a right on this side of the House to know exactly what those thrust groups and probe groups and all the rest of the studies and commission are and certainly, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know how much time and how much money is being invested in this kind of activity on behalf of the Government.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Members outburst in the last few minutes, I think had he asked the question of those that were publicly announced, and I did announce the establishment of a departmental committee which consists of civil servants, which we referred to as a thrust group, we would be happy to provide them with that information. But I know within the Department of Public Health, because of the size of the Department, there are always committees working internally. That is the case now, that has been the case under the former administration. Committees are formed to investigate a particular problem whether it is in the area of public health services or whether it is in psychiatric care or some other branch of the Department. To try and find out what the exact cost is, is impossible. For example, there has been and continues to exist in the Department of Public Health what is known as the management committee. That has been in existence for many years and I suppose that as of July 1st it has been re-established or allowed to continue to function. We have nothing to hide about the investigations that are being made and certainly the reports that will be of consequence and of sufficient importance to the public, will be open to the public. We are not trying to hide anything, Mr. Speaker, but I think that the kind of question that has been asked here is just impossible to answer for many reasons. I would suggest to the Hon. Member if it is those external committees the Premier referred to, fine, we think we can provide the information. The Members opposite rather than waste time by making speeches for newspaper headline purposes, could use the time of the House more valuably. I think that they might be well to withdraw the motion and resubmit it. We certainly are not averse to providing all information they need if it can be properly identified.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — With respect to the comment by the Minister of Health, it is he and many of his Cabinet colleagues who are taking advantage of speeches for political purposes in announcing some of these thrust groups and commissions. You are the ones who have been looking for the headlines. There is nobody here looking for headlines, we're looking for some actual facts.

We are trying to separate and sift the facts from the political chaff and it's been a pretty difficult job in the last number of months, watching the Cabinet Members opposite come out almost daily, and during the time this Session has been on, Mr. Speaker, making many announcements of a major nature as far as commissions are concerned outside of the House and so on. This is what we take exception to and this is what we should like to see outlined in this Order for Return.

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word or two in respect to this debate. I don't know what more rational explanation there can be than the explanation given by the Premier as to the problem that relates with respect to the meaning and the effect of the word 'committee'. If we were to pass the question in this particular form and if we interpreted some 'committees' not to be committees and the information isn't given, the first people to complain would be the Members of the Opposition for not having divulged it all. The fact of the matter is that the question is too indefinite, it's too wide sweeping when we talk about committees to be able to give the information in any meaningful way. I simply say to the Members opposite that if they had spent more time in drafting the questions with precision and less time on worrying about trumped up charges about the question of denying information, then all the people of Saskatchewan, as they claim are interested, would get the information they request. The Minister has said, take it back and come back with any suggested form and we'll look at it. The Premier has given you suggestions as well. Yet the Opposition stubbornly refuses to do this. It is very easy for them to adjourn this debate, this particular item. It is very easy for them to ask for this question to be withdrawn and to come back in consultation with the Government if they really wanted the information, if they were genuinely concerned about the information that they are asking. But they haven't indicated that yet. I invite them to do so. Failure by them to take into account the submission that we bring to their attention will only prove to my mind that they are really not interested in getting the information but are more interested in making a political speech. I am informed by my colleague the Minister of health that thrust group names have been made public at the time of the announcement. To the thinking of the Members opposite it would be very easy to get a committee report. I could perhaps understand that because under the Liberal days there was hardly any planning whatsoever so I suppose you could count the number of committees and studies carried out in one hand. That's not the case in this Government. We've got a big task to do for the 1970s, we've got to define the priorities in the problem areas throughout the Government. This Government sadly neglected by the Liberal Government over seven years. Very sadly neglected. We have fallen behind the rest of the provincial governments. We don't know what's developing in the areas of health and welfare, and all the various other activities. The Liberals simply neglected it to such a point that we've got to now get the operation back on its feet to identify the problem and put it in proper perspective. That's what the people of the province elected us to do, to run the Government, to identify the problem areas and do the best job that we can. We are prepared to share all the information that we can with every Member of this House. I only invite the Liberal Opposition to come back with an intelligent and reasonable question and we shall do it.

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the

Government has brought this question on themselves and we had a good example of that by the Attorney General just before he took his seat. He was getting into a political dissertation that the Liberals hadn't done this and the Liberals hadn't done that. If they were concerned with the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, they would have set up their committees, done their studies, kept their mouths shut, and no one would ever have known that these committees on an internal basis were going on. They are saying here today that anything that goes on internally within the Department shouldn't necessarily be public knowledge. That's exactly what you're saying. You are saying that there are committees and studies and so on within the departments that you can't put a name to. Well, I'll tell you that you can put a name to it when you want to put it into the paper that you're doing your study. You can always put a name to it then. You never tell who is on it, how much it's going to cost the people of Saskatchewan. You say there is a committee for this and a committee for that and I'll tell you if we were going to spend all the time keeping track of the names of the committees and the most of them have never been named, we'd never get any work done. There is hardly a day goes by that you're not announcing a committee, making a study here and a study there. The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) says the names were provided. The names were not provided. All that he told us in the news release was that he was setting up seven thrust groups. I remember a few of them. There was a thrust group on mental health, there was a thrust group on some other kind of health, but there were never any names associated with it. You didn't say whether they were people within the Department, people without the Department, interdepartmental people. This is the type of information that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to have. You can put whatever arguments up you want but if you can't provide this information then what you have provided to the people is nothing but window dressing. You don't even know what committees you have established. If the truth is known they probably haven't established any committees and that's why they can't give us the information today. All they are doing or trying to do is make the people of Saskatchewan believe that you are doing something, when actually you're not. You haven't got any committees, why don't you stand up and admit it. If you can't provide the information in this House of what committees are established, who is on them, how much it's costing, then it is very dubious whether you have even taken the time or have done anything in this regard and all you're using is the name 'committee' to try and disguise the fact that you have been an absolute fiasco since July 1st. Well, Mr. Speaker, we will not accept the arguments of the Members opposite, we believe that this is a legitimate question and if they don't wish to provide the information let them vote the motion down.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

NAYS — 14

Messieurs

Coupland	Loken	Guy
Grant	Boldt	MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac	Gardner	Weatherald
MacLeod	McPherson	Lane
MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)	Wiebe	

NAYS — 39

Messieurs

Blakeney	Byck	Meakes
Woods	Smishek	Romanow
Messer	Snyder	Bowerman
Thibault	Kowalchuk	Baker
Brockelbank	Pepper	Michayluk

Byers	Thorson	Kwasnica
Carlson	Engel	Tchorzewski
Richards	Owens	Matsalla
Cowley	Taylor	Faris
Cody	Gross	Feduniak
Mostoway	Comer	Rolfes
Lange	Hanson	Oliver
Feschuk	Kaeding	Flasch

RETURN NO. 39

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 39 showing:

- (a) The names and addresses of the persons appointed by the Government to the Northern Advisory Council; (b) the remuneration that was paid to each member of the Advisory Council; (c) whether Advisory Council members were assigned Government vehicles on a permanent or casual basis. If so, the names of the person who have been assigned vehicles.

Hon. G.R. Bowerman (Minister of Indian and Metis): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has asked for certain information which the Government wishes to provide to him but the manner in which the question has been phrased leaves some room for difficulty in answering same. He is asking in the (b) part of the question for the remuneration, “that was paid” to each member of the Advisory Council. We wonder just what the question means. In that respect some members of the Advisory Council also have other positions related to the University of Saskatchewan. If the question were to be answered without some clarification being made, the answer may not be what the Member is asking for. I think that we can provide what these minor amendments, the information which the Member is wanting and therefore I should like to move the following amendment, seconded by the Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources):

That all the words after the word “remuneration” in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

paid by the Government of Saskatchewan to each member of the Advisory Council; (c) the names of Advisory Council members assigned Government vehicles by the Government on a permanent or casual basis.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 40

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 40 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been any change in government policy since July 1, 1971 respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by Simpson Timber Co. at Hudson Bay; (b) if so, the substance of the changes.

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I believe that Items 34, 35 and 36 are items which should be taken up under Estimates and I think the Hon. Member can get the answer to those questions more properly during Estimates.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on the issue if there was any issue in Saskatchewan that was of major importance last June 23rd it was reforestation. How many times did we hear the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) talk about the rape of the forests? How many times did we talk about the desolation in northern Saskatchewan? How many times did we hear the Premier and every other Cabinet Minister travel around the Province of Saskatchewan screaming about the rape of the forests and disintegration of northern Saskatchewan. Now we ask a very simple question, whether or not there were any changes made in the reforestation policy since June 23rd. It requires a simple yes or no, and it requires, if yes, what was the substance of these changes so they can be evaluated by the people of Saskatchewan. And now he turns and around and says he doesn't want to answer the question, he wants to debate it publicly in Estimates. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, that open policy that the Premier was talking about here at 1:30 or 2:30 has certainly gone out the window. We ask immediately, Sir, that the Minister agree to give us this information. This is of major public importance.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I think very briefly what the Minister is saying is that if you look at the question it says, has there been any change in Government policy. the key words 'Government policy.' Government policy in my understanding and I'm certainly no expert on the rules of this House or parliamentary procedure, but to my understanding Government policy has always come under very detailed scrutiny and examination under the Estimates. I think that's the proper area, you're not restricted to one question. I don't know whether there have been any changes or not. This is something the Minister can answer for all the Members of the House. It is not a denial of information. I know we all play politics a bit. You know they want to try and make out that we are denying information and we are trying a number of other things. This is perhaps the posture that is being adopted. But I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to questions 34, 35 and 36, for the interest of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan this is surely one area where we don't have to involve ourselves in politics. The Minister says he will give all the answers that are being asked with respect to policies, it is just a matter of good form and good procedure. We are not prepared to bend the rules in that

area. I would respectfully ask all the Members to accept the Minister's explanation.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, the very point made by the Attorney General is the very reason this question is on the Order Paper, because we want to be able intelligently to deal with this when we get to the Estimates. The order merely asks, has there been any change? Yes or No. And if so, the substance of that change in order that when we get to the Estimates we will not take two or three days as were taken last year by my Hon. friend from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) on the DNR Estimates at that time. It is in order to prepare so that we shall be able to do a better job on these Estimates that these questions and Orders for Return are here and this is certainly a classic illustration.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would point out to this House that this is the identical question which the Minister when he was in the Opposition asked, I think it was last year. I was trying to find it in the Journals but I couldn't find it before it was time to speak. But it is the identical question to what the Minister asked at that time. There is another very important point involved here. We all know that questions and answers in Estimates are not recorded and you have to depend upon the reporting of the Press which may or may not get every detail and every answer and every question that is asked in Estimates. We believe as my colleague has said that this is an item of major importance to the people of Saskatchewan. We heard the Minister go the length and breadth of this Province in June criticizing the reforestation practices of the Liberal Government, telling them that if they became the government then there would be some major changes in policy. And I think that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know what the changes in policy are and I think that they shouldn't have to depend upon the reporting of the Press. Not that I am suggesting that the Press would not report it accurately but I am saying that they miss some of the questions that are being asked in Estimates on these particular questions. I think that the people of Saskatchewan have the right to have it in writing, tabled in the Legislature as a Return, what the Government's policy is in regard to reforestation at this particular time. If there have been changes we want to know what those changes are and, therefore, there is no excuse for not providing this information as requested.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 14
Messieurs

Coupland	Loken	Guy
Grant	Boldt	MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac	Gardner	Weatherald
MacLeod	Lane	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Wiebe		

NAYS — 38
Messieurs

Dyck	Meakes	Pepper
Michayluk	Cody	Feduniak

Wood	Smishek	Romanow
Messer	Snyder	Bowerman
Kramer	Thibault	Kowalchuk
Baker	Brockelbank	Byers
Thorson	Carlson	Engel
Tchorzewski	Richards	Owens
Matsalla	Cowley	Taylor
Faris	Gross	Mostoway
Comer	Rolfes	Lange
Hanson	Oliver	Feschuk
Kaeding	Flasch	

RETURN NO. 41

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 41 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been any change in government policy since July 1, 1971 respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by MacMillan Bloedel at Hudson Bay; (b) if so, the substance of the changes.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a comment particularly for Members on the backbenches across the way. I first of all must apologize to the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), it wasn't the Member . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I realize the Member shouldn't speak when he moves his motion but if the House agrees I will allow him to speak and then he will have the right later on.

