

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

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce to you and to all Members of the Assembly two groups of students from the constituency of Regina North West. The first group located in the west gallery consists of 38 Grade Eight students from St. Philip School. Their principal Gerald Small is with them. Gerald Small is a man of great teaching ability, he taught my children successfully when he was the principal of St. Mary's School. The other group of students I should like to introduce are seated above them in the same gallery and they are from St. Pat's Annex, division of Saskatchewan Applied Arts and Science. This group of 28 upgrading students have their teacher Stan Metcalfe with them. One student I should like to call your attention to, Matilda McNeil who is from Fort Smith in the North West Territories. A special welcome to this lady. To all the students on behalf of the Assembly I say a warm welcome and may your visit with us be pleasant, informative and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

RULINGS BY SPEAKER

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Mr. Speaker: — Before I call the Orders of the Day I have two different Speaker's Rulings I should like to give at this time.

Appearing on the Order Paper for today, I direct all Hon. Members' attention to Motions for Returns No. 42 and 53, as they appear in the Orders of the Day. Both of the said motions are seeking information regarding the Workmen's Compensation Board. I would ask Members to look at Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fourth Edition 1958, Citation 178, which states that,

Questions addressed to the Ministers should relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected to proceedings pending in Parliament or to any matter of administration for which the Minister is responsible.

The problem at this point is: whether a Minister of the Crown is responsible for the Workmen's Compensation Board to the degree that the Minister can answer the two motions under question. Section 11 of The Workmen's Compensation Accident Fund Act states,

That appointments to the Board are made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Section 23 of the Act states that:

1. The Board shall appoint an executive secretary and a

chief medical officer and may appoint such auditors, actuaries, accountants, inspectors, medical referees, other officers, clerks and servants as the board deems necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act and may prescribe their duties and fix their salaries.

2. Every person so appointed shall hold office during the pleasure of the Board.

The Act indicates that the Minister is responsible for the appointment of Board Members and for their salaries. The Act is very clear however in spelling out that the Board itself is independently responsible for the hiring of the staff, their conduct and their salaries. The staff of the Board is thus the responsibility of the Board alone.

Section 29 of the Act states that Members shall enjoy the same immunity and the same privilege as are conferred upon judges of the Court of Queen's Bench for any act done or omitted in the execution of their duties.

I refer Hon. Members to the Speaker's Ruling which carefully examined the powers, rights and immunities of the Workmen's Compensation Board, I refer the Members to the Journals of Saskatchewan 1966, page 48. In summary it seems clear that the Legislature can question or debate all matters which are directly related to the Board members, but not to appointments made by the Board. Administrative actions of the staff since the staff is responsible to the Board and not to the Minister, and any decisions of the Board.

Returns No. 42 and 53 pertain to staff appointments and their administrative actions. Since these Returns are the responsibility of the Board and not of the Minister of this Assembly, I rule the said motions out of order.

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, if I might just ask a question in that regard. Could I ask the Attorney General or the Premier where during the proceedings of the Legislature could we get this information?

It is a Board that is set by Order in Council. I am sure that somewhere along the line they must have some responsibility to this House to answer questions similar to what we have on the Order Paper. I should just like to ask the Attorney General when can we get this information which I am sure is public information and should be made available to all Members of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, it would appear from the rulings which have been made in this House over a number of years that the information sought by the Member is not strictly required to be answered by the Government at any time, so far as I can appreciate the rulings. I have examined some of the authorities and the ruling is, I think, correct in a technical sense. I think that we should redefine this matter so that some Member of the Government is in fact responsible for the administration of the Board, but that no Minister shall be answerable for the decisions of the Board on the awards that they make. I think that this would be consistent with the sort of judicial position of the Board and the fact that it is part of the administration of the Government. Without prejudice, and speaking for my

colleague the Minister of Labor (Mr. Snyder) I would answer to the Member that we would be prepared to answer these questions as an accommodation to the House until we sort this matter out, on the Labor Estimates, Administration Vote, if that is satisfactory with the House. As I say, I have looked at this. I think the Speaker is entirely right, but I think we ought to sort out this matter as a House, at some appropriate time.

Bill No. 1 - An Act to Amend the Land Bank Act

Mr. Speaker: — The second statement I should like to give at this time, standing on the Order Paper for today is an Order for Second Reading of Bill No. 1 – An Act to amend The Land Bank Act, 1972. I have examined this Bill very closely and have sought legal advice as to the full effect of the proposed Bill. The effect of Bill No. 1, if passed, would be to make provisions for the sale of land handled by the Land Bank Commission, The Land Bank Act of 1972.

All property, whether real or personal, and all money acquired, administered, possessed or received by the Commission, is the property of Her Majesty in the right of Saskatchewan and shall for all purposes include taxation of whatever nature and description be deemed to be the property of Her Majesty. Rule Number 30 of the Rules and Proceedings of this Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan of 1970 states:

Any vote, resolution, address or Bill introduced into the Assembly for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost to any purpose whatsoever or to impose any new or additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people, or to release or compound any sum of money due to the Crown, or to grant any property of the Crown, or to authorize any loan or any charge upon the credit of the province, shall be recommended to the Assembly by Message of His Honor the Lieutenant Governor before it is considered by the Assembly.

As I say, that is our Standing Order 30.

Under The Land Bank Act, 1972, all land held by the Commission is the property of Her Majesty. Since Bill No. 1 provides for the selling of this Crown land, it is a money bill and contravenes Rule 30. I, therefore, rule Bill No. 1 out of order.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, on your ruling Sir, general interpretation of this ruling has always dwelt upon the question whether or not a motion moved by the Opposition would bring about public spending. While I appreciate that this legislation, Bill No. 1 that is before us, if adopted, could possibly bring that about, but it doesn't because we would debate it and adopt it, it doesn't necessarily bring about a return of funds or money to the Queen, or the Government in this case. The immediate result of adopting that Bill would not necessarily infringe upon Rule 30. I suggest in all deference, Mr. Speaker, that your strict interpretation of that Rule doesn't apply to the question of whether or not we debate the Bill in question.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, surely there is a difference between an option and a requirement.

Mr. Speaker: — I have sought the legal advice which is available to me and that is the information that I have that this is a money bill. Because any motion which purports to either acquire to the Crown additional property or transfer or dispose of it becomes a money bill. Under Standing Rule 30, then I have no option but to rule this out of order. Members can discuss this during the Estimates or during other times what they have in mind. I have no knowledge that amendments to this Bill will be brought in by the Minister concerned, at that time Members may discuss it. But at this time I have no alternative than to rule it out of order.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, again on the point and on your ruling, I must disagree in a sense — I see your point, I can read the rule, of course — but the fact remains that the adoption or the debate on this particular bill and indeed its adoption would not necessarily result in any additional income or charge being returned a sum of money to the province. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would urge you to reconsider or go back again to your legal advisors and have a look at this. A mere adoption of it wouldn't necessarily mean funds or money immediately coming to the province or the provincial coffers as a result. It is on that point, on the point of the option, that I would have to disagree with your ruling in that sense.

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, Rule 30 to me indicates quite clearly that it would have to be a charge on the public purse, this bill we don't feel in any way is. We designed it very carefully for that purpose. The only part in Rule 30 which may be a bit of a problem, or debatable and we looked at this too, says, "or to grant any property of the Crown." This says 'grant', it doesn't say 'sell' or dispose in some other manner. I don't believe that the part about a charge in the public purse applies at all as far as this particular Bill is concerned. The part about 'grant any property of the Crown' if this was construed as selling, of course, could be a problem. My interpretation of grant would certainly be grant of some property without charge and this is not, of course, what we are doing in the Bill.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, maybe this isn't on the point, but I put it forward as a suggestion to you in reconsidering. The present legislation, of course, does provide that after a given period of time the lands in the particular bill referred to may be sold. All we are doing is changing the date. So in that sense again, may I respectfully suggest to ask you to reconsider this ruling in this case.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, have you called Orders of the Day?

Mr. Speaker: — No not yet.

I am prepared to hold it over, but if I do hold it over until I have a chance to go over it, that this Bill cannot be called today. But my advice has been that, a disposition, whether it could be a loss or a gain or even an equal value, it is still property of the Crown and which can only be done by a Minister of the Crown. But I am prepared to hold it over until a future day and discuss privately with any of the Members concerned.

STATEMENT

Automobile Accident Insurance

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might be permitted to make a brief statement concerning Automobile Accident Insurance rates for 1973-74.

During the 1972-73 licence year auto insurance claims increased sharply, as Members know and the Act experienced a large underwriting loss. Indications are that little improvement can be expected during the 1973-74 licence year. In 1972 the experience and frequency of claims was approximately 20 per cent over last year, producing an estimated underwriting loss of \$2 million during the licence year, the Act will be paying out 98 cents out of every dollar taken, compared with the break-even point of 84 cents. In view of this increasing trend and on the advice of management, it has been decided to increase those classes of licences that are putting an abnormal drain on the fund. For those vehicles 1952 or older, rates will not change. For 1953 to 1963 year models, rates not only will not change upwards, but will be reduced an average of \$5.00. Rates for 1964 and 1965 year models will also remain unchanged. However, for 1966 to 1969 vehicles rates will be increased an average of \$3.00 to \$5.00. The 1970-73 models will be increased in rate by \$15.00 to \$20.00. All 1974 models have been set as a new rate group, at an average rate of \$125.

