

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
22nd Day

Friday, February 23, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature, a group of 40 grade eight students from St. Anne's School which is located in Regina North East constituency. They are seated in the east gallery and are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Ted Zurowski and one of their teachers, Mr. Wm. Bernhouser. On behalf of the Members of the Legislature I extend a warm welcome to the students and express the hope that their stay with us this afternoon will be a pleasant one and an educational experience and that it will assist them in their Social Studies. I hope that they will be able to remember their visit with us for some time to come.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should like also to introduce a group of 55 grade eight students from the Arcola School, seated in the west gallery, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Cyril Brown and Mrs. Alice Henderson. Again, to those students, I extend a warm invitation to the Chambers and also express the hope that their stay with us this afternoon will be a rewarding experience.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) I should like to introduce to you and to all Members of this Assembly, two groups of students from that constituency who are seated in the Speaker's Gallery.

The first group of 20 grade eight girls from Regent Park School are accompanied by their teacher Robert Grocholski. The second group in the same gallery is from Sacred Heart School and these 50 grade eight students are accompanied by their teachers, Harry Scheschuck, Ron Syzsky and Ray Stein. All Members, I am sure, extend a sincere welcome to these young citizens and we hope their stay today with us will demonstrate to them our democratic system, in a practical and realistic manner.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words about the Sacred Heart School that is here today. It is quite obvious that the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) doesn't know the city very well, or he would know that they are in Regina Lakeview. I would like to have he and the Premier — it is listed — and I would like your secretary to check that.

The school is situated in Regina Lakeview and there are 50 students here. We are very happy to have them in the House,

Mr. Scheschuk, Mr. Syzsky and Mr. Stein. When I saw this on the board I thought that the Electoral Boundaries Commission had already acted and had taken a curve around Sacred Heart School and put it into the Premier's constituency. But they are in Regina Lakeview and they are welcome here today and I hope they have a good day in the House.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Staff Cut at Regina General Hospital

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek).

I understand there was a news release today that the Regina General has had a staff cut of about 25 positions. This was done by the Minister of Health. I also understand that this is the case with the Saskatoon City Hospital and many other hospitals throughout the province. I wonder if the Minister can tell me what positions have been cut in the General, and also, whether the Board has had the opportunity to decide which positions will be cut? That is to say, has the Board been allowed to set their priorities as to which of the staff will be cut?

Also, can the Minister of Health assure this House that there will be no decrease in the quality of health care delivered by the General Hospital as a result of these drastic cutbacks?

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, the Regina General has not advised me that there have been any staff cuts. If they have made any staff cuts they have done it on their own.

As the Hon. Member perhaps will learn about the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, we don't run the Regina General Hospital. It is being administered and run by a Board appointed by City Council. It is the Board's responsibility and the administration's responsibility to determine the levels of staffs. Certainly from the standpoint of the Hospital Services Plan of the Government it is not intended, in any way, to reduce the services to the people. I am sure that the service is going to be as good as it has been in the past.

In case the Hon. Member may not be aware, we have approved budgets. We have provided — and I have said this publicly — an increase of nine per cent in the Hospital Services Plan funds for the coming year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Smishek: — And I am sure that not only will these hospitals that he has mentioned, but hospitals throughout the province will be able to maintain a high level of health care for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Minister has

avoided answering the question. He knows very well that the Province supplies the money according to the budgets, and has he cut back the money so that the recognized cost of the staff . . .

Hon. Mr. Smishek: — I don't know what the question is, Mr. Speaker, but I have already told the Member that we have approved budget increases in the overall basis of nine per cent. There have been no cuts, there have been increases.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Meeting with Russian Agricultural Delegation

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

Last Monday on the 19th day of February a noon luncheon was held in Saskatoon with the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) and the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Thorson). This luncheon was held with the Russian Agricultural Delegation. I was wondering why the Minister of Agriculture kept this meeting secret. What was the purpose of this meeting and would he mind telling this House what the results of that meeting were?

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself, along with some other invited guests from the Province of Saskatchewan had a luncheon with a Russian Science Delegation, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and some of his colleagues, in Saskatoon last Monday.

We were only invited to host a luncheon with those people and talk over some matters that they were interested in in regard to Saskatchewan agricultural food processing and packaging which I think were the main items of interest.

I am told that the CDA and the Federal Government arranged for the meetings and kept it strictly secret because they felt that was the only way that they wanted to do it. We had no opportunity to make arrangements nor were we allowed to have press releases in regard to the meeting because of the Federal Government's decision in regard to having it kept secret.

Mr. Wiebe: — Just a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does that same ruling from the Federal Government apply after the delegation has left the country, that you cannot make a press release on what was discussed and decided?

Roumanian Tractor Plant

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier, in absence of the Premier, and particularly because he is the Member for Saskatoon.

Is it a fact that there is a delegation headed by the Premier's former partner, John Becky, made up of the Deputy Minister of Industry, Dave Dombowski, the Director of SEDCO, George Hatton, and a consultant, Ralph Henderson, who are heading for Roumania on a very elaborate tour of Roumania at the taxpayers' expense in an attempt to resurrect the floundering negotiations over the Roumanian tractor plant?

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, to answer that question on behalf of the Premier and my colleague the Minister of Industry (Hon. Mr. Thorson), I simply don't know the answer to that as of this day. I will undertake to inform myself of this and to advise the Member, in any event, on Monday.

STATEMENT

Sacred Heart School

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of information. The Hon. Member for Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) doesn't know which schools are in his constituency. He is talking about Holy Rosary. Sacred Heart School is in the Hon. Premier's constituency. It is at 1314 Elphinstone Street. I suggest that there are lots of things that the Hon. Member for Lakeview doesn't know, but he doesn't even know the schools that are in his constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 114

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 114 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Chaplin No. 164, 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 cultivate 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. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to propose several amendments to Return No. 114.

As the Return now reads it says this: "In the Rural Municipality of Chaplin No. 164, as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications that were received to sell land to the Land Bank Commission."

Mr. Speaker, information of this kind is not readily available to the question as it is now worded. Applications,

February 23, 1973

I am told, are received and are filed by name and were then only filed by rural municipalities as they were selected for appraisal. There is no cross reference between the name and the applicant and the rural municipality number for those applicants whose land was not appraised. So in some instances I think it could almost be virtually impossible to find out who the applicants were if they were not appraised unless we personally contacted the applicant to find out if, in fact, he lived in a particular municipality.

The Return goes on to ask for: “(b) (i) the number of contracts or agreements to purchase by the Commission that have been approved”.

Here again, the Return, in the way it is worded, is not really meaningful, Mr. Speaker. The Commission made offers to purchase from prospective vendors which, when accepted, then formed valid contracts or agreements to which the Commission was bound. But there is no contract or agreement made prior to the Commission authorizing it. So up until that point in time the offer was being considered by the Commission it was not, in fact, in any way to be considered a contract or agreement. It is only after the Commission has decided to issue a price or send out a price in regard to the appraised value of the land and the response from that, that it would, in fact, become an agreement or contract to purchase.

In section (f) of the Return it asks for the price offered for each quarter section of land. It is my intention to ask that we amend section (f) by deleting the entire section.

The reason that I ask to have this done is that I think the information should be confidential between the person who is making application to sell the land to the Commission, if he chooses to make it public knowledge that is a choice that he is free to make of his own accord. I think in most instances he will not do that. Especially, I think, that he should have the right to have that information kept confidential until, in fact, a sale had been carried through because I don't think we should be in a position of offering an individual a given or certain price for his land and before has had an opportunity to discuss that price with us or accept that price make that price or offer public information.

Because of these three major concerns that we have I am asking that the Return No. 114 be amended by:

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

In the Rural Municipality of Chaplin No. 164 as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors; (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.

I think this amendment will give to the mover all the information he sought with the exception of the price that was offered to those who were selling the land before they actually had an opportunity to accept that price.

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I just have one question before the Hon. Minister sits down.

Does the Hon. Minister propose with respect to (f) in deleting it, that he does not want to make that information public while the negotiations were in progress, but that it would be made available when the negotiations were closed?

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question. It is certainly our policy and our decision not to make the price offered public during the negotiation stages or before the prospective vendor has made a decision whether to accept the offer to purchase or not. If his decision is in a negative sense I do not know whether there is any real reason for the Government or for the Commission to make the offer public information or not.

It is, however, the attitude of the Commission, of the Government, at the end of each year to give consideration to publishing all the prices paid for land that has been bought by the Land Bank Commission. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that is a distinct change from the former Government in regard to their land sales. Because prior to this Government, they did not publish the prices for land that was sold by the Lands Branch under any circumstances. We have changed that policy so that on request farmers could find what values and prices were assessed against the land that was being purchased by a private farmer, from the Government. We intend to be consistent with that policy in the Land Bank Commission as well.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to sympathize with the Minister of Agriculture in his concern that it is within reason that the Land Bank Commission or the Government or the Department of Agriculture do not release any negotiated offers made by the Land Bank Commission to any individual farmer because that would throw it open once again to competition or bidding.