Mr. Guy: — But the question was moved a year ago identical to the one that I provided and I'll have the House note that it was a question not an Order for Return and it was a question that was asked on one day and the information was provided two days later. The Liberal Government never hesitated in providing this information and yet here we have for about the fourth or fifth or sixth time today Members opposite refusing to provide the Opposition with information on one pretext or another. The last pretext I think was the flimsiest that we have ever heard in this House — that it would be better asked in Estimates where it couldn't be recorded, where the people of Saskatchewan wouldn't know the record of our friends opposite. This was a motion that was moved last year and I'll read it:

Mr. Messer asked the Government the following question which was answered by Hon. Mr. Barrie:

Are there any agreements in existence between the Government of Saskatchewan and MacMillan Bloedel respecting reforestation of areas harvested for use. If so what is the substance.

That was one question. The other question was also asked by Mr. Messer:

Has there been any change in Government policy since

April 1st, 1970 respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut. If so what is the substance of the change.

This is the identical question that they refused today to provide the information for as an Order for Return. And we answered it within two days last year. So there is only one thing that we can assume, they don't want to provide this information. They refuse to provide it. It is not a question that can be better given in Estimates or anywhere else. It is obvious they don't want this information to get out to the people of Saskatchewan after the comments that they made last year and throughout the province during the election campaign. That's the only reason they oppose giving this information. I think that the House is entitled to it, they voted one down, I hope that they won't vote the rest of these important questions down.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister is here in the House when these questions are being asked. This was, as you know, during the election a very major issue in the campaign. We can only assume I believe that the answer is No, that there was no change in Government policy, if there is something different it takes a simple Yes or No. The Minister is here. All he has to do is get up and say Yes or No. In the absence of any comment from the Minister we can only assume that he is afraid to answer this and so we will have to assume that the answer is No, there has been no change and he doesn't want to put that on record.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder in the light of the debate and the comments made if I could beg leave to adjourn this matter.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 42

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 42 showing:

- (a) Whether there has been a change in government policy since July, 1971 respecting reforestation of areas in which timber has been cut for use by Prince Albert Pulp Company, Prince Albert, at Hudson Bay; (b) if so, the substance of the changes.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the Attorney General and I deliberately beat him to his feet with the hope that this very simple answer that requires a Yes or a No, that can be answered as demonstrated by the Journals last year within one day or two, requires not a major Cabinet meeting. It requires a simple decision of the Government's party to provide this information to the people of Saskatchewan and I ask that instead of the Attorney General adjourning this debate that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) rise on his feet and tell this House and tell the people of Saskatchewan why he refuses to provide this information.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, all I can say

to the Hon. Member of Milestone, I think it must be evident to the Press and to everyone here, it certainly was to the young people who were here earlier, that all that the Liberal Opposition is really interested in, I repeat over and over again is to make a political speech and I think basically that there hasn't been one political comment with respect to any of these questions by anybody on this side. There hasn't been. I've tried to indicate what I understood to be the rules. Hon. Members brought to my attention the Votes and Proceedings. I made a motion to adjourn the matter to consider that. Now is that unreasonable? Hon. Members may very well want to represent it as such. I don't think that it is unreasonable. I don't want the Opposition to be painted in a obstructionist way and you don't want us to be painted in a way of holding back information, I am sure. So in the best interest of the operation and in the light of the motion I made in the other one, I would ask leave to adjourn debate on this matter too.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 34

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 34 showing:

A list of all prospectus approved by the Securities Commission, Province of Saskatchewan from July 1, 1971 to March 1, 1972 showing: (a) Name and address of company (b) Nature of business (c) Head Office address (d) Date approval given.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would move seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that Order for Return No. 34 be amended as follows:

- (a) By striking out the word "approved" where it first appears and substituting therefor the words "for which a receipt was issued."
- (b) By striking out the words "approval given" in question D of the said Return and substituting therefor the words "on which a receipt was issued."

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 35

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 35 showing:

In regard to each piece of construction equipment purchased by or for the Construction Branch, Department of natural Resources since July 1, 1971 (a) tenders received (b) the tender accepted (c) if no tender was called, the supplier and the price.

He said:

I should like to say a few words as I introduce this motion. As my colleague a minute ago said, we like to be reasonable on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And I make these few comments now before someone on that side of the House adjourns the debate on this particular motion which they may or may not do. I should like to remind Members opposite that these motions are submitted early in the Session in order to get information which we may be able to use during Estimates. We have been in session now for almost one month and this is the first opportunity that we have had to have these Returns placed in a position where answers can be provided. Also the Government has had one month to look at these, prepare amendments where they are required, so the idea of adjourning debates . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the Member should stay to the motion he is presenting and not to the procedures of the House because we discussed that procedure on a previous motion. I wish you would stay to the point.

Mr. Guy: — All right. We would hope that Members opposite will not adjourn debate on these motions because we are anxious to get this information.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, may I respond to that by saying that I think the record of this Government today in answering these questions is unparalleled since I have been an MLA. Since 1968 when I sat as an MLA in the Opposition and every year that we made a Motion for Return by the Government they turned it down almost invariably. I don't think there was any Government in the history of Saskatchewan, certainly in modern day history, that kept information hidden more than the Government that the Member occupied opposite. They used every technique and trick going. One of their favorite techniques was saying that it was not in the public interest. I recall they wouldn't table contracts because they said it wasn't in the public interest. Question No. 30, Return No. 29 talks about agreements. The Minister without comment said it would be tabled and it is now an Order for Return and that will be answered. But not those boys. They kept getting up and saying it wasn't in the public interest. This Liberal Government opposite operated by cloak and dagger and secrecy in every aspect of their activities. And the last Member to come into this Chamber and lecture us about adjourning on two motions or hiding information is the Member from Athabasca and any of the others formerly sitting on the Treasury benches. They should be ashamed of themselves for obstructing the business of this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't it terrible that the Attorney General finally rose and made a political speech. And let me tell you it was a political speech because he didn't give any figures about the number of Returns or the number of questions that the Liberal Government provided to the Opposition a year ago or a year and a half ago. Why didn't he come up and tell

you the number of questions that the Opposition asked the Government of Saskatchewan a year ago? Why didn't he tell you about the number of Orders of Return that were asked by the Opposition a year ago and the number that were returned and approved and given and provided. And we have the Order Book and let me tell the Attorney General we will have that information. But here, already on the very first day after a month, with Estimates coming up when we need and require this information, there have been more Orders for Return turned down in the first three and a half hours of this debate or of this first Private Members' day than at any time that I can remember in this House. And let me tell that Attorney General, don't let him try and say, anytime there has been a question this afternoon which has indicated any kind of a political implication for the Government, he has automatically stood up and adjourned the debate. Whether or not the information was available whether the only reason that an adjourned debate should take place is because the Minister has not had an opportunity to provide the information. You've had a month and it's time you realized that the Opposition needs this information and the public of Saskatchewan has a right to it and we are going to insist that you give it by every means at our disposal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 49

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 49 showing:

The waiting list figures at the Saskatoon St. Paul's, City and University Hospitals and the Regina Grey Nuns and General Hospitals as at July 1, 1971; November 1, 1971; March 1, 1972.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the Hon. Member, I think he may well like to have more information so that he has a comparison for the same periods this year and last year. We are certainly willing to provide the information that he asked for, but I think that he might want to have more information so that he can have an accurate comparison for the previous year. I, therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow):

That all the words after the word "at" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(a) July 1, 1970; November 1, 1970; March 1, 1971

(b) July 1, 1971; November 1, 1971; March 1, 1972.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased indeed that the Hon. Minister has seen fit to give the staff some more work to do. This additional information will be very helpful indeed. I will be quite happy to receive it.

Mr. Boldt: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise the question to the Attorney General whether this amendment is not holding up the business of this House.

Mr. Speaker: — The question is not in order.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 50

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 50 showing:

Whether Willex Cleaning Products Inc. Ltd., is licensed as a Vendor under The Direct Sellers Act, Province of Saskatchewan. If so, (a) the date the licence was issued. (b) Whether the affidavit, in the application for Vendor by Willex Cleaning Products Inc. Ltd., under The Direct Sellers Act was sworn. If not, the reason. (c) Whether the Government of Saskatchewan has purchased any products sold by this company or any of the company's distributors. (d) If products were purchased whether they were purchased by tender. (e) The amount and type of bond or bonds by the Province of Saskatchewan under The Direct Sellers Act in respect to Willex Cleaning Products Inc., Ltd.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of health (Mr. Smishek) that Return No. 50 be amended by:

That clause (d) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(d) If products were purchased:

- (i) state the amount purchased between April 1, 1971 and February 29, 1972;
- (ii) give date and amount of first purchase since April 1, 1971;
- (iii) were they purchased by tender.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 65

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 65 showing:

Under the Public Service or Supernumerary training program (a) the number who were enrolled from July 1, 1971 to March 1, 1972; (b) the number who are in training as of March 1, 1972.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that

the Hon. Member would like to have the comparative figures for the same period last year. These might be useful to him. I therefore move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow):

That after the words "March 1, 1972" in item (b) the following be added:

(c) the number who were enrolled from July 1, 1970 to March 1, 1971.

(d) the number who were in training as of March 1, 1971.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — OPPOSING PROVIDING OF PRINTING CONTRACTS TO SERVICE PRINTING COMPANY

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca) moved, seconded by Mr. Boldt (Rosthern):

That this Assembly go on record as opposing any policy of the Saskatchewan Government which would provide printing contracts to Service Printing Co., which is solely owned and operated by the CCF Publishing Co. Ltd., which is owned by the membership of the NDP Party (Saskatchewan division).

He said:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in moving this Resolution that would have the Assembly go on record as opposing any policy whereby any government uses its authority to support its own political party. I would hope that all Members of the Legislature will support this Resolution, because I am convinced that its principle is certainly supported by all responsible and fair-minded people not only in Saskatchewan but in every country where freedom of political association is believed in.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The question of using the taxpayers' money to directly subsidize a political party cannot be condoned, and it was for this reason that the Liberal Government put an end to it in 1964. I might say that it was with the deepest regret that we heard Premier Blakeney's statement soon after taking office that this practice would be revived.

To refresh the memory of this House and particularly the new Members, and the people of Saskatchewan, I wish to review briefly how this practice was deliberately planned and carried out for the sole benefit of the former CCF and the present NDP. And it is a sordid story that brings shame to this Legislature and the democratic process of this Province.

Many of us remember how T.C. Douglas, the preacher, went the length and breadth of the province promising to eliminate patronage, dishonesty and corruption in government. Unfortunately he forgot to say that there was a government that this wouldn't apply to and that was his government. He quickly

embarked on the most brazen, corrupt, immoral, unethical scheme that has ever been conjured up by any government in Canada to use public funds for the benefit of a political party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — It all started in 1938 when Printing Company was registered in Saskatchewan. The founding directors included T.C. Douglas — and here is a name that you might recall — C.M. Fines and J.H. Brockelbank, the former Dean of this Legislature. And from 1938 to 1944, while the CCF were in opposition, we have to admit that the growth of this publishing company was very slow. The number of shares issued only increased by 70 to a total of 920 in six years. But after the CCF became the Government in 1944 the growth of that company was phenomenal. Shareholders increased from 920 in 1944 to more than 5,400 in 1948, as friends and relatives of CCF Cabinet Ministers and MLAs saw an opportunity to make money for themselves and their party at the taxpayers' expense.

