

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**December 6, 1977**

The Assembly met at 2:00 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley):** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity of introducing to you and other members of the Assembly a group of students from Glenavon High School, accompanied by their principal, Mr. Ron Williams. I would like to ask all members to join with me and hope that they have a very educational informative day. I am glad the snow made it possible for you to come yesterday to hear the Attorney General, he was that bad but today you may have an opportunity to hear some good ones.

**QUESTIONS**

**Financial Statement**

**MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition):** – I have a question for the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and I see he is absent today so in his place I direct the question to the Attorney General in his capacity as vice-chairman of the corporation. It is clear from the financial statement that was tabled a day or so ago, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation had a net loss on sales operations in the year ending June 30, 1977 of about \$1,300,000. The statement does however, reflect an item for interest of some \$2 million and my question to the Attorney General, was this interest item resulting from merely the corporation taking the moneys that were advanced by the government either through the Energy Reserve Fund or through the bonds that were issued, investing it in the bank until required, and then this interest accrued on the money?

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I'm going to have to take notice of that question.

**Downtown Core Construction**

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** – I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of Government Services or the minister in charge of SEDCO, whoever chooses to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, the question relates to the government's expropriation and construction in the downtown area of Regina and I ask the government why it was necessary to expropriate in the South Railway and 11th Avenue area, amongst other things Firestone and the Campbell and Haliburton building and the Art Egner location. Why, I suppose in a nutshell, did the government over the course of the last year or so decide that they had to move into existing office and business locations in the downtown area, when the railway yards and other property owned by government was available? I ask secondly whether the government feels in building the SGIO building and other construction for Sask Tel in the downtown area, that they need so much extra property, why the extra property?

**HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment):** – Mr. Speaker, the proposal for the downtown renewal project as it affected Sask Tel and SGI involved the acquisition of properties in the area designated for the renewal section and some of those properties were acquired through purchase, others through expropriation because it was the wish of the owners of the property. Other properties because the price could not be agreed to and, therefore, expropriation was proceeded with as a normal method of acquiring property by the government or a government agency.

**MR. MERCHANT:** – Supplementary. Is it not and I suspect indeed that the question should be answered by the minister in charge of SEDCO but he's not here. Is it not true that the government has expropriated almost four times more property than . . . well, expropriated or purchased in the downtown area almost four times more property than was needed for those two buildings. Is it not also true that the government is considering expropriating or buying the Royal International Inn and then building a hotel of their own within some large complex, that the government is intending to establish, about 70,000 square feet of retain space as I understand it. I ask either that minister or the Minister of Government Services why the taxpayer of Saskatchewan is being pushed into the real estate development business? What is the need to expropriate a building to build another? Why do these plans have to be co-ordinated with SGIO and Sask Tel and when did the Legislature empower this government to go into the real estate development business?

**MR. BYERS:** – Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is that the government has not expropriated four times more property than is needed. The plan for the redevelopment of the downtown core is not all finalized at this point. The government has acquired property which it expects will be needed as part of the overall plan for the downtown renewal.

With respect to the Royal International Inn, the government has not acquired the Royal International Inn nor is it in the proceedings for expropriation.

The third question, when did the government obtain the authority of this Legislature to empower Sask Tel to proceed with commercial retail development. The answer is in a bill passed at the last session of the Legislature.

### **Inmates' Compensation**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** – The federal government recently announced a new Inmate Accident Payment Program for inmates injured while working in the federal penitentiaries. The press report of the program indicates that inmates in Saskatchewan's provincial prisons have been eligible to receive compensation for the last three years. Now, checking on my records indicate that here was no public announcement of that and can you advise this Assembly whether your program is similar in application and goal as the federal program or if there are differences, what are the salient differences?

**MR. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Government Services):** – Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the federal program or what announcement that the hon. member is referring to. I will take notice of his question and give him the answer in due course.

**MR. LANE:** – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister also take notice and advise in light of the programs that came to light in the Moore Inquiry that, in fact, no compensation was paid by the government opposite for injuries to prisoners while on golfing lessons or canoeing lessons or bowling lessons? Would you check with your officials to make sure that there are no payments for any injuries to inmates on the great recreational programs of the government opposite?

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, again the member is very adept at throwing in a lot of material that is not necessarily based on fact but I know that that has never stopped him in the past. Let me say, as far as I am aware, no one is receiving golfing lessons. If he is saying that if inmates are hired by our parks or hired by the city of Prince Albert to help develop a golf course, that this is not an acceptable method of employing inmates, then I totally disagree with the member. I think that that is a real slap in the face again of a very worthwhile program and that the member for Qu'Appelle is constantly trying to misinform the public or mislead the public as to what has happened or is happening in the Prince Albert jail. You did that before the inquiry was established; you did it during the inquiry, and you still are doing it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

### **CIGOL Decision**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** – Mr. Speaker, I ask a question of the Attorney General or the Premier with respect to the CIGOL decision and it's quite apart from all the implications, the broad implications of CIGOL; the question is a simple one. Now

that you have had a chance to examine the judgment and I presume inquire into the amount of the judgment in itself, per se, as between you and CIGOL, have you reached any decision on whether you intend to pay the amount to CIGOL in respect of the judgment and costs?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** – I think we can say that any judgment which CIGOL may recover, pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the CIGOL decision, will be met either by direct payment or by set-off.

**MR. CAMERON:** – By way of supplementary just to get that clarified, I think the judgment anticipated an accounting after the judgment was rendered. Is that accounting now in process and can the Premier give us some indication at this stage if it's possible, what the likely amount will be?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, so far as I am aware the accounting is not in process. Accordingly, I cannot improve upon the estimates which have earlier been given to this House of the order of \$3.5 million.

**MR. CAMERON:** – Can the Premier give us any indication of when it is expected you would be paying the amount of the CIGOL judgment?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – None whatever. I think we do not have the carriage of the action. It is not up to us as the defendant to determine when an application will be made for an accounting and I take it that will be made to a Saskatchewan court when the decision might be rendered, when in fact the amount which is owing might be ascertained in terms of dollars and cents and then what steps would be taken to reduce that to a formal judgment.

**MR. LANE:** – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Not only was an accounting ordered by also costs. Is there any indication or is it the government's intention to pay costs on the court action as ordered by the Supreme Court or have you made a decision in that regard?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – I think when I say that the plaintiffs in action have not reduced their judgment to a finite sum, that judgment includes not only the principal amount of the judgment but also any costs to which they are entitled and, accordingly, we have not been faced with the issue of paying the costs. I can assure the hon. member that if CIGOL gets a judgment against the Crown and the right of the province of Saskatchewan be it for a return of taxes or be it for costs, that judgment will be met either by payment or by set-off.

### **Fire at Valley View**

**MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose):** – Following the fire at Moose Jaw, Mr. Minister, I noticed a piece in the paper where one of your officials in your department had doubted the rebuilding of this structure and a comment was made at that time, which is a very common comment these days, in that perhaps those who are mentally and physically handicapped should not be institutionalized in places such as Valley Centre. My question to the minister today, Mr. Speaker, is this, has your department made any immediate plans for the transfer of any of these people to other departments such as the Department of Education?

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, not as a consequence of the fire. I do believe that the

member is aware that we did transfer the developmental program over to the Department of Education but at this particular time we have not made any decisions as to whether or not we should transfer additional people to other department but I can tell the member that the whole concept of normalization and the concept of moving people into the community is under further review because of the fire at Moose Jaw. The member is aware that there are people who believe that nobody should be institutionalized. I made a statement about a year ago that even though we would like to have all the people in the community and in small groups, I felt that there would be a need in the foreseeable future for an institution like Valley View. That is still my point of view and because of the fire, I suppose there is a more intensive review but as far as I can ascertain at this particular time, I foresee a real use for Valley View for the foreseeable future.

**MR. BAILEY:** – Mr. Speaker, if there should be a transfer of any of these students, as I would call them, the smaller areas in Saskatchewan particularly those in the rural area, particularly boards of education, would have to assume the responsibilities of the care and the education for some of these students, which would be an extremely costly venture. Is your department ready and do you have the funds available to make it known to those boards who will be in receipt of those people prior to the completion of the school board budgets which come down on March 31?

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, of the decision is made, and it's a real hypothetical question, if the decision is made to move more people into the community, I would think that we will continue the policy that we have presently and that is, that the Department of Social Services will pick up the tab for those people. I don't see at this particular time that we have to notify the school boards that they would be receiving more people. If they fall within the developmental program, I would expect the Department of Education to pick them up. I think we have to keep in mind that those people who are presently at Valley View probably would qualify for the developmental program and would probably remain under the Department of Social Services. If that is the case, then we would pick up the total cost.

**MR. BAILEY:** – Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to hear the minister and he looked over at the Minister of Education in making his response. Do I understand now from the minister that the cost of the developmental centres within the individual jurisdictions of the school boards across Saskatchewan will be receiving total funding for the operation of those centres?

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, I certainly can't answer that. I think my answer there would be no. But I can't speak for the minister of Education. I think that question will have to be directed to him. My answer would probably be no.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – I'll take a final supplementary.

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek):** –Final supplementary. Does the Minister of Social Services still have in effect the policy where some people are paying \$50 per month for their children in these homes and others are not?

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, I find it rather humorous that the member should ask me again. He asked me just three days ago. I just have not been able to change that policy that quickly. Yes, we do. The policy is still in effect where people are asked. Let me just say to the member that that is based on income whether people can afford it or not. people are receiving family allowances which amount to about \$25 a month, and I

don't think it is unreasonable to ask people to financially assist if they voluntarily give up their children to the department, those who can afford to do it.

**MR. STODALKA:** – Supplementary . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** – I'll take the next question.

### **New Government Office Building**

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** – Mr. Speaker, a couple of question to the minister in charge of Government Services about construction and I would like to start with the new Government Office Building and attached palace just to the south of us. The minister will be aware I expect of the rather alarming stories that are beginning to circulate in the construction industry about the job site. I ask the minister whether it is true or not that your current estimates which I understand were about \$100, are not into an overrun situation and whether it is true that the problem results from the slowdown in the construction industry and you having put almost all of the contracts there on a cost plus basis? Many of the contractors are now slowing down the process of the work, having their men spend extra time ragging the work out with the result that the cost is going up. I ask the minister whether he would be prepared to table the original estimates and now table the current estimates, whether he would not agree with me that Saskatchewan taxpayers will be shocked at that increase?