However, I see no reason, if the Minister of Agriculture has indicated that he is willing to publish the prices paid for land at the end of the year, then I think it is very urgent that the price paid for land of all deals that have now been completed be made public. We have now a new policy whereby a Government is purchasing land for ownership itself. We have a new policy whereby the Government of Saskatchewan is getting into mass purchase of land. There are hundreds and hundreds of thousands of acres that they purchased. This year the Budget calls for \$20 million to purchase land. This is going to have a very dramatic impact upon the price of land for every citizen as well as the farmers of Saskatchewan, both those who want to sell their land and those who want to purchase land. Second, it will have a very dramatic impact upon the amount of saleable land that will be available for a farmer to expand his unit if he needs additional land or a farmer's son who wants to go into farming with his father. There may be no land left. Because he may have over \$60,000 net worth

and of course the Land Bank may have purchased all the available land that is marketable in that area. Therefore, it is important that the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan know what amount of money, of public funds, is being invested in the Land Bank, that are being spent by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to purchase land, to ensure, first of all, that it is not inflating land prices or making it difficult for independent farmers to buy land.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move a subamendment seconded by my colleague the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod):

That clause (f) be added to amendment:

(f) the price paid for all sales that have finalized.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the subamendment I have already indicated to the Members sitting to your left that it is the intention of the Government to publish the prices paid for land at the end of the calendar year or fiscal year of the Land Bank Commission. I think that is sufficient information in regard to what expenditures are being made by the Land Bank Commission in regard to public funds.

They already know how much money is being spent by the Commission from the Budget, \$20 million this year. So they don't need to know what the individual price for land is that is being purchased by the Commission. Also, Mr. Speaker, we have assured them and they are aware that the instructions to the Land Bank Commission and to the personnel of that Commission are that they are only to purchase land in any given region or area until they feel it may be contributing to an escalation of land values in that area and then they will pull away from purchasing land in any way in that area. So that is not the intention of the Land Bank Commission, to accelerate any increase in land values and I think a contributing factor to accelerating those values would be to publish each and every parcel of land as it is bought by the Commission in that area showing what the competition is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer: — It is up to the individual farmer who sells his land whether he wants to publish it at that time, otherwise the Opposition will have to wait until the end of the Commission year when the information will be brought forth for all people of Saskatchewan to scrutinize. I say we defeat the subamendment.

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the subamendment, I think that we as legislators have got a responsibility here in terms of how much money we are spending of the taxpayers' money. For example, we can't get any information from the Minister of Agriculture as to what prices are being paid on land. We can't get any information from the Land Bank Commission, as such, as to what prices are being paid on land. And yet when someone goes out and appraises that land, they find out through public knowledge what land has been sold in that area in previous years beforehand. Now we are getting all kinds of stories back to us that the Land Bank Commission has paid so much for this

quarter of land. They paid so much for that quarter of land. How are we able to come up with anything concrete as to what the Land Bank Commission is actually paying for this land? What, for example, is stopping the Land Bank Commission to come along and say, look, this is a particular piece of property that we want, we are going to pay 10 per cent more than what the land is worth just to acquire that property. And by not making that information available to us and to the people of this province, they can get away with it. There is nothing stopping the Land Bank Commission, for example, to say there is a forced sale in a particular area of the province, that this individual has got problems and he has to sell. The Land Bank Commission can come along and take advantage of that individual and say, look, we will give you 10 per cent less than what the land is worth. I think that it is of extreme importance that we at least in this Legislature, know what the Government is spending of the taxpayers' money in paying for this land. It's public money that is being spent, it is public property that is being acquired so therefore it should be public knowledge on what price is being paid for that land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer: — I believe he asked a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh no, he didn't ask you. He has already spoken.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — He did so.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think you can get back into the debate again.

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, the people of this province and the Opposition here and the Members of the Legislature have waited over a month to find out if the Minister is going to give us this answer or not. We are not just concerned about the description of the land and so on. We can get all this information if we are interested in it. The main thing, of course, is the price they are paying for the land. The people of this province are interested in that one particular point. The Minister has finally come out today and said that he is not going to supply this information to us. Now we don't want to wait till the end of the year or the end of the year for the Land Bank, whatever that is, the people of the province want to know now. Now it appears that they have drawn a curtain of secrecy over these transactions. The transactions will be done in secret, under cover, no one will know really what the price is. He says that they will pull out of an area if they find out that they are affecting the price of land. The people of the province should be the ones to know if they are affecting the land price. It is too late after a year. They may go in and buy for eight or ten months in a year and at some later time publish a price. They may have already very seriously affected the price of land in that particular area. No one is going to know about it until a year after. This is certainly not good enough.

We are all aware, I am sure Members over there are aware as well as here, that there are many rumors around the province regarding the price they are paying for land. There is no use telling us we are going to spend \$20 million and that's the price

of the land. There is a good deal of doubt and there is a good deal of suspicion about the actions of the Government all over this province. There is a cloud over all of the Land Bank transactions and the only way the Minister can remove this cloud is to come clean and tell us what he is paying for all of this land. Give us the details, the people of the province can then judge. I think it would be to the advantage of the minister and to the advantage of the Land Bank program if the Minister would make this material available to the Members of the Legislature who represent the people of this province who are interested in these prices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, it is sort of odd, a couple of weeks ago the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) knew a great deal about land prices and now he is complaining he doesn't know anything.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I think I will leave that as I said it. If the Opposition really wants to get the prices of land, they know how they can get it. They can go down to the Land Titles Office, they can pay, I think it is 50 cents, and they can get the price that is registered on that title. I submit that this Government should not at this time be giving out how much we are paying a farmer for that land. I have talked to a number of farmers who have sold land to the Land Bank Commission. Some of them told me the price they received, some didn't. When I asked them, this was before the Session started, do you think this should be made public in the Legislature, as the Leader of the Opposition has been demanding on television. In every case these individuals said, absolutely not. It is none of his business. And I might say when they said business, they had some pretty nice adjectives to go before it.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to support the amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and oppose the amendment moved by the farmer from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) says, I think it is the business of this Legislature to ascertain what the Government is paying for land. I don't think we are curious because of what the individual is going to get. But as the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) says, there are a considerable number of rumors going around the province. I have run into two recently. One is that in the case of the famous Mr. Wolfe purchase, that Mr. Wolfe had offered the land for a lesser amount prior to the Land Bank purchase than they paid for it. And I think if this rumor is around it should be either confirmed or squashed. The other case is in northern Saskatchewan where the land was assessed at \$24,000 and the purchase price was accepted and then it was discovered that there was a bit of a legal entanglement involving a lien and price was upped somewhere close to \$30,000 to take care of the lien. That particular piece of land apparently is not worth the final price paid for it and I think this should be

public information and available. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture suggested that a year-end report would be given. I presume by that he means on March 31 of this year there will be a list provided of all purchases up to and including that date. If I am not correct on that I would hope that he or someone else would clarify the point.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson (Pelly): — Again we see the total about face of the Liberal Party. You know, this is an extreme example. They know they have painted themselves completely into a corner on this whole Land Bank issue. Now they are trying to wiggle and find a way out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — In no way and at no time should anyone be required to reveal what the price of the land is. If this is to be done by the Land Bank Commission, why not by the Farm Credit Corporation? They make loans. You can't go and find out what farmer A or farmer B or farmer C got. This is absolutely confidential. Yet in the annual report you find out how much they have paid out. This whole issue is one that is nothing but an attempt to discredit a good program. The party opposite knows it is a good program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — They are looking for some way to find something, maybe as a last straw, they can find something to get hold of where they can make some political hay.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this subamendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House some instances of land prices in the area where I come from since the concept of the Land Bank was discussed and brought in by this Government. Farmers who realized that the net rent of over \$60,000 may not qualify them to lease the land, therefore, to obtain more land they bought out farmland at a price higher than the land was sold for. In other words, for these farmers to obtain more land, they paid a higher price. They set the land prices in that area. The Land Bank has bought up three parcels of land in an area but the price of land was already established by farmers who had bought up the land. Therefore, the Land Bank Commission was forced to pay high prices because the farmers who will not qualify to lease land from the Commission increased the prices. If anyone is to blame it is not the Minister and the Land Bank Commission but the farmers who have bought out the land in their community.

