

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 13, 1977

The Assembly met at 2:00 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

Exploration for Uranium — Bayda Commission

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Mining. Yesterday, Mr. Minister, you admitted that 44 out of 47 of the joint mining exploration ventures were for uranium exploration. Would the minister not agree that massive government exploration for uranium will do one of two things. Either, (a) it pre-judges the Bayda report, or (b) it's a waste of taxpayers' money if Bayda happens to go against this development.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — No. Mr. Speaker, I conveyed to the member during the question period that certain commitments, certain undertakings had already been made in northern Saskatchewan, and it would be inappropriate to undertake to bring to a standstill, all of that activity simply because there was an inquiry in relation to uranium, and it is not proper to interpret that because of the exploration activity continuing, that we have made a decision. I don't think that it would be practical to do it in that sense any more than it would to review automobile traffic by-laws or laws and bring everything to a standstill while we are reviewing that. It's a fact of life that exploration and development will continue. It was in place in Saskatchewan. We feel that there were some questions that the government of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan should address themselves to in relation to uranium mining and related developments, and we have structured a very, I think, appropriate and credible committee to do that, and we will not be making any final decisions in regard to some of those activities in northern Saskatchewan related to uranium until that committee reports to us and we have the opportunity to consider that report and make the final governmental decisions.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, if you do proceed, do you not feel that you are potentially embarrassing the Bayda Inquiry and kind of pre-setting what they have to do in that inquiry?

MR. MESSER: — No, I don't believe so, and I don't believe that Mr. Bayda or the inquiry have in any instance during the period of time that they have been carrying out their deliberations, ever suggested that the government in any way, was affecting the credibility and the sincerity of that inquiry and its final conclusion.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — You say that it would have been impractical to have a moratorium, but would you not admit that it's your government policy on many other resource fields of conservation, that in fact, the uranium would still be in the ground and that six months or eight months wouldn't make any difference, and that you could very well have given more credibility to the Bayda inquiry by having a moratorium, and would you now not consider having a moratorium pending the Bayda inquiry?

MR. MESSER: — Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. The Bayda Inquiry is, I think, now

undertaking to put together a report from their deliberations, their discussions and their findings during the year, 1977, and I think it would be most inappropriate now to undertake to establish a moratorium. Certainly they have not indicated that the exploration activity in northern Saskatchewan has in any way, interfered with their deliberations. I might say that I would like to perhaps use as a comparison, the position and the policy of the government in regard to hearings, public hearings in relation to power development in this province, be it thermo or hydro. And simply because those inquiries, public inquiries, are under way, does not mean that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation does not give any consideration or ceases all of its planning in relation to a growing demand for power in Saskatchewan. We still undertake to, in at least an exploratory way, develop other possible alternatives to provide either thermo or hydro power. The world continues to turn as we have inquiries and it's no different in the instance of electrical power or mining for uranium or oil exploration or coal exploration, or whatever, and until some reasonable and sound reasoning comes to the government as to whether or not . . .

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina-Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister two supplementaries, I suppose. First, the Bayda Inquiry appears to be in a sort of a time slide. Has Mr. Bayda indicated when he expects to bring down the report, and secondly, if he decides against the AMOC project, and the delay would seem to indicate perhaps some possibility of that, is it your intention to not allow AMOC to proceed and if you do that will you be compensating AMOC for its losses?

MR. MESSER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the second question. if I may answer it first, is hypothetical and I don't think it would be appropriate to undertake to assume what Mr. Bayda may be recommending to the government. I would also say that Mr. Bayda simply recommends that it will be the government that makes the final decision and they're not going to we are not prepared to, at this time, allude to what our final position will be until we see the Bayda report.

I don't know whether I can adequately respond to the first question. Mr. Bayda does not report to myself as Minister of Mineral Resources. I think that if he was contacting any government agency, it would be the Minister of Environment.

Fire Commissioner's Office

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — In view of the fact that it is necessary to obtain permission from the Fire Commissioner's office relative to building plans, is the Minister of Labor aware that the Fire Commissioner's office, at the present time, is working approximately four months behind schedule, and in fact they are working on plans submitted in August and it's now the middle of December? Is the minister not also aware that this has a dramatic effect of course, on the construction of new buildings. and also the fact that alterations may have to be made at a later time and can prove to be very costly?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — I am aware, in response to the hon. member's question, that there has been some backlog at the fire commissioner's office and the approval of some plans. Part of this has been, I think, the result of a number of grant programs through the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Culture and Youth. We are expecting that this will taper off. Obviously there have been a large number of rural communities that have taken advantage of grant programs that have been made available over the last number of months and accordingly the staff of the fire commissioner's office has been somewhat overburdened and there is

something of a backlog which I believe we are in the process of clearing up at this time with one person that was seconded from Government Services some time ago. I am under the impression that they are able to see the end of their nose at this point in time and that they will be hopefully abreast of the backlog in the not too distant future.

MR. STODALKA: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that indeed in light of the very fact that you had this increase in number of programs that you have intimated, is not a fact that you have actually reduced the staff at the fire commissioner's office?

MR. SNYDER: — No, I think that is not the case.