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):** – Mr. Speaker, as is so typical of the member for Wascana he begins a question by giving a great deal of erroneous information. Then on the basis of that information asks a question. I have not heard of any alarming stories which have struck the construction industry numb about the cost overruns. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that that building will come on under budget, a good real under budget. It is a well-managed. If the hon. member wants to know details of the estimate, he should put a question on the order paper. The oral question is not the place to provide detailed information about estimates.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. MERCHANT:** –Regarding a different building, is it true that the SGIO building is badly delayed because you cannot sink the footings . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** –Order. I'll take the next question. The member for Thunder Creek.

**MR. MERCHANT:** – What's wrong with that, Mr. Speaker?

### **Financial Assistance to CCIL**

**MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek):** – I'm so overwhelmed at being recognized I may have forgotten my question. A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, yesterday in this Assembly you indicated that your government was prepared to provide some form of financial guarantees or assistance to CCIL of Manitoba. Since apparently this company has been turned down for financial assistance by most of our major recognized financial institutions, as well as the governments of Manitoba and Alberta, and as well as the three major prairie Pools, and as well as Federated Co-ops, may I therefore ask the Premier, have your finance people examined the numbers? In other words, have you had people look at the books for CCIL before making the

statement that you did yesterday?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, we obviously have looked at some financial statements of CI. We have not examined their books. We were simply not at that stage of the dealings. Our dealings to date have been restricted to giving an indication of willingness to join with other governments in providing financial support for CI. We are aware in general terms of their financial situation and know that they have very substantial assets. They also have substantial liabilities. Clearly, if one can advance money which will be proffered against most other creditors and most other groups who advance funds, the funds are likely to be relatively risk free. There is nothing risk free in this world.) That is the nature of the proposition we have put forward. It has been put forward in general terms only because there was no need to refine details until we knew whether or not we would have partners in the venture.

**MR. THATCHER:** – A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, in view of your answer in which you did indicate that there are certain problems in that company and that some form of financial re-organization is certainly necessary, will the Premier assure this Assembly and the taxpayers of this province that before any such financial guarantees would be put forward to CCIL, condition number one of such assistance would be that CCIL move their head office and their assembly plant to the province of Saskatchewan?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I think that I must answer that question in the negative. Whether or not we advance funds will depend upon whether or not other governments advance funds. I think I have made it clear that we would not be the sole guarantor of any advance to CI. Accordingly, we would wish, if we were attempting to deal with other governments along this line, to have some flexibility. It is not reasonable I suggest for any hon. member to suggest that we would act in concert with other governments but only if the head office was moved to Saskatchewan. Sure, if we made that request other governments which might be involved could make a similar request for their provinces, the result would be deadlock. I suspect that is what the hon. member would want since he continues his vendetta against the co-operative movement. It is not a point of view which we share and we therefore would wish to be free to co-operate with other governments in making available assistance which might save this industry for western Canada and save this industry as a supplier of parts for Saskatchewan farmers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

### **CIGOL Decision**

**MR. CAMERON:** – Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might get some additional clarification from the Premier on the earlier subject I questioned him about, and that is the position you are in with respect to CIGOL and the payment of the CIGOL judgment. I want to ask you seriously, do you foresee Bill 47 as in effect exempting CIGOL from the position it's in, that is to say, coming at it another way do you not intend to use the taxing provisions of Bill 47 to recover the amount of the judgment that you will face having to pay CIGOL?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is a new tax bill. It stands on its own feet. It is an income tax bill. I do not know

whether CIGOL has liabilities under this bill and will have liabilities under this bill. In all likelihood it will, but I do not know the amount of those liabilities. I am sure that if there are legal liabilities which CIGOL owes, it will pay them in the same way that we propose to pay our legal liabilities to CIGOL. Whether or not the result is any set-off will, I suppose, depend partly on CIGOL and partly on ourselves. We do not make this in any sense a condition of what is going on. We are introducing a new bill which stands on its feet quite independently of anything which has gone before it.

**MR. CAMERON:** – Can the Premier give the House some indication of when we might receive from you some indication at least of the proposed taxing rates retroactively under Bill 47?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I think that it may be a bit premature to indicate what the rates are pursuant to regulations under a bill which has not yet received second reading, so certainly tardiness cannot be charged against a government which does not produce regulations in respect of a bill which has just been introduced on Friday last. The . . .

**MR. MERCHANT:** – . . . taxes under this bill and you say that . . . and you don't give us the numbers.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – I wonder if the hon. member for Wascana has finished his speech!

I answer the member for Regina South by saying that we will be turning our attention to this. I will also point out the fact that we had some discussions with the oil industry. I have no doubt we will have additional discussions with the oil industry and it may well be that the result of those discussions would affect the tax rates. I am not asserting that to be a fact. I am asserting that to be a possibility. Accordingly we are at this time, if we are to be genuinely in a position to talk with the oil industry, we are accordingly in no position to put the precise rates in the bill or in regulations which we would table before the House.

**MR. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley):** – Mr. Speaker, would the Premier give the assurance to the House that the new rate of taxation on CIGOL will be no different to the tax rate on other oil companies as a result of the judgment? As you know, one of the great weaknesses of the bill is that it permits the determination of the tax rate to be negotiated by compromise and there is a possibility, is there not, that different oil companies could be treated in different ways?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – I think that, Mr. Speaker, in the highest degree, unlikely. While I obviously am not going to discuss the affairs of CIGOL and any negotiations which we may have with CIGOL, or its parent NORCEN, if the hon. member is asking me to give him assurance that we will not seek in somehow to penalize CIGOL or NORCEN by some sort of differential rate, I will give him that assurance out of hand and assure him that the fact that CIGOL pursued its remedy to the Supreme Court and was successful, will in no way be regarded on our part as a justification nor excuse for attempting to levy against CIGOL, a greater sum of money than will be levied against oil companies in comparable circumstances.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Final supplementary, member for Nipawin.

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Party):** – This is not a supplementary, this is a question.



**MR. SPEAKER:** – New question, member for Nipawin.

### **Bringing CCIL to the province**

**MR. COLLVER:** – This is a question to the Premier and I am pleased to hear the Premier suggest that there is no differentiation between oil companies. I hope he is taking into account heavy oil in that particular consideration.

My question to the Premier is would the Premier not agree that if all the governments across western Canada have refused to guarantee the loans of CCIL and if the other organizations under the present circumstances have refused to guarantee or back CCIL, would it not be of advantage to the people of Saskatchewan to offer to bring CCIL to the province of Saskatchewan in order to create jobs and opportunities here under a reorganization. Would the Premier not agree that that would be a benefit and should be offered?

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Order, order! Next question, member for Wascana.

### **Delay of SGIO building**

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):** – Mr. Speaker, because this question was ruled out of order, let me only say that I think it is urgent because the problem of the footings has developed in the last couple of months and I direct a question to the minister in charge of Government Services. Is it not true that the SGIO building is greatly delayed because they are finding it impossible to sink the footings for the building?

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):** – Mr. Speaker, neither this department nor the government as such has anything to do with the SGIO building. That is being built by a Crown corporation and the proper place for the member's question is in Crown Corporations Committee.

### **Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation**

**MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):** – Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Last December 1st in the Prince Albert Daily Herald it said that the Inland Commercial Fishermen's Association had asked that a new inland marketing agency be created solely for buying and selling fish.

Mr. Minister, the Inland Commercial Fishermen's Association said that they met with the minister, federal Minister LeBlanc, and were advised that the federal government would make changes and included dissolving the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation if the provinces requested it. Are you aware of this or have you had any meetings with these people or with the federal government to meet this need of the fishermen in Saskatchewan?

**MR. MATSALLA:** – Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this particular meeting that took place between the fishermen and the federal minister. Nevertheless there have been earlier meetings about a year or so ago with respect to breaking away, you might say, from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and set up a marketing system here in the province.

Mr. Speaker, since I am on my feet – on December last . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** – So am I.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** – I apologize to the members. I found the questions and answers so stimulating today that we slipped by the normal time to pass on to ministerial statements.

### **Point of Privilege on Question Period**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Party):** – Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would rise on a matter of privilege as it relates to an answer given to me in this Assembly on Friday last by the Premier.

The Premier stated on Friday last that he would provide to this Assembly the calculations made by his government and would table the calculations made by his government insofar as the rates or the Alberta taxation mode applied to the province of Saskatchewan. It is now Tuesday and these documents have not been provided to us nor to this Assembly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – What is the point of privilege?

**MR. COLLVER:** – The point of privilege is, he has agreed to provide them and we are coming up to argue about the bill and it hasn't been provided yet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Order, order! I think there is no point of privilege. The member hasn't identified one.

### **Ruling on Previous Question**

**MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):** – Mr. Speaker, I raised with the Chair some days ago a question of order with respect to comments by members about the Supreme Court of Canada looking for some guidance from the Speaker as to the limitations that were to be placed on members and their comments about the Supreme Court, and I wonder if, Sir, we are likely to have a ruling soon on that respect.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Yes, I have a ruling ready and I will give it at an appropriate time.

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURN**

#### **Return No. 1**

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 1 showing:

The amount of school operating grants paid by the provincial government to each school district, excluding school units, during the years: (1) 1970 (b) 1971 (c) 1972 (d) 1973 (e) 1974 (f) 1975 (g) 1976 (h) 1977 to date.

**HON. D.L. FARIS (Minister of Education):** – Mr. Speaker, there is some difficulty in

answering the question in the way it's asked, that is that the question asks for the information concerning school grants on the calendar year rather than the fiscal year. I intent to make an amendment that will put it on the fiscal year. Similarly the last point, "1977 to date", would have to be 1977-78 estimated. Therefore I move, seconded by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Feschuk):

That all the words after the words of school operating be deleted and the following be substituted therefor: Foundation grants paid by the provincial government to school districts excluding school units and boards in northern Saskatchewan during the governments fiscal years of 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78 estimated.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 2**

**MR. STODALKA (Maple Creek)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 2 showing:

(1) The total amount of operating grants paid to School Unit Boards by the Department of Education during the fiscal years: (1) 1970-71 (b) 1972-72 (c) 1972-73 (d) 1973-74 (e) 1974-75 (f) 1975-76 (g) 1976-77 (h) 1977-78 to dated; (2) The total budgets for the School Unit Boards in Saskatchewan during the fiscal years (1) 1970-71 (b) 1971-72 (c) 1972-73 (d) 1973-74 (e) 1974-75 (f) 1975-76 (g) 1976-77 (h) 1977-78 to date.