I know of a farmer who bought up a section of land at an extremely high price. I know of another piece of land that was sold to one farmer by another at an extremely high price. The Land Bank has to meet the competition of some of these farmers. These are the farmers that are large farmers. What we are trying to establish is viable farmers by buying up land and giving

it to farmers that have small holdings to make their operation viable. Therefore, do not blame the Minister of Agriculture or the Land Bank Commission. This is the trend established by farmers who are large farmers and not the Land Bank Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, what this demonstrates as nearly as I can make out is the total bungling of the Government as it relates to this whole program. The Hon. Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) gives us what must be the weirdest example ever shown in this House. He says that for a man to reduce his assets below \$60,000 so he can qualify, he therefore pays more for land than it is worth. How that reasoning can possibly fit is something that I fail to understand. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is attempting to shift the blame to the farmer when, in fact, the blame resides with the Provincial Government. They have said, Mr. Speaker, that the Land Bank does inflate the price and maybe this is a clear example.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who spoke just before that said that nobody was going to tell the amount of a loan by the Farm Credit Corporation. Of course, I remind the Member that all he has to do is go down to the Land Titles Office and you will have no difficulty in paying 50 cents and find out the amount of the loan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — The amount of the loan is clearly shown there and what he has said, in effect, is that you can't find out when, in fact, you can find out. Now the Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) said that you can get the amount of the price by paying 50 cents at the Land Titles Office so therefore it is public knowledge, but he won't make it public. Now this is the kind of nonsense that we are getting in this House. We believe, they say, that this information is not to be divulged, however, it is readily available, but we won't give it to you. Now that is the exact kind of nonsense that we are getting out of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the Hon. Members of this House should have to go down and spend a lot of time searching for information which is, in fact, made public, unless, and this is a distinct possibility, unless the Land Bank is deliberately not registering transactions, is deliberately holding back transactions, or is deliberately failing to state a fair appraisal, or a fair sworn value on the transaction as it is registered in the Land Titles Office, or if the Land Bank is, in fact, proceeding normally with its transactions, if it is following The Land Titles Act. If it is swearing the value as it ought to do, then, in fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why information which is actually made public through that device ought not to be given in this House, and anything less than that is pure nonsense on the part of the Minister of Agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the excuses given by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is that at some previous time some previous government failed to give some information and that

still rankles in the mind of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, those of us who are trying to see a higher standard set in this House . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — . . . than has been the case with some of the Hon. Members opposite, certainly resent the continued use by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in the front benches across the way of excuses that it was done by somebody else. What happens over and over again in this House, Mr. Speaker, is when some particular kind of conduct is subject to criticism the only defence is that at some previous occasion somebody else did the same thing. That must be the weakest possible argument for the support of ridiculous conduct and particularly the ridiculous conduct of the Minister of Agriculture.

An Hon. Member: — Strong argument.

Mr. MacLeod: — No, that may not be a strong argument but it is one that the Hon. Members seem to be using.

Mr. Speaker, the whole effort by the Government and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is to delay this information so that he can buy land from other farmers at less than fair market value. It is also possible, Mr. Speaker, that fair play comes into this. They are prepared to pay perhaps \$90 for one quarter section of land and pay \$115 for the neighboring quarter of land per acre. All this demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is not prepared when it is worthwhile to give us the information which will let people know honestly and fairly what their land is worth. They are attempting to buy land cheaper than the fair market value because of the device.

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely support the subamendment to which I have been speaking and I oppose the amendment which the Hon. Minister has proposed.

Hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labor): — Mr. Speaker, this is the most incredible set of political gymnastics that I have seen in this House in a long time. On one occasion the inference is being made that too much money is being paid — wasteful use of public funds. And then the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) suggests that some how or another because we are refusing to provide this information at this given point in time, that somehow or other this is a device that's being used to keep from paying farmers fair market value. If there is anything underhanded about this operation you can be sure of one thing, you will have access to the figures at the appropriate time. In the meantime, just keep in mind one single thing — that you people are where you are, you're there for a very particular reason, because of the arrogance that emanated from you when you were on this side of the House. We are going to provide the information, we'll do it in our time, we'll do it in reasonable order, and you'll have all of the information with which you can make an honest assessment. In the meantime, be responsible Members and try to use the Land Bank constructively. Use it for the purpose it was intended, to be a betterment to the younger farmers who are getting into the agricultural sector and don't be obstructionists every time you take your feet. Try to be honest and

sincere as an Opposition. Show some responsibility for a change.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — After listening to the locomotive engineer from Moose Jaw, I think . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Guy: — . . . I think I have to make a few comments. He raised exactly the point that we have been trying to get at all afternoon, and it was raised by my colleagues. We don't know what's going on in the Land Bank. We don't know whether you are manipulating the prices to go higher, or whether you're manipulating the prices to go lower. You could do either one, but we don't know. All that the people of Saskatchewan know is that you are using the Land Bank and the taxpayers' money to manipulate the prices. There's no question that you are manipulating prices with the Land Bank and that's what we want to know today, not six months from now, after you've gone out and spent another \$10 million. We want to know today the prices that you are paying so that we can bring to the people of this province the manipulation that's been taking place for the last six months.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — There's no question that there's manipulation being carried out by the Land Bank Commission on a political basis as well as an economic and social basis. You are using the public funds in a manner that has never been used by any government in the Province of Saskatchewan or Canada before.

I came across an article the other day dealing with the CCF back in 1935. At their convention in 1935 they stripped off the convention resolution that they were going to socialize the land in Saskatchewan for political purposes.

If you take the last issue of the Saskatchewan History Magazine you'll see an article in there about the CCF and the Communists in the 1930s and they said that in order to break the link between the Communists and the CCF Party they are going to play down the socialization of land.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think we'd better get to the amendment.

Mr. Guy: — All right, but now we find today that we are right back to where they have approved the socialization and the nationalization of land. Trying to compare the Farm Credit Corporation and the Land Bank Commission is ridiculous because the Farm Credit Corporation isn't buying land for the manipulation of prices the way that the Land Bank Commission is.

I'll support the subamendment.

Hon. Mr. Bowerman (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — The former Minister for the Saskatchewan Indian and

Métis Department and Public Works forgets very well the program which was operated under the former Government which is similar, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in nature.

The Older Homes Purchasing Plan which was a plan implemented by the former Government for the purchasing of homes in cities for various persons was a program where they went out and purchased houses and property. They will recall, if they will just take a moment to reflect on the questions which were raised in this House even by myself at that time, asking the questions about what price was paid for the houses, the location and address of the houses and who was purchasing the homes. You will recall, and many Members in this House will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the then Government got to its feet and said that this was not in the public interest to give you information about. This was the usual phrase. The usual phrase, Mr. Speaker, was for the Government of the day to get up and say that it was not in the public interest to give out information of this kind where it involved a person's individual property and the purchase being made for individual persons.

We have said, or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has said this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that this information will be given to the House in due course and certainly if they will just be patient and if they want to trot off to the Land Bank or down to the Land Office with their 50 cents they can certainly find out any parcel of land that they want to and what price has been paid. Certainly they can do it. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be in the best interests of this Legislature, or of the persons who have made sales, or purchases, or have lease arrangements with the Land Bank, or will do so in the future, to provide that information to this House and make it public at this particular time.

Therefore, I support the amendment made by the Minister of Agriculture and I propose not to support the subamendment.

Subamendment negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 12
Messieurs

Coupland	Gardner	Lane
Loken	Weatherald	MacDonald (Moose Jaw North)
Guy	MacLeod	Wiebe
Grant	McPherson	
MacDonald (Milestone)		

Nays — 33
Messieurs

Dyck	Baker	Cody
Meakes	Brockelbank	Gross
Wood	Pepper	Feduniak
Smishek	Michayluk	Mostoway
Romanow	Whelan	Comer
Messer	Kwasnica	Rolfes
Snyder	Carlson	Lange
Bowerman	Engel	Oliver
Thibault	Robbins	Feschuk
Larson	Tchorzewski	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	Richards	Flasch

The debate continues on the amendment.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — I believe that the Government is remiss in not providing this information to the Members here and I wish to bring their attention to at least two reasons why.

First of all, it may be that the Minister of Agriculture has said when the end of the year for the Land Bank Commission is, but as of yet, well, he said the information would be given . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The House has decided on the subamendment. We can't debate that topic. The House has decided and the debate is over.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, May I speak to the motion and the amendment? I have not spoken in the debate previously.

Mr. Speaker: — You cannot speak to the subamendment because the House has decided on the subamendment. You can only speak to the amendment and the motion but not to the subamendment.

Mr. Weatherald: — Agreed, agreed. In any event, Mr. Speaker, to our knowledge we do not have any information as to when the end of the year of the Land Bank Commission is, at which time the Minister said that the information as far as transactions would be offered.