Experience dictates that the rate increases are required also for lightweight newer models in the farm truck class. Rates on those trucks over 7,500 pounds used almost exclusively for farm purposes remain basically unchanged. Rates on all 1965 and older trucks, regardless of pounds, will also remain the same. For those newer model trucks 7,500 pounds and under, the following rates will apply: 1966 and 1967 models have increased from \$3.00 to \$5.00; 1968 to 1971 have been increased from \$11.00 to \$15.00; 1972 to 1974 models have been increased by \$25.00. These rates again reflect the fact that the newer the model of the vehicle, the more costly the repair.

For taxis, trucks, power units, semi-trailers and dealer plates, an overall increase of the present premiums is also required to bring these groups into line. It is planned to use accumulated reserves during the following years to stabilize rates. Without these rate increases today, the reserve fund would soon be depleted.

Mr. Speaker in 1972 Saskatchewan motorists travelled 3.7 billion miles, but they were very costly miles. Saskatchewan motorists set their own auto insurance rates. In 1973 let's all make an individual effort to save lives and dollars.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in comment on the statement made by the Minister. I am pleased to see he made it to the House. I see the ad here in the *Leader-Post* that the Hon. Roy Romanow will go on the television tonight. I saw on the same ad a picture of Brigitte Bardot covering something up. I don't know how much is

covered up here but maybe we can find out.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's unfortunate that this is another NDP promise made and another NDP promise broken. Their New Deal for People said they would reduce by as much as 25 per cent the rates on auto insurance. They did say they would add one cent a gallon on and they haven't done this either.

When we left the Government there was \$10 million surplus in the SGIO. Obviously through mismanagement that money has disappeared and they are in trouble. This is the second year in a row that they have raised the rates. We're not sure that we've got all the rate increases yet. I'd like to ask how much more revenue this will bring in.

He started off his little speech and he said that there will be no increase in the 1955 cars. I got a note from John Gardner and he said, "Would you please thank the Minister that he did not raise the rates on the 1929 Model As." I'm sure that will be a great relief to all of those people. And all the people driving the 1955 cars and older aren't going to have the rates raised. All the people driving 1962 cars and older also won't be affected. But, for the people driving the rest of the cars, which is 99 per cent of them, the Government got a \$25 million windfall from the Federal Government last night, \$25 million, thanks to Otto Lang and Pierre Trudeau — and you socked it to the public today with this increase in automobile rates.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I think it's a shame, it's a disgrace, it's an example of the way they run their Crown corporations, it's an example of the way they run their business.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I'm only responsible for one.

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, just like that, the way you're running it. We wrote it all off and I'm just waiting to see how bad a mess you got that into this year, but we'll deal with that later.

I'm wondering if the Minister would tell the House today, the full truth, not like last year where it took us about a week or ten days to find out the full truth. How much more money in revenue will this bring into SGIO?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I can't answer that exactly because I don't have the information with me right now. I'm getting the Whip to get the file down to give you. I can tell you it's based on the basis of the accident rate that we are currently in right now. We're basing the rates on this year. If the accident rate maintains itself and the SGIO people advise me that it appears to be levelling but will be maintaining itself at that level, on these new rates, that is to say, some increased, some decreased, some unchanged, on these new rates and at the same frequency rate, there will be a profit, a modest surplus of approximately \$250,000 at the end of the next year. That's the sort of projection for one year.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question.

He hasn't answered the question but I presume he has told the House he will get that information for us. When he is getting the information or maybe he could tell us today, the fact that you inherited a \$10 million surplus, how much have you lost since you became the Government in SGIO? What has been your loss?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — With respect to the \$10 million surplus, Mr. Speaker, it still is there. It's not a surplus, it is in unappropriated reserves. That's the thing you are referring to when you are talking about the \$10 million surplus because Mr. Boldt and the former Government set up a number of categories of contingency funds, catastrophe reserves, premium equalization reserves and the like. We set one up last year as the result of certain amendments to expand the benefits to the AAIA. Those reserves are still in existence. This year, as I have said, we've experienced a bad underwriting loss. The report will show that in detail in the next couple of days or so. It's about \$2 million on AAIA for the year that is running out.

Mr. Steuart: — You have a \$10 million surplus and you are going to sock the people an extra \$2 million this year. That then is the answer.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We can't debate the financial situation of the SGIO. That can be done in Crown corporations.

QUESTIONS

Three Per Cent Provincial Income Tax Increase

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could direct a question to our provincial Minister of Finance. In view of Finance Minister Turner's very welcome and very expansionist Budget of last night . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — . . . in particular with reference to his announced proposal to increase the equalization payment to our province of in the neighborhood of \$26 million, and due to the fact that that is intended, as I understand it, to go toward alleviating local education costs, I wonder if our Minister of Finance here in Saskatchewan (Mr. Cowley) is prepared to forego his proposal of increasing provincial tax rates by three per cent to do, in effect, the same thing? And this does it so much better, there is \$26 million as opposed to \$7 million. Would the Minister tell the House if he is prepared to forego that increase and let our people enjoy the full increases announced by Mr. Turner last night?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is 'no'. I'd like to remind the Members opposite that part of the reason for that change was the quiet attendance at a federal-provincial

meeting some three months ago. I'd also like to remind the Members opposite and I'm sure Mr. Turner has it in the back of his mind, that he still has to get that Budget passed.

Mr. McIsaac: — Just one supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker. In light of the Minister's refusal in this instance, I wonder if he would be prepared then to assure us that he'd give that money to our school grants vote to enable the school boards to effectively reduce mill rates from 43 mills to an actual 25 mills instead of a fictional one?

Mr. Speaker: — On questions the rules are that the Members could ask the Ministers questions when we have oral questions on what is a fait accompli but they can't ask for a future policy and I think we are getting into future policies.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Return No. 107

Mr. Lane (Lumsden) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 107 showing:

(a) Whether the Saskatchewan Securities Commission made any investigations in the year 1972. (b) If so, the number. (c) If so, the names of persons making the statement under oath to the Commission. (d) If so, the names of the persons investigated. (e) If so, the action taken by the Securities Commission. (f) If action taken, the reasons for the action taken. (g) If no action taken, the reasons for no action being taken.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Return No. 107, again, a problem has arisen with respect to the way the question is worded. We are concerned in our department about the matter of revealing the names of persons who made statements under oath to the Commission in item (c); and in item (d) the names of the persons investigated. It has been communicated to me by my officers that this would be a very dangerous precedent for us to set. In effect, we might very well jeopardize some investigations to some extent if we start listing the names of all the people who are investigated. One could imagine what ramifications this might have with respect to investigative activities of the Securities Commission, and the Attorney General's department that helps out from time to time. So what I should like to do is delete (c) and (e) and make just one or two very brief other amendments which again, I don't believe will ruin the intention of the motion and still will allow the Hon. Member to have the information that he seeks. If you could give that to Mr. Lane, please.

I would therefore move, seconded by the Hon. Premier (Mr. Blakeney) that the motion that an Order of the Assembly for Return No. 107 be amended as follows:

- (i) clauses (c) and (d) be deleted;
- (ii) clause (e) be renumbered to read clause (c) and the words "and the name of the corporation or person against whom action was taken" be added;
- (iii) clause (f) be renumbered to read clause (d);

(iv) clause (g) be renumbered to read clause (e).

Mr. Lane: — Speaking to the amendment, it's my concern, and I realize the implications, that the accused may perhaps be better prepared to face his accuser assuming he knows the situation that exists, when a report or statement is made under oath, is made through the relative provisions of The Securities Commission Act, I am somewhat concerned that although there may be some wondering what the situation or the position of the Government is as to making that information known to the accused who has such an oath made against him. Again, I realize, and I don't want to see the Government or the Securities Commission in the position where it can't take statements or people will be afraid to make statements under oath, but I am concerned about the idea that the accused should know who his accuser is, and we express some concern on that proposed clause (i) of that amendment.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 108

Mr. Wiebe (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 108 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Maple Bush No. 224, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, again, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) who has direct interest in the Land Bank is not with us today. I should like him to be present to make such remarks as he would like to with respect to this motion. Accordingly, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make one comment here and I don't wish to get into an argument with the Attorney General. I think we all recognize . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! What motion are you speaking to?

Mr. Guy: — On the one that was just called.

Mr. Speaker: — That one is adjourned, you know. The Attorney General asked leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. MacDonald: — We said ‘no’.

Mr. Speaker: — The majority of the House said ‘yes’, so the debate is adjourned. It doesn’t have to be unanimous, it’s a majority vote on an adjournment motion.

Mr. McIsaac: — On whether or not we shall adjourn?

