

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**17th Day**

**Tuesday, February 26, 1974.**

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

**QUESTIONS**

**INCREASE IN BREAD PRICES**

**MR. J. G. LANE:** (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Premier.

The Premier set a precedent last fall when he was prepared and committed his Government to an absorption of the proposed increase in the price of beer. We have also noticed his rather weak attempts to blame the Government in Ottawa for his own dereliction in duty in fighting inflation. And in light of his precedent and his own efforts and in light of the proposed increase in the price of bread in the city of Regina, is the Premier of this province prepared to commit his Government to absorbing that proposed increase in the price of bread for the citizens of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A. E. BLAKENEY:** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of how the Hon. Member proposes that the Government would absorb the price of bread. We do not buy bread or sell bread and therefore we cannot absorb the price by reducing our mark up in the manner presumably indicated by the Member for Lumsden.

May I suggest that in reciting the steps taken by the Government to deal with the cost of living that he neglected to mention removal of the medical care and hospital tax last year which provided a very substantial benefit.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — I am sure that if he bides his time there will be further proposals which will be in the Budget and which will similarly contribute to relieving the high cost of living caused by the inadequacy of Federal policies.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LANE:** — The Premier has attempted to avoid the question. We notice he wasn't in the practice of buying hogs or buying oil until very recently too. Certainly he can do something in that aspect. The Premier mentioned certain aspects...

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! When the Member rises to ask a question it should be a supplementary question pertaining to the original

answer and not a new topic. It must be direct.

**MR. LANE:** — The Premier said he didn't sell bread and I said he didn't sell oil or hogs until very recently either. The Premier also made the statement that I am going to answer and ask a question, Mr. Speaker. The question, very simply is why did the Premier ignore the fact that he raised SGIO rates every year that he has been in office; raised income tax for all our citizens; raised succession duties; raised community pasture rates? The Premier has evaded this question and I still demand an answer as to what is the Premier going to do for the people of Saskatchewan on higher bread costs for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Government policy will be announced in due course.

#### **FIRING OF SUPERVISOR FOR SOCIAL WORKERS IN NORTH**

**MR. A. R. GUY:** (Athabasca): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). We all know that a social worker supervisor for northern Saskatchewan was fired by the Minister in the last few days. I should like to ask the Minister, is it the standard policy of that Department to have supervisors evaluated by other employees of the same branch with fewer qualifications and much less experience in that Department?

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN:** (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — No, it is not the policy of the Department to have of: supervisors evaluated by supervisors in a similar branch. The particular situation with respect to Mr. Baalim is that on the basis of the way that Mr. Baalim was acting and the way that was operating in his job it was necessary that he be supervised.

**MR. GUY:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. If that isn't the policy and it is one that has been made for a particular political reason, I wonder if the Minister could say, in view the criticism by the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers, if you are reviewing the firing of Mr. Baalim?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the criticism of the social workers, the Provincial Association of Social Workers. I have seen no specific criticism with respect to that incident.

#### **INSTALLATION OF SPRINKLING SYSTEMS FOR FIRE PREVENTION**

**MR. G. B. GRANT:** (Whitmore Park): — Before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder).

I know his department has taken a very genuine and sincere interest in trying to prevent fires as well as devise ways and means of warning potential victims. An article in last night's paper indicated that the fire marshal has suggested some changes that are contemplated, one of which is compulsory sprinkling of apartments/housing people in excess of five stories. I believe the National Research Council do quite a bit of work

on this and as I am informed they haven't as yet recognized sprinkling as essential in high rise buildings. I would appreciate him commenting on that.

I would also appreciate a comment as to the senior citizens' home in the 22 block McIntyre Street on which construction has just commenced, I believe it just above ground level now. Is there provision in this building for sprinkling and what other safety and precautionary devices are being included in that building since the Provincial Government has a fairly large stake in it?

**HON. G. SNYDER:** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to respond to the Member's first question. I think it will be recognized that there has been a good deal of concern with respect to the whole aspect of fire prevention and fire protection particularly in light of a number of very tragic fires that have taken place in the city of Regina especially. Accordingly the people of my department have gone through the rigours of preparing a new set of regulations which have been offered to a number of interested organizations. In particular the Saskatchewan Construction Association had an opportunity to present their views with respect to the new regulations until such time as a meeting on March 7th and 8th with respect to National Building Code regulations could be held. So accordingly the new regulations which were alluded to in the release yesterday are still on my desk waiting the results of a meeting which will involve the people who are responsible for the framing of the National Building Code.

With respect to the other question I would have to remind the former Minister, the Member for Regina Whitmore Park, that in those particular circumstances those areas of concern that fall within the cities, the 11 cities where there is an established fire fighting unit, these have become the responsibility historically of the city in question where there is a fire fighting unit.

We have made some overtures to the various municipalities indicating that perhaps there are some better methods of carrying on inspections. We haven't concluded finally the route that we propose to travel except that we do hope in the not too distant future to have a coherent plan and a more effective inspection operation in order that some of the shortcomings that are evident, particularly in apartment blocks and other institutions where the public gather on a regular basis, may be rectified. We are hoping that we shall have something more coherent than is the case at the present moment. We are on top of it and we hope that we will be able to report more fully in the not too distant future.

**MR. GRANT:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I gather from what the Minister is saying that there is no special preventive features included in that building that I referred to. That it is up to the city to determine the safety features that are installed in that building and there is no provision for sprinkling. I think this is regrettable and I would hope that he would comment further at a later date.

He speaks of a meeting to be held on March 7th and according to the article, Mr. Grebinsky, the Regina Fire Marshall

seems to be somewhat in the dark as to what the Provincial Marshal is doing and I would ask the Minister, will Mr. Grebinsky and other local city fire marshals be included in these meetings so that they can be kept informed?

**MR. SNYDER:** — I would expect that that would be the case. I understand that our people have been invited to attend. It will be attended by the Saskatchewan Construction Association, at least two or three members from the Provincial Fire Commissioner's Office as well as a number of other interested people.