Now it does seem to us on this side of the House that with \$20 million more to be spent this year that a great amount of money may well be spent before any information is available to the Members of this Legislature and certainly, if there is no objection to letting us have the information now or then, or whenever the end of the Land Bank Commission year is, it seems difficult for me to understand precisely why the information could not be made available now.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Again, I must call the Hon. Member's attention that this was the debate on the subamendment. That debate has ended, the House has voted on it and we cannot debate it at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. If you would please read the amendment again, Sir, with all due respect. The amendment says they will not permit the revelation of price and that's what the Member for Cannington is talking about, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: — The subamendment, which was moved by the Hon. Member for Milestone, seconded by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), said that (f) be added, that the price paid for all sales that have finalized, be added. The House has decided that. The House has decided on that now, not the Speaker, but the House itself made the decision. Therefore, that debate has been voted on. The House has made their decision and I cannot permit debate on that topic at this time.

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I believe the Minister's amendment deleted (f) and (f) asks for the price offered for each quarter section and we're still debating the motion to his amendment which deletes subsection (f), so certainly the Member for Cannington is entitled to debate the amendment put in by the Minister. That amendment deleted (f) and (f), of course, says the price offered for each quarter section. So the Member for Cannington is talking about the deletion, whether we should or we shouldn't delete (f) which is the Minister's amendment and certainly that's in order.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish the Members would understand what the rules are. The Minister moved an amendment, striking out all the words after the word "showing" and prepared a new Order for Return No. 114 which does not include an (f). The Member for Milestone moved that (f) be added again, maybe in different phraseology, and the House voted on it, the House decided on that. The debate before the House now is on the amendment to No. 114. It's not on the subamendment, it's not on the original motion, because this is a motion replacing No. 114 and it's on the amendment. The House, having once decided, cannot decide on the same topic twice.

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point. I believe Mr. Speaker totally misapprehends what has gone on in this House with respect to this matter and I would submit to Mr. Speaker that the following is the situation and if the blackbirds across the way would just pause for a moment we might get this point clear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation, as I see it and the motion which I seconded, was this; it followed in their vein. It had relation to the debate that had gone on before, Mr. Speaker. It was not something in a vacuum or isolated from the previous events.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) moved his amendment he said that information about price offered for each quarter section was inappropriate during the time that negotiations were underway. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as part of his argument in support of his amendment, he said that (f) as it appeared in conjunction with the remainder of the motion had to be eliminated because we were talking about things in the course of their occurrence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he said that while negotiations were going on they should not make that available. His further argument was that the Government would consider making it available at some future date and then, Mr. Speaker, this occurred. Then when he rose the second time he said it would, in fact, be made available at the year end report of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about and what the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) moved and which I seconded was that the information which he said 'would be made available' prior to that period of time.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about that at all. We are

now talking about (f) and as he has eliminated it it isn't available at all. The previous motion, and that is what the Hon. Member for Milestone talked about and what I talked about, and our motion clearly deals with this, that the date on which that information will be available, and I agree with Mr. Speaker, we were defeated on that motion, we agree that if it is ever made available, the time clearly wasn't specified in that motion because it was defeated. But the Hon. Member does have the right, I submit, to talk about whether or not it will ever be made available and whether (f) should be in there. Mr. Speaker, we think that you have taken the time element of it and converted it into the substantive part of the motion, which I think is in error. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you reconsider that because my learned friend waited to speak to the question of whether the price should be available and we would hate to have the question, the substantive part, defeated on a question of date.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion which was proposed to the House was No. 114 as it appears on the paper. Then the Minister of Agriculture moved an amendment which deleted all the words after the word "showing" and which, with minor rewording went down and included (e). Had not the Member for Milestone and the Member for Albert Park moved a subamendment, the Hon. Member for Cannington would be in order because they would be debating the need for it to be put back in. But the Member for Milestone moved a subamendment that a new section (f) be added to read as follows:

(f) the price paid for all sales that have been finalized.

The House debated that, the House decided it. Therefore, the rules say that the House cannot make the same decision on the same topic twice and to debate it over again; the House has decided. There was nothing preventing any Member from speaking to the Hon. Member of Milestone's subamendment. Any Member could have spoken to it at that time, but when I asked for the question the House agreed that the question should be now put. Therefore, any discussion as to whether (f) should be added to the amendment now or not is out of order because it was voted on by this House on a recorded vote.

The amendment is moved by the Minister of Agriculture and seconded by the Minister of Labor, that Return No. 114 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "showing" and substituting the following:

In the Rural Municipality of Chaplin No. 164 as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors; (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; (e) assessed value of each quarter section.

Amendment carried on division.

Debate continues on the motion as amended.

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, just a few brief remarks to close out the debate on this particular question. Of course, it is unfortunate that we cannot receive the information that we requested. The Government Members opposite at the beginning of the Session quite sanctimoniously told us that any information would be available to us and that this information would be given to us. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that they are withholding this information because by withholding it they are proving that the Land Bank just doesn't work. They don't want to give this information to the people of this province. They have told us of the thousands and thousands of applications which they have received from people who want to sell and yet they are not prepared to tell us who the applications were from or how many actually were received from a particular area. They are telling us that they have purchased hundreds and hundreds of quarters of land from farmers throughout this province and yet they are not willing to tell us in what areas the purchases were made.

An Hon. Member: — You can't . . .

Mr. Wiebe: — Yes, and if you will just wait a minute I'll get this out as well. Mr. Speaker, this just proves a point that they are playing politics with this Land Bank Commission. There is land listed on this sheet of paper, Mr. Speaker, that hasn't even been purchased by the Land Bank Commission. I might read the top here. It states, Mr. Speaker, that all land listed on this sheet of paper is available for lease which means that the Government has purchased that land and that they have not leased any of this land out at the date that this particular article appeared in *The Western Producer*. I will produce letters and I will table them, Mr. Speaker, that will clearly show that there is land listed on this sheet of paper that has not been purchased and the individual land that is listed here the individual has no intention of selling to the Land Bank.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention to the Member of this House regarding land that they say is available for lease. I have a letter here from a person dated January 19 in which he has made application to the Land Bank . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must remind the Member that in closing a debate no Member can bring in new material. They must answer criticism that was made during the debate. The reason for that is other Members do not have a chance to refute a Member closing the debate. He can only answer material that has been in.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, I am just emphasizing a point that this information is required and that this information is being denied to us. The reason I am emphasizing this is that I hope that the Members opposite, by understanding the information which I am giving to them will have a change of heart and vote against the motion as amended by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a young man on January 9th requesting land to be leased . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member on a subsequent motion will

have an opportunity to bring in new material but not on closing a debate.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, if that is the case I imagine I will have five other opportunities this afternoon to bring this information before the House. Again, I say I feel it is highly regrettable that this Government has taken this attitude of denying the Opposition and the people of this province information which is public information and information which should be readily made available to all Members of this Legislature.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

Return No. 115

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 115 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Morse No. 165, 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.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize just how important this information is to this Legislature and to the people of this province. I feel as well that this information is important because it proves again that the Government Members opposite are trying to play politics with the Land Bank. They are trying to justify the acceptance of this Land Bank by publishing information in the January 18 issue of *The Western Producer* that is false, and by doing so, Mr. Speaker, they are misleading the people of this province, and by so doing they are trying to create an impression that the Land Bank Commission is being accepted by the people. By so doing as well, Mr. Speaker, they are admitting this by not giving us the information which we have requested. They refuse to give us the information because they realize it is going to embarrass them and as well it is going to prove to the Members opposite and the people of this province that they are playing politics with this Land Bank scheme.

As I was saying a bit earlier, just to emphasize my point, I received a letter on January 9, three weeks prior to the publication of this issue in *The Western Producer*. I will table the letter and you will have an opportunity at that time, Mr. Attorney General, to look at the letter and I will also table the answer which this individual received from the Land Bank Commission.

I might just mention here that this young farmer does not own any land. For the past five years he has been leasing six quarters of land from a particular farmer in the area. This farmer has sold the land to the Land Bank Commission so this

gentleman wanted to lease it and continue on with his operation. So on January 9 he wrote the Land Bank Commission requesting an application to the Land Bank Commission in order for him to lease this land. Shortly after he received a letter back from the Land Bank Commission and I might read just the first paragraph:

The land mentioned in your letter will not be coming up for competition since it represents a direct descendant transfer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is land that is going to a direct descendant transfer so in other words it means that this land is not available for lease. And yet a week later this same land appears in the paper as being available for lease. As well, Mr. Speaker, it was difficult to find out how many direct descendants that this individual had. You know we couldn't find any, Mr. Speaker. Now these are just a few points which emphasize the fact that they do not wish to give us this information because they are trying to hide something.