Mr. Speaker: — There are other motions of the same type which can be discussed at the right time before the motion for adjournment is adopted.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 109

Mr. Wiebe (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 109 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Huron No. 223, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, as I said in the earlier one, I don’t wish to get into an argument with the Attorney General because as he says there are 45 over there and 15 over here and they can vote everyone of these down, we can call for a standing vote and it would take the whole afternoon. But I think we recognize that these have been on the Order Paper for some 19 days now, just about almost a month, not quite. There has been plenty of time for Members opposite to have their amendments made. We had another example this afternoon, I think, which has been very common during the proceedings of these questions and Orders for Return. Question 208, 209 and 210 were asked for last Thursday. On Thursday the Attorney General stood them, on Friday he stood them, on Monday he stood them, and now today he asks to have them made as motions for return. Now surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason for that and that is to delay providing the answers to this Legislature. If he knew today that that was a question that should have been made a motion for return, surely he could have made it last Thursday when it was on the Order Paper. And we’ve been going through this procedure of standing questions and then having them made into orders for return. As I say I don’t think we want to get into arguments across the floor in the type of handling of the questions in this Legislature. They have never been handled in this way in the past. Why should we handle them this way this year, this is the first time that we have gone into that approach.

As far as these Returns, they have had plenty of time. Because one Minister is away, surely to goodness somebody else in the Government can make the necessary amendment so that we can vote on them and get them out of the way and get the answers back before the Estimates and the whole thing will speed up and improve and accommodate the work of this Legislature.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, just a comment on what has been said.

Mr. Speaker: — If the Hon. Member speaks now he closed the debate.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, just a word on the remarks of the Member for Athabasca.

I should like to point out to the Member that this year the Opposition has, according to my records (I haven't done a detailed check) has passed well over 200 questions in the 19 days or so of this Session. A lot of those questions have been answered. A lot of those questions involve a tremendous amount of man power in terms of preparing for the answers. It is the policy of this Government to answer the questions that can be reasonably answered according to the rules as quickly as possible.

According to my record, there are 144 notices of Motions before this House. That adds and compounds to the work that the Government has to cope with in order to make sure that these questions are properly answered.

I am sure the Member will realize, he having had experience as a Minister of the Crown, that these matters do have to involve some consultation with colleagues. We have to receive their views as to whether or not the question can be answered in proper form or not or if there is some amendment that is necessary in order to get the full answer. As far as I am concerned questions have been handled as expeditiously as possible in this House and certainly as expeditiously as they have ever been handled in the five years that I have been in this House. That is not to take any credit for myself. It just happens to be, I think, the nature of the system that works both ways.

All that I can say to you is that these are very important questions. These are questions that the Minister of Agriculture obviously wants to be heard on. There is nothing that I can do to substitute for him in this request and, therefore, because he is not here and because he wants to be heard. I have no other choice again, Mr. Speaker, but to beg leave to adjourn debate.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like the Members to read the standing orders of 29 to sub (2) which says, all Motions including adjournment Motions and Motions until we have second reading in the Committee stage of the Bill, all these Motions shall be decided without debate or amendments. So once an adjournment motion is made I have to put the Motion and it is decided by the majority of the House.

Now the Attorney General has asked to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 110

Mr. Wiebe moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 110 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Enfield No. 194, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to The Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a word. I should like to point out that as of yet we have not asked the Government of Saskatchewan to do any work in regard to any question on the Order Paper.

First of all until they are passed by this House, no department in the Government of Saskatchewan is required to do anything. So there has been absolutely no work required in the 19 days that this Session has been in operation or since these questions have been put on the Order Paper. All that has been required is the Minister of Agriculture to say yea or nay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has assured us that information on the Land Bank would be made available in this Assembly. To date there isn't a farmer in Saskatchewan who even knows what a lease form looks like. There isn't a farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan who knows what price for agricultural land is being paid by the Government of Saskatchewan and the Land Bank, or what impact this price or sale, made by the Land Bank, has upon other agricultural sales in the Province of Saskatchewan. Just what exactly is the Department of Agriculture, the Land Bank and the Government of Saskatchewan attempting to hide in relation to the Land Bank Commission?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would remind the Hon. Member that on these motions we must keep the debate to what the Motion is on the Order Paper. We can't get into a wide discussion on the principle involved. We must stay to the motion before us.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I have been on the Motion if you would care to read it, Sir.

I am talking about the number of contracts, the amount of the acreage, the value of each quarter section, the price offered for each. I have been talking about nothing, Sir, but the Motion itself. I should like permission to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that this information, requested in these Orders for Return, be made known to the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly the farmers. The NDP and the

Land Bank Commission have refused to provide any information. There are farmers waiting to apply for leases, there are farmers who have had offers for sale. This is almost like the Gestapo. It is so secret and there is absolutely no information made available. We feel that after 19 days, no information nor any work has been provided by the Department of Agriculture. The farmers of Saskatchewan have the right to have this information and have it immediately.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what more I can do other than to repeat the arguments that I did in the earlier debate.

The Provincial Secretary advised us — and these are very rough figures — that something like 223 questions have been asked and this House has already received the answers to some 117. We have tabled something like 26 Orders, 144 Motions for Return not counting the ones we have just passed, still remain on Order. And for the life of me I just don't know what the Opposition is complaining about.

I frankly feel that on Private Members' day the Liberal Opposition feels that it has some sort of duty to raise some form of a ruckus with respect to these Notices of Motions, so that hopefully the Press will pick it up. But I can say that with any degree of honest analysis by the journalists, or by this House, or by the people of Saskatchewan, one would have to dismiss the arguments advanced by the Member for Milestone with respect to this matter. As far as his remarks about the Gestapo and the like as it relates to the Land Bank Commission I will say nothing more than to say that they characterize again, the well-known position of the Liberal Party with respect to Land Bank Commission and farming policies of this Government, policies to help the family farmer and they want to scuttle it.

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

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 111

Mr. Wiebe moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 111 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Moose Jaw No. 161, as of January 25, 1973; (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Mr. Wiebe: — In this Return, Mr. Speaker, we are asking for basic information relating to the Rural Municipality of Moose Jaw. This is information that we feel is very vital. It is

information that we have been requesting for the past 19 to 21 days. The Minister of Agriculture stated that he would be getting this information and that he had no bones about making it available to us.

The Minister of Agriculture also realized yesterday that this was the business that we would be conducting today. Now if he was that concerned about answering our questions for us, why wasn't he here, or why didn't he make arrangements that some explanation could be given as to why he doesn't want to answer these questions.

I might mention as well, Mr. Speaker, that here, again, if an amendment is required and if it is a wording amendment, why doesn't he show the same courtesy to the Members of this side of the House as some other Ministers have?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Let's just debate the Motion. We have to stay right to the Motion, please.

Mr. Wiebe: — Well, I am speaking to this, Mr. Speaker, because . . . All right, I will try not to stray away from it.

But here again getting back to Motion No. 111, if the Government feels that a change of wording is necessary why didn't they notify us. We could have withdrawn the question and the question could have been resubmitted and it could have been answered in time.

This information, we feel, is very vital to us. How do we know what is happening in the Land Bank, for example, if we don't ask the question. The Minister tells us that leases are being made available to farmers throughout the province, yet we haven't even seen a copy of the lease agreement that the young farmer is required to sign before he is able to acquire this land.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Attorney General to allow these questions to be asked and allow us to get the information that we require and not hide it from us.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Motion No. 111, speaking to the remarks of the Member for Morse, I am advised that the question of pointing out to the Opposition what is wrong, if anything, with respect to the wording of any particular Motion so that, if necessary, it would be withdrawn, just can't be done.

The fact of the matter is that the only way that you can't go ahead with this Motion, is not to move it. There might be another procedure I suppose, but not that I know of in any event, Mr. Speaker. So basically it involved the Member for Morse not moving it.

May I say that the Minister of Agriculture has publicly (I am not saying in this Legislature) but certainly to my knowledge has publicly stated that there is some good public reason why, for example, part (f) of the question in No. 111 should not be answered or perhaps should be modified from the present form that it is being asked. I don't want to get involved in any arguments for or against that, but I do know that the

Minister has expressed some reservations about that. I think that the Hon. Member from Morse knows that the Minister of Agriculture has expressed these reservations.

Why shouldn't the Minister of Agriculture been given an opportunity to express those reservations he has, if I am right, with respect to part (f) himself personally? I don't think it is unreasonable to expect this House to wait one day or until the next time around, so that the Minister can offer his views. And the Hon. Member for Morse knowing those views, can either debate them or accept them. Now that is all that we are asking. We are asking for the adjournment, nothing more, nothing less. I say, again, to the Member for Morse that is not an unreasonable request and because the Minister of Agriculture is not here, I would again beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 112

Mr. Wiebe moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 112 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Caron No. 162, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section; (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Mr. Wiebe: — I realize that it is not unreasonable to ask for the Minister's attendance. I hope the Attorney General can assure this House that when these questions next come up next Friday, that the Minister of Agriculture will be in attendance and that he won't use this method of pushing the answering of these questions off until the House is adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: — At this time I should like to point out for the benefit of the Members, these will come up again quicker if the Hon. Member would just ask them to stand, because then they won't come to adjourned debates. They would keep their sequence on the Order Paper.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just to review some of the points made in this and other debates on a similar line, if I may. Some of them will be cross-referenced but I want to point out that these were questions; in the first instance some long time ago. As an indication of the concern of the Member for Morse and other Members here, Mr. Speaker, we asked, I believe, on questions before the Orders of the Day, almost at the outset of the opening of this Session as to how, and by what means, we could use to gain some information on the operations and the proceedings and so on on the Land Bank.