### **SPEAKER'S RULING**

#### **MOTIONS FOR RETURN DEBATABLE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I want to say to the members that in order to facilitate the business of the House over the past number of years there has been a custom growing that these would be introduced without formally being moved. A couple of years ago we had motions for return non-debatable which becomes debatable. So in order to assist the Chair in keeping track of these motions when they are moved for debate, to keep track of them and to assist the staff we will have to get back to the proper formal rules of having these motions, if they are a motion which is debatable, duly moved and seconded. The Clerk has them all typed out so anyone wishing to move these motions, there will be forms for them. I would kindly ask you to have a seconder on them and sign them the same as any other motion so as we can keep track of them. Otherwise it becomes very difficult.

**HON. R. ROMANOW:** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just rise on a Point of Privilege. Is it your view that from here on, every motion for return has to be submitted in writing to you at this particular stage? I thought the practice certainly would be sufficient where the Member rises and simply says that he moves the order. It is all on the form. We see it. I am not sure I have Your Honour's ruling quite clear in my own mind. Would you clarify that for me?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What happens, what makes it difficult, if a motion isn't moved, if it is a debatable motion, then an amendment comes, the amendment is submitted in writing and we have no other copy to fit it with so we know what it is about without searching the blues back all the time. Once Members are aware, they move the motion without having to read it and send it up, it won't take very long. I realize it will be difficult at the start but it is going to facilitate the work of the office and myself considerably if we have these motions.

**MR. J. C. McISAAC:** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, does that mean in essence, if a Member moves a motion for return and he submits a copy to the Clerk and retains a copy and then when he gets up to move it hands in that copy. He has to do it again, that is right. But it is really not doing it again if he made a copy the first time. Is this correct?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Technically he should move

it when he gets up but maybe with the agreement of the House we could work out and streamline it a little bit so that if a motion is submitted that the Clerk has signed in the first place, when the motion is called the Clerk could just date it and send it to the Chair, it would facilitate the work. Maybe we could work out some arrangements along that line so that we have some track of it.

## **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

### **RETURN NO. 1**

**MR. J. G. LANE** (Lumsden) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 1 showing:

A copy of all reports on investigations undertaken by any Department of the Government of Saskatchewan regarding unfair business practices and pricing practices, limitation of competition, advertising and any matter regarding consumer protection during the years 1971, 1972, and 1975.

**HON. E. L. TCHORZEWSKI:** (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to ask at least this side of the House to oppose this particular motion.

The Department of Consumer Affairs as well as other departments, but I am speaking in particular of the Department of Consumer Affairs, has and does many investigations of various kinds. It does those investigations as a result of complaints that it receives from consumers or problems that are brought to the attention by consumers as well as complaints and problems that are from time to time brought to it by people who are the sellers to the consumers. That is the function of the Department.

The thing is, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes those complaints are legitimate and sometimes they are not legitimate. I don't think that it would be of benefit to those concerns to have these kinds of things made public.

Mr. Speaker, we don't feel that every merchant should be dragged out for public scrutiny simply because somebody has brought a complaint to our attention. As I have said not all complaints are always justified. Sometimes it is the consumer who is to blame and not the businessman. It is a strange kind of a question that Members opposite would ask, who seem to feel that they are the only spokesmen for the business community of this province, which is not the case.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I have to ask what kind of a warfare on business is being proposed by the Liberal Party opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, the motion asks for many things. It asks for any matter regarding consumer protection. The Department of Consumer Affairs is now receiving in the range from 200 to 500 and sometimes over 500 complaints and concerns, expressed to it

a month. It is our intention as a Government to respect the confidentiality of the consumer and it is our intention as a Government to respect the confidentiality of the merchant.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Further it is prohibitive to search out every one of these files and provide this kind of information.

Certainly we are most willing to provide statistics on work that is being done through the Department or through any other agency of government related to this and if the Member wishes to look up in the annual report he will find a great deal of information that is already provided there.

The information, Mr. Speaker, asks for such information which I feel, and we feel as a government should be kept confidential and we believe that the consumer and the business community have a right to expect this confidentiality. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that this House defeat this motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. A. R. GUY:** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I find the comments of the young Minister of Consumer Affairs rather amusing. If he had been in this Legislature when they were on the Opposition side of the House and seen some of the questions that they put on the Order Paper and expected answers to he would not speak the way he did. I remember the present Attorney General getting on his feet whenever we suggested that there was certain confidential information between the Government and the people that they did business with. The present Attorney General screamed to the high heavens that everything that goes on in government should be open to the public.

I remember in 1971 the NDP campaigning on that very platform that we were now going to have an open government. Everything we do is going to be above board and on the table. There is never going to be a question in the Legislature that is going to be turned down because we believe in having the public aware of everything that is going on. Here today, after two months of sitting, of doing nothing, I think you would have to use that expression in view of the fact that there has been so little done. We have had two questions that have been on the Order Paper for two months, stood, and on the third one they are asking to have it turned down.

This is the open Government that went to the people in '71 and promised to provide the openness that today we see is nothing but a complete farce. I think there are some occasions when the correspondence between Government departments and certain groups perhaps should be on a confidential basis, but I hope that the Government opposite will keep this to a minimum and also that they will not adopt that holier-than-thou attitude the next time they sit over here on the Opposition benches.

**MR. J. G. LANE:** (Lumsden): — Just a comment, Mr. Speaker. The remarks of the Hon. Minister are a farce to say the least. The hypocrisy of the Hon. Minister is also a farce to this Legislature. He talked about

confidentiality and yet he goes on television and he talks about a report that he had prepared that he won't give to the Legislature, that he won't give to the Members of this House and talks about what bad guys Safeways are in their pricing. That is not confidentiality; This is biased, unfair reporting and his investigations will select certain individuals and certain groups and then go ahead and run to television and give that report because they are bad guys and we will get them and then he calls that respecting confidentiality. His answer is nonsense, the position of the Government opposite is nonsense.

The Member for Athabasca made it quite clear what your position was before the last election and how you have dishonored it so far today.

He talked about confidentiality of the consumer and of business. Let us make no mistake that government records are not confidential. The Minister himself is guilty of breach of confidence on his investigations. He selectively picks which ones he wants to take to the public. I say that is unfair. Sure, talk about war on business. Your unfair approach and unfair practices are a war on business and I say a discredit to the Department and a discredit to the Government opposite.