**MR. FARIS:** – Again, because of the way the question was asked, I must amend it, I think, to give the information that is really sought. In the first part of the question we must change the (h) 1977-78 to budgeted and the second part of the question puts the question in terms of fiscal years and in this case it should be in terms of the calendar years. Therefore I move, seconded by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Feschuk):

The clause (h) of part one be deleted and the following substituted therefor: (h) 1977-78 budgeted. In part (2) that all the words after the words, "The total," be deleted and the following substituted therefore: expenditures exclusive of the amounts of United Board fee payments of the School Unit Boards in Saskatchewan during each of the years: 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 budgeted.

Motion as amended agreed.

### **Return No. 3**

**MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 3 showing:

The total of the budgets of the school districts, excluding the school unit, during the years (a) 1970 (b) 1971 (c) 1972 (d) 1973 (e) 1974 (f) 1975 (g) 1976 (h) 1977 to date.

**HON. D.L. FARIS (Minister of Education):** – Mr. Speaker, once again I think just a rewording of the question will provide the information which is sought. Therefore, I move the amendment that:

All the words after “the total” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Expenditures exclusive of inter-board fee payments of the school district, boards in Saskatchewan, excluding school units and school boards in northern Saskatchewan during each of the years 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 budgeted.

Seconded by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Feschuk).

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 10**

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 10 showing:

The names of persons in the employ of the government who use their own vehicles on government business and are paid a mileage allowance plus mileage whether on government business or not.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):** – Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, I have given up trying to figure out why opposition members want some of this information and it's not strictly speaking relevant, but with respect to this question it can be answered and we can answer it fairly easily, so we are prepared to agree to it just as it stands.

Motion agreed to.

### **Return No. 11**

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 11 showing:

The names and positions held of all persons in the government services who have been issued credit cards which allow them to charge flights on aircraft, chartered or regular flights. (a) the amount charged by each person in the years 1975 to November 1, 1977.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):** – Mr. Speaker, this question is just a little more difficult. Let me tell you first of all what the policy is with respect to credit cards, allowing people to charge flights on aircraft. Two groups of people get such credit cards, one, is the ministers, who may use them just for their own uses. Having been an executive assistant and worked in a minister's office I know that that rule is adhered to. The other group of people who get (it may have been otherwise in previous administrations, I don't know.) credit cards are deputy ministers. They don't get them just for their own use. The deputies are instructed that anyone in the department may use it if it's okayed by the deputy – he may give the credit card to anyone in the department, that's what they do. They have a department credit card which is kept in the possession of the deputy. He can authorize other members to use it.

The difficulty with the hon. member's question is part (a) it says, the amount charged by each person in the years 1975 to November 1, 1977. I don't know at this point of time if we have that information and I would think all we would have on the credit card slip would be a signature, which we may not be able to make out. I'm not sure that's what the hon. member wants. Perhaps the best thing to do, Mr. Speaker, would be to adjourn this motion and perhaps the hon. member and I can work out something that will give him the information.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 13**

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 13 showing:

All Government of Saskatchewan purchases on credit cards for goods and services outside the province of Saskatchewan for the period of September 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977 inclusive, (a) in each case, state the agency or department, and the person making the purchase and the place where the purchase was made.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON:** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, charges may be made on credit cards out of the province in two sort of ways. Firstly at the border places people may just cross the border, say Lloydminster, they may just cross the border to get gas in Lloydminster. There's no rule against that. The rule with respect to vehicles is that vehicles may not (CVA vehicles) may not be taken out of the province except with the permission of the associated deputy, that's actually the minister. You have to get the minister's permission. And it is done sometimes. I had a personal experience with it. We had, in Edmonton, last summer, the games for the handicapped, the Olympic Handicapped Games. The cost of flying all the athletes, they gutted Saskatoon for a bit of a jamboree the day before, the cost of flying them would have been prohibitive. So we got three CVA vehicles, loaded them all in, drove them all to Edmonton. That's the kind of use for which vehicles are made out of the province. As well, of course, vehicles may be refuelled. Flin Flon is another example of a place often where the cross the border to refuel.

I think the amount of work, Mr. Speaker, that's involved with this question is really incredible. We don't keep any separate track of these. The problem is those which are refuelled across the border. The only way that I can see we could get the information would be to go over each one of the steps individually, that is a mountain of paper to review. Some of those steps aren't all that readable. For today, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate and again perhaps we could work out a question which will give the member the information he wants.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 18**

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 18 showing:

(a) The name, address and type of business of the companies in which SEDCO holds

shares; (b) The names of the companies in which SEDCO held shares that: (i) are no longer in business or (ii) are in receivership or (iii) have a receiver manager appointed; (c)(i) the amount of each loss that has occurred to date and (ii) the name of the company in each case; (d) (i) the number and the total amounts of the loans from SEDCO which are overdue six months or ore (ii) the name and address of the companies with the overdue loans.

**MR. R.E. NELSON:** – Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier under Return No. 7 the particular return, Return 14 would be a matter to be dealt with by the hon. member for Biggar, the minister responsible for GFO and I would like to give Mr. Cowley, that member, the opportunity to comment on this motion and since he's not here I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):** – Mr. Speaker, I would just like a few remarks before I move this motion, Mr. Speaker, these resolutions are straight forward and little can be added that hasn't been said many times before, he said many times before. I am saying that the opposition has the right to much more information with regard to SEDCO than is being made available at this time. The government tells us to ask the questions in Crown corporations and this has proven to be a joke, The minister in charge, if he does know the answer, refuses to answer. Many times the answers we need are ruled out of order because it is not in the year under review. Surely, Mr. Speaker, when the citizens of the province of Saskatchewan have invested money in a company they should have the right to information on that company. This government has covered up the transactions of SEDCO to an extent that one wonders what is really happening within that corporation.

The people in SEDCO have come and gone on such a regular basis that it is time some light was shed on the working of that corporation.

We do not find out about the financial fiascos until the out of business sign has been hung up. Then there is a blanket of secrecy put up so that it is next to impossible to find out how many tax dollars have gone down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, we can't help but wonder when we see businesses started with the involvement of MLAs across the way, only later to go broke. Why aren't these facts made public? Why are the minister and the government covering up? Our job as opposition members is to scrutinize and criticize the government. The government and the minister are attempting to deny us that right. They shout about the war on business and that is what they are really waging. It is an underground war cloaked in secrecy. Too often they are ruining successful businesses. If the government is prepared to put taxpayers' dollars into ventures they should be obligated to tell the people the amount they are investing and the nature of that business.

If the minister and the government have nothing to hide, they will support this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford) Return No. 18

**HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Renewable Resources):** – Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would like to address a few words to the resolution that the member just moved.

Let me firstly say, when I was a member in the opposition, sitting a little ahead of the

member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson), I on occasion with some other members of the then opposition asked for certain informations of the then Liberal government, the Thatcher government, pertaining to the activities of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should convey to the members of this Legislative Assembly the attitude of that government of the day, now, Mr. Speaker, in relation to that information. There was certainly information that is not as extensive as that being sought by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg here today. And almost without exception, Mr. Speaker, we were told time after time after time after time that it was not in the best interests of the opposition or the general public to be informed of the activities of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg should speak to the only remaining member who was on the Treasury Benches at that time, as to what their reasoning was for that attitude. I think that if we went back through the debates and Proceedings or Hansard, we will find on occasion, that one remaining member rising to his feet to defend the reasoning behind the government in not providing that information to the members of the opposition or the general public of Saskatchewan. And he said it is not in the best interests of you or the general public of Saskatchewan to know. I would not be surprised if we couldn't find on the record that he was saying this is a wary on business launched by the CCF or the NDP, and that none of this information if it was made available would in any way enhance either the business, the Crown corporation, the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation or for that matter the Government of Saskatchewan in its pursuit in establishing business in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at what happens in the province of Saskatchewan when we meet with the Crown Corporations Committee. There is a free exchange of information, Mr. Speaker. There is more access to information in the Crown corporation structure here in the province of Saskatchewan than there is in any other province in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:** – This government, Mr. Speaker, under that apparatus provides access to the activities of the Crown corporations in a more open way than in the case in any other province in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Wascana asks why we're going to answer and I'm suggesting that that decision rests with the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation and in his absence I think that I would be negligent in not undertaking to respond to the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg the tax on the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation and the Government of Saskatchewan and I'm certain that the member for Melfort, the minister responsible for SEDCO will deal with this matter in a most appropriate way when he has the opportunity to again return to this Legislative Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should also take some closer scrutinies of the endeavors and the objectives of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. That corporation has been instructed under his government to be much more sensitive to the requests made by businessmen in the province of Saskatchewan or potential businessmen who want to locate or establish operations in the province of Saskatchewan. We are much more sensitive to demands made for smaller sums of

money and for smaller businesses than was the case during the Thatcher regime. In fact, we are most sensitive. Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation's activities are most sensitive to small urban Saskatchewan and small business rather than just the very large and grandiose business structures. We are also sensitive to a objective of decentralizing as much as possible our economic, our business community in Saskatchewan, thereby providing a revitalized economic stability for small urban communities spread throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I think that all members in the Legislative Assembly would agree with that objective, at least I hope that they would agree and those who do not, I would appreciate them standing on their feet and conveying to the Legislative Assembly and through this Assembly to the people of Saskatchewan why they would disagree with that kind of policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in undertaking to do that, that means there is a greater element of risk involved in financing those ventures. In almost all cases without exception, when we look at the kind of credit, the kind of financing that these ventures need especially if they are going to be located in small urban communities in the province of Saskatchewan, the established lending institutions have either turned a blind eye or a deaf ear to them and whereas turned down their request for financing. That does not happen with the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. In a good many instances we pick up those clients who are, yes, a risk, but we think the risk measured against the potential benefit if they are successful by locating a new industry in a small urban community is worth it. So that I am saying, Mr. Speaker, given those kinds of circumstances, the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation will be subject to some failures and some loss. No worse and the members opposite know, no worse than are the other development corporations of other provinces in Canada. In fact, the statistics speak very clearly. Ours is much better than most other development corporations in Canada and all they have to do is look at the information that was provided to them last year during the Crown corporation debate and discussions and they will find that the losses of Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation are modes by comparison to a lot of other provinces, some Liberal governed provinces as well as Conservative governed provinces, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hear one of the members saying that we don't have anything to hide and I think that we gave them some very significant information last year pertaining to the activities of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, very significant. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there was even some criticism emanating from the business community itself in Saskatchewan when we talk about a war on business. Criticism of the members opposite, the members who your left, Mr. Speaker, in their endeavor to try and solicit sit to. second-hand information which was only going to be detrimental to that business and its operations in the province of Saskatchewan and I think, Mr. Speaker, it's not the members of the government who coined the phrase, 'a war on business', it was the business community themselves complaining about the kind of information being sought by the Liberals and Conservatives in this Legislative Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because I know members will want me to say more other remarks pertaining to this particular motion, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **Return No. 19**

**MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg)** moved that an order of the Assembly do



issue for Return No. 19 showing:

(a) The names of the companies or individuals that have received loans from SEDCO from 1970 to date; (b) The number of companies or individuals receiving loans from SEDCO which either discontinued business or closed without paying their debts in full to SEDCO from 1970 to date. (c) The name, address and type of business engaged in by each of the companies or individuals who did not clear their debts with SEDCO. (d) The amounts of money owing by each company or individual in (c).

**MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):** – Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a few words on this resolution about SEDCO and I want to start off by saying that the member indicates that the Crown corporations or that the Liberal government, Liberal administration in years gone by did not give as much information as they would have liked to have had. And I would say that that is probably true. Mr. Speaker, there is a very basic difference and the difference is that we ran it like a business. Mr. Speaker, I want to give two examples that have come on my desk today of business. The first one, Mr. Speaker, is the Annual Report of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and do you know what they are doing? They have got big ads in the Leader Post and I don't know why the Government of Saskatchewan ever placed an ad in the Leader Post after what the Attorney General said about them yesterday. I didn't think you liked them. But, Mr. Speaker, a big ad in the Leader Post said that they made a profit of \$890,000 and you know what they did? They took money from the Provincial Treasurer – a \$125 million and put it in the bank until they completed the transaction and at the interim period, they draw \$2,166,000 of interest and they called that profit, and they called that profit, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what they really did was lose \$1,335,000.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – The member is talking about a Crown corporation rather than SEDCO and I think he should confine his remarks to SEDCO, otherwise we could be debating too many things on this specific issue.

**MR. MacDONALD:** – What I am trying to do is draw an analogy or a comparison of a government that has established itself as a bank in this province to lend I am trying to show the kind of business management and record that it has. For example, I have another one here – I got an Order for Return on my desk yesterday and what it is – the value of each share held by the Government of Saskatchewan in Land Processor's Co-operative Limited on the dates of purchase, the present value of each share. Here is what the government answered: (a) each share was worth \$100, when they bought the shares; (b) the market value (and here is what the government said) most likely 'nil' due to accumulate deficits. This bankruptcy cost us \$50,000.

I could go to the Meadow Lake door factory, the Golden Acre Motel in the Minister of Labour's city, the Isaac Jewelry of Regina, Fleury Industries. I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. What has really happened to SEDCO is that there has been a very dramatic shift of policy. They are advertising on the radio and on television and they are now setting themselves up as a Saskatchewan bank. The policy of SEDCO in the past, Mr. Speaker, used to be very simple. When a company couldn't get a loan from one of the normal institutions (like for example the Royal Bank or the Imperial Bank of Commerce) then they came to SEDCO as a bank of last resort. Today, SEDCO is advertising and asking people to come and take money from the Saskatchewan taxpayer that they could get from the Royal Bank or they could get from the Imperial Bank of Commerce and asking the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to take that risk. This, Mr.

Speaker, is a dramatic shift in policy and it is a bad policy. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, the millions of dollars of taxpayers money that SEDCO has washed down the drain, it is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we should have a complete expose on SEDCO. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the minister something else. He talks about the Crown corporations revealing the information. You know when that information reaches the members, it is normally a year and a half late. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of Crown corporation information that we get.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every member to support this resolution. I think it is about time that that government over there showed the people of Saskatchewan what is happening in their business ventures. I think it is time that the NDP began to show the people of Saskatchewan the kind of mismanagement, the kind of bungling that is going on in the business.

Mr. Speaker, I'll have more to say about this and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 22**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 22 showing:

The number of matters appealed by Legal Aid Commission solicitors for the appellant in the years 1975, 1976 to October 1, 1977. (a) The number in each year. (b) The number appealed to each appeal court. (c) The number of successful appeals in each of the years.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – Mr. Speaker, I intend to move an amendment which I think will still provide the member basically what he is looking at. in a way that we think we can manage the answer.

I will move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek) that the motion for an Order for Return No. 22, by Mr. Lane, Qu'Appelle, be amended by deleting all the words after the word 'showing' in the second line and substituting the following therefor:

For the fiscal years 1975, 1976 and to the period April 1, 1977, to October 1, 1977. (i) Matters appealed by Legal Aid clinics (a) The number in each year. (b) The number appealed to each appeal court. (c) The number of successful appeals in each of the years. (ii) Matters appealed by private solicitors on behalf of the Legal Aid Commission. (a) The number in each year. (b) The number of successful appeals in each year.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 23**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the assembly do issue for Return No. 23 showing:

(1) The generic and trade names on all drugs covered under the Drug Plan at (i) inception of the Plan (ii) January 1, 1977 (iii) June 30, 1977 (iv)

September 1, 1977. (2) The number of drugs removed from the list of approved drugs, and, (i) the trade and generic names of such drugs and (i) the reason such drugs were withdrawn. (3) The names of the pharmaceutical manufacturers from which drugs were purchased and the total amount purchased from each from date of commencement of the Drug Plan to September 1, 1977.

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health):** – Mr. Speaker, I am most anxious to provide the House with the information that the member for Qu'Appelle requests concerning the Saskatchewan Drug Plan but in order to provide that information most expeditiously and without unreasonable cost to the public, I am going to move an amendment after I make my remarks explaining the reason for the amendment. Essentially in my amendment I am going to say that all the words after the word 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(a) The number of drugs deleted from the Saskatchewan Formulary and the trade and generic names of such drugs, showing reasons for such deletion (i) from inception of the Drug Plan to January 1, 1977 and (ii) from January 1, 1977 to July 1, 1977. (2) the names of the pharmaceutical manufacturers from which drugs were purchased and the total amount purchased from each for the period September 1, 1975 to March 31, 1976 and April 1, 1976 to March 31, 1977.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want the House to understand that I am fully prepared and the government prepared to provide all the generic and trade names of all of the drugs covered under the Saskatchewan Drug Plan. These drug names are already printed in each edition of the Saskatchewan Formulary and the Formulary is printed twice a year – in January and July – and I can send over copies to the member and I think that will answer that part of the question which he asks. I will send it over so he has it. I think because they are printed there is no need to go through the work and the expense of reprinting them or recopying them in the form of an Order for Return. I might add, also, for the interest of members and the public who may be interested that all of these formularies can be found in every regional library in Saskatchewan and there is very easy and quick access to them.

You will note, also, Mr. Speaker, and members should note that I will be proposing in my amendment that the date of September 1st, 1977 be changed to March 31st, 1977. With respect to their request for names of pharmaceutical manufacturers from whom drugs are purchased, that information will be supplied as requested up to March 31st, 1977. For the period beginning April 1st, 1977 up to September 1st, 1977, it will be very expensive in the form of several thousands of dollars for us to obtain this information. This type of information will be contained in the annual report of the Saskatchewan Drug Program so that the information the member has requested for the current fiscal year will be available in a 1977-78 annual report of the drug plan. Because it will be available about the same time as it would be available if it went through the procedures of putting it together as well as an Order for Return, the member will be getting it about the same time.

So essentially, Mr. Speaker, I will be providing the information the member wanted with some changes to make it easier to do so, and save the cost, and therefore I move, seconded by the member for Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington) that this amendment

which I just stated previously, be accepted.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 24**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 24 showing:

The studies done, if any, by the Government of Saskatchewan prior to renting space in the new Regina City Hall regarding space requirements including (a) copies of such studies, (b) any cost estimates shown.

He said: I call to the House's attention that the motion states specifically whether any studies were done and the question very pointedly in the motion says, if any. I trust the minister will permit the motion.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services):** – Mr. Speaker, with respect to Return No. 24, I must say a couple of things about Return No. 24. Firstly, it is not the policy of the Government of Saskatchewan to disclose internal studies. I can tell the hon. member that there were no external studies done at the time the Regina City Hall was rented and we have that kind of expertise within the department and we in the Department of Government Services very rarely contract that type of thing out. I think in the time I have been minister I don't think we have every contracted out a study of that sort. It is our policy and indeed it was the policy of the previous administration that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle was associated with in some fashion or other, it was their policy as well not to disclose internal studies. They aren't done with a view to making them public. They often aren't written in a language which is comprehensible and they could be easily misunderstood. This administration and the previous administration did not make internal studies public and that's the only one that is available.

I might say as well, Mr. Speaker, I raise a more serious concern about this study. I indicated earlier some interest, some curiosity about why members ask questions like this, and again I am not in any sense casting aspersions on the member for Qu'Appelle, but if you want to try to answer that question I suppose you might ask who this sort of information would benefit, who the information would be of interest to. The only persons this information would be of interest to, Mr. Speaker, are real estate developers who provide space to the government. To disclose a study which gives information about what Government Services expects to pay in terms of rent, what type of buildings we expect to lease, how much of it we expect to lease, would be of great interest to real estate developers. I am always intrigued by the number of such firms which seem to be allied with the Conservative Party. A personal memory for me would be the Conservative candidate who ran in the Regina Centre, in the last election, who was employed by the Salvation Army but was opposed for the nomination by a real estate developer. I thin of other real estate developers in this city. Tom Drope, I wonder if this information would be of interest to him. Yet I am not casting any aspersions on the member for Qu'Appelle but I say that this information would be of great interest to the developers and landlords and the business interests who have bought and paid for the old line parties time after time.