So again, I suggest to the Attorney General that there has been ample time. We learned, in a debate that he just spoke on a minute or two ago on the previous Motion, we learned of one possible area of concern to the Minister and the Government Opposite; (f) the price offered for each quarter section.

This is a very key aspect of the entire operation, Mr. Speaker. I surely hope that when the Minister presents himself to the House at a time when we can debate these that he will be prepared to justify any possible suggested changes. May I say, too, that the Attorney General mentioned again in the previous debate, that he had to go back and look at the amendments and go back to his fellow caucus Members. Surely this is not a reason in the first instance whether he does decide to go back, they don't have to go back and by the same token this House will decide whether this information is coming, not his caucus, Mr. Speaker.

So I ask him to keep that in mind as they review any possible amendments to these and other similar Motions. But surely it is not unreasonable to expect that we should get this information without any further delays or hold-ups. Any Member of the Cabinet benches can propose these amendments and there is no reason why they shouldn't be able to do so.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to make a suggestion to the Government that I put forward in good faith.

There is certainly need, I think, for bringing the Land Bank Commission to the Assembly at a very early time. We are now in the stage of being able to bring Estimates before the House and, I think, that I should like to suggest at this time that the Government would be wise in bringing the Land Bank Commission to the Assembly for discussion at a very early time. The reason I suggest that is because I have studied the regulations that have been put forward by the Government and in my humble opinion I think that the regulations are easily interpreted in practically any fashion that it is extremely difficult to know precisely what the policy of the Government is according to the regulations that have thus far been published.

I think that if the Land Bank Commission was brought to the Assembly, where the Minister could give information to the Members, where the Opposition has the opportunity to bring up what we consider legitimate points that are of concern to farmers, as farmers are now entering into contracts for the leasing of land and for the sale of lands. Some has been sold and some has been leased already. They are very important matters involving, even as far as the individual farmer is concerned, thousands of dollars.

I would at this time suggest that the Government do everything in its power to bring to the Assembly the Land Bank Commission so that it can be discussed and so that the Minister can clear up a number of matters that I think are not very clear at this stage. Certainly in studying the regulations I think that the regulations leave so much leeway in many instances that it is really impossible until the Minister makes a policy statement or until the Government does, to know precisely what the Government's intention is regarding both buying and leasing land.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just so we don't prolong the debate, apparently the Government is going to request to stand the Motions. We will go along with that proposition, but I should like to point out, Sir, the reason that these are important. Had your ruling not come into effect today, we would now be debating the Land Bank Bill in this Assembly later on this afternoon. That is the reason, precisely, that this information is so important to the Members of this Assembly. We may now well be debating it on Friday afternoon. We want this information before this debate and before we proceed with our own Bill.

I point this out to indicate why we consider this matter so vital. I certainly agree with my colleague, the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), we will co-operate and stand some of these if my colleague from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) will agree, but we would ask that they go back and expedite these questions and all information regarding the Land Bank at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to this Motion. We have put a number of questions on the Order Paper regarding the Land Bank. I don't believe there are any greater questions in rural Saskatchewan today than what type of transaction is the Land Bank making. The people of this province want to know and we as their representatives want to know.

We have asked the Minister how we could get this information and he told us to put questions on the Order Paper. And this is what we have done and we should like to put more if we felt that they were going to be answered. Up til now the only source of our information has been what we get locally. I would be the first to admit that this may not be a completely reliable source. I have many letters on my desk and receive them every day of transactions that are taking place. People tell me how much the Government has paid for the land; what they have done; who they are leasing it to. All kinds of detail. I am reluctant to make these public because I am not sure if they are correct or not. But it is material that should be available to the Members of this Legislature. I should like to get the correct material so that we could use that. I don't want to have to refer to information that is sent to me in the mail or information that I get around the province from farmers who are involved in these transactions. I would hope that the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) would urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) to supply us with this information. It should be available to the Members of the House, we would then have the correct information, we wouldn't have to rely on the information that we are able to obtain throughout the province from the people involved.

Hon. Mr. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — It seems to me that there is a lot of ragging the puck going on here for no particular reason except mischief. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that people who want to carry on a transaction with the Land Bank ought to be able to do it in private. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is nobody's business how that should be conducted. That's between the buyer, the seller, etc. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, there are 364 satisfied customers at the last report. I would think the only thing that the gentlemen opposite want to do is to try somehow to sabotage this plan.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think we are straying too far away from what the motions themselves, we are getting into the principle of the whole Bill of the Land Bank. And we must stay to the motions and not have a wide-open debate. We must stay to the motions.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two about the comments made by the Members opposite. I can assure the House we will endeavor to provide all the correct information or as correct as we think it can be from the Government, once the Return is ordered, subject to any human error, but honest human error. I can assure you that we will try to expedite every order that is made, so that the answer is in your hands and I can assure you that with respect to any order this Government has nothing to hide. It is especially has nothing to hide with respect to its conduct. That is what we are here for, to answer to the House. The minister of Agriculture is a very busy person and I can give no commitment, of course, that on any given day he will be here, any more than I can give a commitment that any other one of my colleagues will be here. The Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) said that I wanted to take these motions back to caucus. I want to tell the House that when I said colleagues, I meant by that cabinet colleagues. I think that is a fair enough operation because after all these are motions that do affect the Government.

And if item (f) is so important as has been suggested then obviously the Members opposite will want the Minister of Agriculture to state the reasons if there are reasons on item (f). The Land Bank will be discussed in detail I tell the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) at a number of opportunities in this Session, not the least of which will be Estimates, which I hope if everything works out well we can start on very shortly. There will be very ample opportunity for the Opposition to ask detailed questions and if they have some background information from these orders and otherwise I am sure they will be satisfied. But as I say again, the Minister of Agriculture is not here, I have no other alternative but to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 113

Mr. Wiebe (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 113 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Wheatlands No. 163, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved; (ii) the number of purchases that have actually been completed; (c) under (b) (i) and (ii) above, the (a) land number of each quarter section; (b) acreage cultivated in each quarter section (c) acreage of native grass in each quarter section; (d) acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section; (e) assessed value of each quarter section and (f) price offered for each quarter section.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) feels that he is qualified enough to answer and speak on behalf of the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We must stay to the Motion.

Mr. Wiebe: — I am staying to the Motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I cut the Minister of Highways off on the last Motion and I would ask Members not to refer back to the last Motion. We must stay to the Motion before us.

Mr. Wiebe: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if we can't discuss what another Member said I guess I better stay out of it. I might say that the information which we are attempting to derive from these questions is Government business, Mr. Speaker. They are not individuals, certainly we must honor the individual's right as far as purchase goes but as an Opposition it is also our right to find out just exactly how much money this Government is spending. It is our responsibility as well to find out how much this Government is putting the taxpayers of this province into hock by borrowing money to go out and purchase this land. And if they are not willing to give us these answers, it means that they have something to hide. The Attorney General stated that he couldn't guarantee whether the Minister of Agriculture could be here or not. I might mention that his responsibility, as well as to the people of this province, is to this Legislature. If he knows that business like this is coming up, it is his responsibility to be here as well. Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the questions that we do stand come up on next Friday that the Minister of Agriculture will be here and that he will give us this information.

Mr. MacLeod (Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, this presents the Opposition with a good deal of difficulty because the Government has refused to answer this particular question. We certainly don't want to embarrass any civil servant or member of the Land Bank Commission by attempting to obtain information from them behind the back of the Government and certainly that is not the kind of thing that any Member of this Opposition would do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — But it does seem to me that the Return is a fairly simple one, Mr. Speaker, and shouldn't require a great deal of difficulty. Surely the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission as of a certain date, about a month ago, is not an unreasonable request. Secondly, the number of contracts or agreements to purchase that have been approved. Now surely there is nothing secretive about that. Surely the Government isn't going to hide the number of contracts or agreements — not that are fully signed at this point — but that have been approved. Then, subsequently we want to know those that have actually been completed. Again, we are not asking for anything that should in any way be more than statistical and

which I would expect them to have a running total of. Now, we do want to know the land number of each quarter section, the acreage cultivated in each quarter section and the acreage of native grass. This Government is very concerned for the transfer of cultivated acreage to grass acreage and surely to goodness and being so, and so involved in the accumulation of statistics, I am sure this one is not past their notice. They should have no difficulty at all in presenting that to us. The acreage of seeded pasture in each quarter section — Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness they are not going to go around buying land without knowing how many acres of pasture there is and how much is under cultivation. I wouldn't be a bit surprised but what they might do that for some special friends of the Government, but generally speaking I think they would know the amount of seeded acreage and the pasture in every quarter section. Surely to goodness it is not beyond the realm of expectation that they would know the amount of the assessment of each quarter section and the price offered.