You know there are a lot of well known names in the CCF Party that were shareholders including Dick Michayluk, MLA for Redberry; Wesley Robbins MLA for Saskatoon; Fred Dewhurst MLA for Wadena. But the largest shareholder has always been the CCF Party of Saskatchewan which held all the common shares. Thus from the beginning the CCF Publishing and Printing Company has been owned individually and collectively by the CCF-NDP political party.

The June 30th, 1945 Saskatchewan Gazette shows a certificate of partnership whereby the CCF Publishing and Printing Company stated they would carry on business under the name of Service Printing and stated further that they were the sole owners of Service Printing Company. After the CCF Party became the Government, Service Printing became the front by which the Government tried to hide their relationship to it from the general public.

Mr. Speaker, do you know how much of the taxpayers' money the former CCF-NDP Government channelled into the CCF-NDP Printing Company?

Mr. McPherson: — How much Allen?

Mr. Guy: — Well, for the 20 years they were the Government they channelled \$465,000 through the Queen's Printer to their printing company. Now due to a different accounting procedure for the first two years, the records for these years are not too clear and they are not all available, however, it is absolutely clear and the documents are there to substantiate it, that more than one-half million was taken deliberately from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for the benefit of the NDP political machine. And what I want you to recognize is that it was done by the Members of the Legislature sitting as Cabinet Ministers and MLAs. They subscribed, supported and were shareholders and members of this scheme.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard or seen a more blatant disregard of the moral and legal ethics than this practice of pure, unadulterated patronage? Needless to say the Liberal Government immediately took steps on assuming office in 1964 to put an end to this practice.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And it appears that the cutting off of funds has had a major effect on the NDP printing company. Because at the annual NDP convention in 1964 the balance sheet showed that the Service Printing Company for the year ending May 31, 1964, which I would remind Members of the House corresponded to the last year that the NDP Government was in office — had a net profit of \$6,032. During that year they received \$25,000 from their NDP Government. So it is obvious that without this direct channelling into their company of the taxpayers' money, they would have had a net loss of \$19,000. However, by this dishonorable practice every Liberal, every Conservative and Social Credit or any other political faith in the province, as well as the thousands who have no political association, were forced to see their tax dollars go to subsidize the NDP to help them keep solvent and build up their campaign fund.

However, hard times fell upon the publishing company after 1964. And from June 1, 1964 to May 31, 1965, the first year they did not receive patronage they lost \$6,100. In 1965-66 again without the patronage of the government \$4,748 was lost, 1967 - \$2,758, 1968 they made a profit. They made a \$1,000 profit in 1968. But in 1969 they went \$17,406 in the hole without the support of the government and the taxpayers' money. In 1970 a further \$18,487 was lost. So it wasn't any wonder that in June of this year just around election time they reported that the NDP were in bad financial shape. They are always in bad financial shape unless they can channel the taxpayers' dollars into their own political purse.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, for five of the six years that they were not the government their printing company lost money for the first time since it was established. This shows that it was the taxpayers' of the province who kept Service Printing in business for 20 years. Without the transfer of public funds from the NDP Government to the NDP printing company, the printing company would have gone broke.

The people of Saskatchewan should not be called upon to subsidize the publishing of political propaganda of any political party.

With this financial record it is not surprising that since 1964 the records show that the individual shareholders have become disenchanted and they have sold their shares back to the party, until today Service Printing is owned solely by the NDP Saskatchewan section. This shows that the shareholders were primarily interested in profits before people. Probably the next return, Mr. Speaker, will show that Members are again buying shares now that the NDP Government is committed to providing them with the taxpayers' money again.

Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned that Premier Blakeney on December 23rd confirmed that Service Printing was reinstated to the list of companies which get provincial government printing business. This is what he said:

Printing plant again eligible. Premier Blakeney said

Wednesday that Service Printing Company owned by the Saskatchewan NDP has been reinstated to the list of companies which get Provincial Government printing business.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, this announcement on the 23rd of December by the Premier was not a Christmas present to the people of Saskatchewan. However, it wasn't surprising when one recalls that for the short period that the Premier was Provincial Treasurer under the NDP Government, he channelled \$25,000 to Service Printing.

You know I have also been dismayed by the comments of NDP Members in the Crown Corporations Committee when they continually state that they hope Service Printing will receive some of the advertising from the Crown corporations. I am sure . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I hope they clap and I hope that every one of those Members opposite will get up and speak on this Resolution and come out in support of the taxpayers paying for the publishing and the propaganda of the NDP Government opposite. I just want to warn the Members on my side of the House that they will not stand up and speak on this Resolution. I would be greatly surprised if the Premier got the courage to stand up and speak. I would be more than surprised if the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) who in the Crown Corporations Committee said, "I sure hope Service Printing gets it," will speak in this debate. But I hope that he will get up and make the same statement on this Resolution. And the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) the one who had the shares but turned them in when it became a fiasco after they didn't get any more of the taxpayers' money. I hope he will get up and say that he was proud that he was milking the taxpayer of hundreds of thousands of dollars when they were the government before.

You know the Premier's announcement was immediately criticized by all fair-minded people of Saskatchewan as being ethically wrong. They claim, and rightfully so, that the Government should not use its authority which is given by the Legislature for the benefit of all Saskatchewan people of all political beliefs to finance their own NDP political party from public funds.

An editorial in the Leader-Post sums it up very well . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — . . . when under the title of . . .

Mr. Romanow: — An independent newspaper.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, an independent newspaper. Well I will tell you it is an independent newspaper compared to Service Printing. I don't blame the independent newspapers in this Province for being upset when the Government and the Premier deliberately take taxpayers' money that is not available to them and uses his power as Premier and as head of the Executive Council to take

money which has been voted by representatives of the taxpayers of this Province and then channel it into his own political machine.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — This is what the paper said on December 29th. The Pork Barrel is what it is called:

Under this neat pork barrel arrangement everyone in Saskatchewan is forced through the use of public funds to support the NDP.

This is where it really strikes a chord. It said:

Had any other party attempted to do this when in power the cries of righteous anger from NDP Members would have raised the roof of the Legislative Buildings.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Then it said:

But profits before people, once again can be added to the long list of socialist slogans.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader-Post is not very far wrong in its comments because we all recall last year, I think, when some Young Liberal mail went through the postage meter by mistake.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — You all recall the screams of anger that came from Members opposite. Oh, I remember the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) got up and said, “Oh, that is terrible.” And do you know how much money was involved? Was it \$485,000 when he raised the roof of the Legislature in righteous indignation? Was it \$485,000 that they took from the taxpayers and put through the meter? I will tell you how much it was. It was \$6.06! \$6.06 and I thought the Attorney General that day would have a heart attack! Oh, he was angry. He said, “This is terrible, it is immoral, it is unethical, it is irreligious”, and I don’t know what other expressions he used. But he said that any government that would use the public funds to put it into their own political party was just unbelievable. I’ll tell you what he did. He called for our resignation right on the spot.

An Hon. Member: — No.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, he did. He called for our resignation right on the spot. And then it was the next day that Mr. Whelan, the Member for Regina North West, who didn’t sleep the night before, wrote out this question — question 187 in the Votes and Proceedings of last year:

Has the Government of Saskatchewan incurred any costs on behalf of the Saskatchewan Young Liberals? If so, has the Government of Saskatchewan received any payment

in respect of such costs?

And the answer, Mr. Speaker, was very clear-cut and I tell you we didn't have to go through the contortions that we did this afternoon to get answers. They got the answer two days later, like they always do. It said that certain envelopes were inadvertently mixed with Government mail and went through the postage meter before they were seen. The Government of Saskatchewan has received full payment of \$6.06 in respect of such costs.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, it is this concern for honesty and integrity which leads me to believe that every Member opposite including the Premier and the Attorney General is going to support this Resolution. Because, after all, if they were so upset for \$6.06 I am sure that they will be upset about the practice of putting \$485,000 into their political party.

Now I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have had a long enough association with certain Members opposite to recognize that it might be a little too much to expect or even to demand of them that they repay the \$485,000 which they took from the taxpayers for their party from 1944 to 1964. We paid our \$6.06 back but I don't know whether we can expect them to pay \$485,000. I think if they are completely honest they might. Even if they didn't I wouldn't hold it against them. But I am confident that they will not continue to support a renewal of this practice.

Oh, I guess I didn't tell you who the chairman of the printing company was. Well in the last Return that has been filed for the CCF Publishing and Printing it is shown the following: name, CCF Publishing Company, NDP Saskatchewan Section; address, 1630 Quebec Street; occupation, political organization — political organization — the chairman, Mr. J.H. Brockelbank. Well he was the Dean of the House and I am most disappointed that he will still associate himself with this type of political shenanigans. Not only that, I'll tell you there is another Member over there who I think deserves a little condemnation too. Well, the secretary of this organization — I hesitate to mention his name in this Legislature — but it is Mr. Donald Faris, MLA for Arm River.

An Hon. Member: — You mean the Reverend?

Mr. Guy: — A former member of the cloth who has involved himself with this nefarious activity of using the taxpayers' money for their own political party. But you know the arguments that they use are pitifully weak. I hope that before this debate is over that if they insist on continuing to follow this practice that they can devise a better argument to justify what they have done in the past and what apparently they are determined to carry on in the future. They have only two arguments: one is that Service Printing Company is a reputable company and therefore deserves their share of the business, and two, that the ownership of Service Printing is no different than McLaren's, Commercial Printing or any other private agency.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want it absolutely clear on the records of this House that at no time did we suggest nor do we that Service Printing is not a reputable company, but we respectfully suggest that this doesn't even enter into the issue at hand.

The real factor is the ownership of Service Printing and the CCF Publishing Company. We submit that by no stretch of the imagination can you say the ownership of Service Printing and those other printing companies are identical. The ownership of other printing companies is made up of shareholders all over Saskatchewan, Canada and elsewhere, and there is nothing to say what their politics may be nor are they associated directly in any way with a political party. I suspect that you will find all political beliefs represented in the structure of other printing companies and if they make political contributions at all, they make them to more than one political party. Also I want to remind you that these contributions are made voluntarily if they are made, as the spirit moves them. The spirit is moving them all the time on that side of the House, and it is an evil spirit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . kept in the desk drawer voluntarily!

Mr. Guy: — The revenues from Government contracts to these private printing institutions do not in any circumstances go directly to a political party, but they go to individual shareholders whose political belief is unknown, unless they wish publicly to announce what party if any they support. But now, Service Printing Company and the CCF Publishing and Printing Company are completely different. As I pointed out, the latest statement shows that the sole owner and shareholder is the NDP, Saskatchewan Section, political organization located at 1630 Quebec Street.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this in itself is in contravention of regulations and it has been pointed out to that political party no less than three or four separate times. I should just like to ask the Premier and the Attorney General what would happen to a private printing company that didn't follow the orders and requests of the Deputy Registrar of Companies. I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that this is the way the printing company is getting away with things today. June 24, 1971, the day after the election, a letter was sent from the Deputy Registrar of Companies to the CCF Publishing and Printing Company telling them that under the regulations there had to be more than one shareholder of a company and asking that at their earliest convenience the names of at least two other members be presented and filed so that it would not be in contravention of the regulations. That was June 24, 1971. August 18th, we have another letter to the CCF Publishing and Printing Company saying:

We note that your company has not filed a balance sheet since your company is a public one, the Companies Act requires that you file a balance sheet with your annual return. Please forward a copy of your balance sheet by return mail.