So all in all, Mr. Speaker, because it is an internal study, because the information would harm our position, vis-a-vis those real estate firms with which we deal constantly, I am

going to recommend to the Assembly that the motion be defeated.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** – Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen a more despicable approach to hiding behind a refusal to give information by the government. Usually they at least have the courtesy to say that it is because it is not in the public interest. Let me tell you who else would be interested. I think that I would be interested to know because I will tell you what the answer is. It is an old rule in the House of Commons, don't ask a question unless you know the answer. The answer is that the government didn't have any studies. The reason that the government got into this particular deal was to try and bail out the City Hall of the city of Regina.

Now, that may be a proper motive for the government opposite to decide but it certainly didn't have the guts to come out and say so. It thoroughly disrupted the Attorney General's Department. It thoroughly disrupted public servants who were taken away from the Court House. We are now sitting with vacant space in the Court House because of the actions of the Minister of Government Services. Now he says that is of interest, that is of interest to the real estate developers.

The fact is that what this government is trying to hide and trying to cover up is that not only in this case but in probably hundreds of cases around this province the government didn't have any studies on its space requirements, never intended to have any studies on its space requirements and, in fact, is now trying to say, "Oh, it's because you are in bed with the real estate developers that we don't give you the information."

The fallacy of the minister's argument is that the decision was made nearly two years ago. The impact on the real estate developers of this province now would be negligible. It's a specious argument on the part of the minister. It is a fallacious argument on the part of the minister and I suggest a scoreless and untruthful argument on the part of the minister opposite.

The fact is that giving that information today, if you are saying that your space requirements today are affected by your decision of two years ago, then you should resign because you are incompetent and you are funning two years behind time. That is precisely what you are saying.

Surely you make your space requirements, if you are going to do any reasonable studies to do them in advance, not after. That is the stupidity of the argument; it would have absolutely no impact, no results, no bearing on anybody's plans for the city of Regina. I say that the minister is to be condemned for an absolutely stupid and fallacious argument. The fact is the reason he is not giving the information, the Minister of Government Services is not giving the information, because he didn't have any studies, internal or external, and that is typical of the bad planning and the bad management of the government opposite. Mr. Speaker, I have made the motion. I challenge the government opposite to vote as they intend to do for further hiding of bad management and bad government and stupid reasons. That is what they are voting for.

Motion negatived.

### **Return No. 27**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 27 showing:

The number of prisoners at Saskatchewan Correctional Centres who were released from incarceration prior to sentence being served (not including release for statutory remission of sentence) in each of the years 1966 to 1976 and the number in 1977 from January 1, 1977 to September 1, 1977, (a) The Correctional Centres from which the prisoners were released.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it became evident during published reports of the Moore Inquiry that some prisoners were being released from incarceration prior to sentence being completed and I am not taking into account and I make a specific reference to it, I am not concerned about statutory remission but for other reasons.

I therefore move, secondly by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) Return No. 27.

**MR. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** – Mr. Speaker, before moving an amendment to this motion I have a few words that I want to say on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to this opportunity to say a few words and I think that the member for Qu'Appelle gave me that opportunity when he said it became very evidence during the hearing that some prisoners were being released prior to being sentenced. I want to tell the member that I am moving an amendment in order to reflect, I think, more the intent of the motion, at least what I would hope would be the intent of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, because the member related to the hearing and I assume he was referring to the hearing in Prince Albert, I think everyone is aware, or if they are not aware, I should make them aware that members opposite, and particularly the member for Qu'Appelle and the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake and the member for Nipawin, before the inquiry was established attempted to interfere, interfere with what I consider was a very delicate situation in the Prince Albert Correctional Centre.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion and I think we can base that on facts which I hope to do some time during the Session in another speech which I hope to give, that the members opposite, in a way, in a very direct way, were a cause of many of the things that happened in Prince Albert. They, Mr. Speaker, were the ones who really instigated and were the catalysts who kept the incident alive and I think to the detriment of many people inside the Correctional Centre, both inmates and the guards and I think the people in Prince Albert themselves.

I think that there is no doubt at all that the members of the Conservative party (and I am solely referring to the members of the Conservative Party) were the ones who made no effort, no effort at all, in fact, Mr. Speaker. I think they took some positive measures to . . . maybe the language is a little strong . . . but I think to interfere with the due process of law that was established by this government and by this Assembly.

I think the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) particularly I think ought to bear the main brunt of the fault of the Conservative Party because he was the one, Mr. Speaker, that I believe in 1966 and 1967 and 1968 who worked for the then Attorney General.

**MR. LANE:** – Wrong again, Herm!

**MR. ROLFES:** – Well somewhere around that time you did. And Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. LANE:** – Executive Assistant.

**MR. ROLFES:** –Well, I think if we ask the then Attorney General he would also deny that he had any relationship at all with the member for Qu'Appelle, because no one would want to stoop so low to even admit that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the member for Qu'Appelle that I resent some of the steps taken by the Conservatives over the last three or four or five months, when I, as a minister, had to be quiet and could not react because a public inquiry had been established by this Assembly, and yet that didn't seem to stop those people. And, Mr. Speaker, it didn't seem to bother them at all that maybe they were interfering with the due process of law, didn't seem to bother them, Mr. Speaker, as to what rights that they were infringing on of the people in the Prince Albert area, and Mr. Speaker, they seem to have, I think, a total disregard for Judge Ben Moore and the work that he was attempting to do in making absolutely certain that we got to the bottom of the problem in the Prince Albert Correctional Centre.

The question that is before us, Mr. Speaker, I think cannot be answered in the form that it is and I think the member for Qu'Appelle know that. He knows as well as some other members do that the early release of prisoners occurs through enabling federal legislation under Section 36 of the federal Prisons and Reformatories Act. That's how they are released. This is done, Mr. Speaker, only under two main conditions, or two stringent conditions. First it is done for medical grounds or medical reasons and secondly, it can be done on humanitarian grounds.

Mr. Speaker, the question as it is put, again, I think impugns something that the member, I think, deliberately tried to do and that is that there somehow or for some reason that the director of the centre was negligent in his duty. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no evidence at all to substantiate that allegation that he is attempting to make. But, that's not the first time that the member for Qu'Appelle will do this. He will make an assumption, throw in a whole bunch of immaterial or innuendoes is a good word, and materials that are totally unrelated, try to confuse the issue, to embellish it with a whole (as the Minister of Finance says – innuendoes) and then he hopes that the people will accept that as grounds as evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I am given to understand that all the releases that were made were done under Section 36 of the federal Prisons and Reformatories Act; that all of them were done with very, very stringent conditions as far as medical grounds and humanitarian grounds are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we also had to make one other change and here maybe my dates aren't exactly correct, but I do believe that the member for Qu'Appelle has to take some responsibility for this, but my understanding is that no records were kept in 1966 or 1967 or 1968, as to how many were released and how they were released so, therefore, we are simply unable to answer those. We haven't got the materials for those years. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I regret having had to make those remarks, but I do believe that it is about time that the people of this province know exactly what the Conservative Party and certain members (particularly certain members of that Party) will do to gain political power in this province. And I think the Prince Albert Herald bore this out when they called the Leader of the Conservative Party's statement as cynical, political opportunism. That paper has been very, I think, easy and very positive in most

regards when it comes to the Conservative Party. But even that paper couldn't stomach some of the remarks made and finally, I think, had to take some actions. Mr. Speaker, therefore, I want to move, seconded by the member for Humboldt, that all the words after the word 'centres' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The number of prisoners at Saskatchewan correctional centres who were granted an early release under Section 36 of the Federal Prisons and Reformatories Act of more than two days not including release with statutory remission of sentence, in each of the years, 1969 to 1976 and a number 1977 from January 1, 1977 to September 1, 1977 and further the correctional centres from which the prisoners were released.

**MR. SPEAKER:** —May I just ask the member that moved the amendment in the preamble or in the direction here it says all the words after the word 'centres'. Does he mean where it first occurs? It occurs in the first line and the last line. I presume it's where the first line.

**MR. ROLFES:** —First line.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — We're dealing with a motion for an order for Return No. 27 to which an amendment has been offered, moved by the Minister of Social Services, seconded by the Minister of Health, will the Assembly take the amendment as read? Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the amendment?

Motion as amended agreed to.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Mr. Speaker, the original motion asked a very simple question and I know why the minister refused to answer it and why he was ashamed to answer it. Because one of the reasons for the complete falling apart of the correctional system in this province is the attitude of the minister opposite when in fact he implies and said that people were released for other reasons, humanitarian, whatever the reason may be. The fact is, and the minister knows it came out at the Moore Inquiry, that you have a policy of only releasing a prisoner before his sentence is served and that policy and that attitude of the minister opposite has done more to lessen the morale of the officers in the correctional centres. You have put the officers and the guards in an impossible position. And when the Conservative Party stands up and defends a position of the guards, we do it with pride and we're not ashamed to stand up in this House and defend the guards. The reason that the guards are being undercut is because of the actions of the government opposite, its policies and its programs. When you start releasing prisoners, when you start, as it came out in the Moore Inquiry, using the courts for a labor relations tribunal to persecute the guards, as you've done and the member knows that he's done it, then that's why we have problems in the prisons and that's why the morale of the guards is down to nothing. And that's why the morale of the prisoners has never been higher. We say that's the wrong approach to take.

When you start implementing policies like golfing lessons and canoeing lessons and hiking lessons, that's why the morale of the guards is down. That's why we have a mess in our correctional systems. It's because of your attitudes and your programs. You know, it came up in earlier debate, the question about how many escapes have been reclassified as hiking lessons. The members opposite thought it was funny. I suspect if we could ever get an answer out of that minister, we'd find out there were several, a little solitary hiking lesson, a little marathon, a little steeplechase you're into the racing. The reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have the problems in the correctional centres is because



the government has gone overboard on its treatment of prisoners in a stupid way. When I talk about rehabilitation, it means golfing lessons and I say that if you look at the decision logically, how are you going to rehabilitate someone by giving them golfing lessons.