We have asked for investigations and I don't know why you are afraid to table them in this House. You have biased investigations, you have already admitted that, you admitted that in the last session. You have admitted breach of confidentiality since the last session. There is no question that the information that we asked for is legitimate and it is certainly right to have it tabled before this House.

It is very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that on the federal level the Government of Canada tables this information and it is reported and the Members opposite they may have something to do with it. They can check all the investigations and dispositions in the Canadian Association Consumer magazine. They will also find in that magazine who was prosecuted and who was found guilty. They are not afraid. They are afraid because they only intend to have biased investigations, unfair investigations and that is wrong and we, on this side of the House, cannot support that approach of the Government opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion negatived.

## RETURN NO. 2

**MR. H. E. COUPLAND** (Meadow Lake) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 2 showing:

All correspondence between officials of the Government of Saskatchewan and any interested parties, concerning the application of Meadow Lake Feeders Limited for financial assistance.

**HON. K. THORSON** (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, this motion asks for information which frankly should not be made public. I want to hasten to add that I am not trying to determine now whether or not anybody connected with Meadow Lake Feeders Limited has applied to any

Government agency for any financial assistance. That is really not the question that concerns me. I think it is a very bad precedent if it becomes known that when people write to the Government, correspond with Government agencies about the possibility of financial assistance from Government agencies, that that correspondence will be tabled in the Legislature and made public. Because when people write in about matters of that kind they are very often asked, and very often volunteer, to supply all kinds of information about their own financial circumstances. I don't think any of us in this Legislature would expect those people to be exposed to a public review because they corresponded with the Government about that possibility.

May I say that if the question is rephrased in some other way or if the Member wants to get in touch with me directly, and there is some information that can be supplied that is useful and helpful, I would like to co-operate in that regard. But in its present form, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Assembly to defeat the motion.

Motion negatived.

### RETURN NO. 5

**MR. T. M. WEATHERALD** (Cannington) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 5 showing:

(1) A copy of all analyses, comparisons, projections, graphs, summaries, and reports prepared by the Minister of the Environment or his Department, and/or any other agency of the Government comparing the effectiveness of Saskatchewan's anti-pollution program to each and any of the programs in the other nine Canadian provinces.

(2) A copy of all resumes, comparisons, reports, or summaries comparing Saskatchewan's anti-pollution legislative program to the programs in any or all of the other nine Canadian provinces.

**HON. N. E. BYERS:** (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Cannington asks for a good deal of information:

1. To compare the effectiveness of Saskatchewan's anti-pollution program with those in other provinces.
2. For the effectiveness of our anti-pollution legislation with respect to other provinces.
3. For figures on research spent in Saskatchewan as compared to Canada.

I want to say to the Member that we will be able to provide him with some information in this respect. I do, however, want to point out to him that as Departments of the Environment are relatively new in most Canadian provinces and relatively new in the Federal Government, that we have not really been spending much time comparing our legislative progress on environmental matters with other jurisdictions. We have been moving ahead on a number of fronts, whether it is in the area of air pollution control measures or water pollution control measures or the implementation of the Litter Act, etc. However, not all



provinces are moving at the same speed in this regard.

I want to say to him that one of the things that we have endeavored to do is to work as closely as possible with our sister provinces in an attempt to develop regulations and legislation that are, insofar as possible, uniform across the country. We would think that it would be a disservice to Canada if we were to have provinces that could be earmarked as 'pollution havens.' Therefore, there has been a good deal of co-operation with the other provinces. Obviously, not all provinces are moving at the same pace with respect to legislation and they are not all moving as fast as we are. I want to point out to the Hon. Member from Cannington, for example, in an area such as our Litter Control Act, that we have been receiving enquiries from across the land as to its effectiveness, how are we getting along since we have not allowed the use of non-returnable bottles and banning of canned beverages and this sort of thing. Therefore, in many respects, we are out in front with respect to the other provinces.

But insofar as it is possible to provide him with this information on a comparative basis we will certainly provide that information which is available.

Motion agreed to.

## RETURN NO. 12

**MR. GUY** (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 12 showing:

Under the Public Service or Supernumerary Training Program:(1) the number of persons who were enrolled from July 1, 1971 to September 30, 1973; (2) the number of persons who were in training at September 30, 1973

**HON. A. TAYLOR:** (Minister of Social Services) Mr. Speaker, I shall be moving an amendment to this particular Return.

The Return caused us a few problems, particularly in its wording, as it asks for the number of persons enrolled from July 31, 1971 to September 30, 1973. It was a little difficult to define what the Member wanted. If he wanted the total enrolment in that period or the number of new enrollees. So my amendment will provide wording which will clear up that. We also felt, at least I felt, that since this program has been phased out, I think as most Members know, that it would be to the advantage of the House to have a review of the total program and therefore the amendment which I am going to move will provide for all years of operation of the program.

The Members will be interested in knowing that at the close of the program about 500 people at that time were blanketed into the Public Service into newly created permanent positions. These employees had in fact been used as permanent employees but were not given the advantages of union memberships, superannuation and the like. The program had this difficulty although it did attempt to provide some training. This is one of the reasons for phasing out this particular program.

The amendment which I propose, Mr. Speaker, seconded by

the Hon. Mr. Cody:

That all the words after the word 'Program' in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

(1) The number of persons participating in the program (a) January 1st, 1968 to July 1st, 1971; (b) July 1st, 1971 to September 30th, 1973. (2) The number of and percentage of persons who have successfully completed their training and who have obtained regular employment from (a) January 1st, 1968 to July 1st, 1971; (b) July 1st, 1971 to September 30th, 1973.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**RETURN NO. 19**

**MR. GUY** (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 19 showing:

(1) Copies of any communications issued by the Executive Council or any individual Cabinet Member to civil servants prohibiting communication by them with the public, and prohibiting them from answering questions posed by citizens concerning the operations of any government departments or agencies.

(2) A list of civil servants to whom such communications were made.