Two ways in which they are contravening the regulations. As soon as they became the Government, the CCF Publishing and Printing Company said, "Why should I follow the regulations, that's my government, I am the same as the government, I have no longer any regulations to follow." That was August 18th. Then we come to December 22nd and another letter from the Deputy

Registrar of Companies:

Dear Sirs:

In the very near future you will no doubt be preparing your annual return for submission before March 1, 1972. We would like to take this opportunity of reminding you, as we did in our letter of June 24th, that your company should have more than one shareholder. In due course we shall be pleased to receive your Form L, showing at least two shareholders.

Then on the next day, December 23rd, a further letter went out correcting the first one, where they realized that under Section 25 of the Companies Act which they enclosed a statement of for our friends opposite, they said that there must be three shareholders of a company. This was on December 23rd.

Now, we come to February 28th and another letter from the Deputy Registrar of Companies addressed to CCF Publishing and Printing Company, 1630 Quebec Street:

Dear Sirs:

Please advise when we may expect to receive your reply to our letter of December 23rd, asking that you advise us of the names of at least two additional shareholders to whom you have allotted or transferred shares.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the CCP Publishing and Printing Company should be treated the same as any other printing company or any other company of any kind in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Why should they be allowed to flaunt the regulations that private companies have to fulfil, just because they are going to receive Government funds from the taxpayer to keep them solvent. That shouldn't under any circumstances allow them to forego the regulations that have been established. It is bad enough that they are going to take public funds to keep their printing company in circulation without flaunting other regulations that every other printing company has to follow.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — This is the type of government, this is the type of people that we are dealing with, once they become the big whip, the authority, they have no respect for law or regulations or anything else. I think it is time that the people of Saskatchewan took them to task for this.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Who's the Minister-in-Charge?

Mr. Guy: — I don't know who the Minister-in-Charge of it is, it would be interesting. It would be interesting if one of them would get up and admit that. I suggest that perhaps it's the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) since he has the shortest line of

communication with the Deputy Director of Registrations.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a company solely owned by the NDP of the province. All revenues from the NDP Government contracts go directly and only to the NDP political party and are used by the NDP political party to organize, finance and support their political activities and election campaigns.

Mr. Messer: — Like a church!

Mr. Guy: — I could even suggest, as I did earlier that the new Members over there, the back benchers, who weren't aware of what went on from 1944-1964, might have some thought that what was going on was fair and just. However, I am sure that now that it has been pointed out to them that they will take an entirely different look at the situation. But I will suggest there is absolutely no excuse for the Premier, or the Member for Redberry, Touchwood, Wadena, Battleford, Swift Current, I had forgotten him. I am glad you reminded me, because if there is ever an honorable gentleman in this House, in the past the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) has always shown that he will not stand for any type of deceit, dishonesty, and I am sure that he would never allow the taxpayers' money to go into the political party that he happens to represent. I would expect that he will get up and take very strong exception to the principle and will be one of the first to stand and be counted in support of this motion. But the rest of them, there is no excuse, there is no way that we can condone that type of activity. Because these revenues, Mr. Speaker, come from all the taxpayers of the province who are of many political beliefs we believe that it is wrong and against the basic freedoms of political association to have these funds go solely to the NDP political organization and it is on this basis that we move this Resolution and ask all Members of this House to support it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to take part in this debate. I was questioning which part of the horse that the motion was coming from.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, that is before the House, if it is carried out by this House will exclude one printing company in the Province of Saskatchewan from being able to tender competitively for the business of this Government. This, I think, is one of the basic underlying pieces of the free enterprise system; everybody should be able to get a piece of the action. I am really not a strong advocate, Mr. Speaker, but I do it out of fairness in my own mind . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and I think that all Members will agree with me that we should try to be as fair as possible.

I will be offering an amendment to the House to this

particular motion, and the only reason I offer the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is the motion itself is very negative. I should like to have the House avoid being put in the position of dealing with something that is so negative.

The substance of the amendment which I will move at the conclusion of my remarks will be this:

That the House favors a policy of providing as near as practical an equitable opportunity for Saskatchewan Printing Companies to obtain printing contracts regardless of their political affiliation provided they are capable of doing such work on a competitive basis under fair wage and working conditions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The debate, Mr. Speaker, up to this point has ranged fairly wide on the topic that is before us. I should just like to clear up some misconceptions that were placed before the Members of the House by the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

There has been some printing done for the Government by Service Printers Limited. That company has not as the Member from Athabasca indicated, received the money for doing nothing. Mr. Speaker, they received the money for performing a service on a competitive basis. I should just like to deal with those figures, Mr. Speaker, to show you how much of the money they have received from the Government. The Member opposite says in the neighborhood of some \$400,000 over a period of 20 years. Let's go back to 1944-45. At that time, Service Printing Company received \$932.57 worth of business from the Government of Saskatchewan. That was out of a total, Mr. Speaker, of \$94,768.60 worth of business done for the Province of Saskatchewan by all the printing companies in the province. I think, Mr. Speaker, we should put these figures on the record once and for all.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — In 1945-46, Service Printing received \$15.15 worth of business from the Government of Saskatchewan, that was out of a total business of \$13,938.68, Mr. Speaker. In 1946-47 Service printing received \$22,048.25 worth of business while the Government of Saskatchewan did \$292,406.78 worth of printing. In 1947-48, Service Printing received \$37,517.38 out of a total of \$472,728.51. In 1948-49 Service Printing Company did \$22,704.89 worth of work for the Saskatchewan Government Printing out of a total of \$458,658.30. In 1949-50 Service Printing Company did \$18,953.05 worth of work out of \$436,445.13, Mr. Speaker. In 1950-51 Service Printing did \$27,565.89 worth of work for the Government of Saskatchewan out of a total amount of work of \$556,446.03. In 1951-52 Service Printing was down a bit that year. They did \$18,763.11 worth of business for the Province of Saskatchewan out of a total amount of business of \$635,834.86. In 1952 they were down a little more. They did \$12,571.76 worth of work for the Government of Saskatchewan out of a total amount spent of \$600,247.13. In 1953-54 they were up a little bit. They did \$30,612.83 worth of work for the Government of Saskatchewan out of a total amount of \$866,404.65. Mr. Speaker, in 1954-55 they were down considerably. They did

\$19,184.21 worth of work for the Government of Saskatchewan out of \$892,352.12. In 1955-56 they were up a bit. They did \$28,274.52 worth of work for the Province of Saskatchewan out of a total amount spent of \$963,191.80. In 1956-57 Service Printing did \$20,051.14 worth of work for the Government of Saskatchewan out of \$1,005,729.90. In 1957-58 Service Printing Company did \$28,802.71 worth of work for the people of Saskatchewan out of a total amount spent of \$1,156,043.51. In 1958-59 Service Printing Company did \$24,415.16 worth of work for the Province of Saskatchewan out of a total amount spent of \$1,108,898.24. In 1959-60 Service Printing did \$27,426.17 worth of work out of an amount spent of \$1,276,607.63. In 1960-61 Service Printing Company did \$29,277.99 worth of work for the Province of Saskatchewan out of an amount spent of \$1,447,351.08. In 1961-62 Service Printing Company did \$31,407.31 worth of work for the Province of Saskatchewan out of an amount of \$1,295,986.72. In 1962-63, Mr. Speaker, Service Printing Company did \$24,125.19 worth of work for the Province of Saskatchewan out of an amount spent of \$1,314,096.07. In 1963-64 during the period April 1 to June 30, Service Printing Company did \$4,379.89 worth of work for the people of Saskatchewan out of an amount spent of \$1,963,337.62. During the period from July 1 to March 31 in 1963-64 they did \$22,377.76 of work for the Province of Saskatchewan. In 1964-65 Service Printing Company did \$15,555.75 worth of work for the Province of Saskatchewan out of an amount spent \$1,458,926.04.

At that point, Mr. Speaker, the work that was done on a competitive basis by Service Printing for the Government of Saskatchewan was cut off. Over 20 years Service Printing had received \$466,962.68 worth of business out of a total available amount of \$18,310,399.90.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of work that was being done for the Province of Saskatchewan by all the printing companies continued to rise each year. It went in 1965-66 to \$1.7 million; 66-67 it was \$1.8 million; 67-68 it was \$1.9 million. 1968-69 it was \$1.96 million, a little higher. In 1969-70 it was \$2.1 million; in 1970-71 it was \$2.1 million; and in 1971-72, for eleven months, it was \$2.2 million.

Now as you can see, Mr. Speaker, from the figures that I have put on the record of the House that the amount of work done by Service Printing Company on a competitive basis for the Government of Saskatchewan was a very insignificant amount of the work that was available to be done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Never, Mr. Speaker, never at any time during that period of time did Service Printers do the largest amount of work. Never! This was done by Saskatchewan Government printing itself in all cases except in 1944-45 the largest single item was Commercial Printers, nor did Service Printers at any time in the history of this Province, have the second single largest amount of work from the Government of Saskatchewan. Over the years, Mr. Speaker, the second largest single figure of work has gone to such printing establishments as these: Moose Jaw Times, Business Printers, Caxton Press, Central Press, Capital Envelopes, Moore Business Forms, Mid-West Litho, Moore Business Formers again, several times Crane Business Systems, Capital Envelopes, Mid-West Litho, Moore Business, Modern Press, Moore Business

Forms, Modern Press, Mid-West Litho, Moore Business Forms. Never at any time, Mr. Speaker, did they have the second largest amount of printing nor the third, fourth nor the fifth largest amount. I imagine, Mr. Speaker, and I have all the figures here, but I don't want to bore the House with them, but if you were to check the figures you would find that their amount was a very insignificant amount in relation to the people that had the first highest amount, the second highest amount, the third, the fourth, the fifth and the sixth.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, they must have done a good job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — There seems to be some confusion in the mind of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) when he talks about the amount of work that is done for the Government. To begin with, Mr. Speaker, Service Printing doesn't do advertising as such. I think, maybe, the Member is confused with the Commonwealth, which is the party newspaper of the New Democratic Party. He should be more familiar with it because I see him reading it quite often. And he quotes generously from it to support himself in his debates in this House.

It would be sad, indeed, Mr. Speaker, if the Commonwealth were to go under because I know several Members over there that wouldn't be able to make a half decent speech in this House unless they had some kind of support like that.

Mr. Speaker, while I am talking about the Commonwealth may I suggest we are trying to be fair about advertising. So we thought that maybe we should give the Saskatchewan Liberal a little bit of work. The Saskatchewan Liberal is a paper that, I think, is owned by the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan and it publishes intermittently. The first advertisement sent to the Commonwealth, a newspaper that publishes regularly and has a very large circulation, for a paper that publishes every other week, circulation of 20,000, was also sent to the Saskatchewan Liberal giving them a chance to get in on some of the advertising that the Government was doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This particular advertisement, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan 1972 tax reminder notice. These are the advertisements that appear in the paper late in the fall to remind the people that there time for paying the premium is moving up on them and they shouldn't forget it.

Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth printing the advertisement — and as a matter of fact the Saskatchewan Liberal printed that advertisement — and they got paid for it, Mr. Speaker, \$53.55 or something near that amount. But when the second advertisement was to be placed with the Saskatchewan Liberal we found that their intermittent press runs were interfering with the regular type of advertising the Government does and they were forced to return the advertisement saying they didn't know when they were going to publish again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a vendetta that has carried on by Members like the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) in this House about Service Printing and about the Commonwealth, companies that employ people, pay wages, pay taxes which the other printing companies do in the Province of Saskatchewan, I hope.