Mr. Speaker, the only explanation that I can accept is the one presented to this House by the Hon. Minister of Highways and that is that the Government doesn't intend to give us that information. If that is the stated policy of the Government, I wish they would simply say to Return No. 113, "We don't intend to give you the information; we intend to keep it secret. We will not fool around anymore." We will then seek our remedy some other way. If the Government is not intending to answer these questions then I suggest that they be honest enough, forthright enough, to tell us that they do not intend to present us with the answers. Now that isn't expecting a large amount of courage. Therefore, I assume that they will be able to present that kind of an answer if in fact it is the policy of the Government. If it is not the stated policy of the Government I trust that either the Hon. Minister of Highways will get up and retract what he says or that it will be contradicted by the Hon. Attorney General.

We recognize that the policy of secrecy may well be imposed upon this kind of thing. We got no satisfactory answer the first day of the Session when this question was raised with the Hon. Minister. He has at no time as far as I know communicated with any Member of the Opposition how we may get further and better information relating to the conduct of the Land Bank Commission. As I say, we certainly don't want to undermine the Land Bank Commission. We will do nothing at all to damage it because I can assure the Hon. Members that when the Liberals return to power in '75, we will probably continue it but in a greatly improved form. Certainly not in the kind of form that is presently the case. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why we shouldn't get this order immediately.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, much of what the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) said I think we could all accept except that last statement about it wasn't the intention of the Liberal Party to undermine the Land Bank. At that stage in the game I almost fell off my chair because I thought immediately, when one sees that statement from the Liberals opposite, every other statement made by them must be automatically suspect. That is obviously the case as far as the Member for Albert Park goes. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, and the Liberals themselves admit it that that is their avowed intention to undermine the Land Bank. The Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is agreeing

with me, saying absolutely he is opposed to it, the Member for Albert Park is for it. But that is neither here nor there. The point that I say again to the Members of this House, all information that is in the public interest and is reasonable in the public interest will be available to the Members of the House. The Minister of Agriculture will be here to state the arguments with respect to this Motion, if there are any when he is here the next day. I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate on this Motion.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 119

Mr. Wiebe (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 119 showing:

(a) The number of fatal accidents that occurred in Saskatchewan during 1972 on Saskatchewan highways. (b) The location and date of each fatal accident. (d) The loss of life in each accident. (e) Whether this is an increase or decrease over the last three years.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on 119 I have a brief amendment to propose to the House, which again does not thwart the intention of the Motion. What it will do is it will strike out the word 'Saskatchewan' in the second line on Saskatchewan highways. Thus it will make it more legal if I can describe it to say on public highways. We will be able to give the statistics then and on the basis of that explanation, I move, seconded by the Hon. Premier, that the motion that an order of the Assembly for Return No. 119 be amended:

by striking out the work Saskatchewan in the second line of clause (a) and substituting the word 'public'.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken I should just like to say that I am in agreement with this amendment. My comment is this — that the criticism that I have had, the reason why this particular question was put on the Order of Return debatable was because the question was worded incorrectly, or that the right information could not be received. And again I say that had the Ministers had the courtesy to point this out to me while it was still a question, I could have withdrawn the question and submitted this one. This would have speeded up the answers which we would have received. And I have indicated that some of the Ministers have shown this courtesy to Members on this side of the House. I hope that in the future to avoid unnecessary time required in the debating of these Motions and this type of thing that the Ministers opposite would follow that line of amending these questions other than bringing them up into an Order for Return debatable.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 120

Mr. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 120 showing:

The total number of employees in the public service that were categorized other than permanent employees on: (a) July 1, 1971; (b) January 1, 1972; (c) July 1, 1972; (d) January 1, 1973.

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, we would be very happy to provide an answer. The difficulty lies in the wording of the question and I should like to propose an amendment which I think will clarify it and be acceptable to the Hon. Member opposite. As he may be aware for example, when he says other than permanent employees, this could also be take to include casuals who, occasionally, if a girl is brought in because of another's sickness for two days, is paid sometimes by voucher and, therefore, it is rather difficult to find the answers immediately for him. I will, therefore, move, seconded by the Hon. G. Snyder, that Motion for Return No. 120 be amended by:

deleting all the words following the word employee in the first line and substituting therefore the following:

temporary and supernumerary, in the Public Service on (a) July 1, 1971; (b) January 1, 1972; (c) July 1, 1972; (d) January 1, 1973.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, just a comment, I am not sure whether this provides the information that I was after or not. I might add that the question that is being amended was originally placed on the paper in an identical manner to one that was answered a year ago.

My question was to get all employees, other than permanent. Now we have got temporary and supernumerary listed here in the amendment. But what about casual? Does temporary and supernumerary include casual? I am not sure, I am not that well versed in the different categories of the Public Service Commission. The intent of the resolution was to include every type of employee other than permanent which includes casual, temporary, supernumerary and so on. If the Minister can assure me that casual is included in these, I would be prepared to accept the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have just had a nodding conversation here with the Minister who is in difficulty by reason of the fact that he has already spoken. I think that the frank answer to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is that the words do not include 'casual'. I think that's my understanding and it was because of some difficulties in ascertaining just what number of casuals there were at any given date that this change was suggested. I'm relaying that information on behalf of the

Minister.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, seeing my colleague has already participated in the debate, I should just like to point out we are most interested in ‘casuals’. The number of people that are hired by the Highways Department; the Department of DNR, and there is no difficulty in the Public Service because everybody that is hired is hired through the Public Service and the numbers should be there. We also know that, for example, temporary employees are being reduced. The number of supernumerary programs is being reduced and it’s not going to give an accurate picture of the question that we are asking and this question has been answered in its exact form in the past and we would request that perhaps the Minister would withdraw his amendment so we could be provided with the information we are requesting.

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we could adjourn debate on that particular Motion.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 121

Mr. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 121 showing:

Under the Public Service Commission, the number of permanent positions that were removed from the classified to the unclassified category for the calendar years 1970; 1971 and 1972.

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — There is a slight difficulty just in the wording and I think this will provide the Member with the information he wants.

The figures are not kept on the basis of a calendar year, but on the basis of the fiscal year and, therefore, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Labor (Mr. Snyder) that Motion for Return No. 121 be amended by deleting all the words following the word ‘unclassified’ in the second line (as it appears in Votes and Proceedings) and substituting therefore the following:

unclassified division for the fiscal years 1970-71; 1971-72.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I will be satisfied to accept this amendment. I might point out that of course the fiscal year 1971-72 ended almost a year ago now. I shall be submitting a further question which I hope could be answered in the question for that period from April 1

, 1972 until February 1st.

, 1973. Otherwise we’ll accept this as amended.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 123

Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 123 showing:

- (a) The total cost of the advertisement by the Occupational Health and Safety Division, Saskatchewan Department of Labor of "Health and Safety Requires Action"; (b) The newspapers and the television stations where this advertisement was placed; (c) The advertising agency that prepared and placed the ad; (d) The purpose of the advertisement.

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labor): — Mr. Speaker, Order for Return No. 123 asks the total cost of advertising of "Health and Safety Requires Action", and it presents a very minor problem in that all of the bills have not yet been received by the Occupational Health Branch of the Department and accordingly in order that the question may be answered, I would move, seconded by Mr. Bowerman (Shellbrook) that Return No. 123 be amended by inserting the word "projected" after the word "the" in the first line. It will give an indication of total projected costs and this is the intent of the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Just a question for clarification — you've got "projected." Projected when? Projected for the next five years, ten years, what?

Hon. Mr. Snyder: — Well the projected cost, the projected total cost. The series of advertising is completed and the Department is awaiting final accounts for payment of all the bills that have been incurred.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 1

Mr. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue a Return No. 1 showing:

To January 25, 1973, for the Intersessional Legislative Committee on Welfare: (a) the total cost of the committee to date; (b) the members of the committee and the remuneration and expenses each member has received to date; (c) the number of meetings held by the committee; (d) the location, dates and number of the public present at all public hearings or meetings held by this committee; (e) the destination, intermediate stops and the costs of all out-of-province trips; (f) the names, qualifications, remuneration, expenses and allowances of all secretarial, research, technical and other personnel attached to the committee; (g) any and all

additional costs paid or estimated for advertising, printing and all other expenses related to this committee.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I've consulted with the Clerk on this and I gather that there is a problem with respect to paragraph (d). "The location, dates and the number of the public present at all public hearings or meetings held by this committee." I'm advised that no records were kept of the number of the public present and there was no information on which that could even be reasonably estimated. So I am moving that Motion for Return No. 1 be amended by deleting clause (d) thereof, where it appears in lines 5 and 6 of the Motion (as it appears in Votes and Proceedings) and that the following be substituted therefore:

(d) the location and dates of all public meetings or public hearings held by this committee.