For the information of the Members I will table this document.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government opposite to pass this motion as it is presently stated in No. 115. This will then, by them not amending it, by them passing this motion as it states on the Order Paper, will prove to this side of the House and will prove to the people of this province, that the Government opposite has nothing to hide in terms of the Land Bank Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — I move, seconded by Mr. Romanow (Attorney General) that Return No. 115 be amended by:

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

In the Rural Municipality of Morse No. 165 as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which was appraised by the Land Bank Commission (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors.; (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.

I move that amendment, Mr. Speaker, in order hopefully to curtail or stop the political sabotage that continues to emanate from the speakers to your left, Mr. Speaker. It is perfectly obvious from the remarks that have been made by the Members that are sitting to your left that they are the ones that want to play politics with this Land Bank Commission which has been so successful in its first eight months of operation. They know, Mr. Speaker, that there is no relationship between one parcel of land and its value in relation to another parcel of land and its value because of a number of circumstances that will not be evident unless you gave them detailed information which I think is almost impossible to give to them. By just looking at a

quarter section or a description of a piece of land and saying it is worth a given amount and comparing it, as they have suggested, to a neighbor's piece of land across the road and finding a difference of 50 per cent or 100 per cent, they tell the people of Saskatchewan that we are not following a consistent formula. It is obvious that is what they want that information for. The fact of the matter is when you simply relate to a location or a particular piece of land and do not take into consideration improvements, buildings or livestock operations, then you have a disproportionate concept as to what the land is really worth. This is why we don't want to give them the kind of information now that they are obviously going to misinterpret and misrepresent when they talk to people in Saskatchewan in regard to the activities of the Land Bank Commission.

They talk about political gain, Mr. Speaker. Well, I think it is perfectly obvious where the political gain is coming from. It was stated in this House as it has been stated outside of the House by the Members opposite, in particular the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), where he said the Land Bank Commission was going about purchasing land. In fact, I think he was quoted as saying, "Worth only \$34,000 and we paid \$50,000." On another occasion, "Worth \$27,000, we paid \$30,000." On a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, four or five, I asked the Member from Moosomin to bring forward those cases he was referring to so that we would be able to justify any sale price other than the one that was fair market value for that land. That was some two or three weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, but he hasn't attempted to bring that information forward because he knows full well it is false and the kind of information that they want to use to continue to mislead farmers in Saskatchewan about the Land Bank Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Now the Member for Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) talks about the assessment of a particular piece of land in northern Saskatchewan. He says because there is a lien assessed against it, that we went out and reappraised or readjusted the value of that land. I ask him if he thinks that there is information that would lead him to believe that in fact is going on, it is his duty as a Member of the Legislative Assembly to bring that to my attention as that we can act accordingly. Again, they will not do that because they are playing politics. It's a case of political sabotage on behalf of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan trying to sabotage a plan that farmers especially in Saskatchewan have waited a long time for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) says that we are, and the way I interpreted his remarks, are falsely listing land in *The Western Producer* that we do not own. He knows full well, when we go through the numbers of parcels of land we listed in *The Western Producer* some weeks ago, that there is room for human error. He finds one parcel of land out of hundreds that were listed where there was an error made and in fact, it was attempting to relate to another parcel of land which he had purchased but because a quarter section number was out, it related to a quarter section that we had not purchased. He tries to play on the minds of farmers of Saskatchewan on the

populace of Saskatchewan that we are attempting to lease land that we don't even own. Now, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous can he be because he knows there is no gain for anyone to be made with that kind of advertising. It is just cheap politics to try and play on that kind of misinformation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) he says that on one hand if you buy your . . .

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — The Member for Albert Park has not spoken in this debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member from Albert Park spoke in the previous debate. Unless he is referring to something he said outside this House on a different occasion, he can't quote a previous debate in this House.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Hearsay has it, Mr. Speaker, rather accurately put that the Member from Albert Park says that one can find . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — I would just love for you to let him continue with that kind of a ruling, Mr. Speaker, because I will certainly take every advantage of it in the future.

Mr. Speaker: — I think all Hon. Members are aware of the rules, that you can't quote from a previous debate of this Session.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the remark in regard to the Member from Albert Park and the statements that he may or may not have said. But the fact of the matter is that it is common knowledge what Members to the left have said and they admit you can get the information that they are now asking for from the Land Titles Office by just going down and asking to see the title of transfer and paying the 50 cent fee or \$1 fee, whichever it may be. There, in fact, the information is available to the general public, it is available to the Members opposite if they are interested in a particular piece of land. We don't say that is not true, in fact, it is, and those people who are concerned about the Land Bank making errors or deliberately paying prices less than what they should be paying for land, or deliberately paying prices that are higher than the real assessed value of that land is, they have every opportunity to go down and find out the price and relate to what they may consider a fair assessment or a fair appraisal or a fair worth of that land. They know that opportunity is open to them. We say that we will give them information when we feel the Land Bank Commission has finished its year's operation, when we can sit down and list the land that was purchased, give its location and give the value of the land, so that not only those who are interested in a particular piece of land but all residents of Saskatchewan will be able to find out what we are paying for land when the Land Bank Commission is buying parcels of land.

Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, we say we will not make available the information now, but that it will be forthcoming and it will be there for all to scrutinize, I therefore move the amendment to the motion.

Amendment agreed to on Division.

The debate continues on the motion as amended.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to enter this debate but before I do I should just like to ask the Minister a short, quick question. When is the end of the year for the Land Bank Commission at which time this information would be tabled?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — He can't answer.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, he must know when the end of the year for the Land Bank Commission is.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — He has spoken.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, we are going to let him answer before he takes his seat. If he doesn't wish to answer now he has three more on here and he can answer when he stand up to speak.

An Hon. Member: — Ask him.

Mr. Weatherald: — I'm asking him now.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot precisely say what the end of the year is. I suspect that it is the end of the fiscal year. The question was asked, Mr. Speaker, and I will attempt to answer it for the Members if they will give me a few moments so I can precisely find out what the year-end for the Land Bank Commission is. It is they that have said that information would be tabled at the end of the Land Bank year. I said that once we had tidied up the year's operation for the Land Bank we would be publishing or we would be considering the publishing of the land descriptions and the value of the land. We have already, I think, said that we have changed the attitude of the former government in regard to making available the prices that are paid for land in order to be consistent we will continue to make the information available.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister has hung his hat on the information for this House that the Government is going to table information on land prices at the end of the Land Bank Commission year. Now we have, I think, at least three more debates that will be coming before this Member this afternoon and I would wholeheartedly suggest to the Minister at this time that he go and make a phone call and find out when the end of the Land Bank Commission year is and when he enters the debate to move another amendment on another item, that he inform us, Mr. Speaker, as to when that information will be available and when the end of the Land Bank Commission year is. Because as of yet we simply have not had that type of information presented to us. Also as to whether the price will be given at that particular time of the land that has been purchased.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite seem to want to hang their hats on that we, in the Opposition, could go down to the Land Titles Office and pay 50 cents to get the information they are talking about. I would think, considering that there

probably have been at least five or six hundred transactions now, all of which a person may well be interested in, rather than one, I think that would be a rather unique way of going down to each Land Titles Office in Saskatchewan and paying 50 cents or so and trying to compile all of the information that can be produced by the Government. I should think that would be rejected by even Members on their own side of the House and being totally impractical because you could run into 500, 600, 700 or even 800 transactions or maybe more depending on how much they bought. We would be travelling around every Land Titles Office in the province and paying 50 cents for each transaction. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that should be rejected as being totally impractical. It's fairly obvious that it is.

Mr. Speaker, the Government hangs its hat on the fact that there are all sorts of rumors around Saskatchewan created by the Member of the Opposition. Well, I would suggest to the Government that if they are so out of touch with public opinion that they believe that, that they get out into rural Saskatchewan and find out. I could venture to guess, Mr. Speaker, that in rural Saskatchewan today, if you spent two hours in any coffee shop, this subject would come up and it wouldn't have to be anybody to do with the Liberal Party or a Liberal Member there to bring it up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — People all over Saskatchewan are discussing how much was paid by the Land Bank for such and such a piece of land. Nothing to do with politics, they're strictly farmers, they're just passing the time discussing about it, Mr. Speaker. The rumor is always there, even on individual transactions, because until the rumor is created, they don't have any solid information to go on and that's what we're asking the Government to produce. If the Government has done an honest, straightforward job, they have nothing to fear if they tell how much was paid for the land.

They suggest the Farm Credit Corporation. The relationship to the Farm Credit Corporation and the Land Bank is zero. The Farm Credit Corporation is lending money. The people of Saskatchewan are not investing money in land through the Farm Credit Corporation. The Farm Credit Corporation is simply making loans that they get back in again. If they don't get it back in again, they've got security to cover the loan.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — Subsidized interest rates.