When they were the Government in 1964 they cut off the Commonwealth from advertising. They cut off Service Printing from competing for any of the printing. They were attempting to wield their power the hard-fist way to exclude the Service Printing Company from any other contracts, by a sort of blackball system. Apparently the Leader of their party sent a letter to the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, telling them that they should not place work with Service Printers. We thought, Mr. Speaker, that this was a matter of grave concern so we put an order before the House, at that time, which asked for a copy of any letters or letter sent from the Premier's office to officials at the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, regarding university business transacted with Service Printers Limited, Regina. "The debate continued and the question being put it was negatived on the following recorded division." And it shows that the Yes' were the New Democratic Members and the Nays were the Liberal Members, Mr. Speaker. They refused to provide that information to the House about the methods that they were using to blackball Service Printers, truly a vendetta, Mr. Speaker, if I have ever heard of one.

They, Mr. Speaker, holier-than-thou, say, we are only after people like the Commonwealth and Service Printing Company. But, Mr. Speaker, when I go through the records of the printing company of this Government I find that they not only went after them but they went after some other newspapers too. Papers like the Wakaw Recorder. They cut him off completely. He doesn't put his profits into the New Democratic Party. What was the reason for chopping him off? He has a wife and family, sends his son to university, Mr. Speaker. He should have a chance to get in on the business that this Government has.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Therefore, this Resolution that I am going to amend, Mr. Speaker, will provide that everybody has a chance to compete for the business of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Let me tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, about the Service Printing Company. A few years ago you will recall that the Federal Government had a plan whereby if you were able to provide jobs by constructing some new enterprise you could get some federal money to proceed with on the basis of the amount of jobs that you were able to create.

At that time Service Printing Company wanted to put in a new press so that they could do a better job of printing, they wanted to be competitive, Mr. Speaker. They applied to the Federal Government program for \$80,000 to buy a new press, but

Mr. Speaker, they were turned down.

Now I wouldn't be a bit surprised if the people at Ottawa got the message from the people from Saskatchewan across the way, 'watch out for those guys at Service Printing because they are trying to get a new press to provide new jobs for people in Saskatchewan'. Service Printing was turned down, Mr. Speaker. What did they do? They went out and raised \$80,000 and bought a new press and installed it . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and continued to do competitive and good quality work for the people of Saskatchewan and will for the Government of Saskatchewan.

Take another company, Mr. Speaker, Graphic Business Forms Limited. Their history is a little different. They are a private company. They weren't able to finance themselves. They didn't have the capital, but they went to SEDCO, the loaning agency of this Government, and they borrowed money. I might say, Mr. Speaker, it was considerably more than \$80,000. Representatives of that company, Mr. Speaker, have been in my office. Were they asking for some business from the Government of Saskatchewan? No, Mr. Speaker, they were asking for more business from the Government of Saskatchewan. We have on the one hand, Service Printers who get up their own money, put in their own press and do quality work. We have another company which borrows money from the Government loaning agency, builds a printing plant and does quality work. Now am I going to say, Mr. Speaker, or are any Members in this Chamber going to say, that both of those companies shouldn't have an opportunity to do the work that has to be done for the Government of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I don't think they should be excluded. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my remarks are not as flowery as the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), perhaps I feel more seriously about the topic than he does, anyway I think maybe he had his tongue in his cheek.

I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, where all those wonderful virtues of private enterprise have gone — like competition and free enterprise and the opportunity to get in on the business that the Government has to have done. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I feel quite comfortable in putting forward this amendment for the Members of this House to discuss and weigh. I think that this is good to have this type of amendment before us. I think we should follow this policy and I believe that this House will follow this policy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, amend by striking out completely the negative Resolution that is before us and substituting the following, seconded by Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):

That all the words after the word "as" in the first line

be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

favoring a policy of providing, as near as practical, an equitable opportunity for Saskatchewan printing companies to obtain printing contracts regardless of political affiliation, provided they are capable of doing such work on a competitive basis under fair wage and working conditions.

It is a pleasure to move that amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard much from the Members opposite about priorities since this Legislative Session began. Well let's look at some of the priorities of the Members opposite.

The first thing they do is they cancel the P.A. Pulp Mill, then they cancel the Choiceland Iron Mine and then they allow Service Printing . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the P.A. Pulp Mill and the Choiceland Iron Mine isn't on the motion. We better stay to the motion. I would hate the House to be too far apart.

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — On a Point of Order. When the Member spoke from Saskatoon (Mr. Brockelbank), he mentioned a Liberal that was not in the Resolution. I think this is grossly unfair to the Member here when he mentions in passing the Pulp Mill and he wants to make a point.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I mentioned the Saskatchewan Liberal because it's a newspaper that's a counterpart of the Commonwealth and the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was talking about advertising on behalf of the Company which is Service Printing Company.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on that point, the Commonwealth, itself, was mentioned in the Resolution or by the speech of the Hon. Member for Athabasca. It was by the Member for Mayfair.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think we are getting away from the Point of Order. The Point of Order was that we must stay to what's before us as motions and I don't want Members discussing the agreement with the Pulp Mills and so on. I will concede that maybe he was in a passing reference, but we mustn't discuss them as such.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think in this particular case without trying to create an argument here, that we are talking about Saskatchewan business, the question of profit and loss, the question of a company's right to do Government business and, therefore, it is very difficult to make a point on a principle such as that without bringing in the relationship of other companies and other corporations and other businesses in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe, Sir, that the Member has a right to finish the point he has to make

before that kind of a judgement should be made.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion deals with printing. You may proceed.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, Members opposite, the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) brought in other questions. My question was priority and I'm integrating that into the point I'm trying to make with regard to Service Printers. The point that I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government priorities which include the cancelling of the Pulp Mill and the cancelling of an iron mine, but then they turn around and immediately thereafter make a public point of allowing Service Printing, which is owned by their own political party, to do business with the Government. And that's the type of priority that we are getting from the Government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the prime example of political nepotism is the efforts made by the Government opposite to pour public moneys into the coffers of their own party. There won't be any objection, I submit, Mr. Speaker, from the Members opposite about the profit of Service Printing. I don't think we'll hear the Premier talking about an insufficient margin of return with regard to Service Printing. He'll guarantee a sufficient margin of return by more Government business. We won't hear any talk about the Waffle Members opposite about nationalizing Service Printing. That's a double standard here, Mr. Premier, what's good for the party is good for the Government of Saskatchewan, and that's all that counts.

We won't hear the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, talk about a bad deal, but this is a bad deal, Mr. Speaker. It's a bad deal for the people of Saskatchewan, that a political party will allow contracts with its own party organization. It's a dangerous principle that's in effect, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — The Government's amendment says in effect, in principle, that a Member will be able to contract, that's a Member of this Legislative Assembly will be able to contract on behalf of the Government with his own Company. And that is the principle that's involved.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Now I realize that this may not be unlawful under the provisions of the Legislative Assembly office, but the practice of this House, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is for example that a Cabinet Minister resign his directorships when he becomes appointed to the Cabinet. The only reason that that principle is held by this House is not because they distrust the Cabinet Minister, but because there is a potential for abuse. That is the reason that Cabinet Ministers give up their directorships and that is the very principle that the Government opposite is trying to refute with this amendment because it's not the fact of contracts with the Government but it's the potential for abuse that exists and that is the principle that is very much the centre of argument here tonight and that's the principle we are concerned about. If the amendment, as proposed by the

Government opposite passes this Legislature, why should a Cabinet Minister give up his directorship. There is no reason for it if this amendment passes. The principle of a political party allowing its own publishing company to contract with Government is dangerous and it is wrong and the abuses can be very detrimental to the people of this Province. The principle also that concerns me somewhat that the Minister-in-Charge of the Provincial Secretary's office is allowing in effect his own company to breach the regulations and breach the laws of this Province.

Here is Rule 14 of the Legislative Assembly that governs the Members of this House and perhaps some of the Members opposite should be reminded of it. The principle is very, very important and should be made aware to all of us:

If a Member of the Assembly either directly or indirectly becomes concerned or interested in any bargain or contract entered into by or on behalf of the Government or participates or claims to be entitled to participate whether directly or indirectly in the profit thereof or in any benefit or emolument arising therefrom, or accepts any office or place of emolument under the Government, or in any character or capacity for or in expectation of any fee, gain a reward, performs any duty, transacts any business or does anything whatever, for on behalf of the Government, his seat shall thereupon be vacant.

And that's the principle that governs this House and with that statement of the rules that govern this House, the principle, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 3 — TWO-PRICE SYSTEM FOR WHEAT

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse) moved, seconded by Mr. D.G. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly commends Honourable Otto Lang and the Government of Canada for the implementation of a two-price system for wheat.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, as an individual involved personally in the farming industry of this Province I realize the great and varied difficulties facing our agricultural economy today. Two of the greatest factors that have affected our agricultural economy has been the rising operating costs and also the grain growers' dependency on world trade and the depressed world trading price on grain. Many groups in Canada have the power to demand increased returns for their products whether it be labor or the retail price of a commodity that they produce which in turn enables them to offset their rising operating or living costs. Some understanding must be given by governments at various levels and also by the consumers to give a fair deal to grain producers who are caught in the cost-price squeeze.

Many governments, political parties and farm organizations over the years have advocated some form or other of a two-price system of wheat. One that applies to the actual production

cost and relates this to the domestic human consumption of grain in Canada. I am pleased to note that it was the present Government of Canada which first introduced a two-price system in 1969, when it announced that the price for domestic human consumption of wheat be held at \$1.95½ per bushel while world prices dropped much lower than this figure. I am pleased as well that it was this present Federal Government which in January of this year due entirely to the untiring and constant efforts of the Hon. Otto Lang, accepted the arguments for a realistic two-price system for wheat and agreed that returns to grain producers should be based on a domestic price for wheat for human consumption at \$3 per bushel. While I may not agree entirely with the distribution of the two-price wheat money, I feel very strongly that payment in this first year of operation is the correct one and one that will greatly benefit the moderate, average and small-sized farms, as well as still encourage crops other than wheat and give help to those who had misfortunes in their production last year.

Another important aspect of this two-price system is that it places no pressure on the price of bread to the consumer. The Federal Treasury will pay the farmers the difference between \$1.95½ and \$3 per bushel. By this method it does not add to the inflationary cost of living.

I am a bit disturbed by some of the remarks which I have heard to the effect that it is a Federal subsidy to the grain producers of this country. In effect, Mr. Speaker, it is a realistic price, related to the actual cost of production. If there is going to be a subsidy called in effect it is a subsidy to the consumer who will not have to pay the increase in the cost of bread products. The implementation of this two-price system is a tremendous victory for Otto Lang and the Canadian grain producers. Its benefits will be felt by all levels of our economy in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at great length reciting the benefits and the needs for this two-price system and I am sure all of us in this House realize this fully. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this House to put aside any political or party loyalties that we may have and I urge you all to endorse this Resolution and in so doing commend the tremendous efforts of Otto Lang and the Federal Government for this great step forward that this two-price system will mean to our agricultural economy. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. L. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I was listening rather intently to the Hon. Member from Morse in his remarks on this Resolution. I was wishing and hoping as a farmer that I could have been as enthusiastic on the two-price system as he seemed to be. In looking at the whole structure of the two-price system we find that it is not a two-price system at all. It is going to be nothing more than a direct producers' subsidy which is not satisfactory, which does not embrace the principle of what is involved in the ills of agriculture today. If it were a two-price system it wouldn't necessarily embrace all grain producers as in need of a subsidy. If this were the case it would have moved in the direction of total price stabilization. This, of course, is a principle that the Liberal Party is not prepared, or Otto Lang

is not prepared to embrace. If it were a two-price system I wouldn't find it very difficult to support. That principle has been looked at, thought about, proven necessary not only by the New Democrats in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan but basically by farm organizations for a great number of years. It took a long time for that principle to be adopted by the Federal Liberals even in name and yet when it came to practice they weren't able or willing to put it into true effect.