First of all, if you look at it that way in the country, we haven't had a professional golfer make any great deal of money even when he is on the outside and has taken lessons for hundreds of years or tens of years. The fact is that it's not a direction. It's not a direction for rehabilitation. And yet you persist, you persist in stupid, absolutely inane policies and you wonder, you wonder why the guards are upset.

The next question has got the number of the matter of agreements. You certainly have policies where you have an agreement between the prisoners and the head of the correctional centre. In other words, nice labor management agreement between the prisoners and the management of the correctional centre. You don't treat the guards fairly. If some guard happens to overreact because of the intense pressures you put him under because of your actions, your policies, you fire him. What do you do with the prisoners? You give them golf lessons if they're tense and they're upset because they happen to be in jail. You know it's about time you started to look at two things. First of all, the intense pressures you are putting the guards under because of your stupid policies and, secondly, you had better start taking into account the feelings and the wishes of the public of Saskatchewan because the public of Saskatchewan is already condemning you for your foolish and ridiculous attitude. Now the member opposite says that the cause of the riots, the cause of the riots was the Conservative Party. That's what the hon. member said. The hon. member forgets that he stood up in this House and shaded the truth beyond belief by telling us the damages is in the fire in the Prince Albert Correctional Centre.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** —Not so loud, I'm reading.

**MR. LANE:** — Well, I hope it's not just the comic books because I hope you're trying to improve your mind for a change. Now he gave us misleading information either intentionally or otherwise when the first fire and the first disturbance at the Prince Albert Correctional Centre last spring. It turned out that his own happy little investigator went out and apologized to everybody for having no experience and having to get a report back in two days knowing full — one, he wasn't qualified debating it and, secondly, didn't have the time to give a report. he was chosen deliberately because you didn't want him to look into the mess he had created. You eventually got into such a bad position because of your policies and your ridiculous attitudes that you had to have a public inquiry. That public inquiry was long overdue and I'm not going to predict what the public inquiry is going to say and I would suspect that you're not going to be 100 per cent happy with it and I would be prepared to suggest rather than accuse the Conservative party that if, if that Moore Inquiry in any way condemns the government's policies that you'd be prepared to resign. That you share the courage of your defence (interjection) fair enough. If it condemns your policies which cause the riots and the disruption make no mistake, make no mistake. Mr. Attorney General, you and the Premier have commented on court cases in the past and there is absolutely nothing wrong with it and I'll stand behind that letter. Now the reason is and one of the major reasons — talk about the Premier talking about cases and criticizing the Supreme Court in public as you have done, as you have done. That is absolutely a ridiculous statement by the Attorney General and he smilingly knows it.

Now we go back to the token member for Social Services and get it back. How do you

expect a guard to function when you are on the one hand giving golf lessons and steak dinners to the prisoners and letting them out early without a by-your leave and here this guy is supposed to be there for taking the general public and enforcing the rules supposedly of a correctional system. The reasons you've put the guards in an impossible position. You have forgotten why the prisoners are in jail in the first place. probably because they did something wrong and I think it is about time, Mr. Speaker, that the government opposite not only have the Moore Inquiry in the Prince Albert Correctional system but to look completely at the way it's handling that correction system and the correctional centres in this province and you have been delinquent in your role as minister by your attitude and that's the cause and that's the true cause and it's a time for a complete reassessment of your policy in the correctional centres. It's time to re-establish the goals that protect the public is just as important as other goals. The true rehabilitation should be looked at to make sure it's effective and not a fun lark as you have done in the past. Those are the costs and the minister knows full well those are the costs. I suggest that the minister would be well served go give this House the true reason, the true answer, Mr. Speaker. I so move.

**MR. SPEAKER:** —The question before the House is on Return No. 27 as amended. However, before I put that question, I want to go back to the amendment for a brief moment or two to point out what appears to be a slight typographical error that if changed will in no way alter the amendment and the item I wish to draw your attention to is the word 'centres' which was the word in which the amendment was supposed to start. Perhaps that should be the word 'showing' and if it is the word 'showing' it will then read properly as it is listed there on the amendment sheet, otherwise you will have a repeat of the first line which would then read as follows: "The number of prisoners at Saskatchewan Correctional Centres, the number of prisoners at Saskatchewan Correctional Centres who were granted", etc., etc.

What's the point of order?

**MR. MERCHANT:** —The point of order is that as I recall — I can't put my hand on it but you've ruled before if an amendment or a motion is not ordinarily readable and makes no sense, then the amendment or the motion fails and I suggest to you that we're now well beyond in the debate any opportunity to amend the amendment even if that were possible and that your honor has little alternative but to rule the amendment out of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the member's point of order would have been well taken except that we have already agreed to the amendment and it's out of the way. I'm merely asking as a convenience to the Chair and have it appear properly in the paper and that we substitute the words 'showing' where the member had 'centres'. Hearing no dissent I will change that to 'showing'.

### **Return No. 28**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 28 showing:

The agreements entered into between the Government of Saskatchewan or its correctional centre employees and prisoners in the correctional centres since 1971 and (a) dates and copies of such agreements and the criteria used for selecting the prisoner representative.

He said: I am sure the minister is fully cognizant of the information being requested. I am sure too that if the hon. member wants to continue the debate we are quite prepared to do so and I therefore move this motion, seconded by Mr. Wipf, the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an opportunity to say a few words in respect to this motion. I am not ready and I therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 29**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 29 showing:

(a) The number of cases by month investigated by the Verification Unit of the Department of Social Services since its establishment to October 1, 1977 (i) The members of the Verification Unit, (ii) The qualifications of each member. (b) The number of applications reviewed refused social assistance and the reasons. (c) The number of applications reviewed whose social assistance was increased and the reasons for such increase.

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, the question as it appears is very difficult to answer and therefore I would like to move the following amendment, seconded by Mr. Tchorzewski (Minster of Health):

That all the words after the word 'member' be deleted and the following substituted therefore: (a) the number of cases verified and determined ineligible for all of the benefits they have received; (b) the number of cases verified and determined eligible for more benefits than they had already received.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 30**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the assembly do issue for Return No. 30 showing:

The umber of Indian and Metis receiving Social Assistance in each of the fiscal years 1974, 1975, 1976, and April 1, 1977 to September 30, 1977.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this Return I recall that the same matter was raised in the Assembly I believe about three or four years ago and at that time the department indicated that they do not keep records by race. My question is basically to determine whether or not the department policy has changed and that is the reason it is an update of a question asked I believe two or three years ago, at that time. It will be very interesting to see the answer of the minister, so I move Return No. 30, seconded by Mr. Bailey, the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, the member for Qu'Appelle says that a similar question was put on the order paper about three or four years ago. I can't recall what the minister gave as an answer at that time but I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if you look at that you wonder why the question wasn't asked for the number of Germans receiving social assistance in each of the fiscal years. Or why the number of Irish, why the number of French or why the number of Scots or why the number of Ukrainians, receiving social assistance for each of the fiscal years/ Why isn't that as important to the member for Qu'Appelle? Why wouldn't he want to know howdah Irish people are receiving social assistance, why wouldn't he want to know how many French are receiving social assistance in this province? Why didn't he simply ask why or how many Germans, one of the largest groups in this province, are receiving social assistance? Why did he just put in here Indians and Metis receiving social assistance? Could it be that the member for Qu'Appelle and his colleague notice out in Saskatchewan and notice out in Canada as a whole there is sort of a resentment by certain people who have, I suppose castigated the Indian and Metis people and that these people are for the member opposite. I suppose I should not impute any motives, in asking this question, but I simply can't help but wonder why he would single out those people who were the first Canadians of this country, the native people of this province, the Indian and Metis. Mr. Speaker, it's not so long ago when we had a by-election in Pelly and it was interesting in Pelly, what happened. It was interesting when the Conservatives had an advertising campaign, wherein they, I suppose imputed certain motives to the NDP Party, wherein, they I think attempted, attempted to rouse up the white people in the Pelly by-election, but particularly in the town of Kamsack, in saying that the Blakeney government would discriminate against the while people, in favor of Indian and Metis people. That, Mr. Speaker, isn't so bad, but I think that at the time, certainly the Conservatives, what they were attempting to do, is try to arouse in the people of the constituency of Pelly, arouse in them some hostility, to make certain that the people would, I suppose discriminate against those people who were the first Canadians in this country.

What they attempted to do, Mr. Speaker, was to set Indian and Metis against Ukrainians, against Germans, against French people, against the whites. They tried to get two camps going and I think the Prince Albert Herald, again, was correct, when it said, this is done purely for cynical, political opportunism. We have seen more of this, Mr. Speaker, and again, I think, we have to single out solely the Conservatives in this regard. Mr. Speaker, I would ask every member, every member in this House, to simply not give any further thought, to the motion that was asked, and simply to defeat it, defeat it, I think with a feeling of disgust, with a feeling of contempt for a member of this House, to ask for information which he knows full well, we do not have in the first place, which in the second place, we have no intention of providing, if it was here. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see any other reason, why the member for Qu'Appelle would ask for this information, other than, that he will go out into the white society and say, this is what the NDP government is doing with your money, that is how they are squandering your money, without any regard, for what it may do, in dividing and setting people one against another. Mr. Speaker, the member from Qu'Appelle, again didn't disappoint me. But he would be about the only in that party, that could stoop so low, and ask a question of that kind, in this House.

So I ask every member, again, to defeat this motion on the grounds that it is discriminatory; it smacks, in my opinion, of racism.

**HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont):** – . . . resolution or question, as well.

Reading, Mr. Speaker, a little magazine put out by the Canadian Labour Congress called Human Rights in Canada, focused on racism. The forward to this particular booklet was written by the Honorable Emmett Hall, retired Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. Mr. Justice Hall, in this particular forward, had this to say:

Yesterday it was sexism, manifested by employment and wage discrimination co-existing with the shameful treatment of native population. Today, it is racism, as dehumanizing as any of its predecessors, such as slavery, bigotry, ignorance and colonization.