Mr. Weatherald: — The Farm Credit Corporation, Mr. Speaker, is not involving massive funds by the taxpayers of this province into land transactions as the Province of Saskatchewan is doing. Therefore, there is no particular reason that we need to know why the Farm Credit Corporation lends somebody \$30,000. It's not of any particular interest to any other individual.

The Government suggests another reason, Mr. Speaker, as a Member at another time mentioned, Mr. Speaker, he says, well, we paid maybe too little sometimes and sometimes paid too much, and all the big farmers are pushing the price of land up because instead of the Land Bank getting the land the big farmers are going out and buying up all of the land. Well, I want to tell

them about one case because it happened reasonably close to where I live. It's quite true that a farmer who owned two sections went out and he paid more for that half section than what he thought the Land Bank was going to buy it for. He paid more for that half section than he should have and that was inflation. And I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, he did. Because he has two sons and he wants those two sons to be farmers.

Hon. Mr. Bowerman: — Name them.

Mr. Weatherald: — I'll give you the name, I'm not going to speak it out here, but I'll send you the name if you want it. Mr. Speaker, he has two sons, he wants to buy that land and he wants those two sons to be farmers. Now he knows that if that half section is bought, Mr. Speaker, the land will never be available to his two sons and they will not be able to make a unit that they can both farm. So he knows that if it goes to the Land Bank, he never gets another chance for it. So he has bid more than he should for that land in order to make certain he got it. Certainly this is inflation. But nobody can convince me that here was a big farmer who went out and bought that half section of land to do all the little people out. The reason he bought that half section of land is because he wants the two of his family in farming operations when they get to be a little older, a very, very legitimate reason. And this is all the more reason why the Members here need to know why and what prices are being paid for land all over the Province of Saskatchewan.

There are other cases, Mr. Speaker, where individuals in Saskatchewan, where young farmers have made leases with individuals and the young farmer was hoping and had reason to believe that he would be able to make a contract to buy that land. Now the Land Bank has come along and bought it and that young person has not got title to the land and if he wants it he's got to pay a higher price than he was anticipating. This is happening in many cases where young farmers were previously renting and that land has now been sold to the Land Bank, and as to whether he gets that lease or not he doesn't know because there may be seven or eight other individuals who put in for it and he will lose his chance for that piece of property.

The best thing the Government can do is provide this type of information. They're going to spend another \$20 million in the coming year. If they give us the prices I don't think they need to worry about whether we decide if it's too much or too little because what they do need to worry about is whether all the average individual people around Saskatchewan think it's too much or too little. If the people of Saskatchewan think it's too much or too little in X, Y or Z town in Saskatchewan, I guess they will reap the fear of those people in that area. If they paid too little, I guess they'll benefit or pay the consequences as well. They don't really need to worry whether we think they paid too much or too little but they do have to worry whether the other people living in the locality think they paid too much or too little. And I think this is the type of information that can be very easily cleared up. All we have to do is have the information to see where the taxpayers' money is going. And I would strongly suggest to the Government that they tell us when it's going to be available, if it is for certain, and I strongly suggest to them that they change their mind this afternoon and provide the information on the land they have purchased.

Amendment agreed to on Division.

The debate continues on the motion as amended.

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, just one brief comment on what the Minister said in regard to the price of land and the effect that building would have on a particular piece of land. Now I am sure that while it may not have asked that directly in question (f), that the Minister when answering this question, if he was concerned about that aspect, could have mentioned that so much was paid for land and so much was paid for buildings and improvements. He could have also mentioned that he could have left out the total price of that land and he could have said that we paid so much per acre for the cultivated land and so much per acre for that land. This is all the information that we require. I might say that it's a sorry state of affairs in this province when information of such great importance as this is denied the Opposition and also denied the people of this province.

Motion as amended agreed to on Division.

Return No. 116

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 116 showing:

In the Rural Municipality of Excelsior No. 166, 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; (d) under (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 (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I've been forced into this debate, but I must say that it is not with a great deal of pleasure that I am going into this debate because basically the thing that has concerned me about it is these repeated questions, this one, this item 3, Motion 116, and similar questions indicated by the Members opposite. I want to say that I want to appeal to the Members in this fashion. I don't see what the difference is in the situation that is being sought to receive answers for now with respect to the Land Bank, and a situation that exists on a day to day basis with respect to any other transaction that the Government may carry out with respect to any of its routine activities of expenditure. I simply say to the Members of the House, when do you have a chance to check accounts of expenditure? That's basically what you're asking for. You have that in the normal and usual channels. It's presented to you on a regular yearly basis and you check the expenses as opposed to what has been voted for the year before. You do that for 1,001 things, 1,001 things where there is room for discretion and variation in Government policy if the Government is so inclined as you intimate is the case with respect to the Land Bank. It's the way Government is operated, it's the way Government

can best operate. It's the way you as Opposition Members can best fulfill your role as Opposition Members of not only approving accounts but checking accounts on a regular basis.

So I don't understand why the special fuss is raised or being raised by the Opposition with respect to the Land Bank. It doesn't work for any of the other expenditures on a regular basis, why should you differentiate? This could only lead one to assume that the basic reason for the differentiation is simply because, as I suspect, there are political motivations behind the amendments that are here. And I urge the Members of this House and say to them, that you will have the information undoubtedly in due course, in the normal and usual fashion. You will have lots of opportunity in Estimates. The amendment proposed, that I anticipate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) will propose, is certainly going to be a reasonable one.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, surely the Attorney General is not standing up in this House and suggesting that the Opposition doesn't have the right to information. Every day we ask for information regarding expenditures. That's a nonsensical argument. We are only carrying out our responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bowerman, the amendment to 116 to read as follows:

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

In the Rural Municipality of Excelsior No. 166 as of January 25, 1973: (a) the number of applications to sell land which were appraised by the Land Bank Commission; (b) (i) the number of offers to purchase land by the Commission that have been accepted by vendors; (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.

Amendment agreed to.

Debate continues on motion as amended.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister has been suggesting that we would have an opportunity to get this information and apparently he has still not yet seen fit to tell us when the Land Bank Commission year-end is. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, we are very disappointed that he has not seen fit to tell us when the Land Bank Commission year-end is and when this information will be available. And I think that will be taken note of by all Members of this House.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — In answer to the Hon. Member's question . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Minister of Agriculture has spoken to this amendment and cannot speak again.

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I am in the same position as the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), I had not planned to participate in this debate. But, Mr. Speaker, the people are sick and tired of somebody else saying in this House that because somebody else did something, it's justification for us doing it. Mr. Speaker, we have heard in this debate that because the Liberal Party, when it was the Government, had refused to give information, that it's all right for the party opposite to do it. Mr. Speaker, it was wrong then and it's wrong now, and that's an issue in this particular debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has stated that the reason for not giving this information is the fact that each parcel of land is different and they can't be compared. And yet, Mr. Speaker, when the price is decided on what the Land Bank will pay, they take into account the neighboring prices and the related prices in order to decide the appraisal price. Mr. Speaker, we say that the relationship is an issue and it's all the more reason, Mr. Speaker, to table this information before the House and make it available to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has accused the Opposition of political sabotage in dealing with the Land Bank and the Land Bank Commission. Mr. Speaker, the argument that the Minister of Agriculture gives on political sabotage is facetious, it's arrogant and it's misleading.

Mr. Speaker, the political sabotage is coming from the party opposite. This Land Bank Commission when it appoints party hacks to the Land Bank Commission and refuses to give the information to this House, Mr. Speaker, that's why the plan is going to be undermined, it's by the actions of the party opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Opposition has been accused of spreading rumors around this province about prices in land. If we're spreading rumors, Mr. Speaker, if my part is spreading rumors, the best way to put a stop to the rumors is to supply the information to the House, Mr. Speaker. The best way if the rumors are not true, supply the information. There's a simple answer that would stop that fallacious argument given by the party opposite. Mr. Speaker, the party opposite has been hiding behind a screen of, "well, we don't have to supply the information because somebody else didn't do it". It's trying to accuse the Opposition of spreading rumors, it's afraid to put a stop to the rumors, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government opposite, it's not going to be the NDP, it's not going to be the Land Bank Commission and it's not going to be the Government opposite that decides whether there are fair prices paid for this land. It's going to be the people themselves that decide, Mr. Speaker. And that's the reason right there why the information should be given to the people today and the Government should quit its arrogant practice of withholding that information

from the House, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking to the amendment and particularly in rebuttal to the remarks of the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) with respect to the Land Bank Commission and the Members of the Land Bank Commission. I think nothing better illustrates the argument that has been advanced by the Government and I will repeat again, that any information that is given to the Opposition in good faith is bound to be misinterpreted and twisted and distorted by the Opposition purely and solely for political information. Nothing better shows that statement and the statement made just a minute ago by the Member of Lumsden speaking to the amendment in this debate.