This amendment simply deletes any reference to the number of people present. Otherwise all of the information requested is provided for.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to accept the Premier's amendment. However, I must add that I find it rather strange that committees would travel the length and breadth of the province holding public hearings and that a record would not be kept of the number of people who were present to attend these meetings. Surely the value of the meetings should be determined by the number of the public who take advantage, or take the opportunity to present briefs and to attend at the hearings and to think that the Chairman of these committees would not see that recorded numbers are kept of those attending is rather difficult and rather hard to believe that this would be the case. It's certainly not in the public interest. I should think, to have these committees and not keep track of the number of public that attends.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — May I just remind Hon. Members that the Chairman of all of these committees may have kept very . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I close the debate and he moves an amendment and there's no closing debate on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — No, well I thought we voted on the amendment and we are . . .

Mr. Speaker: — We voted on the amendment but we are on the Motion as amended, but you have already spoken on the Motion as amended when you move your amendment. You spoke on the Motion and moved an amendment.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — All right, I'll accept that.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 2

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue a Return No. 2 showing:

To January 25, 1973, for the Intersessional Legislature Committee on Small Business Firms: (a) the total cost of the committee to date; (b) the members of the committee and the remuneration and expenses each member has received to date; (c) the number of meetings held by the committee; (d) the location, dates and number of the public present at all public hearings or meetings held by this committee; (e) the destination, intermediate stops and the costs of all out-of-province trips; (f) the names, qualifications, remuneration, expenses and allowances of all secretarial, research, technical and other personnel attached to the committee; (g) any and all additional costs paid or estimated for advertising, printing and all other expenses related to this committee.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I move, if I may, the same amendment with respect to Motion No. 2. May I add that it may well be the Chairman kept very accurate minutes, or even detailed records. That is not information which is in the hands of the Government or of the Clerk. If a Member of the House wants to keep any records he likes, that is neither the information of the Clerk or of the Government. I frankly don't know whether records were kept. The amendment I move is as with reference to Motion No. 1.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 5

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

To January 25, 1973, for the Intersessional Legislative Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations: (a) the total cost of the committee to date; (b) the members of the committee and the remuneration and expenses each member has received to date; (c) the number of meetings held by the committee; (d) the location, dates and number of the public present at all public hearings or meetings held by this committee; (e) the destination, intermediate stops and the costs of all out-of-province trips; (f) the names, qualifications, remuneration, expenses and allowances of all secretarial, research, technical and other personnel attached to the committee; (g) any and all additional costs paid or estimated for advertising, printing and all other expenses related to this committee.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) the same amendment to clause (d) as I previously moved. May I call to the attention of the House a typographical error in the amendments which I have passed in.

They say February 2nd, when they should say February 20th. There's a 2 where there should be a 20.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 8

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

1. Since July 1, 1971, whether any studies were commissioned by the Government of Saskatchewan to any of its departments or to any outside agencies, regarding the nationalization of the oil industry or the creation of any integrated oil company run as a Crown Corporation;
2. If so, the names of the persons who did the studies, and whether reports have been submitted to the Government;
3. Copies of any such reports.

Hon. Mr. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — I should like to move an amendment that Motion for Return No. 8 be amended by deleting the words: "any of its department or to any outside agencies", which words appear in the second and third lines of Section (1), (as it appears in Votes and Proceedings) and substituting therefore the words "agencies outside the Government of Saskatchewan." Then paragraph (1) will read:

1. Since July 1, 1971, whether any studies were commissioned by the Government of Saskatchewan to agencies outside the Government of Saskatchewan regarding the nationalization of the oil industry or the creation of any integrated oil company run as a Crown Corporation;

Mr. Speaker, I just say in support of the amendment that it is really impossible to answer in the way the Motion was originally worded because of the difficulty of defining what is a 'report' really within the Government, in a Department or between Departments or within the Cabinet. That could be anything from a single page memorandum to a very elaborate memorandum or study that is committed to writing.

Secondly, I say, Mr. Speaker, that while it is not only virtually impossible to answer the question in the original form, it is improper for a Government to make public statements about studies it is carrying on in the same sense that it is improper for Cabinet Minister to make public statements about discussions they are having within Cabinet or studies they are pursuing as Members of Her Majesty's Executive Council.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Would the Minister reread that amendment before he takes his seat please.

Hon. Mr. Thorson: — If you will go just to the second line and read up to

"Government of Saskatchewan to" and strike out all of the words "any of its departments or to any outside agencies" and in that place insert the words "agencies outside the Government of Saskatchewan."

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Minister's change and correct me if I am wrong, or someone over there can perhaps. The effect of his amendment is to narrow the scope of the question as it was originally placed in the Order Paper asking whether or not any studies were commissioned by the Government to or of any of these departments as well as any outside agencies. As I understand the amendment the Motion will now read:

Since July 1, 1971, have there been any studies commissioned by the Government of Saskatchewan to agencies outside the Government of Saskatchewan?

No reference made to any study that may have been undertaken at the direction of Cabinet by a government department. Is this correct? In other words, Mr. Speaker, this amendment certainly will restrict and take away considerably from the original request as it was placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, if I might add a few words I think what my colleague from Wilkie has said is certainly true, that this amendment does eliminate the thrust of this question. Now, obviously, at least I would suspect that obviously there were no outside consultants brought in to do any studies on the nationalization or moving into the oil industry. However, I am sure that before the Government proceeded with their proposal to go into the exploration business that considerable study was done from within the Department by reports of one kind or another. I think that the public of the Province of Saskatchewan are entitled to have the benefit of those reports in order to see whether the judgment and the decision for the Government to go into the exploration of gas was a sound one, or whether it wasn't. The only way that the people of this province can be assured that the Government has made a wise decision in this regard is by knowing on what basis this decision was made. We, in the Opposition, and the general public have not the research, have not the material, have no source of making the necessary judgments that I am certain the Government made before they embarked on what may or may not be a wise scheme. I think that the people of Saskatchewan and this Legislature, and I am sure there are Members opposite, that would like to know on what basis the Cabinet Members made the decision to go into the oil industry. I don't agree with the Hon. Member, although I appreciate his comments, that we are not entitled to these reports which have obviously been made and presented to Cabinet and to the Minister. These should become the property of, and made public, not only to this Legislature, but to the people of Saskatchewan so that the people can judge on what basis they have made their decision to go into the oil industry.

Hon. Mr. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, when I send a memo to my Deputy to ask his opinion on a certain subject, I am commissioning him to provide for me an answer on that certain subject. I would assure you I would be very careful how I worded any such messages to

my Deputy if I felt that I was obliged to produce those messages and what he says in return in the House. I don't think you can expect the inter-departmental or the messages between a Minister and his Department to be brought into the House and I think this is what is being asked here. If it has to do with commissioning a study outside of the Departments well that's different again but when it comes to correspondence between the Government and the departments, I don't think that that can be expected to be made public.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just a word on this. One of the reasons that this question was asked is because very rarely that you pick up the *Leader-Post* or *StarPhoenix* in the last 19 months without having some great task force, some great survey, some great thrust force being created. It is from the reports of these thrust groups and task forces and you name it survey committees that major policy decisions are being made by this Government that affect the lives of every citizen. These are not departmental memos, departmental inquiries from the Minister to an individual that we are asking for. We are asking for the thrust groups and the surveys and the major studies that they have announced publicly and from which major policy decisions have been made which have changed the direction of governmental policy in the Province of Saskatchewan. One of the reasons it is so important that this information be tabled in this House is that you and I, Sir, and the people of Saskatchewan know the extent of the research and how great they like to talk about the lack of research in the Government. Here the Government organizes a little survey or a study or a thrust group and from it they make a major policy decision. How do we know the calibre of the study, the extent of the research, the quality from which major policy decisions are made. I think Sir, that with all due respect that this is a very important and fundamental question that the people of Saskatchewan and particularly the Opposition not only have a right to expect, but it is their responsibility to ask and demand, Sir.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong this debate except to say that I think it has been recognized, I would have thought without question before this, in the parliamentary form of government, that a government was entitled to conduct studies among its own staff, was entitled to seek advice from its staff members, seek opinions from its staff members and to get full and frank opinions in the full knowledge that those studies and those comments could not be called for in the Legislature. It is necessary for a government to have a full and free flow of knowledge from its public servants to its elected officials if the process of government, as we know it, is to continue. I simply know of no instance where internal studies have been required to be tabled pursuant to an order of the Legislature or Parliament. It may well be that a government has on occasion tabled such a study — I am not suggesting that that hasn't happened. I am just saying I know of no instance where an order of the Legislature or Parliament has required it. I think that it is a precedent which would be most damaging to the conduct of public business. The Order as it stands does indeed ask for any studies that were commissioned by the Government to any of its departments and it seems to me that under those circumstances we, as the Government, can only do what other governments have done since time immemorial. Indeed it is not

at all uncommon for governments to commission reports from outside agencies and give them instructions that the report will be kept confidential. A government takes responsibility for its decisions. If we act on bad advice we certainly can be reprimanded by the electorate and undoubtedly will be reprimanded by the electorate. The quality of the advice is a judgment which we have to make. I can recall, as I am sure all Hon. Members know, that the feasibility study for the Athabasca Pulp Mill project was never tabled in this House and that project was perhaps the largest business venture that a government of Saskatchewan ever contemplated undertaking, with a total exposure in the order of \$150 million. Notwithstanding that this feasibility study was done quite outside the Government of Saskatchewan, it was never tabled and in fact the tabling of it was voted down by Members opposite. So I think the idea that it is appropriate to keep feasibility studies or other reports private even when they may be prepared by outside agencies has been established rather firmly in this House, and very important reports at that. What we are talking about here, however, is something quite different and much more modest. That is the proposition, the long established proposition, that a government can look to its public servants for advice, perfectly free and frank advice which shall not be exposed to publication without the consent of the Government and not on the order of the Legislature or Parliament.