But often more subtle, Mr. Speaker, often more subtle, in its application than what has preceded it. This particular resolution, I think, Mr. Speaker, brings me back to being a child, in the way my mother brought me up, some of you may or may not know, that my background is Roman Catholic. My mother always brought me up, detesting Tories and I could never understand why. You know I thought this Diefenbaker buy was great. My mother said eh was the worst human being that ever lived, and I could not understand why. She told me about 1928, a few years preceding that, a member from Moose Jaw remembered this probably, or his folks, would have remembered it, because this particular group was particularly strong in the Moose Jaw area. I speak of course of the Klu Klux Klan, and they were fairly subtle, in those years too. Mr. Speaker, not as subtle as this, not as subtle as this but they were fairly subtle. What did they do at that time, the Conservative Party? They got after this band wagon of the Klux Klan. Why did they do that? Because they knew that in the community, there were problems, the economy was starting to dip, people were feeling a little bit insecure, there was a Liberal government in office, and many of the people in Liberal government were Catholic, and they placed on this anti-catholic sentiment, and they were successful. They elected a government. What do we see today, some 35 or 40 years later? We see the same kind of thing resurrected by the same kind of people, see a Wasp party basically, people who make fun, no, and I have heard your people make fun of ethnic minorities like the leader does, play on people's feeling of insecurity; they are today. We live in a society where people don't know what is happening. They are looking for a scapegoat, Mr. Speaker. People in society are looking for a scapegoat. The Conservative Party have said, well let's make the Indian people the scapegoat. We have found out that our electoral support from people of Indian and Metis background isn't very good anyway. We'll write those people off, Mr. Speaker, and we will attack them — sometimes subtly as in this particular order, other times not as subtly as was mentioned by the Minister of Social Services in the Pelly by-election, which I didn't think was subtle at all.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of thing is pretty tough to take. There was a time when I know that people of the Conservative persuasion would go around and talk about this kind of thing on the doorstep. They would never put it on paper. They would never come out in the press and say the kind of things that they have been saying over the last six or eight months or a year.

I have got a lot of other things that I want to say about this particular issue. I haven't had as much time as I would like to prepare and I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 33**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

The moneys paid by the Government of Saskatchewan or any Crown corporations to law firms in each year 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977. (a) The amounts paid to each law firm, (b) the type of work paid for in each case.

**MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – Mr. Speaker, I will move a small amendment which is a technical amendment . . . would you give that to Mr. Lane. It is a technical amendment. The member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) – I haven't heard from him for a long time, nice to know that he is still around and with us and happy – that has been around for a long time. In fact, I would say to the hon. member for Souris-Cannington so long, that this is something that members in the House should perhaps note. I think that we have answered this question going back to '73 and even earlier, '74 and '75 and '76 for the last three years or four years running, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am sure that if the hon. member for Qu'Appelle had done just a little bit of research, he would have found out that the return was ordered for 1975 and 1976. All he could have done or would have done is picked up the return and made the application applicable for the year 1977. I don't know, I guess private members' day is a very valuable and important day for the private members to make their speeches and all that other kind of stuff that private members do. I do think that this is a kind of an example of the request on the civil service and on the government, an obligation for the provision of information which so much more easily could have been done if the members had spent a little bit of time looking at their homework and doing the kinds of things that we have prepared for so many hours in the past. I don't mean this in any critical sense to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. He obviously may want a comparison or something, I don't know, to see if the figures coincide or whatever his own purposes are. For whatever reason I will just simply move this amendment which will provide yet once again the names of the barristers and solicitors, etc.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek):

That the motion for Order for Return No. 33 by Mr. Lane (Qu'Appelle) be amended by deleting all the words after 'showing' in the second line and substituting the following therefor:

The names of all barristers and solicitors in private practice retained by the Government of Saskatchewan and its Crown corporations for the calendar years 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976 and from January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977 and the sums paid to them for the legal services rendered.

**MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** – Mr. Speaker, just comment on the remarks made by the Attorney General. I think if the Attorney General had done his homework and read the motion for return a little more closely he would have noticed that there was a different question asked this time and that was the type of work that was paid for in each case. The reason that that was asked of the Attorney General is because we wanted to know . . . it could have been ceramics . . . the way you throw money around, but we wanted to know how many different opinions and different law firms were working for example on the constitutional aspects of the CIGOL case. We wanted to know how many law firms worked on the various aspects of the potash nationalization. Now that was a fundamental difference in the question as the Attorney General well knows, and I think that the opposition's reason for asking the question was sound and proper and one of the functions of the opposition. I think it's a highly proper question for the opposition to

ask the type of work done by the law firms. We note and I suggest that all members of the Assembly duly take note that that aspect was voted down by the government members opposite for fear, I suppose, of the opposition discovering what types of work are paid for by the government by the types of work that are being done. And secondly, it had another aspect and that is how much duplication was being done by outside law firms that could be done departmental solicitors, so I say that the question was twofold, the question was different and I say the Attorney General's remarks were not properly called for in this instance.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Return No. 34**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 34 showing:

The number of students employed by the Government of Saskatchewan in 1975, 1976 and 1977, the number of summer students, and the names and addresses of such students and salary paid each.

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance):** — Mr. Speaker, some of the problems in the other motions that the hon. member has moved were expressed by my colleagues, pose themselves also in this very question. First of all, there is no way that we are able to define what is a student, maybe the hon. member can, but for purposes of employment, nor are we able to define in any precise way what he meant or would like us to try to interpret of what is meant by a summer student. Because of the problems of defining both, we find it very difficult to be able to try to answer the question and why would — Mr. Speaker, not trying to impute any motives, I really wonder why the hon. member is trying to seek the information in this kind of a way, or that type of information, particularly when the question or the answer he is seeking for is the names, addresses, and the salaries of students, and summer students. Does he want the names and the addresses for purposes of mailing out PC political propaganda? Mr. Speaker, I must ask, could this kind of information be used in any way to try and intimidate present or past employees of the government? Has he asked for names and addresses and salaries, is it intended to get the names and addresses and then proceed to pump the present or former employees for information? Mr. Speaker, it's hard to know and I say that, because, in the light of some of the past statements and questions that were made in this House, you may recall that this last year or two years ago when the Leader of the Conservative Party was saying to the public service that they had an obligation to provide the opposition with confidential material, Mr. Speaker. This is unheard of in this House or in any legislature or in the House of Commons that opposition members would be going out on television and radio and pleading and asking the public service to break the oath of secrecy and provide opposition members with confidential information. Well since they weren't able to get it that way, Mr. Speaker, they are now asking for lists of employees, and remember that there isn't an employee that is in the public service who at one time may have been a student. Presumably what he is asking for and since he doesn't define a student, is the list of all employees that are today employed in the public service. Mr. Speaker, surely, we should not be asked to provide that information and surely the names of public servants should not be subjected to this kind of revelation.

As a government we hire a lot of students. Most of our students were for summer employment; we employ high school students, university students, students from the

technical schools, during the summer months, those employees are employed as relief personnel to relieve regular employees who are on summer vacation. We employ students, many students in highway construction, tourism. We have a program called YES, Youth Employment Service in which we provide money to local governments to employ students. That is part of our policy and part of our program.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be totally unfair to be providing lists of hundreds and thousands of employees to an opposition party who would, I'm afraid, use the names in a way that I don't think the employees would want them to be used. There is such a thing as some secrecy and some privacy. Obviously, individuals have some rights, some freedoms. As my colleague, the Attorney General says, "freedom from harassment by PCs." Mr. Speaker, there are other things I would like to say about this motion and perhaps give the hon. member an opportunity to think through the kind of question that he is asking and probably withdraw, and since I have to say about it, I beg leave to adjourn debate at this stage.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 35**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 35 showing:

The number of employees of the Government of Saskatchewan selling land to the Government of Saskatchewan in the year 1976 and legal descriptions and amount paid and the name of the employee in each case.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General keeps making reference to muckraking. I find it very strange that the government offices would be afraid to give information about . . . no they wouldn't give me the information . . . and I suppose they won't give me the information on this motion that I am about to table, as well. The reason is that, I think it well accepted in the province, the employment practices for the summer depend something to the extent on the color of the card held by the individual. However, on the motion that I have before the Assembly I think the hon. minister will be making the same excuse and I don't think he should take it as lightly . . . I don't think he should take it as lightly.

I dare the minister to stand up and say that that's a witch hunt. I challenge the minister, when in fact we don't know if there has been any. We have argued the opposition, the opposition I believe has argued, that there should be fair conflict of interest legislation; that it should apply as well to senior civil servants. I think that is proper, I think that is fair, and I think it is an admirable goal.

Now the member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) calls that vicious interrogation. he is against a fair conflict of interest legislation and he is well known for being against conflict of interest legislation. I wouldn't be surprised if he is the leader of a cabal in that caucus that stopped the Attorney General from bringing in conflict of interest



legislation, that he has expressed publicly as being an admirable goal by his government. It wouldn't surprise me a bit if it's the member for Moose Jaw North who is against it and has fought conflict of interest legislation so much that he is probably prepared to disrupt Cabinet and party solidarity and has probably made it clear that he is going to vote against it should the Attorney General ever be able to bring it before this House.

He is against vicious Tories. I think after the next election you won't have to worry because you will be sitting back in your happy little job in Moose Jaw and the people will find out how benevolent and how good and how sound and how good managers the Conservatives are, and I suggest that the hon. member for Moose Jaw North and we know his protestations against conflict of interest.

I am not sure and I say this to the minister, I am not sure that the motion as phrased is not too far because what I am trying to do is to see if the government does have any record of land transactions because I believe that if we are to have conflict of interest legislation it should apply to senior civil servants. I think that's only fair. There have been numerous debates in this House before, and I will be prepared to admit that my motion may or may not be too broad but if the information is available then I suspect that the information should be made available to this House because if it is available, then I suspect that it would assist the opposition in attempting to attain some precision as to the level of government to which conflict of interest legislation applies. I am not sure, but that in the matter of land sale transactions or major sales, and I don't know the level at which that should be, that all such conflict of interest matters should be table d before the provincial Legislature. I think that's fair. I think it would be within the intent and the tenor of conflict of interest legislation.