MR. STODALKA. — Is the minister prepared then to consider additional staff at the fire commissioner's office? From my understanding and my dealing with them they are at a real handicap and they indicated to me that it is going to be an extensive time before they are able to bring these plans up to date.

MR. SNYDER: — The finalization is in the process of winding up and those matters will be given thoughtful consideration at that time.

Control of Lotteries and Games of Chance

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General. In the November 25 issue of the Saskatchewan Gazette you have issued new regulations pursuant to Section 190 of the Criminal Code and this section deals with lotteries and games of chance ranging all the way from the mammoth car bingos to the small church bingos and the local high school raffle.

My first question to you, Mr. Attorney General, and I would like to use the words of the mayor of a town in rural Saskatchewan, my question is this: What has prompted the government of Saskatchewan to issue regulations that will destroy the income to the smaller projects in rural communities, and does the government realize that organizations in rural areas will find it almost impossible to deal with the new regulations?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be aware that the regulations and the need for regulations are a requirement of federal law - criminal code law and the need to make sure that lotteries are properly governed. The other side of the hon. member's question could be misinterpreted, or I think legitimately interpreted to say that there should be no control on lotteries or bingos or games of chance at all, that we should simply say to the province of Saskatchewan, "open it wide open, have whatever kind of a lottery that you want to have under whatever kind of rules you want to have." And I don't subscribe to that. That may be the position of the member for Rosetown-Elrose, it may be the position of his party. It is not the position of this party. If, in the development of certain regulations, there will be operating difficulties or administrative problems and charitable organizations and have had difficulty in complying with them. Either myself or the Minister of Consumer Affairs would be more than pleased to receive submissions from them and to make necessary adjustments, but to open it up I cannot agree with the hon. member.

MR. BAILEY: — A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Certainly everybody recognizes, Mr. Attorney General, that regulations are required particularly for the lotteries of the gigantic nature, but would the Attorney General not agree that the regulations have gone too far as the church bingo is concerned, or the local high

school raffle? Don't you think that those regulations have gone too far as to the effect on small towns and rural Saskatchewan?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly prepared, and again, my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs who I believe is in charge of the operation of those regulations, to take a look at them to see if they have gone "too far". But this is the kind of duplicitous argument that we are so used to hearing in this House, Mr. Speaker.

I'm all for regulating games of lotteries and games of chance, but, and then comes the but, then comes the other side where I'm all for the de-regulation of them, and that's the position the Conservative Party is always taking. And I say to the hon. member, he either believes in the need for regulation of lotteries and games of chance or he doesn't, and if there is room for amendment, as I suspect that there probably will be, my position is as I have stated. We would be more than pleased to listen to charitable organizations who think in the administration that there has to be some sort of improvement, but I don't think the hon. member can do as he did in his first question preface it by somehow saying, 'when were these regulations imposed upon the people of Saskatchewan, and why, because they can destroy every little community function?' You can't have it both ways. You're either for it or you're against it.

Funding of Meals on Wheels

MR. MERCHANT: — A question to the Minister in charge of Social Services. As a part of the proposed home care program, I ask the minister whether it is true that you have now told Meals on Wheels that the government will no longer assist in funding the Meals on Wheels van which is volunteer-run, and was donated and cost \$10,000 a year, and I ask the minister whether the effect of telling the volunteers that they must deliver these meals in their private cars is not to see to it that the meals are no longer hot for one thing, and destroy if not seriously impair this excellent service that's provided?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, as far as . . . I have not given those instructions. I don't know the particulars of it; I assume the member is referring to the van in Regina, but I have not given those instructions.

MR. MERCHANT: — A supplementary. I ask the minister if he would look into the matter because I think the minister will find that that has happened and I also ask the minister whether it is not true that under the home care proposals, you plan to have nurses working directly for the government, and indications have been given to the Victorian Order of Nurses that they will not be required under the program, taking their largest customer from them, and I understand, perhaps driving the VON out of Regina and out of Saskatchewan because of the loss of that customer?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, first of all the answer to his first question is yes. I will undertake to look into the matter. The answer to his second question is absolutely 'no', there is no truth in the accusation made by the member opposite. None whatsoever. We don't intend to follow the steps taken by the British Columbia government.

Road Tax

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — A question to the Minister of Revenue, Mr. Speaker. You are probably aware that North American auto manufacturers are increasingly building vehicles with diesel power and it appears that the use of diesel engines will

increase. First of all, why is your government charging those consumers driving diesel cars 2.7 cents tax compared to 16 cents tax for gas driven engines when diesel car vehicles are considerably more efficient and economical?

HON. A. BLAKENEY (Premier): — I don't know to whom the question was directed — perhaps it was the Minister of Revenue, but I think the member in effect answered his question when he asked it. Essentially the reason is that diesel engines are considerably more efficient i.e. they get more miles to the gallon than a gasoline vehicle equipped with a gasoline motor, the same vehicle equipped with a gasoline motor would and since it is essentially a road tax and since it is designed really to tax people for the use of the road, and if they use the fuel which allows them to use the road for less money, the tax is equated so that it means that a diesel vehicle and a gasoline vehicle of the same kind and shape will pay approximately the same amount in road tax to travel 200 miles or 300 miles, or as the case may be. That is the theory of it, it has been that way across Canada for many, many years. Every province has it. That's what this province has had for decades.