He said: — Just before I move this, I should like to say, we have seen here today perhaps one of the best examples of an inefficient government that we have had in this Legislature. I remember yesterday when we wanted to adjourn one of the second readings we were severely reprimanded by the Attorney General for not having our material ready. I suggest there is a lot more work to be done in preparing for a second reading, particularly when you haven't had the Minister make his opening remarks regarding the purpose of second reading of a Bill. But here we have a question that has been on the Order Paper for more than three months. All the information that can possibly be provided is there right in front of the eyes of the Ministers who are going to answer the question. Here we have today the Attorney General standing up time and time again begging leave to adjourn the debate. Surely to goodness with the number of special assistants, executive assistants, assistants to the assistants along with the research and planning personnel and other people whom they have hired in each and every one of their departments, they could get the answers to these questions and at least have the amendments prepared in order to pass it and expedite it through this Legislature.

I think this is a gross example of inefficiency that the people of Saskatchewan will not tolerate from a government that promised to be open and faithful and true to the people of Saskatchewan. I so move Return No. 19.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW:** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in moving this particular motion, the Member for Athabasca-Rosthern or is it Rosthern-Athabasca, I am not quite sure which, but the tweedle-dee or the tweedle-dum side of the team that sits over there either . . .

**MR. BOLDT:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken to the motion yet. Don't count your chickens before they are hatched.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I would then say that the future would-be Member for Rosthern, present Member for Athabasca — I want to stress to the Hon. Members opposite the would-be aspect of the statement — talks about inefficiency. I tried to tell the Member for Athabasca, and the Members opposite that with respect to many of these Orders for Return the respective Ministers are not in their chairs, out on government business and would have to have other comments to make with respect to some of the issues that are involved. Now that is a fact. It happens on our side. It happens on your side. I ask all Members to understand that.

But really when we talk about inefficiency and waste, I think one of the things that the public in Saskatchewan should know is some of the inefficiency and waste that is generated by what are absolutely ludicrous statements, as examples, questions by the Opposition opposite. They clutter the Order Paper with questions which ask for information anyone with any degree of experience in parliamentary activity would know ought not to be asked. Questions which if they are to be answered would mean mountains of paper and hours of work in research.

To give you an example, this particular question that they ask here for Order for Return No. 19, Mr. Speaker. This Return asks that copies of all communications issued by the Cabinet or any Members of Cabinet to civil servants prohibiting communications, be tabled. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what person who reasonably and objectively looks at the process of government would expect that question to be asked by an Opposition.

**MR. STEUART:** — On a Point of Order, what motion is the Hon. Member talking about. Stick to the motion we are talking about.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The motion that we are discussing is Item 14 for Order for Return No. 19. I believe the Member is discussing this motion.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, as I tried to point out about the inefficiency of the Legislature due to the wasteful and obstructive questions very often advanced by a bankrupt opposition, that is basically the position that we are in. No one denies the right of the Opposition to ask a government questions, pertinent questions on facts relating to its operation. We will try to answer those questions as best we can, Mr. Speaker. But it is this ritual that we go through with the Liberal Opposition not having any policies, not having any ideas, trying to scheme up questions like we see here on Order for Return No. 19. Talk about inefficiency, Mr. Speaker;

I was about to say anyone who is fair-minded, who might

approach this problem in any responsible way, would he honestly expect any government to answer a question that has been put forward here with respect to Item 14, Order for Return No. 19? What this Return is asking is that the Cabinet deliver to the Opposition copies of communications, privileged communications that it makes between itself and its employees. When was the last time the Members opposite when they were the government, that a question of this nature was answered by them? When can it be expected that in the day to day operations of government a member of the Executive Council or the Executive Council itself should be tabling communications between itself and civil servants? I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan would believe for a moment that this is a fair type of question, that this is a responsible type of question.

Mr. Speaker, this is a question which really is looking to uncover something. It is a question which is trying to uncover something but can't. It is a question which really serves no possible end result, but simply a question based on a blind guess. Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the inefficiency of the Opposition which is resulting in a day like this, when it could be a productive day for Private Members, being dragged down into the types of political comments made by the Member for Athabasca. I say to the Member for Athabasca and the Leader of the Opposition, the people of Saskatchewan are urging you to get out of this rut that you are in. To get out of this negative approach of trying to do witch-hunting in effect, to try and get you out of this rut and start asking responsible questions to make this Parliament and this Government work better. We will co-operate all the way that we can, but don't ask us for Orders for Return like No. 19, nobody could reasonably expect an answer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

**MR. GUY:** — We listened to the Attorney General talking about confidentiality of material and so on. Most of the material that we are asking for in this Return of course has already been made public, at least parts of it. We have the comments made by Mr. Art Baalim who was fired unnecessarily by the Government, who went to the Press and gave a report on what he received from the Government in his notice of dismissal. We had some from Gerry Hammersmith when he was fired by the same Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, who went to the Press and a lot of it became public information. What we want now is to see the total amount of documentation that has been passed on between the Ministers and . . .

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The Member for Athabasca said that he sought communications directed to Mr. Hammersmith, if I understand that right, that terminated his employment with the Government. I want the Member if he saw that communication to table it in this House. If he can't table that communication in this House, then he should retract his statement. May I, for the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, say that Mr. Hammersmith was not fired, he was on a contract and the contract expired.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The Minister raised what may be a Point of Order, if the Member said the way — but we can't continue to elaborate

on it. The Member for Athabasca.

**MR. GUY:** — The Minister better open his ears. I didn't say anything about seeing it, I said that the parts of the transmittal from the Minister to Mr. Hammersmith when he was dismissed appeared in the newspaper. That's what I said.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

**MR. GUY:** — That's not a Point of Order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Chair won't know until I hear it.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — The Member for Athabasca said there was a transmittal from me that appeared in the Press with respect to the release of Mr. Hammersmith. I respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that the Member presents that news clipping to this House, because there was no release clipping that I am aware of.