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Premier is not being entirely frank with this House when he talks about these feasibility studies being made public. We recognize that the Government is going to commission a number of studies, we recognize that some of these are going to be outside studies and some of these are going to be commissioned from members of the civil service. We fully appreciate the Government is going to have to take responsibility for its own actions as a result of these studies. However, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for the Opposition to judge the conduct of the Government without having some of these studies made available to it. Now what the Premier was talking about throughout his remarks was the question of whether or not the studies would ever be made available. What he should have been talking about is whether or not they will be available at any particular time, particularly if he is going to refer to the feasibility studies of the Athabasca Pulp Mill. That was a commercial enterprise and because of that there was a timing problem. Mr. Speaker, I am responding to the remarks of the Premier and if my remarks are out of order then his remarks are out of order and he ought to have been called for being out of order. He was not, so I assume that I will be permitted to respond.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, a similar type of study was undertaken with respect to the Prince Albert Pulp Mill and that feasibility study was not immediately made available. My information, Mr. Speaker, was that after the completion of all the contracts, at a time when competitors could not have taken advantage of the feasibility studies, those feasibility studies were in fact made available to this House despite the fact that they were made privately for the information of the Government and the Government of the day took the decision on its own initiative, took the responsibility for acting with respect to those feasibility studies, and will of course always be judged by its own actions with respect thereto. Nevertheless, this material was made available in due course and at the proper time to the Opposition so that the Opposition of the day could have

a full and fair opportunity to judge the conduct of the Government. Now, I see no offer in the remarks of the Premier to make this available at some other time. His example just doesn't fit this case.

Another example of what is going on are these studies along the Churchill River Basin. These studies ought properly to be made available to the Opposition the moment they are completed. I understand the delays that the Government uses to defer the information, to hold the information back from the Opposition, it isn't forgotten nor will I forget that the Government sat on the Qu'Appelle Basin Study from October until the end of January for the purpose deliberately of avoiding taking any action in this Legislature. But, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, the argument on principle is quite frankly wrong. If the Premier says that we will defer it and supply it to you at a later time, certainly, being a very reasonable Opposition we would take that into consideration. We have not heard anything in this argument which indicates that the timing is wrong, just simply that they won't give it to us and, Mr. Speaker, we can't accept that.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

Return No. 11

Mr. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 11 showing:

(1) The amount that has been expended in the fiscal years 1970-71; 1971-72; and 1972-73 to January 25, 1973, by the Saskatchewan Liquor Board on: (a) radio advertising; (b) television advertising; (c) print advertising. (2) the advertising agencies used and amounts paid for each for: (a) radio advertising; (b) television advertising; (c) print advertising. (3) the names of the printing companies used and the amounts paid to each printing company.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, again on this one I don't think there will be any thwarting of the intention of the question but I should like to propose an amendment which I think sets it out more clearly and comprehensively. I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs) that the motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 11 be amended by:

That all the words after the word "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(1) The amount of advertising that has been placed in the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73 to January 25, 1973, by the Saskatchewan Liquor Board on:

- (a) radio advertising,
- (b) television advertising, and
- (c) printed media.

(2) The advertising agencies used to place such

advertising.

(3) The persons, companies or firms with which the said advertising was placed and the amount paid to each.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 12

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

(1) The amount that has been expended in the fiscal years 1970-71; 1971-72 to January 25, 1973; by the Human Resources Development Agency on: (a) radio advertising; (b) television advertising; (c) print advertising. (2) The advertising agencies used and the amounts paid to each for (a) radio advertising; (b) television advertising; (c) print advertising. (3) The names of the printing companies used and the amounts paid to each printing company.

Mr. Guy: — If the Minister has a similar amendment which I presume that he has, I wonder if when he moves that amendment he would answer a question. Does this include the printing companies to which this advertising and particularly the printed media of the advertising there? Will we get the names of the printing companies that are involved in this, it is not that clear to me?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the same amendment. Quite frankly I hadn't thought that aspect of the question out. I assumed that printed media is fairly broad but I am just not sure. It just appeared to me that this would be the best wording used. I just can't give any commitment that way to the Member.

I, therefore, move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Wood the same amendment.

That all the words after the word "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(1) The amount of advertising that has been placed in the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73 to January 25, 1973, by the Saskatchewan Liquor Board on:

- (a) radio advertising,
- (b) television advertising, and
- (c) printed media.

(2) The advertising agencies used to place such advertising.

(3) The persons, companies or firms with which the said advertising was placed and the amount paid to each.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — I am sure that we all sympathize with the Attorney

General. I am sure that everybody is aware that there is a need and a desire to find out exactly which printing company the government moneys are being paid out to. I, therefore, should like to make a subamendment.

That after the tenth line (as indicated in Votes and Proceedings) the following be added:

(4) The names of each printing company used and total amount paid to each printing company in each of the fiscal years indicated.

Hon. Mr. Byers (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate on this subject. I suggest to the Hon. Member that if he wishes, to stand the others of the same type.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 43

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 43 showing:

(1) All printing contracts with their values, given to Service Printing Company, from July 1, 1971 to December 31, 1972, by all Departments, Boards, Agencies, Commissions or Crown Corporation of the Provincial Government. (2) (a) The above contracts which were tendered and whether the low tender was accepted in each case; (b) Where the low tender was not accepted, if any, the low tender, and the reason why it was not accepted; (c) Any of the above contracts which were not tendered.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — On this one, I am advised by the Minister of Government Services who is not here that the question should be appropriately amended so that we can provide more information to the Hon. Member from Athabasca. I am sure that not only would the Hon. Member from Athabasca want to know about a company called Service Printing Company, but also would want to know the value of all printing contracts given by the Queen's Printer to all Regina printing firms for a certain period of time. If that is acceptable, I should like to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek):

That all the words after the words "showing" be deleted on Return No. 43 and the following substituted therefore:

Total dollar value of all printing contracts given by Queen's Printer to Regina printing firms for fiscal periods 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 up to December 72.

Showing (1) (a) the total amount allotted in each period (b) the total amount tendered in each period (2) (a) all instances where low tender was accepted (b) if any, reason why low tender was not accepted.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Attorney General being so willing at this stage of the afternoon to provide us with additional information. However, as I look at the amendment I am not sure that this is really the case. This amendment will be acceptable only on the basis that there is no other printing, other than what goes through the Queen's Printer. If the Attorney General can assure me that all printing, and I say all printing, that this Government allocates to printing companies goes through the Queen's Printer, then we will accept the amendment. But if this is not the case, then, of course, he is not providing the information that we are asking for and we would not be able to support the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, just to be absolutely certain that this information is provided I should like to move the following subamendment:

That the words "Queen's Printer" in the fourth line (as indicated in Votes and Proceedings) be deleted and the words, "Government of Saskatchewan" be substituted therefore.

I should like to make a very brief comment, Mr. Speaker. We have as yet, if I am not mistaken, not received this information from over one year ago in this Assembly for a similar question asked. We have now watched the gymnastics of the Attorney General on the last 8, 10 or 15 Orders for Return. We have watched his gymnastics on this particular Order for Return, asking for information regarding Service Printers, which, as you know, is the NDP printing service in the province, and the amount of money that is being paid by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to subsidize that particular printing institution and that particular political party. I think it is absolutely essential that this Government immediately provide this information. After all I think there has been a great deal made about Service Printers in this Assembly and I am sure that the NDP would like to clear up any misunderstandings that have been in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan. I know that they would certainly like to assure the people of Saskatchewan that there isn't real patronage, there isn't anything dishonest about paying taxpayers' money to a government or to a political party and particularly to that political party's institution or newspaper which provides its printing service. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this subamendment should be carried wholeheartedly by the Government. I think on top of that they should make every effort to provide this information as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker: — I think we are getting out of order to some extent and I hate to clamp down too much and I will let this go. But I would suggest in a case like this it would be better if the Hon. Member would adjourn the debate, because he spoke, then he sat down and then rose to speak again. It does complicate the proceedings when we have those things happening.

Debate resumed on the Subamendment.