Now because of this I think that this Legislature ought to embrace a much broader and much more worthwhile and necessary principle. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move seconded by the Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) an amendment. It's an amendment that I hope will embrace and that will lay emphasis where it is truly needed in so far as the ills of agriculture are concerned at the present time. I invite all Members on the opposite side to do some soul searching in condemning or not supporting this amendment. I invite them to vote against the principle that will be embraced in this amendment. I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk):

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

acknowledged the Honourable Otto Lang and the Government of Canada for the implementation of a long over-due two-price system for wheat, and that this Assembly, out of concern for the temporary nature of the proposed payment, urges the Federal Government to establish a permanent two-price system with a method of distribution which is fair to both wheat producers and producers of other grains, such distribution to be through a Grains Income Stabilization plan as proposed by Saskatchewan's present Minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the amendment and the motion.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to have a copy of that Resolution, if you would give us a few minutes.

This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether it is in order in view of the Resolution moved by Mr. Kowalchuk. This is the same Resolution, it calls for grains income stabilization. Would you want to consider that? I don't want to give up my privilege of speaking before I sit down. But if you will permit me to sit down and rise again I should like you to consider it.

Mr. Speaker: — If the Member would like to adjourn the debate. I could look at it and then you would be in a position to debate next time when the Resolution comes up. Would you like to do that?

Mr. Boldt: — No, I don't think so because if those fellows over there get hold of these resolutions they might not open them up again. So I will make a few remarks regarding the Resolution and particularly to the stabilization program that this

amendment points out.

The NDP's concern for an income stabilization program at this time once again points out the inconsistent and selfish and the arrogant attitude of the NDP of about a year ago when they deliberately calculated to defeat the Federal Stabilization Bill. Now all of a sudden they have a great heart for the farmer. At that time, in particular, the NDP could not afford to have the Federal Government pump \$100 million into the economy of the prairie farmer. With their counterparts in Ottawa they were able to stall the Bill under after the June election and that was the prime purpose of the NDP Members of Parliament. Don't shake your head you know exactly what is the truth. When later in the fall the Federal by-election was called in Assiniboia they again made sure that the Bill would be held up in the House of Commons until after the election. What was even more shameful and disgraceful was the action taken by the Federal NDP Member, Les Benjamin and our Provincial Attorney General, in urging and assisting the NDP farmers into taking court action against the Federal Finance Minister, Mr. Benson.

The Federal Stabilization Bill was not designed to take care of all the farmers' troubles but it certainly was a great step forward and those concerns such as rising farm costs would have been taken care of through other measures. The NDP in Saskatchewan are great experts at keeping industry and finance out of this Province. Prior to June 23rd they did not feel the need for the farm price support. Now all of a sudden they appear to have a great change of heart. The results of the action forced upon the — if that gentleman would leave the girls alone. If he would leave the girls alone the loudspeakers might work.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Is that your department, Roy?

Mr. Romanow: — That's bust lines.

Mr. Boldt: — The result of the action forced by the Federal Government to eventually withdraw the Stabilization Bill meant that the prairie farmer was put out to the tune of \$60 million. It has been argued that eventually most of this will be recovered through The Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. The fact is that the farmer could have received \$60 million extra dollars a year ago when he was in dire need of it. The \$100 million that was to have been distributed last spring would have gone to all the farmers regardless of how many bushels of grain he had delivered to the Wheat Board. As an example a section farmer, highly diversified, need not have sold any grain to qualify for participating in the program. He would have received roughly \$1.50 per acre on a maximum of 640 acres for an allowance of \$960. Under The Temporary Wheat Reserves Act this farmer receives no benefits, absolutely none. On the other hand the rich landlord whom you despise but yet you unknowingly help, who is perhaps living in the United States and has had some grain delivered, he receives the participation certificates on his rent share. For every bushel that he delivered to the Wheat Board he receives some remuneration. Surely the Saskatchewan farmer will take this into account as

indeed he already has. As it is obvious that the NDP Government has lost its support in the rural as well as in the urban centres.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Resolution suggests that costs of production should be taken into account. This has always been a pet argument of our farm organizations. The area of concern would disappear if the Wheat Board could sell all the grain the farmer can raise. One must realize that the so-called two-price system announced but not yet paid out represents about a one bushel wheat quota. The real bug the farmer has to contend with is lack of sales which contribute to his cost. The grain farmer has been forced to sell many a bushel at a fire-sale price to keep him from further expenses of building more grain storage. The emphasis must and always should be to sell what we can produce. The cost of production must always be related to sales. To be able to produce a 25-bushel wheat crop and only sell 10 bushels makes very poor economics. Then how can our experts really tell what it costs to produce a bushel of wheat. To stabilize farm income the Provincial Government has major responsibilities. I believe that the 40-hour week and the minimum wage to a degree will tend to increase costs to the farmer. The increase in the farm licence plate surely was not necessary as this was an increase in his cost and is a far cry from stabilization.

This Government has a great penchant to point to the Federal Government for a stabilization program yet at the Provincial level they have no concern for the farmer whatsoever. What about the hog enterprise that bypassed Saskatoon and is going to Alberta? Just because this Government has no concern for the farmer except that the Federal Government is to do all the supporting. I am convinced that the Provincial Government, again because of its hatred towards the free-enterprise system and anti-business attitude, just threw cold water on the proposal and hoped to exchange it for a two-bit tourist attraction. I don't think that the Government can comprehend such figures as 640,000 hogs annually, 1500 jobs and 11 million bushels of feed. Premier Lougheed of Alberta didn't think twice when he heard that such an enterprise wanted to establish in Canada and he apparently has succeeded in getting this industry into Alberta.

The article in the Star-Phoenix makes very interesting reading and we note that two Saskatoon business people have found it necessary to invest in another province. I want to just show this clipping of last Friday or last Saturday when I bought the Star. I opened it on the third page and I read the headlines, "Hog Enterprise bypasses Saskatchewan and goes to Alberta." In the first paragraph it says that this hog enterprise will be processing more than 640,000 hogs annually. It will produce 1500 jobs and it has contracted 500 to 700 farmers to raise these hogs in Alberta and they will use 11 million bushels of feed. Not one piece of pork will be sold on the Canadian and American markets, it will all go overseas. But that's only part of the story. Turn over to page 4 and another shocker to the farmers of Saskatchewan, "125 Jobs Chopped as Quaker Closes its Doors." And you know this Government sits idly by as industry after industry passes this Province and moves into another region. We shall now be shipping our raw

material, wheat, oats and barley to Peterborough, Ontario for processing. This is the method of socializing, this is the method by which the socialists want to industrialize Saskatchewan that so many of our industries are going to Alberta and Ontario where they have free-enterprise Conservative governments.

The Liberal Party of Saskatchewan supports the principle of the income stabilization for Saskatchewan farmers. We deplore the political actions taken by the NDP in Saskatchewan and of the Federal NDP Members of Parliament in defeating the Federal Stabilization Bill introduced by Otto Lang in the House of Commons in the spring of 1971. It is very interesting for me to note that at this time the Member from Pelly (Mr. Larson) wants a stabilization plan.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

RULING OF RESOLUTIONS 2 AND 3

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member has asked leave to adjourn the debate but before I put that question he raised a Point of Order earlier for my consideration. I have had a chance to look at it and while I will agree that this Resolution and the one above it the words “two-price system” is mentioned in both of them. they are both in the same ball park but it is hard to say if they are dealing exactly with the same topic. I think they are coming at the same problem from two different angles. If not I should have had to rule No. 3 out of order because No. 2 had proceeded it on the Order Paper. So I hope to give the Members the right to express their views on these resolutions as they are really coming at a problem from two different angles so I will rule it in order so that the Member is in order for the speech he has made and to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — PUBLIC WORK PROGRAMS

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora) moved, seconded by Mr. Cowley (Biggar):

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for action taken in bringing forward public work programs in the early fall of 1971 and in extending and supplementing federal government programs for the relief of winter unemployment;

Expresses regret at the tardiness of the Government of Canada in announcing its 1971-72 winter employment programs and at the dilatory manner in which municipal applications under the Local Initiative Program were processed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration;

And further that this Assembly endorses the proposal for a joint examination of the existing programs by federal, provincial and local governments, to evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and to prepare criteria, guidelines and contingency plans for the winter of 1972-73 under varying assumptions of unemployment levels.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the Resolution before us is an important Resolution. It is timely and deserves good, constructive debate.

The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, gives the Members of the Legislature an opportunity to discuss what our Governments, Provincial and Federal have done and are doing to relieve the serious problem of unemployment through Public Works and Winter Works programs. It will also give the Members an opportunity to propose plans for the year to come. In moving this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that Members on both sides of this House will give their full support to it and work co-operatively with the Government in planning an employment program for the 1972-73 winter.

During the Throne Speech and Budget Debates, Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the House expressed concern about the unemployment situation and the way it invariably increases during the winter months. Our Government ever since taking office last summer showed great concern about the situation. And almost immediately took steps to alleviate it by accelerating the Public Works programs.

Mr. Speaker, let us briefly review the unemployment situation. During some part of 1971 some 2 million Canadians were unemployed. About half of them were unemployed during the greater part of the year. And about one-half of the unemployed were under 25 years of age. Tomorrow's leaders are today's unemployed. An embarrassing position to find ourselves in! Mr. Speaker, we can say in other words, out of 8 million employable Canadians one out of every four were unemployed in 1971. This is an alarming situation. Now, Mr. Speaker, unless our governments become concerned and are serious about doing something about the situation our nation is heading towards disaster. I say this, Sir, because without employment our nation is a losing nation. We lose in productivity and we slow down in technological and scientific advances and furthermore amongst the people there grows a feeling of frustration and despair which often leads to unrest and trouble.

Now early last fall the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate increased to 7.1 per cent from 6.5 per cent in August. It was becoming very evident that above normal unemployment was with us. And with the coming of cold weather the problem would grow and become more severe as we approached the winter months. Now was the time to act and to plan special employment programs. Now was the time for the Federal Government to become conscious of the seriousness of the problem and to lay out plans for combating it. The Saskatchewan Provincial Government was already involved in expanded and accelerated public work programs. But it wasn't until the night of October 14, 1971, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Benson, the Minister of Finance, announced his employment programs in Parliament. The programs were to cost a total of \$1070 million, and out of this amount \$260 million was allocated to the Local Initiatives program and the Federal-Provincial Loan program. The announcement, of course, was welcomed by the Provincial authorities and each expressed a hope that the programs were designed to have the desired effect of relieving the growing problem of unemployment.

About the time of the announcement, Mr. Speaker, this Government established a Task Force on unemployment to study the situation and make recommendations to the Government on the best ways of tackling the unemployment problem. The Task Force was made up of representatives from the two municipal organizations, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, the School

Trustees Association, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, Federation of Labour, Saskatchewan Hospital Association, the Chamber of Commerce and others, a cross section representative of the people of Saskatchewan.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, to say the least that the Federal Government ignored the Saskatchewan Task Force and the Federal Government ignored the Provincial Governments. There was no program consultation with the Provincial authorities. Ottawa simply went ahead on its own.