MR. HAM: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Why the difference between a consumer purchase of gas or diesel fuel and a truck driver?

MR. ROMANOW: — It's a road tax, what's the question?

MR. SPEAKER: — Member for Regina Lakeview.

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition) — Is the Premier saying to this House that it is the policy of the government in this particular tax to penalize efficiency and to make those who are more concerned about conserving gas and getting better mileage on their car because of the gas they use, penalizing them by the tax they pay. Is that your policy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — It certainly is the policy to charge people in essence for the use of the road, that is the essence of gas tax, and if a way is found to operate a vehicle with a substance which allows them to go 100 a miles to a gallon, I suspect that the tax on that substance will reflect the fact that it permits the use of the road for 100 miles. This is essentially the theory of taxation of diesel fuel as opposed to gasoline, certainly anyone is quite at liberty to get a smaller vehicle which permits them to use less gasoline per hundred miles and they will pay less tax because basically they are using a lighter vehicle. But the member is simply not following the argument. The member for Indian Head is saying 100 miles is 100 miles. What trivia, what perfect nonsense. The idea that a ten ton truck can go 100 miles and not cause any more damage to the road than a rabbit, than a Volkswagen Rabbit, is sheer nonsense, sheer nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think I'm going to try for another question.

Minister of Industry and Commerce

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, the member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) and I for better than a week now have wanted to ask some questions of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I would like to ask the Premier if he can inform

this House when the illusive minister will be returning to his seat so that the member for Wascana and I can put these questions to him.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I'll take the next question.

Aircraft for Chasing Game

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister in recent years your department has used aircraft to scatter big game prior to the opening date of the hunting season. Reports, Mr. Minister, are coming in to us and drawing to our attention that your department actually hired aircraft for the purpose of chasing game from the hunter after the season opened. Mr. Minister, very simply, why is your department doing this?

HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the matter of use of aircraft by our department is not for the purpose of chasing game, that's absolutely incorrect. We use aircraft for the purpose of making a count and survey of game in various parts of the province. This is mainly what it is used for.

MR. BIRKBECK: — A supplementary to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I would preface my remarks by saying that I will table a letter that will substantiate the question which I have put to you and, furthermore, I think that you would be aware and your department of government should be aware that it is illegal for individuals to use aircraft, snowmobiles, trucks etc., for the hunting of wild life. Do you not agree that once a hunter has attained a licence that his hunt should be allowed to continue in a sporting and venturesome way and uninterrupted by the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the last remark made by the hon. member, we certainly agree that the hunter should hunt game in a sportsmanlike manner.

Home Care Program

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. Being your proposal for the Home Care Program is causing misunderstanding in opposition, would the minister guarantee us that he will look in to delaying the proposal for six months in order to find that there are no duplications and to consult nursing personnel in the communities?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I will not take responsibility for the confusion that exists in the Liberal minds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — It is not my fault, Mr. Speaker, if those people opposite are confused, they should go back and seek the reason for that themselves. I can't accept

responsibility for your confusion. The answer to the latter part of your question is, No.

MISS CLIFFORD: — Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying that he is unwilling to listen to the people in the rural areas and therefore not to listen to any suggestions from the nursing personnel?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, the essence of my answer was, I don't want to listen to the confused opposition. You asked me whether or not I was responsible for the confused opposition. I said No. Mr. Speaker, we had hearings throughout this province, we've heard from at least 100 to 125 organizations, everybody had an opportunity to present their facts to us. They did so, we were very pleased with the hearings. Anybody who wishes to at this particular time can still make their views known to us. We have not made a final decision. I think I stated in the press before that I don't expect a final decision until about possibly the 1st of April. I am certainly very prepared to listen to any group who wishes to have their opinions expressed to us. I can't listen to a confused opposition any longer.

Delta Holding Leases

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. If I may give a little background to my question - on May 5 of last year, Mr. Minister, you said that the agreement between Delta and DNS was that if they were to build, that we would rent from them at a fixed price — these apartments and houses. You asked for how long, you said "12 years on the apartments" and I believe, "15 years on the houses." That's quoted from the Hansard. In view of a press story in the Prince Albert Daily Herald a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Minister, Brian Cousins, Director of Extension Services for DNS in La Ronge said some employees in his branch were living in the buildings in question and that they had been advised that the DNS and Delta were negotiating about the lease. Is it a precedent, Mr. Minister, to be set by your department that if a company finds that they have entered into a long-term lease or contract with DNS that they can re-negotiate at any time they want, or is this a special deal for Delta?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, the answer from my colleague, the Minister of Social Services to the members of the Liberal caucus is apropos to the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: — Any member that lacks the kind of credibility that that member lacks with regard to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Just to clear up the confusion in everybody's mind, I was just asking the member to get to answering the question, rather than making personal remarks.