**MR. McISAAC:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister had a chance to speak on the motion. He may find another opportunity if he watches the Order Paper, instead of his nose in his desk, and pays attention to the House business he can get his speech in yet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — If any Member has a Point of Order it must be raised at the time, and the Hon. Member from Athabasca referred to newspaper clippings, and maybe he can answer those comments and see that those are supplied, what he is referring to.

**MR. GUY:** — The question, Mr. Speaker, is that we want to know how many other employees of the present Government have been treated in the same sort of fashion, as the two or three examples that I mentioned were treated by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Therefore, I think it is a perfectly relevant question and one that should be answered by the Government opposite.

Motion negatived.

## **RETURN NO. 22**

**MR. GUY** (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 22 showing:

(1) All printing contracts with their values, given to Service Printing Company, from January 1, 1973 to all Departments, Boards, Agencies, Commissions or Crown Corporations of the Provincial Government.

(2) (a) With respect to the above the contracts that were tendered and whether the low tender was accepted in each case. (b) Where the low tender was not accepted, if any, the name of the low tender and the reason that it was not accepted, (c) With respect to the above the contracts that were not tendered.

He said: — Just before I move this

motion, I am wondering if the Attorney General will make the same comments regarding this. I am sure that he would like to make the comment that this is irrelevant, that we are wasting the time of the House by asking for the value of all printing contracts given to Service Printing from January 1, 1973 to September 30, which will be amended by my colleague. I should like to hear the same comments made by the Attorney General in relation to this Order for Return that he made in relation to the last one. I am sure in this particular case he would like to have the courage to tell his colleagues to vote this motion down. But I don't think in view of the hue and cry across the Province of Saskatchewan in the mismanagement of funds going to Service Printing that he would dare have the gall to stand up in this House and I suspect that he won't even dare adjourn the debate, but will let this one go right through.

**MR. D. BOLDT:** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment, seconded by Mr. Grant (Whitmore Park) that Return No. 22 be amended as follows:

That the words 'September 30, 1973' in the second line be deleted and the words 'February 25, 1974' be substituted therefore.

Amendment agreed to.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Athabasca asked me whether I would make any comments with respect to this request for information. This Question in my judgement is frivolous and politically vexatious, not because it seeks out information about Service Printing. That I think is perfectly in order. But that it seeks not to ask about information about all the other people, printing companies, that have contracts with Government. The answer is really because the Liberal Opposition is back in that same old rut again, trying to single out what they think is something which they feel might be politically embarrassing to us. Now, if you ask me if that is a proper question, I say that if you people were going to be asking the types of questions within the proper frame of Government Opposition you wouldn't be singling out one company. But in any event I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned on the following recorded division:

**YEA- 35**  
**Messieurs**

Dyck	Michayluk	Owens
Meakes	Byers	Mostoway
Smishek	Thorson	Gross
Romanow	Whelan	Feduniak
Snyder	Kwasnica	Comer
Bowerman	Carlson	Rolfes
Kramer	Engel	Hanson
Thibault	Cody	Oliver
Larson	Robbins	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	Taylor	Flasch
MacMurchy	Matsalla	Richards
Pepper	Faris	

**NAYS — 11**  
**Messieurs**

Steuart	Boldt	Weatherald
Coupland	Grant	Lane
Loken	McIssac	MacDonald (M. J. N.)
Guy	Gardner	

**RETURN NO. 33**

**MR. G.B. GRANT** (Regina Whitmore Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

A copy of all correspondence and agreements entered into up to November 30, 1973 between any officials representing the Government of Saskatchewan and any agencies of the Government of Roumania regarding a proposed tractor manufacturing, tractor assembling or tractor distributing facility or facilities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. K. THORSON:** (Minister of Industry & Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the House to defeat this Motion. As is well known in Saskatchewan the discussions and relationships between the Government of Roumania and the Government of Saskatchewan which was carried on in the year 1971 up until the fall of 1973, with respect to the possibility of the establishment of a plant to assemble tractor parts in Saskatchewan, finally were terminated. Throughout that period of time the various letters and communications of one form and another that were carried on between the two governments dealt with a great many prospects and possibilities. At no time was it suggested to the Roumanians that any of this correspondence was to be made public other than joint releases from time to time or agreed upon news statements that were made from time to time. I frankly think it would be impossible for the Government ever to carry on such negotiations in any meaningful way if the parties to the negotiations outside the Government felt that everything they wrote down and every agreement they entered into of a tentative nature was going to be exposed to public view. Had we finally been able to reach an agreement and were proceeding with some kind of a project on a joint basis undoubtedly the Members would want to know the exact terms of the agreement and the relationship between the partners. But since the partnership is dissolved and since there was nothing more than discussions back and forth which finally led to a breaking off of discussions, I frankly think it would not be in the public interest to make all of that correspondence or all of those agreements, which were all of a tentative nature, public.

**MR. D.G. STEUART:** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I find it very amusing that the Members opposite continually confuse or attempt to confuse the public in this regard. At least I will give the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) if that is what he still is, the credit for having the courage to get up and say, "This is an embarrassment to us, we couldn't get along with our comrades from Roumania." First it was to be a tractor factory, then it was to be an assembly plant and now I see the latest soft peddling was that it was to

be an assembly for tractor parts. Well, I don't blame the NDP government and the New Democratic Party for implying, let's try and ride this rather sad, sorry little episode that we waved so proudly and for so long in an attempt to confuse or kid the people that we had a real industrial development program, but to get up and say this information is not in the public interest is sheer hypocrisy. It is in the public interest to know what went wrong and how much money was spent and all the effort that was put into it. Of course, they are going to use their majority to deny this information. They have used their majority time and time again. I don't think anyone is deluded by this Motion to adjourn the last debate, they just haven't got the intestinal fortitude against the press. They don't play up the immoral act of the Government handing business to their own printing press but if this were done in Ottawa it would be the most disgraceful action that any government had ever pulled off. However, the little ploy of saying we will adjourn this doesn't really fool anybody. In this case they are going to defeat it as they have defeated most of the Motions we have asked for.