Those are my reasons for moving that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 35, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter).

**MR. ROMANOW:** – Mr. Speaker, I will be asking the House in a moment to adjourn this debate, but I must, however, make a couple of general comments.

First of all, with respect not only to this motion but what we have been witnessing here, by and large all day today, this I think, Mr. Speaker, the experience we have gone through this afternoon signifies a very significant and radical departure in emphasis to the affairs of public business brought to this House now by the Progressive Conservative Party, certainly as opposed to their emphasis in 1975. In 1975, Mr. Speaker, there were seven members and in 1975 to about this year the number of orders and motions for returns were very few, two or three . . . the original seven. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, in debates past how the members of the Conservative caucus said that this kind of motion which we are talking about here and the others, that was the nasty business of the Liberals and the NDP, kind of muckraking approach that the two old line parties were getting involved in, but we being the third new group, we had something new to offer, a new alternative, a new approach to offer.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is typical of the kinds of motions which we have dealt with today if you go through virtually all of them, well not all of the, but a great deal of them. You get a motion that picks out Indians and Metis under the pretext that three years ago or so this similar question was asked and the department said that it did not offer that kind of information based on race. That's the pretense. Does anybody in the House believe that?

Now this motion is before us, not for anything else except the pretense according to the member for Qu'Appelle because he's interested in conflict of interest legislation. Does anybody believe that? Mr. Speaker, if the member for Qu'Appelle was interested in conflict of interest legislation there are a number of ways he could have highlighted his interest, a motion on the order paper to debate a resolution urging the government to get on with the task, or a motion asking the minister a question, perhaps to me in question period, where is the law reform commission at in terms of its recommendations that you refer to them in this area? Not at all, Mr. Speaker, that's just a cover up excuse. It's a ruse. We are entitled to assume that what the members of the Conservative Party wanted is what the black and white letters of this motion say they wanted. And, that is, they want the number of employees selling land, the legal description, the amount paid and the name of each employee in each case. And you go to the next motion, which you just finished dealing with, but it's applicable to one of my remarks. It's very specific what they want. They want the number of students, the names and addresses and the salaries of the students and go straight down the line. They want the same thing with respect to the Indian and Metis and they keep on going in this whole routine. You go straight up the back of the whole routine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a very radical departure from the Conservative caucus. I've noticed it in the last several months, this muckraking mentality which is the only way to describe it, which is creeping into their approach to public affairs. That somehow, there's a scandal under these questions. And there's a whole bunch we're going to deal with later on, just let them put them on, their aircraft flights and credit cards and leases and all that. That kind of a muckraking mentality which is brought to the affairs of public business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Conservatives somehow thought that off in their own minds as Roy Romanow or somebody else making a partisan political speech and I don't care how they treat that. But I'm just asking anybody who looks at it objectively 'the blues this year and the blues last year' and I tell you that caucus has changed. And I say it's changed in a lot of ways. It's changed, not only numerically from seven to eleven, but it's changed in its attitudes. It's changed. I don't think it ever did have positive alternatives to offer particularly, but it certainly changed in its attitudes. And I think that what we're seeing here with the particular motion, Mr. Speaker, is that kind of a muckraking mentality that I deplore, that I believe the people of Saskatchewan deplore, that isolation of employees, that isolation of students, or Indian and Metis or have it what you will, designed to have government by embarrassment, government by scandal, government by public expose on the theory that governments are defeated and not elected in the absence and in the failure of putting forward sound and positive policy alternatives to the people of Saskatchewan. This Conservative Leader in this Conservative caucus, Mr. Speaker, has indeed embarked upon a very undesirable, a momentous course in the affairs of public business in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to have quite a few more words to say about all these motions and what these motions exhibit at a later date, and I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Return No. 36**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle)** moved that an Order of the assembly do issue for Return No. 36 showing:

The number and names of all government employees who have been given leave of absence to attend educational institutions in each of the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977 to November 15, 1977, and the institution each was to attend and the payments made by the government to each employee while the employee was on leave.

He said: I'm not sure how to approach this, Mr. Speaker, one year we're accused of not doing enough work as the opposition, now we're accused of doing too much. Now I find that a rather strange attitude on the part of the Attorney General. Now I know the Attorney General is embarrassed. I know the Attorney General is embarrassed because the Conservatives will have too much information about the government's activities, and rightly, he should be embarrassed. He should be. If I were in his position working for the government that he's working with, I'd be embarrassed. I wouldn't want to give any information if I was the Attorney General. I don't think the Attorney General even believes that the opposition has no right, no duty, no obligation to stand up in this House and ask questions. Because make no mistake, we do have that right and we do have that obligation and we intend to fulfill that obligation without regard to the feeling and the wishes and the political embarrassment of the Attorney General of this province. Now, make no mistake, Mr. Attorney General, that we intend to continue to ask questions, and you can stand there, and I'm glad to hear the member from the department of Northern Saskatchewan say Conservatives all eleven of us are rough shodding over the government. Boy, I'll tell you, you're giving us, now that's what he said, these Conservatives that he doesn't take seriously are now running rough shod over the government. Well we may be running rough shod over the government. I suggest that we certainly have been running rough shod over your department. You'd be well advised to be back home doing your homework, instead of sitting here and participating in the debate this afternoon. But, let's make no mistake that we have another question. It ask information of the government, the Attorney General can attribute to it whatever motives he wishes. It is a fair question, It is a proper question. We note very pointedly the Attorney General did not say that the questions were unfair; he implied most emphatically that the questions were political, that he's afraid. Sure, and the hon. member agrees that they're political questions. when did this parliament ever decide that oppositions could not ask political questions? I'd like to know the precedent for this. I'd like to know the precedent for total closure as the Attorney General has just advocated and the rights of opposition members to ask questions. And the Attorney General can't stand up in the House and say that he never asked a political question as a member of the opposition. He knows full well he did, And quite properly. And so did every other member of the government opposite that sat in the opposition benches, and that's fair and that's proper. And I suggest when I ask these questions and members of the Conservative party ask questions. And we have a right and we don't intend to shirk from our duties because you don't want to answer question or you're embarrassed by the questions. That's your fault, that's not ours. Don't try and blame the Conservative Party for your error. I therefore move for Return No. 36 showing and seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter).

**MR. ROMANOW:** —I am not going to ask leave to adjourn this debate but I do want to say a few things in rebuttal to the opening remarks made on this motion by the member for Qu'Appelle, I want to make myself absolutely clear. The member for Qu'Appelle says that I say that he has no right to ask political questions. That is false. I never said that and I do not say that now. You have the full right to ask political questions.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the point of my remarks are that the member for Qu'Appelle must recognize that that is exactly what those questions are, political questions.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I said in the previous debate and I repeat again in this debate, nobody can stop the member for Qu'Appelle asking any kind of a question that he wants whether it is a muckraking question or not. But I want to tell the Conservative caucus, tell the member for Cannington that if I shut my eyes, closed, and I didn't know the facts of life, the same type of questions basically from the same member, he asked when he was seated over there with the Liberal Party and he is now seated with the Conservative Party. No one says he doesn't have the right to ask those kinds of questions. He has every perfect right to ask that question but the point that I make and I repeat again to the House is that this request's a major departure in approach to Saskatchewan politics on the part of the Conservative Party and make no mistake about that. Not that he doesn't have the right to have that departure, not that they don't have the right to ask about any kind of a muckraking approach that they want, not that they don't have the right to look for scandals under rocks, not that he doesn't have a right to embarrass us. He has a right to embarrass us but that is the course of political conduct that they have embarked upon and my point, Mr. Speaker, is that this is the party which tried to say to the people of Saskatchewan that they were going to offer something new to Saskatchewan political life. And I say to this House, this question belies the truth of that statement and that intent. Three is nothing different from their approach in this question or any of the other series of questions, nothing whatsoever from what the Liberals embarked on when the member was sitting over there as a Liberal, nothing different. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that's the kind of approach to Saskatchewan political life that I objected to when the Liberals were embarrassed with him and they are still there. It is the kind of political approach to political life to object to now most strenuously under the Conservative Party.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! I can't help but think that the last two speakers have paid scant attention to the motion that is before the House and I would like to see the Attorney General get to the gist of what is before us in the motion. I was expecting the member for Qu'Appelle to hew to the line that's in the motion in his remarks and I heard very little of it. As a matter of fact, I don't think he mentioned the motion once and I believe the Attorney General has had an adequate rebuttal of the remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle and he should deal directly with the motion.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, okay, if I can't by your ruling respond to the remarks made in this House and I am denied apparently the right to respond, I shall abide by the ruling if that is the position that I am in.

I will simply close my remarks by saying that the minister in charge of the Public Service Commission will make undoubtedly some further appropriate remarks and some further amendments and close my remarks by saying that it is in my judgment a low level of political affairs to see the kinds of questions of the muckraking mentality put on by the Conservative caucus which in my judgment represents a significant departure in the approach to Saskatchewan politics that have been taken up to date by the Conservatives and I deplore that very much, Sir.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this and say it very quickly. I think it is about time we stopped wasting the time of this assembly and the catcalling between the two parties. I have been sitting here, Mr. Speaker, for about two hours and I have listened to the catcalls and the insinuations and the implications

between those two parties that is in itself a kind of an insult.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – If the member for Indian Head-Wolseley is rising on a point of order, I would concur with him 100 per cent but I wasn't aware that's what he was rising on. He was rising to speak to the motion and I would say to him what I just said to the Attorney General that he devote his entire attention to the motion.

**MR. MacDONALD:** – Mr. Speaker, although I should rise to the point of order or continue my remarks on the motion, I will try and put them to the motion. What I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, this kind of a motion and the kind of response that the government has done today is really wasting time. First of all, I see very little wrong with the question, this question or the majority of questions. I didn't like a couple of them, to be perfectly honest. I thought the jumping of the government on the member for Qu'Appelle in relation to a couple of them was rather childish. Some they maybe had an argument but what I am really trying to say is, let's get down to the business of the House and quit trying to catcall, act like gentlemen, act like intelligent people in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I may want to say something more on that. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:51 o'clock p.m.