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney

General in his amendment is trying to be fair and reasonable to the Opposition in providing them all the information. As the Hon. Member knows, Government printing is awarded through the Queen's Printer and that is the reason for the agency.

He knows full well that is the purpose of the agency and, therefore, Government contracts are awarded through the Queen's Printer. I think he is trying to throw sand in the eyes by amendments of this nature. If hereafter he finds that the information he is looking for isn't sufficient he can place an additional Motion. After all the Queen's Printer has been established for a particular purpose to award contracts and the initial amendment will give him that information.

The Hon. Members opposite like somehow to leave the impression that in their years of office that they did not indulge in patronage. For a period of seven years, patronage was rampant in this province to the extent that we are uncovering, still daily, the kind of patronage that was paid by the Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the subamendment that was proposed ought to be defeated. So as not to becloud the issues, the information will be made available to the Hon. Members on the printing companies that received the business, the amounts tendered for and allotted and the amounts of money paid. It is intended to provide this House with the complete and full information and it will be provided through the Queen's Printer.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the subamendment that was moved be defeated.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that I can speak on the subamendment. I think the Hon. Member who took his seat knows full well that he is misleading the House.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, no!

Mr. Guy: — Oh, yes, he is. He knows very well that the printing from Crown corporations does not go through the Queen's Printer. The question was not amended to strike out Crown corporations. So in order to get the full disclosure that we asked for in this question it has to be other than just through Queen's Printer. It has to be through all the agencies that submit printing by contract to any printing company.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, just speaking on the subamendment. I would say in response to the Member for Athabasca that he has full opportunities I am sure that he will take in Crown corporations to find out all the answers to questions he may raise in Crown corporations respecting any contracts that may be given to this company called Service Printing Company. We are prepared, I am sure, in Crown corporations to provide that information.

I think the Minister of Health has given a very adequate explanation. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to hide about this and we should reject the subamendment on it.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two on the subamendment.

It is obvious, of course, that the Attorney General's remarks and those of the Minister of Health that the Government just doesn't want to let the Legislature know how much money has been directed into Service Printing coffers. That is most certainly obvious. If they did wish to co-operate we would have had last year's return by now. If they did wish to co-operate this return wouldn't have been mutilated to the extent that it is by the amendment, because it very much restricts the original question and the original Motion.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question here for the Hon. Attorney General which he might answer in closing debate or at some other point, or once we get off the subamendment debate. The amendment proposed as I read it, by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank is the total dollar value of all printing contracts. I understand this to mean the answer would come back as one definite figure without any breakdown. This is the understanding. Is this the intent — one single total figure? Is this the intent of the Motion? But if it is broken down into the companies, well that answers my question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say that when I just stepped out, I have gotten in contact with one of the officials from the Queen's Printing division and he told me that there is no printing done by the Government, no contracts let, except through the Queen's Printer.

So far as the Government is concerned there is no printing let except through the Queen's Printer.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I think since the NDP have been elected as Government of this province they have been practising one of the most blatant dishonest acts that I can imagine.

I think that the people of this province have every right to know every cent that is going to Service Printers. And the wording, there is nothing wrong with the wording of the Government of Saskatchewan and makes it clear to every citizen of this province who doesn't know what Queen's Printer is. I think they have a right to know just exactly what the Government of Saskatchewan is passing along to their own political coffers.

I think that it is about time that we understood this.

Subamendment negatived on Division.

Amendment agreed to

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 55

Mr. Guy moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 55 showing:

(1) The total number of new permanent positions established in the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission since April 1, 1972 to January 25, 1973. (a) The number of these positions that have been filed. (3) The names and salaries and whether appointments were made by Order in Council or through the Public Service Commission.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — It is moved again by myself, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) the same amendment to No. 55.

That:

(1) In clause (1) the words "excluding the number of permanent positions previously filled in other areas of Government and transferred to the said Department" be added after "1973."

(2) A new clause (4) be added to read "The total number of permanent positions deleted in the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission since July 1, 1971, to January 25, 1973, excluding transfers to other departments."

(3) A new clause (5) be added to read "the number of vacancies existing in the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission as of January 25, 1973."

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I think I understand what the amendment does in the first part. You are referring Mr. Attorney General to transfers from one department to another of a branch. You are not including in the Return any of the permanent positions that were in that branch prior to the transfer, but would include any additional members in that branch after the transfer has been made to that particular department.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Perhaps I can answer it this way.

Mr. Speaker: — We are getting out of order, but I will permit the Minister to answer. Maybe we can facilitate the others but he has already spoken and has lost his right to speak. But if you are asking a question before he takes his seat, I can permit it.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, perhaps he could explain what the first part does and may save some time.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — The way I understand this to work will be as follows, Mr. Speaker.

I am using page 15, item 63, Return No. 54 as an example. (See Votes and Proceedings and Orders of the Day No. 19). And what we will be showing is the total number of new permanent positions established in the MCIC from July 1 to January 25, 1973.

But in that number of new positions we would not show those positions, say, that were established in the Department of the Attorney General, let's say as an . . . Analyst IV, if there is such a position in the Attorney General's Department, and then transferred over to MCIC in that period. That is the effect of the amendment.

That type of permanent position previously filled in another area of the government, i.e.; the Department of the Attorney General would be excluded from the report in the total number of new permanent positions in MCIC. The reason for that is simply because in the overall complement of the Government, it makes no difference just to transfer from one side to the other side.

Mr. Guy: — It would be counted in the Department from which it came.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Yes, that is right, because you will add a new (4) to that amendment — the total number of permanent positions deleted in MCIC, excluding transfers to other departments. We would not count the exclusions of transfers from MCIC to say over to the Attorney General's Department, because you would count it there. I don't know whether I answered your question well enough or not.

Mr. Guy: — I know it is highly improper going back and forth across the floor.

Mr. Speaker: — Highly improper.

Mr. Guy: — But I might just ask one other question. Now these questions are being asked for every department. So that position if you are not going to count in MCIC because of a transfer, would it be included in your own department? Would you please provide the answer to that.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out and try to keep this thing in a better semblance of order. Maybe the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) could get into the debate and answer my question here.

The total number of new permanent positions established in let's say MCIC. I understand the Attorney General, in his amendment, is going to exclude any people or positions that may have been transferred in. It is not uncommon for an Admin. Officer 11 or 111 from somewhere else to be moved over or to switch his own job. But as I recollect, Mr. Speaker, it is not very frequent that a position as such that is set up, let's say in the Attorney General's Department, would ever be (the position that is), transferred to say Municipal Affairs or Public Health or any other. It will be just left and not filled. If that is the only exclusion I can see there would be few and far between — or I would think there would be. Am I correct in this?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think we can clear this rather readily. It's a position that we're talking about and if I may give an example. The Department of Social Services has just taken over mental

retardation (some 680 positions were transferred) and this could have happened in some other departments too. So we're talking about where positions are transferred because of program area changes and this is the inclusion that we are intending to get. It gives a more accurate picture of the additional positions which are involved and I think this is what the Opposition really wants.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — One further question just to clarify. But at the same time you will also include in the Department of Health those 680 positions, eh? So that there is no way in the shift they are lost in the Return. That is not in the amendment, though.

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, if I may help the Members further. As they are aware, there has been a fair bit of Government reorganization. I believe what you are after is the complement of staff that are employed in the various departments. For example, the Department of Government Services is a new department. It used to be the Department of Public Works. If you said new positions, only, all of those employees who worked for the Department of Public Works could be considered new employees within the Department of Government Services. The same is true of the Department of the Provincial Secretary. A number of positions were transferred to the Department of Consumer Affairs because it's a new department. What we want to do is give you the information of the total complement of staff during the periods requested. In the case of the Department of Public Health, the Hon. Minister of Social Services has mentioned core services, the additional group that has been transferred from the North Battleford Hospital into the Riverside Nursing Home which was established and Level III care is provided. Equally, from our Department the Occupational Health people were transferred to the Department of Labor. Unless this is done, you would find there would be stacking of Civil Service which I'm sure you don't want and we don't want to leave the wrong impression with the public.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 60

Mr. Guy (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 60 showing:

- (1) The total number of new permanent positions established in the Local Government Board since July 1, 1971 to January 25, 1973. (2) The number of these positions that have been filled. (3) The names and salaries and whether appointments were made by Order in Council or through the Public Service Commission.

Hon. Mr. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, with all deference to the Hon. Attorney General, I think the Motion that they substitute the amendment that he is proposing will not clarify the situation in regard to this Motion. This Motion for Return asks for the total number of new permanent positions established in the Local

February 20, 1973

Government Board since July 1. The answer to that would have to be nil because there have been no new permanent positions provided. I don't think nil is quite the answer that the Hon. Member opposite is looking for and if the amendment that has been proposed for these others were put in its place it would not change the situation. So I am proposing, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) that Motion No. 60 be amended:

That sections 1 and 2 be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

- (1) The total number of positions filled in the Local Government Board since May 22, 1964 to January 25, 1973.
- (2) That Section (3) be renumbered Section (2).

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.