At the time of the announcement, no guide lines or regulations were set out. It was impossible to establish who would qualify and what kind of projects would be eligible for grants. It wasn't until the latter part of October, October 29th, I believe, that the Saskatchewan Government received from Ottawa a supply of application forms and some guide lines. These were immediately distributed to the local authorities, that is all urban and rural municipalities and school units. By this time it was well into the first and second week of November. And then the fact that municipal and school authorities meet regularly only once or twice a month the subject of winter works programs in many instances was delayed and not dealt with until the next meeting which meant the middle of November or the first week in December. I am pointing this out, Mr. Speaker, to indicate the lateness of Federal Government program announcements and the delay in providing adequate information to local governments on the program. I also want to indicate the time required for municipal and school authorities to plan, organize and decide on program participation keeping in mind worthwhile eligible projects and financial requirements. Decisions such as these aren't made instantaneously, they need careful consideration since in nearly all cases extra funds were required to finance the projects.

Further, Mr. Speaker, and of equal significance to the failure of the current winter works program are the rigid criteria and impractical guide lines set out by the Federal Government. On perusing the information it leaves one wondering why all the ballyhoo about the multi-million dollar winter employment program when only projects of great magnitude could qualify. The 30 man-months of work requirements was unrealistic, was ridiculous. It was just impossible for rural municipalities, small towns and villages to qualify for assistance under the program. It would seem that they are too small for the Federal Government. In so far as non-profit organizations were concerned, Mr. Speaker, it simply wasn't designed for them.

So what do you have left, Mr. Speaker? About the only local government bodies that would have qualified would be large towns and cities. By saying this I don't begrudge the towns and cities coming under this program, after all that's where we do have a lot of unemployment people. But what I mean to say is, why does the Federal Government design a winter works program supposedly for municipalities and local governments, "so that benefits are as widespread as possible," and then sets out strict guide lines and regulations in order to rule them out. The original intent and whole design of the program was an absolute farce. The program lacked realism and sincerity. It was not a serious effort on the part of the Federal Liberal Government to relieve the nation's unemployment crisis. I want to put on record, Mr. Speaker, that if it wasn't for our Premier, Allan Blakeney, making a strong case for Saskatchewan and for that matter

Western Canada the criteria of 30 man-months of work would have still applied.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — It was primarily through his effort that the Saskatchewan Government was able to convince the Federal authorities to reduce the period of work requirement by one-half, that is 15 man-months rather than 30 man-months. Apparently Ottawa and Mr. Otto Lang, are so remote in understanding the winter conditions of Saskatchewan that it was necessary for our Premier to remind them of this.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have discussed the rigid criteria associated with the Federal Winter Works program I should like to spend a few moments on the mal-administration of the program itself, and for that matter the entire Manpower branch of which the Hon. Otto Lang was the Minister-in-Charge at the time. I mention the Hon. Otto Lang because his department not only ill-managed the processing of Winter Works applications, but under his direction the service provided by the Unemployment Insurance Commission in handling of benefit claims, I would say it was the worst and slowest in the history of its operation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — And this is not to say anything of Mr. Lang's lack of concern and understanding of the problems of western farmers. One can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that if Lang is in charge, the contribution will not be large. With a change in Cabinet portfolio to Minister of Justice, I do hope that the Hon. Mr. Lang accepts his responsibilities more seriously and makes a greater contribution in the direction of a just society.

Mr. Speaker, when I speak of mal-administration of the Local Initiatives Program I am specifically referring to the delays in processing of applications and evidently the lack of any standardized method of approving or rejecting applications. To illustrate my point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make reference to the Local Initiatives Program application of the R.M. of Buchanan No. 304 of which I am the secretary-treasurer. Upon receipt of adequate information on the program the council made application covering two main projects. One of the projects was brush clearing and removing obstructions in the Crooked Hill Creek to provide better drainage and alleviate flooding of farm lands. The second project was the stockpiling of crushed gravel for road construction and other municipal purposes. It was estimated the total cost of the projects to be in the neighborhood of \$47,000.

The application was submitted to the Department of Municipal Affairs on November 23, 1971. A check with the department indicated the application was examined and forwarded on to the Regional Manpower office at Winnipeg on November 26th. No reply was received out of the Winnipeg office for a week. I, as the secretary-treasurer of the municipality, contacted the supervisor of the Winnipeg office and inquired about the position of the application and when we could expect approval. The reason for the inquiry was our desire and anxiety to get started on the projects before the cold winter weather and the heavy snowfalls. The supervisor explained to me that our application was

not received by their Manpower office so I again called our Department of Municipal Affairs. I was reassured that the application left the Provincial office on November 26th. A few hours later in the day, Mr. Speaker, I received a phone call from the Winnipeg office informing me that they had located our application along with several others. On this point several questions arise. How as the winter works mail handled? Were applications deliberately held up from review and processing? Were there any priorities established? Or were decisions made on an arbitrary basis?

At the request of my council I again called the Manpower office on December 20th to find out how our application was coming. The reply was that nothing was done so far, and that it was expected the municipality would receive a reply within a week. By about the first week of January, 1972 when we still had no reply, I called the Winnipeg Office again. I was told that no decision was made on the application. However, a preliminary review was made. I then asked what the possibilities were in receiving approval to the application. The reply was that the application was a good one, it covers useful and beneficial projects which appear to meet the criteria of the program. It is one of the several that is being considered. This, of course inspired our hopes, but our anxiety continued to grow because by now we were nearly in the midst of the cold winter with heavy snowfalls. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't until the latter part of January that the municipality received a reply in the form of a circular letter stating that our project was rejected. There was no reason given for the rejection except to say and I quote: "We regret that it is not possible to approve a contribution to this project". The municipal council's hopes were shattered. It left them very disappointed and with the feeling that this Winter Works Program was a fraud and a hoax.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — Let us again, Mr. Speaker, quickly take a look at the length of time it took the Federal Manpower office to make a decision on the municipal Local Initiatives Program application. The municipality submitted application on November 23, 1971, reply of rejection received two months later.

I have illustrated to this House one case of extreme delay in processing of applications. I am certain there were many others in this same category. It took two months, Mr. Speaker, to make a decision on whether or not the project would qualify under the program. Finally it was arbitrarily rejected. During this same period of December and January unemployment continued to rise and reach unprecedented levels.

It is difficult to reconcile, Mr. Speaker, the lackadaisical approach and the apparent delay tactics of the Federal Government with its expression of concern and desire to solve the unemployment crisis. To me the whole thing just doesn't make sense. The Local Initiatives Program was dreamed up in a hurry without co-operative planning and consultation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — The program could not have been a sincere one. It appears to be one concocted for a political smoke screen in an

attempt to save the failing Trudeau Government in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: And to hide the shortcomings of Otto Lang's policy on agriculture and the unemployed of this nation. It has the design of a publicity stunt in preparation for an early election in spring or summer. I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the program was not a serious one. For if it was then surely the program could have been planned much earlier and surely there could have been consultation with Provincial authorities to design a program that is practical, meaningful and effective in doing what it is meant to do, relieve the pressure of unemployment and speed up the economy of the country. I want to tell the Liberal Opposition Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, the big LIP, Local Initiatives Program, the big LIP service out of Ottawa has left many private organizations and municipalities very disappointed. They didn't have too much faith in Ottawa Liberals in the first place, but now it has dwindled down to nothing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — It's going to be a tough battle for you fellows come election this summer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — The New Democratic party is riding high and now with the Provincial Government courageously picking up some 58 municipal projects that were rejected by the Federal Government, people of Saskatchewan have even greater confidence in the NDP to have a job done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — The Saskatchewan New Democratic Government has moved ahead in tackling unemployment as it has done in many other problem areas. This Government in spite of limited resources has taken a bold position by fully participating in the two Winter Works Programs, the Local Initiatives Program and the Loan Program. This Government committed millions of dollars to co-operate with the Federal Government in the two programs. We are hopeful the programs will prove effective in creating jobs for the unemployed and successful in speeding up the economy of Saskatchewan and Canada as a whole. Originally the Saskatchewan New Democratic Government pledged \$1 million the Local Initiatives Program and \$6.9 million to the Loan Program. Later, when the Federal Liberals started backing out by rejecting applications submitted by local community organizations and municipalities, the Saskatchewan New Democratic Government added another \$.5 million into the Provincial Local Initiatives Program making a total of \$1.5 million. The provincial program was especially set up to provide for consideration of LIP applications rejected by the Federal authorities and re-submitted by villages, towns and rural municipalities. Up until now some 58 applications were approved. It is expected the projects will create 1,370 jobs. This action on the part of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Government clearly indicates

the true concern of this Government about the unemployment problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — It clearly indicates the courage of this Government to stand up for the municipalities and to do all that is possible for the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, we had a bad experience with the administration of the Winter Works Program. In the first place, the Government of Canada was too late in getting started. By the time information was disseminated we were already in the cold winter weather.

Secondly, the Federal Government held no prior consultation with provincial and municipal governments. Communication between Ottawa and the provincial governments before the programs were announced was non-existent. And following that, there was much to be desired in good communication.

Thirdly, the Federal Government failed to recognize the conditions as they exist in the various parts of the country. They failed to recognize the extreme winter climate of Western Canada. They failed to recognize the presence of unemployment in our rural and small urban communities. And finally, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government failed to be consistent in the application of its own criteria. Schools and hospitals were at first eligible if the province classified them as local government institutions. Then they were declared to be ineligible and then eligible again. This kind of waffle-waffle in policy is very confusing and certainly frustrating. In the process many worthwhile applications were rejected for no apparent reason.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the bad experience we have had in the way the Winter Works Program was administered, there is a need for all levels of government to confer and examine the problems that were encountered and at the same time set out plans for next winter's programs. Seasonal unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is a persistent problem in Canada. The problem is more severe in the Prairie Provinces than in any of the other provinces. Our Government has asked the Federal Government to call a Federal-Provincial Conference in May of this year to jointly examine the present winter employment programs. There are probably at least four areas that would require attention. 1. Have the programs met their purpose and how effective were they? 2. What were the problems and why have they occurred? 3. Were the criteria and guide lines meaningful and practical in purpose? 4. Could early and joint planning improve the operation of the programs?

In consideration of these four areas of concern, our Government is asking the members of the Task Force on unemployment to tell us what the Government should be doing to combat seasonal unemployment. We believe that local governments, municipalities and the like could be of great assistance in planning winter employment programs. They are directly involved in these programs as employers and as financial partners.

The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and other associations of local government represented on the Task Force are asked to submit briefs setting out their proposals for

future winter works projects and stating the kind of projects they would like to see as well as suggesting what criteria and guide lines should be used. We firmly believe that this kind of participation could be very beneficial to all concerned. Presently, it may be too early to assess the effectiveness of this winter's employment programs since many of the approved projects are just being started on. Nevertheless, there is concern that the May 31st completion date is not realistic in the terms of obtaining maximum government assistance on work done. On this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a strong plea to our Government and the Government of Canada to give serious consideration to extending the May 31 deadline date to at least June 30.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — In all fairness to community organizations and municipal governments that received late approvals and faithfully got started in their projects but were unable to meet the completion deadline date, it may be essential that the completion date be extended. I believe the two governments have some obligation here. I would urge that they consider accepting this responsibility.