The Member for Lumsden got up and said that the Land Bank Commission was composed of party hacks. Those are the words that he used, political hacks. He says that of Gib Wesson. Mr. Speaker, he says that the Chairman of the Land Bank Commission is a party hack, Mr. Gib Wesson. Mr. Wesson comes from a family, I need not remind the Members of this House, a family whose roots in agricultural history in the Province of Saskatchewan go father back than the Member of Lumsden's ever has and ever will go back to benefit the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Wesson's family and Mr. Wesson's father was the first president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in this province. Mr. Wesson's family has been contributing to the way of family life in agriculture for years and the chairman of the Land Bank will continue to do so. And for the Member from Lumsden to get up and call him a party hack is total, irresponsible, political nonsense by the Liberals opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Lumsden gets up and call Professor Jake Brown of the University of Saskatchewan a political hack he's talking political nonsense. Professor Jake Brown is a Professor of Economics at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Campus. He has been appointed to numerous boards and commissions of numerous organizations throughout Saskatchewan on farming activity. He's been appointed by the former Government to boards and commissions and yet the Member from Lumsden gets up and calls Mr. Jake Brown a political hack with respect to the Land Bank Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Member from Lumsden and I say to the Members and the people of Saskatchewan, if there is anything that proves the point made by the Minister of Agriculture and those in Government, it is the statements by the Member from Lumsden about political hacks. They are totally irresponsible. Why do they say that, Mr. Speaker, why do the Liberals get up and make these sweeping statements about political hacks, about the Wesson family? The Members from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) are embarrassed the way the Member from Lumsden is talking about the political hacks. Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that some Members of the Liberal Party go about name calling the members of the Land Bank as political hacks? Why is it that these questions and this amendment is being

opposed by the Liberals opposite? I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because they will use names, innuendoes, smears, anything in their power, anything politically advantageous to them to bring down the Land Bank, they'll do anything in their attempt to get power in 1975.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — This Liberal opposition, Mr. Speaker, will stop at nothing in a desperate grab to get power in 1975. Nothing! If we give the answers to them, it is bound to be misinterpreted and twisted, just as badly as the Member from Lumsden's statements were twisted with respect to the members of the Land Bank Commission. I say to the Members of this House, and I say to the people of Saskatchewan that we can't trust the Liberal Opposition with respect to information. They are irresponsible, they are politically out to destroy the NDP Government and the Land Bank and the people of Saskatchewan ought not to place one iota of faith or confidence in them whatsoever. I'll support the amendment of the Minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate that the Attorney General found it necessary to bring in names of certain people in this particular debate.

An Hon. Member: — Who brought them in?

Mr. Gardner: — The Attorney General, I repeat! He has said that some of this information may be distorted by the Liberal Opposition, that is the reason for not giving it to us. He is entitled to think this, I suppose, if he likes. But he is also saying that he doesn't trust the people of Saskatchewan with this information, and this is the important part. It is a typical example of the arrogant attitude of this Government. Well, they say, we are not going to give to the people of Saskatchewan this information because we don't think you are capable of making a good judgment, we don't think you are capable of deciding whether we are paying the right price for this land or not. We think it is better for you, better for the people of Saskatchewan if you are denied this information. That's exactly what they said. I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan will take note of this, that the Minister and the Government are purposely denying them this information because they don't think they are capable of using good judgment in interpreting the information that they are given.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, it was obvious when the Minister, the Hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) leaped to his feet that he had got an opportunity, as he saw it, to divert attention from the real issue. His argument was obviously weak because his shouting was strong. Also, Mr. Speaker, he named a number of names on the Land Bank Commission but he deliberately avoided the name of David Miner. Of course, one must not assume that he forgot about him, he deliberately didn't mention the party hack to whom we refer.

Mr. Speaker, the real point at issue is that this information ought properly to be available because it can lay to rest all the suspicion and all the rumors that are now about the country. It also eliminates the opportunities for abuse that presently exist in the Land Bank Commission, not by the people he named, but by others. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know and to know today if \$90 an acre is paid for one piece of land and the neighboring land is sold for \$115, why the difference exists. We should have the right in this House to question the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) about the difference. If there are true and reasonable circumstances, I am sure he will have an explanation but if the real explanation is that the man to whom \$90 is paid is an ordinary citizen without political affiliation and the man who gets \$115 per acre is a member of the New Democratic Party, that, Mr. Speaker, is not the kind of circumstance that we will accept.

Mr. Speaker, this is nothing more or less than a deliberate and barefaced attempt by the Government to deny us information, and the result of it, Mr. Speaker, is that the Land Bank will, in fact, be forced to pay higher prices for land in many cases than it ought to. We all well know that nothing inflates the price of land more than a rumor. If they will lay the rumors to rest, if the land prices are made available and known, then we will have no further trouble. Mr. Speaker, the silliness of their argument is made clear by the fact that on the one hand the information is available, and on the other hand they say it ought not to be available. Nothing is more contradictory, nor more ridiculous. I call upon the Minister of Agriculture to change his attitude and call upon the Government to be a little more realistic and perhaps trust the people more than they have up till now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to on Division.

Return No. 13

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 13 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 Highway Traffic Board on: (a) radio advertising; (b) television advertising; (c) print advertising.
- (2) The advertising agencies used and 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.

I would hope that the Attorney General could provide the answer when it appears the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) didn't have the same success as the Attorney General and I had the other afternoon about when we were answering our returns.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I will be proposing an amendment to Return No. 13, just like I did the other day with respect to a similar motion. Mr. Speaker, I'll be asking the House to make an amendment which is similar to the one last time around,

namely:

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 Highway Traffic 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. Speaker, in speaking to this you will recall that the other day a subamendment was proposed by the Members opposite along the lines of asking for the names of printing companies used and the amount paid to each. This is properly in front of the adjourned debates, I don't want to be too far out of order, but in case that is again contemplated by the Opposition, in my judgment, item 4 is not necessary because it is incorporated in item 3. The persons, companies or firms with which the said advertising, of which printed media is, obviously, an item, (c) was placed and the amount paid to each. So that the 'names of printing companies' would appear to me to be those that we would have to list in the information, in fact, be listed.

Mr. proposal is that this amendment is all-inclusive which includes the information that the Opposition wants and provides it for the House. I would move that, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Labor (Mr. Snyder).

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment. I have had a chance to look at the amendment that had been submitted by the Attorney General last day, and I agree with him that it is an all-inclusive amendment and that the subamendment which we proposed last day is not necessary. The information we require will be covered by the amendment, particularly item (3).

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 153

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 153 showing:

(1) Whether the Department of Labor granted any exemptions to The Labor Standards Act in the year 1972. If so, to whom and the exemptions granted; (2) Whether the Government of Saskatchewan refused to grant exemptions to The Labor Standards Act in the year 1972. If so, the names of those refused exemptions and the reasons for each refusal.

Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labor): — Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to discuss this motion with the Hon. Member and I indicated to him that the motion, if answered in its present form, would produce a nil answer and I am sure that isn't what he is looking for. The

motion asks whether the Department of Labor has granted any exemptions to The Labor Standards Act in the year 1972. In essence there have been no exemptions to the Act. There have been some exemptions to the Hours of Work Provisions. So I should like to move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture.

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

Whether the Department of Labor granted any exemptions to the hours of work provisions of The Labor Standards Act in the year 1972. If so, to what class or group of employees or what class or group of employers the exemptions were granted.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 93

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 93 showing:

(1) The names of all Government Departments, Branches, Agencies or Boards which accepted collect or charges reversed telephone calls from Members of the Saskatchewan Legislature since August 1, 1972. (2) The names of the Member or Members of this Legislative Assembly who made such telephone calls.