MR. BOWERMAN: — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the lack of credibility that the member for Prince Albert, I would wonder why he would raise that question again in this House. He sought a number of times for information respecting the Delta Housing operation in La Ronge. In addition to that he has gone out into the hails and made accusations about the staff in Northern Saskatchewan. He has accused the department and the staff with the kind of accusations of which of course he has no proof and no substantiation for and can't substantiate. With regard to the agreement, yes we have an

agreement with Delta and that agreement so far as I am concerned will remain until such time as changes can be agreeably made.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Speaker, Brian Cousins said in that same story that unless the negotiations are not satisfactory, the employees will continue to live in these buildings. Who has asked for the negotiations to open? Was it Delta or the DNS, and when was this requested?

Home Care - the Nursing' Professions

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. Would he please tell me if he considers all the nursing profession in the province of Saskatchewan and the VON's, confused like the Liberals because they too ask to delay the home care program and the SAOS . . .

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, first of all let me . . . I do want to answer that question. First of all, all I said was that I can't be responsible for the confused Opposition of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we had a number of nursing groups make representation to the committee. We listened to the nursing groups. We had the VON also make presentations to us. The VON were particularly concerned about what had happened in British Columbia, and asked us whether or not we would be considering the same procedure as British Columbia. Our answer to them was simply this — it would depend on which option the government would go for. If we went for a provincial option, then certainly it could be that there would be many more employees hired under the government. If we went under the regional option, then it would be left up to the regional board to decide whom they would hire and who would offer the service. If we went for the district option, Mr. Speaker, we told them also if we went for the district option, then it would be completely the decision of the district board, the district board as to whether or not they would hire the services of nurses of the regional board or the VON.

Land Bank — land sale

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — A question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In the light of your recent policy decision regarding the sale of Land Bank land that you will be selling at the current average market value, would you agree that there are four factors affecting this sale of Land Bank land, that you stand to make windfall profits on the land resources of this province, and secondly, that the federal government does not make a practice of charging . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

Point of Privilege — Leader Post Statement

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, as the House Leader for the Liberal Party, I would like to rise on a matter of privilege to correct an error — a statement made in the Leader Post as of Tuesday, December 13, and I would like to quote it:

Bill 47, the Saskatchewan government's answer to the Supreme Court decision which has struck down previous oil taxation laws, is meeting stiff

opposition from Liberal and Progressive Conservative members of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that the Tories are in bed with the NDP on this one. How could you say that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Points of Order on the Question Period

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Order regarding a series of supplementary questions that I chose to ask — a supplementary question that the member for Indian Head chose to ask, and was not allowed to ask a supplementary that the member for Wilkie, Miss Clifford, chose to ask and the substance of the point of order is this, Mr. Speaker, that in an effort to be fair between the two parties, you've stopped making judgments of the quality of the question; in past years when you could see that you were dealing with an area of some importance and urgency, you would allow supplementaries to sometimes go to five. What was happening in this question period was a classic example - in an effort to be fair for which I commend you, you were continually sitting us down about important matters and allowing the Tories to ask their silly and stupid and petty questions that they were asking throughout this question period.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am afraid I can't accept blanket points of order. The member must be a little more specific and to the point about which question he is dealing with. If he feels there is a general tone in the question period which is not desirable for his group in the Legislature, I think I can report that I cut off a number of Conservatives so I could make them happy today in their questions and in their supplementaries as well as cutting off some Liberals because I found, I might say, a lot of questions lacking urgency or importance so for that reason I cut off right after one supplementary or if the question was put in a debatable manner, a highly debatable manner, I intended to cut it off right away or after one supplementary. I think the member for Wascana wants to be more specific.

MR. MERCHANT: — I ask you then why, for a series of questions when I sought to ask supplementaries, I was not allowed to ask supplementaries? I use that as an example. I don't say it in a very critical way and there might be a time when the Conservatives have a good area and we don't but I suggest to you that the effort to be fair between two parties, which is legitimate, is restricting your ability to make that judgment. Now if you say to me that I didn't allow those questions to be asked because I didn't think it was urgent or important, then I accept your decision. If instead the motives that I imputed to your actions is correct, then I ask that you reconsider that in a general way.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well finally to settle the point if I can; I make my judgements not on the basis of how many questions one group will get or the other group will get. I try to be fair in throwing it back and forth between the groups but I do attempt to make my rulings on the basis of the rules that are established for the Speaker with regard to the oral question period. They say that the questions must be brief, urgent, important, relevant, not put in a debatable manner and I sometimes rule questions out for a spectrum of reasons, not just one reason but a spectrum of reasons and unfortunately some days it might appear as if one group is getting more attention than the other.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, we would prefer that you make the rulings in the Assembly.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, on a historical precedent and perspective, that allowing the Liberals to decide what is important to the public would be a tragic failure in the democratic process because it's been unsuccessful in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well that's an interesting debating point but hardly a point of order. There are no questions put by members - motions for return debatable.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 68

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 68) showing:

(1) The total of Farm Start loans made to individuals to date for the establishment of Poultry Production Units. (2) Of that total: (a) the number of new units established (b) the number of existing units that were expanded (c) the average amount of the loan (d) the number in arrears in payments (e) the number that have ceased operation.

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, we have looked at this request for Motion for Return and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order.