This is legitimate information. Of course, there is nothing we can do about it if they defeat it but I want to call it to the attention of the public through the Press. One of the complaints the NDP had when they were in Opposition, and from time to time I am sure that complaint may have been justified, is that our Government refused to give them legitimate information. I want to point out that probably one of the reasons that we were defeated was that very thing. This Government, when they were the Opposition, took the very sanctimonious attitude that this was the denial of proper public information. They would run an open government that would lay the cards on the table for everyone to see. Yet, I am convinced that they have refused to give this Opposition, and it isn't important to give it to the Opposition because what they are refusing to do is give it to the public, more information they have refused to give us more information in the 21/2 years they have been the Government than we ever did in the total seven years that we were the Government. This is a fact.

So refuse to give the information. Of course you will, because it embarrasses you and it should embarrass you. Your individual record as a Minister of Mineral Resources was a disgrace, you were removed from that. Your record as Minister of Industry, or Industrial Affairs or Industry and Commerce is equally a disgrace. Obviously they are not going to remove you because they don't know what else to do with you. But to refuse this honestly because it embarrasses you, I could understand that, but to refuse and to say it is not in the public interest, of course, is just sheer hypocrisy.

I ask some of those Members who sit there giggling and laughing and enjoying themselves, to go back and remember the things they said when they got elected. Remember the pledge they gave to the people and then take a look at this Motion and ask if this, along with all the other Motions that we have asked for and been denied, are not really in the public interest and if you are not sitting back there playing a part, stooges to the front benches in their denial of proper information to the public. I am sure it wasn't even discussed with you, I am sure they didn't even bother to take it into caucus because they have as much contempt for you or more than they have for us or the public. They are making you party to a very deceitful operation, an operation that refuses to give legitimate



information to the public. You sit back there and vote like sheep for whatever they tell you to. I guarantee that it hasn't even been discussed with you. I guarantee that they haven't even done you the courtesy of bringing it up in caucus. They just walk in here, they defeat, they hide, they cover up whatever they feel like and you rubber stamp it in the vain hope for most of you that some day you might grace the front benches and get that big \$29,500 salary, the big car and the ten executive assistants as well. Well, for most of you it will be a vain hope. I ask you to remember whatever happened to your principles, if you had any, and though you proclaimed them loud and long, they have long since disappeared in the 2 1/2 years you have been in power.

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK:** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition, trying to lecture us on the ethics and some of the errors that from time to time do happen and some of the failures. I should like to remind the Leader of the Opposition of some of his failures. I recall when he was in government the Premier of the day announced the heavy water plant. It made great big news headlines. A few days later he announced a Volkswagen Assembly Line Plant. The people of Regina are still waiting for that assembly line plant to come in. I remember just before the election him announcing a phoney deal of a Choiceland mine. The Liberals were very skilled and very able in running to the press announcing things that never did happen and never developed and never took place.

Now the Leader of the Opposition talked about us refusing to table agreements. Mr. Speaker. I think if we look at the record, the records of Hansard are strewn with the failures and refusals of the Liberal administration to provide agreements and to provide information to the Opposition. I recall over and over again where we asked them to table agreements with respect to the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. They never did table them. I recall asking for agreements to table with respect to the Athabasca Pulp Mill. They never tabled those agreements. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition may want to present an argument or have an argument but he must confess that this is something that isn't new to Governments not to table correspondence because it may be privileged, it might not be in the public interest but I should hope that he should not be that sanctimonious in trying to lecture us and say that when he was in office they did provide the information.

**ME. E.F. GARDNER:** (Moosomin): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Roumanian Tractor Plant is one project that captured the imagination of a lot of people in this province. It was a departure from what was expected of the NDP Government. They had been telling us that they weren't in favour of capital from outside of Canada or outside of the province. There was some taint apparently on capital from the United States, or Switzerland or elsewhere. But apparently capital from a communist country such as Roumania was not so tainted and they were going to get some of it. They were going to set up a tractor plant. This was a precedent, of course, and this interested many people in the province. I had requests from university students for information on this for writing papers. People were waiting day by day to see what was happening with the Roumanian Tractor Plant. This went on for months. As you will recall Saskatchewan cities were almost at each

other's throats to see who -was going to get this plum from the NDP Government, this great Roumanian tractor factory that -was going to come. People were making trips to Roumania. The NDP Government sent people to Roumania, some of the cities sent people, and we were just waiting day by day for this great announcement. The press reported that property was bought in the city of Saskatoon, that property was actually purchased by the NDP Government in the city of Saskatoon. They get up now and say that people are not entitled to know what was the result of these negotiations, what has happened with this property that was bought by the NDP Government for the Roumanian tractor plant, or assembly plant, or some type of enterprise in Saskatoon I think it is a bit ridiculous to suggest that the people are not interested, that the people are not entitled to know.

Apparently the voters are going to be denied the final information as to what has actually happened to the Roumanian tractor deal that they watched for so long in the press of this province.

**MR. J. G. RICHARDS:** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I beg the attention of this House on this subject. I don't have anything startling to say that I don't think that Members have not thought about beforehand.

We are getting on to the issue of confidentiality of government as opposed to the right of the public to know and it is very easy to come forward with sanctimonious statements on such a subject. I must admit that in the past I might have been one to make as many sanctimonious statements as anyone. I don't think that one can strictly argue on the basis of Woodrow Wilson that open agreements, openly arrived at, is the only way to run a government. I think it is too simplistic a case.

I have, in my files, confidential information provided to me about people of a confidential nature and I would not want to make that public information because of the implications for particular people. And I am making that kind of judgemental decision and I am sure the same thing applies to other Members of the House. Obviously I am not in the position of the Government, nonetheless, where in politics government is constantly making judgemental decisions of weighing different factors in this issue. On the other hand one can't simply come forward, as the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) did and defend what the Government is doing on the basis that those people did it when they were the Government. We got into that kind of debate on the Pulp Mill many a time in which the defence of the Government, the present Government, was with respect to supplying of information that people then on this side of the House wouldn't provide when they were the Government. And so we are going to go back and forth and back and forth so I don't expect this will be a particularly illuminating afternoon, that we are going to make any great resolution of this kind of conflict.