In my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to point out to this Legislature the inadequacies of the present winter employment programs and the dilatory manner in which applications were handled and processed by the Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration. I expressed satisfaction with and commendation of the action taken by this Government. Firstly, to accelerate the Public Works Program last summer and secondly, to extend the winter employment program on its own in order to cover municipal applications rejected by the Federal Government. And finally, Mr. Speaker, I outlined what we as a Government propose to do to prepare and plan for an employment program for the 1972-73 winter. I also suggested that the completion date of May 31 be extended at least to June 30. Mr. Speaker, for consideration of this Assembly I take pleasure in moving this Resolution as stated in the beginning of my speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest as the Hon. Member for Canora got up and initially began his remarks on this motion. I had thought we were going to see a good, honest discussion of the points he made. Then he went on to be critical of the Federal Government in every line of his remarks. Critical of a program that has put millions of dollars into Saskatchewan in every corner of the province. Mind you, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I and others on this side listened with dismay as the temperature and the mercury went down through January and the snow got deeper and the brush wasn't yet cleared from Buchanan Creek. But he went on then to eulogize the efforts of the Provincial Government as far as winter works were concerned. But in typical NDP fashion, Mr. Speaker, he berates the Federal Government, he belittles the genuine and sincere effort of the Trudeau Government in this regard and again at the conclusion of his remarks turns around and asks the Federal Government now to make plans for next year for more of the same.

What about the Government opposite? What plans have they

made for winter works and unemployment next year?

Mr. Romanow: — It's all in the Budget.

Mr. McIsaac: — Yes, all in the Budget is right, and very little in the Budget, Mr. Speaker. Not an increase in the capital works spending, but a decrease this year in the Public Works capital spending.

Mr. Speaker, I'll have a good deal more to say on this Resolution at a later time to try and indicate to my friends opposite what the Federal Government has done with respect to unemployment in Saskatchewan and what my friends opposite have not done and are not doing. Accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 — MEMBER'S RIGHT TO SPEAK RATIO

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone) moved, seconded by Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie):

That this Assembly protect the rights of free speech of all Members by declaring that Rules 22 and 23 of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly 1970, take precedence over the ruling of Mr. Speaker, dated March 3, 1972, whereby a Member's right to speak will be determined on a ratio of three Government Members to one Opposition Member.

He said:

I am very tempted on this, Mr. Speaker, to make a real political speech, but I am not going to do so. I think that all Members of the House respect the decorum and the debating privileges of the House and all of us have a very high regard for the principles of democracy and the rules of the House that guide our conduct herewith. I think, Sir, that you know and I know that all the Members of the House know that this Resolution was moved in the height of a controversy that took place in the House between the two sides and which has now been, at least, it appears to be satisfactorily resolved. Therefore, I have no intention, at least at this time, of reiterating and recalling and rehashing all the incidents of that particular dispute between both sides of the House and the thing that caused you, Sir, to make the ruling that you did. But I do want to tell you this, Sir, that as far as the Opposition is concerned this is the most important issue facing this House. And if we do not find, Sir, with some satisfaction, we are prepared to debate this, Sir, for the rest of the sitting of this Legislature.

I am going to make a few very brief remarks, Sir. Then I am going to ask the Members of the Government if they will support this Resolution. And if they do so, then we can very speedily, Sir, dispose of this matter so that the rights of free speech in this House will not be infringed upon. I should like to say just very quickly, Sir, the reason that as far as the Opposition is concerned we cannot tolerate the ruling that has been made by yourself, Sir. I think that under the stress and the strain of the moment and in the height of the confusion and the feelings of the House, that somehow your ruling, Sir, was

tempered by the incident itself, and I hope, Sir, that at this time, you have reconsidered your decision made at that time. But, Sir, to suggest that the Member who is going to speak in this House will be selected before that Member even rises from his chair is against every rule of parliamentary democracy and against every rule of the right of free speech of a Member. And to make rulings, Sir, which depicts a Member's right to speak in this House because of his political party or whether he is in the Government or the Opposition is in itself, Sir, an infringement on free speech. Because a Member is not to be selected to speak in this House because he belongs to the Government or to the Opposition but because he is an elected representative of an individual constituency and his right to speak is based upon his individual representation and not by his party representation. Sir, the Resolution itself very simply calls upon, and if I might read it again, Sir:

That this Assembly protect the rights of free speech of all Members by declaring that Rules 22 and 23 of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly 1970, take precedence over the ruling of Mr. Speaker, dated March 3, 1972, whereby a Member's right to speak will be determined on a ratio of three Government members to one Opposition Member.

I should like to recall for the Members of the House the two rules, Rule 22 and 23 from the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, 1970. Rule 22:

Every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered, and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

Rule 23:

When two or more Members rise to speak, Mr. Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now hear" which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

Sir, I don't intend to say anything more at this time. I certainly will have a lot more to say at the closing of this debate. But I have no desire to rehash it. I should like to see this matter, Sir, satisfactorily dropped not only for the present Members in this Assembly but for all future Members that will be elected on either side of the House regardless of political affiliation in the future. I should like to ask if a Member in the Government will indicate very quickly and very shortly as to their attitude toward this particular Resolution. I so move this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, there may be some ambiguity as to precisely the ruling that you made, and you might question the interpretation placed upon it by the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald).

However, I think that it is incumbent upon this House to take very seriously the point made by the Hon. Member from Milestone. I find myself basically in agreement with the motion that he has made to the extent that I think it is not possible

that we recognize speakers in the House on the basis strictly of the proportion on one side of the House relative to the other, and to do so would transform the debate into a simple diatribe back and forth, and we, with the larger number, will inevitably come out on top.

If we are to preserve and make credible the very tenuous institution of parliament, it is going to require that the Opposition can oppose and that it not be constrained merely by its numbers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult motion to speak to because I sincerely believe that the Member from Milestone speaking on behalf of the group that he is leading, wants to avoid a situation that resulted in this motion being placed before you and being debated today.

I want to tell him that certainly that is the concern that I have as a Member in this Legislature and a Member in the Cabinet.

It is a difficult situation as well, Mr. Speaker, because it appears to me that there are basically two things that are tied up to this motion and that is firstly, the motion places an interpretation on your words or on the acts of that particular day in such a way that, I think, can be honestly questioned by any other Member of this House. I stand to be corrected, and I haven't checked the exact transcript in preparation for my remarks, but I think there is another interpretation, one which is very, very consistent with the sentiments expressed by the Member from Milestone and the sentiments expressed by the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards).

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I thought the debate concerned itself around rules 22 and 23 quite obviously. Let me just take a minute to read rule 22. Rule 22 says:

Every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered, and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

Rule 23:

When two or more Members rise to speak, Mr. Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his place, but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now hear" which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

I think the key words here are in Rule 23 in the first two or three sentences. "If two or more Members rise to speak, Mr. Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his place."

As I recall the events of the day in question, Mr. Speaker was faced with a situation which — I wasn't sitting in the sort of impartial place you were — but certainly where both Members got up simultaneously or very close to being simultaneous, both saying "Mr. Speaker" and both in effect putting you in a very awkward position of having to recognize one of them. And in these circumstances you were forced into making a decision as to which Member you in fact first recognized to rise in his place.

Rightly or wrongly, I interpreted the events of that day to be simply this: that you ruled that you saw the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer). That was the substance of the ruling. In the course of making that ruling, Mr. Speaker then sought to explain things. He was telling us that he was not supposed to acknowledge in any formal way, the question of 45 Members on one side, 15 on the other side and the question of the informal arrangements made. All of these accepted practices that for some reason exist but are not talked about openly, or not very often at any rate, yet every Member of the House knows that they exist.

I interpreted in a certain way as one Member sitting in the Legislature the comments that you made with respect to three to one. What I am trying dispassionately to say, without any political bias, was that you recognized the Member for Nipawin. That is the ruling but you would not be human if you didn't recognize the nature and the makeup of the House. It would be unrealistic for any person, either you, Mr. Speaker, or any Member from this side of the House or that side of the House, not to realize the situation. In the attempt of making sure that everybody had a fair and right opportunity to be heard, certain factors on occasion would be considered by yourself and the ruling was made with respect to the Member for Nipawin.

Now, that is the way that I interpreted the facts. The Member from Milestone quite legitimately interprets them another way. He incorporates your comments on 3 to 1 as being in fact the ruling. I invite the Member from Milestone and all Members of this House to agree with my interpretation that 3 to 1 was not the ruling. The Member from University says and the Member from Milestone says that it would not be particularly advantageous to have this type of ruling. In fact the ruling of the day was simply that the Member from Nipawin be recognized in precedence, I believe, to the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. MacDonald) and you made comments during the course of making that ruling. If Members of the House accept that as the ruling and as the interpretation of the ruling, then I think that we can all subscribe to some basic principles. We can, first of all, subscribe to the basic belief in the unimpaired freedom of speech in this House.

I don't want to sound political about it but I adhere to that principle and I don't think there is anybody who has had any experience in this Chamber who would not agree to that. At the same time we would uphold rules 22 and 23, because I think that they are difficult rules arising in this situation. They have to be there and we are going to have to uphold them. And at the same time we could uphold, Mr. Speaker, your ruling without further impairing any debate which of necessity must bring into question your impartiality and integrity, Sir.

I think this can be done if we place the interpretation that I place on it. I know that many of the Members on this side of the House place the same interpretation on the events of that day. I am, therefore, going to propose an amendment for the consideration of the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and Members on the opposite side. Believe me I say this in hopes that it will be acceptable to them. I, therefore, move this amendment, seconded by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood):

That all of the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted

and the following substituted therefor:

affirms its belief in the principle of free speech but at the same time recognizes the right and obligation of Mr. Speaker to interpret all rules of this Assembly, including Rules 22 and 23, fairly and impartially, and commends Mr. Speaker for carrying out his task in the best traditions of this Assembly.

I think that that type of suggested amendment does not involve any face-saving problems or any questions of lack of impartiality or any questions of 3 to 1. It would recognize the right of free speech. It would uphold Rules 22 and 23. It would express confidence in you, Sir, a man of 20 years or so in the House. And it would allow us, as Legislators, to move on with the business before this House.

In short, I say to the Member from Milestone and to all the Members of the House, that just speaking from the Government's standpoint, we don't agree with any imposition of any 3 to 1 in terms of any other Member. But at the same time we don't view Mr. Speaker as having ruled that. We view Mr. Speaker as having ruled that the Member from Nipawin be recognized and in the course of so doing made certain comments.

I invite all Members to accept that motion and to take it in the spirit that it has been intended.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Procedure. I want to ask you a question, Sir. Do I have the right to speak on the amendment without losing my right to close the debate?

Mr. Speaker: — You will have the right to speak on the amendment providing you don't refer to the main motion. Because you have spoken on the main motion, but other Members have not.

The debate continued on the motion and amendment concurrently.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, there is only a few minutes and I think it is well that there are only a few minutes. I think most of the Members on our side of the House would like to have an opportunity to peruse this.

I should like to point out one thing, Sir, I did not bring the record of the House for that day but I did read it carefully. And the problem that concerns us is not only that your ruling, Sir, is down on the record, but what is even more important is your application of that ruling. And that is what bothers us, because for the rest of that day and the and the following day you applied the rule that you made verbatim in the House. In other words it wasn't only the decision of the ruling which I appreciate the Attorney General's attempt to interpret the ruling in a different manner and it isn't only the interpretation of the words that you used, Sir, it was the fact that you applied the ruling and applied it on the ratio of 3 to 1 for the rest of that day and following the debate until the issue was settled in the House. And that is the issue, Sir, and therefore it isn't quite as easy as suggesting that Rules 22 and 23 can be

March 21, 1972

interpreted as the amendment says.

Therefore, Sir, in order that we might peruse this and go over the record again, because as I say, I think the Members on this side of the House would very much like to get this out of the area. It was generated in the heat of battle and certainly out of respect of the House — and all of us do respect the House — but we do feel very strongly about this and we would like to peruse this amendment and then come back and have an opportunity to discuss it again.

Therefore I beg leave — can I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker — I doubt that I can.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think you can. I haven't had time to check, but you moved the main motion and this is an amendment to your main motion, so you would be adjourning your own motion.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, maybe I could help. Could I ask leave to adjourn the debate?

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:28 o'clock p.m.