MR. KAEDING: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the request in the Order for Return is somewhat difficult to respond to in the way it is written. The return does not request, as of any specific date, what the number of loans were and we find it difficult to make a determination because the number of loans going out are varying all the time and we would like to have a specific date shown so we could get a specific figure. The motion also calls for, under Item C, the average amount of each loan. Now, I think we should identify here that loans are made on the basis of a projected plan and it's not always necessary or advisable that the loan be drawn down totally at any one time and so the loans are often drawn down over a period of time. Therefore, it's extremely difficult without going through every member's individual file to make that determination. We would, therefore, prefer to provide the information on the basis of the amount of each loan approved which is readily available to us. In order to facilitate that information, I think it would give the member the information he wants, I would want to amend Return No. 68 by deleting all of the words after the word showing in the second line and substitute the following therefore:

(1) The total of Farm Start loans and grants approved to October 31, 1977 for the development of Poultry Production Units. (2) Of that total: (a) the number of new units established (b) the number of existing units which were expanded (c) the average amount of each loan and grant approved (d) the number of loans in arrears in payments on October 31, 1977 (e) the number that have ceased operations as of October 31, 1977. **PD I move this amendment seconded by the Minister of Consumer Affairs.**

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 69

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the MLA for Maple Creek that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 69 showing:

(1) The total of Farm Start loans made to individuals to date for the establishment of Feed Lot Production Units. (2) Of that total: (a) the number of new units established (b) the number of existing units that were expanded (c) the average amount of the loan (d) the number in arrears in payments (e) the number that have ceased operation.

MR. E. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, the same comments apply to this motion as to the previous one and the same comments would apply to all of the motions to Return No. 72 so I would move that all of the words after the word 'showing' in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

The total number of Farm Start loans and grants approved to October 31, 1977 for the development of Feed Lot Production Units. (2) Of this total: (a) the average number amount of each loan and grant (b) the number of loans that were in arrears in payments as of October 31, 1977 (c) the number that have ceased operations as of October 31, 1977.

I move that seconded by my desk mate, the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 70

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Maple Creek that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 70 showing:

(1) The total of Farm Start loans made to individuals to date for the establishment of Dairy Production Units. (2) Of that total: (a) the number of new units established (b) the number of existing units that were expanded (c) the average amount of the loan (d) the number in arrears in payments (e) the number that have ceased operation.

MR. E. KAEDING: — As I again move seconded by the Minister of Consumer Affairs that all the words after the word showing in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) the total number of Farm Start loans and grants approved to October 31, 1977 for the development of Dairy Production Units (2) Of that total: (a) the average amount of each loan and grant (b) the number of loans that were in arrears in payments as of October 31, 1977 (c) the numbers that have ceased operations as of October 31, 1977.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 71

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 71 showing:

(1) The total of Farm Start loans made to individuals to date for the

establishment of Cow Calf Production Units. (2) Of that total: (a) the number of new units established (b) the number of existing units that were expanded (c) the average amount of the loan (d) the number in arrears in payments (e) the number that have ceased operation.

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — I again move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, that all of the words after the word 'showing' in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The total number of Farm Start loans and grants approved to October 31, 1977 for the development of beef production units. (2) Of this total (a) the average amount of each loan and grant (b) the number of loans that were in arrears in payments as of October 31, 1977 (c) the number that have ceased operations as of October 31, 1977.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 72

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 72 showing:

(1) The total of Farm Start Loans made to individuals to date for the establishment of Hog Production Units. (2) Of that total: (a) the number of new units established (b) the number of existing units that were expanded (c) the average amount of the loan (d) the number in arrears in payments (e) the number that have ceased operation.

MR. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I again offer a motion, seconded by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, that all of the words after the word 'showing' in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) The total number of Farm Start loans and grants approved to October 31, 1977 for the development of hog production units. (2) Of that total (a) the average amount of each loan and grant (b) the number of in loans that were in arrears payments as of October 31, 1977 (c) the number that have ceased operations as of October 31, 1977.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 37

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return — No. 37 showing:

The agency of the Government of Saskatchewan or group of individuals of the Government that co-ordinated the participation of Crown Corporations in the Government promotion known as the 'Saskatchewan Family of Crown Corporations' and the names of the members of the co-ordinating group or agency.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I placed a question on the order paper, a series of questions dealing with an ad campaign by the government of Saskatchewan known as promoting the so-called Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations. Now we may be establishing a family of Crown corporations as the government so often states, but supposedly one of the members of the family is the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan which was imposed contrary to the wishes of the people. Now I suppose if the government believed in truth in advertising and my recognition of medieval history is correct, what used to be, Mr. Speaker, in the escutcheon of the families occasionally running from the top left hand corner across the family escutcheon was a black bar known as the Bar Sinister. Now that indicated that the particular individual who had the Bar Sinister was illegitimate and a member of the family. Now I am not sure but that across the escutcheon of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation a Bar Sinister wouldn't be called for and I think it would indicate as well the true facts, that is we do have a family which I suggest is not correct, then the adding to the family of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation is embarrassing to the rest of the family and I think if we went back to the old days where you could bury your secrets in the closet, I am sure the rest of the family of Crown corporations would be quite happy to bury the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan back in the closet. Mr. Speaker, the question that I have asked, the series of questions I don't suspect is controversial, I suspect that the honorable members will agree that the agency or the people or the group of individuals in the government that co-ordinated the advertising campaign is the first question. Obviously when we're dealing with a series of Crown corporations that there had to be a co-ordinating agency or individuals and we have simply asked the government for that information I have every confidence that the government in the interests of developing its institutional ads will be happy to supply that information to us. I therefore move, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose Return No. 37 showing.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I had a long speech written and I anticipated the member for Qu'Appelle was going to give us a long speech on Crown corporations and how he was in favor of them etc., this afternoon, but after listening to him I can conclude while he may not have been in the bar sinister it must have been some other bar, prior to giving his speech. Mr. Speaker, I think that the government is quite prepared to supply all the information that the member for Qu'Appelle is interested in indeed I'd like to give him a little more. So, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I intend to move an amendment to this one which will simply give him the name of the Crown corporation which co-ordinated the advertisements with respect to the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations, the names of the members of the Crown corporation responsible for the co-ordination, which is indeed what he thinks. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the series of advertisements were placed there on behalf of the Crown corporations of Saskatchewan, not the government of Saskatchewan as was inferred by the member for Qu'Appelle. Certainly I think everyone I talked to in Saskatchewan regardless of their political belief with the exception of a couple of members opposite, have been impressed with the advertisements with their objectivity, the way in which they portray the Crown corporations of Saskatchewan, in which they portray the employees of our Crown corporations, who work diligently and hard on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan building for this province a brighter future as they have built a brighter past for us. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of these advertisements when I compare them with some of the advertisements that come out of the private sector which we all as consumers pay for. I think of the less free enterprise campaigns which I think some members could suggest were mildly political at least, Mr. Speaker.

Who paid for it? I'll tell you who paid for it, I've got some insurance policies with London

Life and I suspect I help pay for those, unfortunately. Now I said, I have them, I kept them. That's right, Mr. Speaker, cash them in. the leader of the Liberal party says, cash them in if you don't like them. I suppose the leader of the Liberal party will undoubtedly suggest to the people of Saskatchewan that if you don't like Crown corporations, same as the Leader of the Conservative party then vote for either of them and they'll get rid of all them. We know that is their policy, Mr. Speaker, we know they're in favor of bringing back private auto insurance, we know they're in favor of selling the Power Corporation, we know they're opposed to our low rates for Sask Tel, we know where they stand, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Liberal party said if you don't like them cash them in. Vote for us and we'll get rid of the Crown corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's clear that we're quite prepared to supply all of the information requested by the members, so I would like to move so he gets it clearly and correctly that all the words following showing be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

The Crown corporation which co-ordinated the series of advertisements with respect to the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations and the names of the members of the Crown corporation responsible for the coordination.

I so move, seconded by the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista, the Minister of Social Services.

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the minister, of course leave an awful lot to be desired. He asks and he's afraid to tell us who coordinated the family of Crown corporation then? I could tell him that I believe Jack Kinzel was one individual, Jack Kinzel well known in NDP parties and political circles, a heeler, a war heeler, a hack, a paid worker for the NDP, one of the main co-ordinators of the Saskatchewan family of Crown Corporations Act. I believe that, the Crown corporations were somehow supposed to be politically independent but from the words today of the minister we find out that they are not politically independent under that government and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, that the people of Saskatchewan quickly await the day when the Crown corporations will again be established to a position of political independence and freedom from the grasping political tentacles of the government opposite.

Now we have, I believe, Mr. John Houston involved in the co-ordinating we find too that the agency involved in the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations was one J.A.C. Struthers, well known in NDP parties and political circles as being the local mouthpiece or big lie agency that develops things for public consumption on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan. Now we know, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about ads and the position of the government opposite in Crown corporations and how proud they are, I wonder when we talk how proud and how it tells about government employees, why the minister refused to tell or forgot to mention the SEDCO ads. SEDCO ads have two case studies of true situations in SEDCO - one when SEDCO made loans to a monkey for an organ grinder, a case study that the member opposite is very, very proud of - probably a true situation if we could ever get into SEDCO, if we could every get in under the present system and under the present government of trying to find out the truth about SEDCO, we'd find that that actually happened. I wouldn't be at all surprised that that little monkey went to one of the party hacks and got his loan and I'll bet you

that's how he got it. The government proudly stands up and says, 'a true representation of the actions of SEDCO, which is what the member said. The member said that the ads give the true picture of the Crown corporations.

I suggest that the second case study of SEDCO about the hot-air balloon building that is being highly touted, actually happened. I have no doubt with the crazy operation and some of the crazy investments of SEDCO, that someone in SEDCO recommended that the government invest in this new idea of pumping up a building anywhere and then filling it with civil servants and leasing it back to the government and everybody will make lots of money — and we have helped local investors and local initiatives. Now, that's the ad that the government stands up and says is a good idea. Anybody I talked to at SEDCO thinks the ad is embarrassing. They are trying to tell me they didn't loan to the monkey. That's what they feel. Now we can't get to SEDCO and find out but that's the government's position. That type of ad is a discredit to the government and a discredit to SEDCO. I think the member starts to realize it.