As I was sitting here listening to the not particularly enlightening debate as it went on, I wondered if the mover would be able to accept some kind of an amendment to his motion, such that we might try and get at, at least what I think is a minimal required release by the Government, of matters that pertain to the public debate about the possibilities of secondary industry and secondary manufacturing, and in particular, the manufacturing

of farm implements.

There must have been considerable economic debate going on about costs, about marketing, and this is something that certainly the public is entitled to know in order to make some intelligent decisions about resource development. I am afraid that I would have to beg the indulgence of the House for a couple of minutes to try to arrive at the precise wording of something, but if it be agreeable to the mover and it might make it simpler if we could move, even at the discretion of the Government, what they will be willing to release of this material. Not all of it, not all the private letters and private correspondence which would breach our diplomatic relationships with Eastern Europe. On the other hand there should be considerable sections that they might be willing to disclose. I think that it isn't good enough simply to go back and forth, back and forth, jibe and exchange on this kind of thing. If we are trying to make a serious job as the Attorney General begged us to do half an hour ago, not to just engage in trifling, not to just engage in cheap tricks. There is the serious aspect to this Order for Return and that is to provide public information on which to make rational decisions of the public about resource developments.

I should like to move then an amendment to the effect that the Government release what information about this, in its discretion, it believes feasible.

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

A copy of all correspondence and agreements pertaining to the proposed Roumania tractor assembly plant that the Government feels it can release without damage to confidential relationships.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — There is one point about this amendment which is perturbing to me is that it is asking for information at the discretion of the Government. The Government can answer in any way, shape or form necessary that they please. No one can say that the information wasn't supplied because it is at their discretion. That is the wording of it. I believe that in the Assembly that a motion should be to the point, shouldn't include debate, it should ask for more information or definite instructions. So I believe on those grounds I shall have no alternative but to rule the proposed amendment out of order.

**MR. GRANT:** — Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder why the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) tries to come to the rescue of another Minister when it pertains to something other than Health or Labour, because he certainly didn't strengthen the case that the Minister of Industry and Commerce supposedly tried to make.

I don't blame the Minister of Industry and Commerce for not wanting to disclose this information because it is not going to embarrass anybody except himself and the Government, because I don't know of any single industry that has ever been talked about in this province that received so much press and so much acclamation as, "The Roumanians are coming, the Roumanians are coming."

Saskatoon got into the show and if they had been left on their own they possibly would have had the Roumanians in Saskatoon by now with an established plant, but no, some of the Saskatoon Members got into it and people from Moose Jaw got into it, some from Regina. The first thing we knew we had two delegations going over to Roumania, one from Moose Jaw and one from Saskatoon. The Minister himself made a trip to Roumania, I believe. I know that the Premier even on one or two occasions was checking into the Roumanians. I really think that it is of public interest and public importance to ascertain what generated all this activity, flying back and forth to Roumania and all the news releases, etc.

The Minister of Health said that we were not very ready to release information on projects of this sort and I will remind him that all the documents in connection with the Pulp Mill were tabled with the exception of one and that was because Mr. Steuart was absent from this city at that time. It was tabled the following year.

He spoke of Choiceland. Well, I don't think that Members opposite should point any finger at us over here about the loss of Choiceland because they are the ones who flushed Choiceland down the drain. And there has also been reference made about the Heavy Water Plant. Well let me remind the older Members on the other side because the new Members don't know anything about it, but when the Heavy Water Plant was announced by the Liberal Government it was as a result of the Federal Government indicating that the contract would be awarded to the Victoria Machinery Company whose bid was based on locating a plant at Estevan. We did not make the initial announcement. Naturally we were pleased to have this news come from Ottawa but the Members want to check their facts pretty carefully when they point the finger at our announcement about the Heavy Water Plant because it was made from Ottawa and not from Regina.

Also, I don't recall it being headlined to the extent that the Roumanian Tractor Plant has been. If this is going to be a sample of the work of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the procedure that he is going to follow when he fails to get an industry, that he is going to cover it up and not disclose to the people what was involved in the negotiations or why it failed after making such a fanfare, I think it will be most disappointing to the voters of this province. I am very disappointed that he is not prepared to make it available to the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

**MR. THORSON:** — Mr. Speaker, may I just rise on a Point of Personal Privilege. I am sure that the Member for Whitmore Park does not want to mislead the House by suggesting that I have been to Roumania. If he is in any doubt then I want remove that doubt and assure him that I have never been to Roumania.

**MR. GRANT:** — I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker.

Motion negatived.

#### **RETURN NO. 60**

**MR. GUY** (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 60 showing:

- (1) Whether the 50 houses and 2 apartment blocks being constructed for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan by Delta Systems Ltd., were advertised by public tender.
- (2) If so: (a) the date(s) it was advertised; (b) the number of bids received.

**HON. G. R. BOWERMAN:** (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, the question that appears under Item No. 19, Return No. 60, one might ask the question whether or not that question was in order in that it has presumed a number of things. It presumes that there were two apartment blocks and some houses constructed for the Department by a company and there are other matters in that question, as it appears on the paper which are an assumption on the part of the questioner. Therefore, it is necessary in order to get the facts before the House and for the information of the public; I propose an amendment to that question and that Return.

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

1. (a) Whether Delta Holdings Ltd., submitted tenders to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to lease staff housing accommodation to that Department, (b) Whether the Department of Northern Saskatchewan solicited and received tenders from other sources for provision of staff housing in La Ronge. (c) From whom tenders were solicited, (d) The amount of each respective bid received.
2. (a) Whether the lowest tender was accepted, (b) From whom the tender was accepted.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — On a Point of Order. I would submit that the essence of Return No. 60 is concerned with public tenders and whether or not public tenders were or were not issued. I would argue that the amendment denies the substance or the essence of the Return and therefore should not be ruled in order.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That is not a Point of Order.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — A Point of Order, Mr. Speaker in the sense that I am requesting a decision by you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The original motion asks whether 30 houses and two apartment blocks being constructed for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan by Delta Systems Ltd., were advertised by public tender and if so the date that it was advertised and the number which have been received.