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — I am frankly at a loss as to what to do with respect to item 44, Return No. 93, because it says the names of all Government Departments which accepted collect or charges reversed telephone calls from Members of the Legislature since August 1, 1972. I think this is almost an impossibility to answer if you really think about it. Because it is conceivable that an MLA could call a director or some department and the director may well have accepted the call from the MLA, not having any record of the MLA making the phone call. And furthermore, not having any record of the particular instance. How could the Government be held accountable for that? The same with item (2). The names of the Member or Members of this Legislative Assembly who made such telephone calls. I can visualize very easily a situation arising where an MLA may make a phone call to a deputy in a particular department, the deputy accepts the reverse phone call. How would we know the name of the Member who made that telephone call? There is no instruction out to the Government to say that you must keep a record of every MLA who makes a collect telephone call back to the department since August 1, 1972. As I am sure the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) will note, because he has had experience in this area, phone bills and phone calls by numbers collect or otherwise are usually of such size that it would be almost an impossibility to provide the information with any degree of accuracy. I do say in all sincerity to the Member from Lumsden that the question, and I don't mean this in any chippy or snippy way, is, I think, badly worded because it just won't allow the Government to answer it. The names of all departments that accepted collect calls. If it was worded in a different way, such as, is it the policy of the Government to accept collect or charges, then we could

answer it. I don't see how we could answer number (2) under any circumstances. I, for one, would be afraid to say that the Department of the Attorney General should answer no, to give the answer no, there have been no Members of the Legislative Assembly who have made such telephone calls because it may very well have been that somebody in Saskatoon was phoned by an MLA in Prince Albert or whatever, and there would be no record of that. There could be no record of that. Now perhaps what the Member is saying is that we should change our policy and list every time and tell our civil servants that every time an MLA calls that he should make an identification and list it. But I think that is unnecessary and unreasonable. I don't think that he would want that as well. Really what I am saying to the Member is that I hope we would, in the light of my explanation, which I offer to him in good faith, would withdraw the question. If he wants to pursue the matter, I might suggest perhaps he could pursue it along the lines that I have indicated. Because I just don't see what other alternatives there are available to the Government given those facts.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, when I filed this question in this paper I knew the difficulties involved. Mr. Speaker, the Members are quite well aware that amendments were made in The Legislative Assembly Act, I believe, whereby telephone credit cards were issued to Members of the Legislative Assembly. A certain limitation was put on the amounts to be spent or charged to the telephone credit card. And the same amount was applied to all Members of the Assembly in the amount of \$600 per year. My question, Mr. Speaker, was attempting to find out whether or not any Members of this Legislature on either side of the House have abused the privilege given by the people of Saskatchewan that this added expense was to be reduced by public moneys. Mr. Speaker, as I say, when I filed the question I knew full well the degree of difficulty involved. Answers can't be given because I realize there is a great degree of difficulty in that all collect and reverse telephone charges are recorded. I am prepared to accept that if the Members of the Treasury Benches are prepared to direct that all their department heads, agency heads, they themselves have received such calls from the Members of this Assembly. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we in this Assembly were given a privilege by the people of Saskatchewan to have credit card expenses in the amount of \$600. And any Members of this Assembly, if there are abuses, and I preface that, if there are abuses, Mr. Speaker. I am saying if there are.

An Hon. Member: — Are you assuming there are?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lane: — Can I proceed, Mr. Speaker? I say if there are, Mr. Speaker, then they must be stopped. The Members who are abusing the privilege, if such is the case, must stand accountable to the public. Mr. Speaker, I was quite aware, I am going to stand by this question, I think it can be answered. I realize there is a great degree of difficulty, but if there are abuses in the practice and the privilege given by the people of Saskatchewan, the Government and the Members of this Assembly should be accountable. That is the reason for the question. Mr. Speaker, I stand by the question.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 94

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 94 showing:

(1) the names of all Government Departments, Branches, Agencies or Boards which supplied mailing lists to any individuals or corporations in the year 1972. (2) To whom were such mailing lists supplied.

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, again we are faced with a much similar problem but I think this one can be rectified with an amendment.

That clause (2) be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(2) in cases where the Department, Branch, Agency or Board maintains records of such information, the names of those to whom such mailing lists were supplied.

I will explain it very briefly again, Mr. Speaker. We have a situation here where I am advised this question is not going to be free of difficulty in answering. I don't know what a mailing list is. The definition is not set out in the question. It could range from a mailing list under SHSP cards, or SHSP listings as one example, to a mail list of all the MLAs in this House. So it is not free of difficulty even given those limits but we are going to let that go untouched for the moment. But again, I don't know how it could be reasonably expected for the Government to know to whom such mailing lists, in their multiplicity, by the Government, to whom they were offered. So I think the amendment is reasonable where the department has such records of names of people who have these mailing lists whatever those will mean. We will undertake to provide the names of the persons who received the mailing lists. I think that the amendment should accommodate the Hon. Member opposite and give him some of the information that we have, certainly all of the information that we are capable of getting in this area. I move this amendment, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood).

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, a couple of comments. I hope that the Government opposite does not intend to get into the practice of trying to hide behind a screen of difficulty, Mr. Speaker. If the questions are difficult, that doesn't mean they shouldn't be answered. I can remember, Mr. Speaker, volumes and volumes and volumes being tabled in this House of questions from Members opposite when they were in the Opposition which required years to answer and which took up a great deal of time in this House just to supply the information. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney General has stated that first of all he isn't sure what mailing lists are. Again, I can't give a more adequate definition than stating what they are. I think they are pretty commonly described. However, in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General is proposing, he says, first of all, he doesn't know what mailing lists are and then he says he is going to supply us with the names of those to whom such mailing lists were supplied. So first he doesn't know what the definition is. Now he is going to supply us with it.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I don't know what kind.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to try the information and we will see if it is adequate and if not we will submit another question or Motion for Return, Mr. Speaker. On that basis we will accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 183

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue of Return No. 183 showing:

(a) The number of accused who were released under the provisions of the Bail Reform legislation from implementation of the legislation to December 31, 1972. (2) The number of accused who were not released. (c) The number of accused who were released, refused or failed to appear for trial. (d) The number of accused who were prosecuted for failure to appear for trial. (e) The number of convictions that were there for failure to appear for trial after being released under the provisions of the Bill Reform legislation.

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on No. 183 I will be proposing an amendment as follows. The amendment, again, is basically designed to provide the information that we have information about within the Department of the Attorney General. I would therefore move that Return No. 183 be amended as follows:

That: (i) At the end of clause (a), the words "as reported to the Department of the Attorney General" be added. (ii) At the end of clause (b), the words "as reported to the Department of the Attorney General" be added. (iii) Clauses (c), (d), and (e) be deleted and the following clause be substituted therefore:

(c) The number of accused who after release under the provisions of the Bail Reform legislation have been reported to the Department of the Attorney General as: (i) having failed to appear for trial; (ii) having been prosecuted for failure to appear for trial; (iii) having been convicted for failure to appear for trial.

I am advised by the department officials, that I will make this statement again, we will Endeavour to provide the answer but I don't want any Member of this House to be laboring under any illusion that the answer is likely to be coming very quickly. The names that are required to be attached and the reasons therefore, the numbers and the like, is going to be a difficult process for the department to undertake. That is not a complaint or anything against the Member for Lumsden for asking that question because it is an important area of concern, Bail Reform. But I do want you to know that it is not going to be that simple. I should like to move that amendment, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood).

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, just a comment. I quite accept the amendment that the Attorney General has proposed. Again, I am quite aware of the degree of difficulty. The Attorney General has stated, Mr. Speaker, that the question of Bail Reform is a very urgent one and a very vital one. We would hope that the Attorney General's Department can get us the information as soon as possible. Again, I realize the degree of difficulty involved. The question is a very important one and a very vital one. And we would appreciate the information as soon as possible.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 163

Mr. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 163 showing:

- (a) the date plans were announced for the construction of Nelson's Seed and Cleaning Ltd. at Wiseton.
- (b) The date construction began.
- (c) If the company applied for a provincial loan.
- (d) If so, (i) when the loan was granted; (ii) the number of people currently employed; (iii) the number of people expected to be employed by December 31, 1973.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — I will be proposing an amendment to this, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the amendment is basically because of the wording of "provincial loan". Provincial loan would be all-encompassing involving either a loan under SEDCO or a loan granted under The Industrial Development Act. I am sure the Hon. Member who asked the question will appreciate that loans under SEDCO have been confidential and have been treated as such, quite obviously, for business reasons. I am sure that he would want that confidentiality respected. However, the matter of loans under The Industrial Incentives Act is a matter of public information, I am advised. Accordingly, what I would propose to do for all of these questions is to amend, we'll use Return No. 163, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood):

That the words "provincial loan" in clause (c) be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

"forgiveable loan under The Industry Incentives Act, 1970.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the Attorney General's observation about the confidentiality of SEDCO's loans I have to agree with him, but I don't think that I put the interpretation that he is putting on this, namely, as to who applied for loans and whether they were granted or not. I think that is carrying confidentiality a little too far. That is why I worded it in the manner that I did, because I didn't want to impose on the recognized restrictions of SEDCO.

The other comment that he made on the interpretation of "provincial loans", I worded this way purposely to take in

both branches. I think the question as worded is quite in order. The amendment certainly doesn't supply the information that I was desirous of getting.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock p.m.