I suggest that the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations' ads, including the Potash Corporation losing several millions of dollars right off the bat, being imposed contrary to the wishes, being instituted and founded on the whim of the government as in frustration after the 1975 election when it didn't know which way to turn, discredits the other Crown corporations of which we are proud. That family of Crown corporations, ad is a far cry from information giving ads as Sask Power and SaskTel do on a regular basis, which ads are sound and needed. I think too that the ads of STC are proper, although I understand they are also done by the same ad agency. The family of Crown corporations' ad is a complete and utter abuse of the public trust of Treasury and public moneys. It's done for purely partisan political purposes, serves no purpose whatsoever other than to try to sell the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. Every single Crown corporation has its own ads. We are duplicating the ads done by the Crown corporations. we are costing the public double the money. When you have to go and hire a great Hollywood producer to come in and do high paid ads and you won't give the information as to who that individual was, I think it indicates and is further proof positive that that ad program is a political propaganda effort and nothing else. And for that you are to be condemned and I think hon. members opposite are not too proud of the fact that they are spending hundreds of thousands of the public's money on a phoney, partisan, unnecessary bit of political propaganda. How can you stand up in this House and justify the actions of the Crown corporations in advertising by using the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations ad. In fact, every Crown corporation has got its own ad program. In addition, they have proved in the past that they are quite capable of selling their story to the people of this province. There is one Crown corporation that hasn't been able to sell its story because its story is so bad, so costly, so wasteful and so risky that the other Crown corporations are made to carry the load. Make no mistake the other Crown corporations don't want to carry the load and don't want to be saddled in with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the information given by the minister is typical of the government opposite as they cover up the actions of the Crown corporations, as they refuse to give the opposition the true story of the Crown corporations. We get financial statements for the Potash Corporation that are highly inaccurate to say the least, it's typical. It's unfortunate but it's typical. This government is costing the taxpayers literally millions of dollars on partisan political propaganda, more waste and abuse of the public trust than any other government in the history of this province and for that you are to be condemned. We don't accept your amendment, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, we think it's another example of your efforts to cover up complete abuse of the public trust.

Amendment agreed to.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words as a result of the remarks made by the member for Qu'Appelle and, Mr. Speaker, trying to categorize what I believe have been two or three major inconsistencies in the arguments which have been advanced by the member for Qu'Appelle. In fact I think, Mr. Speaker, that these inconsistencies are typical of the kind of inconsistencies that both opposition parties are hastily falling over each other to find out and to try to sell to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Let me give me you an example; the member for Qu'Appelle says in his remarks, "Mr. Speaker, this government is involved in the politicization of Crown corporations," and he elaborates on this argument that we're involved in the politicization of Crown corporations. And then in the same breath, he turns around and says, "But make no mistake about it, we're proud of the Crown corporations, the most of whom the majority of which are not involved in political activity apart from the political activity that somehow this big, bad government is trying to drag it into."

An inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, of the highest order. Take another point, the member for Qu'Appelle says, you know everything is working out OK with Crown corporations, he says, in fact we support Crown corporations, all of them are OK except this one little illegitimate son called the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And then having said that everything is OK with the Crown corporations, he turns around and says that the series family of Crown corporations is a political propaganda tool and as such is unworthy of Crown corporations and unworthy of the government and should be junked. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of difficulty in following the member for Qu'Appelle's logic at the best of times, but I have a great deal of difficulty in times like this when I hear him talk that the series of the government is a politicization of Crown corporations, at the same breath saying that there is no politicization by and large of the Crown corporations save the one. Saying on the one hand that this is a political propaganda tool but on the other hand saying that the advertising of the Crown corporations save but one is not a political propaganda tool. Inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, inconsistency designed to undermine the family of Crown corporations, make no mistake about that, Mr. Speaker. Now, the member for Qu'Appelle, he says, you know that the Crown corporations are obviously capable of selling their own stories. Now, if you follow the logic of that, Mr. Speaker, presumably they could do it individually, and presumably to follow the next logical sequence the member for Qu'Appelle had no objection to that because he says they are capable to doing it, they have done it, there's nothing wrong with it. Would he take that same position if the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan by itself, singly, as a Crown corporation advertised capably of selling its own stories. No, all of a sudden, he would, I bet you a dime to a dollar, turn around to his political point of view which again would say that somehow this is a politicization of the entire family of Crown corporations. And if it's OK, and if they've done it in the past, if they've sold their stories individually, if it's OK to sell it individually, why isn't it OK to sell it collectively, Mr. Speaker. What is the logic of the Conservative and the Liberal Party in that regard? If you can tell the Crown corporation story singly why can't you tell the Crown corporation story collectively, Mr. Speaker? There's absolutely no logic to that point of view whatsoever. Politicization, no politicization. Political propaganda? No there is basically no political propaganda. Capable of selling their own stories individually, not capable of selling their own stories collectively.