The proposed amendment says; did Delta Holdings Ltd., submit tenders to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to lease staff housing accommodation for that Department. I believe that is along the same line of thought; as the other one. The original asked for Delta Systems Ltd. Did the Department of Northern Saskatchewan solicit and receive tenders from other sources for provision of staff housing in La Ronge? And (c) from whom tenders were solicited, and what was the amount of

each respective bid received?

I would have to rule that the amendment is in order, it deals with Delta Holdings Ltd., and northern housing.

**MR. RICHARDS:** — I certainly accept your ruling, I just want to repeat what I think is the implication of the amendment and, therefore, I would rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment is to slough off those two crucial words 'public tender' and that is the crucial concept in this Motion for Return. Was this done by means of public tender publicly requested by the Government, bids from different potential contractors; The fact obviously is that Delta Holdings must have submitted some statement about what it intended to do and what price it would charge, nobody's doubting that. The Government may also have informally gone and chatted with somebody else and said what would they have charged. That is not of particular interest I think to this motion, what was casually done by the Minister or his officials on this issue. The guts of the issue are, were correct procedures followed using public tenders? I don't think we have to go into the sorry story of Delta Holdings and that shadow company which was formed a couple of weeks before it was actually awarded the contract. I would just request that the House realize that this is the guts of the motion, the question of public tendering and the Government by this amendment is by sleight-of-hand trying to slide over that issue.

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, the amendment as it is worded does appear to give some further information and in fact will give us more information than we ask for here. With that I agree, but I agree with the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) that what the amendment will succeed in doing is allow the Government to slide over or pass over or avoid facing the very unpleasant situation of what in fact they did do. We want to confirm publicly that what they did do was go to people who normally weren't in the contracting business and ask them for some submissions. They got some submissions. I would imagine that they knew before they ever got submissions they were going to be hired. It was a cosy little cooked up deal. No one can deny it. But we want the Government to face this and tell the public. They have been hiding this now from the public for quite a while and so with this amendment they are again going to give the appearance of giving some information while at the same time are trying to avoid the very unpleasant fact that not only was there misuse of government funds but in fact there could have been a great deal more than that in the very unusual, to say the least, and secretive way that this contract was handed out to a company — to people who were never in the contracting business before in their lives. Since we want to have time to submit a further subamendment to this, to try to force the Government to give us the information that we want or else give us a straight turn down as I presume they will, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### RETURN NO. 74

**MR. K. R. MacLEOD** (Albert Park) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 74 showing:

The amount of money that has been spent or authorized by the Province of Saskatchewan for arenas, skating and curling rinks in Saskatchewan for the fiscal period ending in 1972, for the fiscal period ending in 1973 and for the current fiscal period to November 30, 1973 giving in respect to each such arena, skating or curling rink, the amount spent or authorized and the name of the applicant.

**HON. R. ROMANOW:** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the officials of the Department that the way the question is worded makes it difficult for them to answer it because they don't have the grants determined by virtue of project which is the way this is set out. The proposal rather is that we should indicate the grants made under program such as provincial, municipal, winter works programs etc. I think this amendment should provide the information that the Hon. Member is asking. I will therefore move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) that we delete all of the words after the word 'showing' and substitute the following:

Grants paid under the Provincial-Municipal Winter Works Incentive Program, 1972-73, in aid of projects where arenas, skating rinks or curling rinks were involved, and applications approved to February 25 and the estimated amount of grants under the Provincial-Municipal Winter Works Incentive Program, 1973-74, in aid of projects where arenas, skating rinks or curling rinks are involved.

**MR. J.C. McISAAC:** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, on the amendment, I am not sure if I take the Attorney General at his word in the sense that he is not trying to withhold any information. Are there any other Government programs for example in the Department of Culture and Youth Agency or anywhere else where grants or assistance to curling rinks for example could be forthcoming. This is the point that crossed my mind when the Minister put forth the amendment. There may well be other areas that other agencies of Government granting some assistance. And if the Minister can assure us of that . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't assure him of that. The officials simply advise me this way and in the rush of it I accepted their information. So if someone on the opposite side would like to adjourn the debate, I am prepared to accept that. I will undertake to inform myself.

**MR. McISAAC:** — I would ask leave to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

## RETURN NO. 68

**MR. A. R. GUY** (Athabasca) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 68 showing:

A statement projected of the estimated income from all present sources and expenditures by the departments of Government of Saskatchewan for existing programs and policies for the five fiscal years ending: March 31, 1973; March 31, 1974; March 31, 1975; March 31, 1976;

**February 26, 1974**

and March 31, 1977.

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS:** (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments with respect to this particular Order.

It strikes me as rather strange that a request for information with respect to the years ending March 31, 1973 and March 31, 1974 should be made. The Opposition already has that information. They have that information for the fiscal year 1972-73; and the fiscal year 1973-74. They are well aware of the fact that the information with respect to the year ending March 31, 1975 will be tabled in this House when the Budget comes down in a few days time. It is obvious that no information could be supplied with respect to that particular item at this time. As far as the years 1976 and 1977 are concerned, the information is not currently available publicly.

I think it should be pointed out that it is not the policy of this Government nor the policy of any other government in Canada, as far as I know, to issue five year projections of revenues and expenditures. The Government has to make policy decisions in due course in relation to allocation of expenditures and the sources of revenues they anticipate receiving. The information for the fiscal years, 1975-76 and 1976-77 will be made to the public at the appropriate time.

I therefore would ask this House to defeat this motion.

**MR. A. E. GUY:** (Athabasca): — I was glad to hear the comments of the Minister because we really got the answer that we expected. The Government opposite have been hiring researchers and planners through every department of government for the last three years. We now find out that they have no projected estimates for the future. They have no plans for the future. There isn't a government in Canada today that has not made a projected estimate of their financial income for the next five and probably the next ten years.

This is the Government that is supposed to be the planners.

This is the Government that has been hiring people from all across Canada and the whole of North America and yet they can't even project for two years down the road what their income estimates are going to be.

This is exactly the answer we anticipated from the Minister of Finance. They should have left him back where he was because he certainly hasn't contributed or added anything to the Cabinet when he can't get his people to work to provide a few simple estimates for the future.

Motion negatived.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:17 o'clock p.m.