Mr. Speaker, if you continue to mount up these arguments which are launched by the

Conservatives and the Liberals on this series of advertising; they spell out one thing, Mr. Speaker, and I tell this to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, make no mistake about it, the bottom line of this attack on Crown corporations shows that the Liberals and the Conservatives, if they were in power, would start to dismantle the family of Crown corporations in the province of Saskatchewan, because what else is this all designed to do? Why else are they chipping away on the advertising? Take a look at the messages, the messages say that there are many men and women who work for Crown corporations and are doing a good job. Does he object to that? The messages say that Crown corporations have been a part of historical and social fact of the province of Saskatchewan. Does the member object to that? The messages say that Crown corporations have lived an economic usefulness in the province of Saskatchewan. Does the member object to that? Yes he does object to that, Mr. Speaker. The Tories and the Liberals do object to that, that's why they are snipping away at this business of the family of Crown corporations' series of advertising.

We don't ever, in this Assembly, hear one word uttered by the PCs or the Liberals about advertising that their big business friends put out on the propaganda and the media. Somehow that's OK. CP Rail, that's OK, the boys are smiling. They say, "Who pays when CP advertises?" Every farmer in Saskatchewan pays every time CP advertises in the province of Saskatchewan. What about Imperial Oil and their friends? It is all right to tell the corporate message as far as the Liberals and PCs are concerned there; oh they can spread this free enterprise philosophy from here until doomsday, they are not going to object to freeing enterprise but when the people's own, when the very Crown corporations which are such a basic bulwark of Saskatchewan life try to advertise, the Conservatives and the Liberals object, Mr. Speaker.

Make no mistake about it, that bottom line attack is very simple. They are opposed to Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker. Tories and Liberals don't believe in Crown corporations, they never did, they don't now and they never will and if they ever should be elected to the government of Saskatchewan, I tell the people of this province that they would start to systematically destroy the Crown corporations, the family of Crown corporations, not only the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to pick out one little bit of argument the member says. Let's assume that what he says is right. He says all this advertising for everybody else is OK but there is one illegitimate son and that illegitimate son is the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, that black bar, whatever that insignia talk of his was. Now what that means, Mr. Speaker, point blank, is he is obviously opposed to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. That's why he made those remarks. But listen to what his leader says, Mr. Speaker.

His leader would have the people of Saskatchewan believe that somehow he is for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, so much for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan that he would give out these funny shares - you know, the fabulous fifty shares, the fabulous fifty shares of which my friend, the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher), would be one of the lucky fifty. This two per cent maximum - that's what the Leader of the Conservative Party says.

Well if I am dishonest, I invite the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Lane) to get up and to tell me in point blank terms that that's not the position of your party. You tell me that the position of your party is not that you support the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, is it or is it not your position? Because, Mr. Speaker, if you are confused, I can tell you that I am confused and the people of Saskatchewan are confused because

your leader says he is for the PCS and your member for Qu'Appelle gets up and says today that's the illegitimate son from the family of Crown corporations - that's the son that somehow every Crown corporation is ashamed of. You heard him this afternoon. That's the Crown corporation that somehow should be expunged from this advertising, should be expunged in the next logical step from the family of Crown corporations. And he nods his head in approval, Mr. Speaker. Now I note this to the people of Saskatchewan. He nods his head in approval to what I am saying - that PCS should be expunged from the family of Crown corporations. There it is.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize is a significant change in the Conservative up-to-now stated policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that the Conservative Opposition and the Liberal Opposition in this province are not only opposed to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, not only would they sell it back to their fabulous fifty friends, the Potash Corporation, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that they would start a systematic witch hunt and attack of Crown corporations in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, when I first became the minister in charge of SGIO in 1971, the Liberals had undertaken a few years before that, a plan to sell the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. They hired McLaren Advertising; they hired consulting agents; they carried out surveys; they went so far, Mr. Speaker, as to devise a rating system based on the sell-out of SGIO, namely SGIO being a straight competitive Crown corporation, straight head to head competition with the private enterprise boys. The Premier of the day was Premier Ross Thatcher. There is documented proof to that effect. The insurance businesses got together in Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, and they said that that was the case. They repeated that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody who would have you believe that the member for Qu'Appelle, who was an executive assistant in that Liberal Party and government of the day, who was a Liberal member and now switches his same message over there to my far right, still doesn't hold that view when he attacks this series of advertising is fooling oneself, Mr. Speaker, because he is; he believes as much today in the selling of SGIO as he did in 1964 when that administration of which he was a part was about to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the facts and when they say that this advertising is false, they say the hard work of Crown corporation employees in Saskatchewan is false. When they say that these advertisements are false they are saying that Crown corporations have no place in the economic role of Saskatchewan is false. When they say these advertisings are false, Mr. Speaker, they make a simple point of saying that if they ever got into power they would sell them out to their private enterprise friends, make no mistake about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear. hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now I want to tell the member for Qu'Appelle, he's got another think coming. First of all, he is not even going to get a sniff of power to sell them out. But if he ever should, Mr. Speaker, he will find that the wrath of the people of Saskatchewan will be such that it will be even too much for him to handle.

You know, we are sometimes doomed, Mr. Speaker, to learn our lessons over again in

history. We don't learn - 1964 to 1971, we had the old Thatcher government, now we have the new Thatcher party in power, Mr. Speaker. The old Thatcher government, the old Thatcher party wanted to sell the Crown corporations, now we have a new Thatcher party that is called the Conservatives and they want to sell it. It's the same Thatcher philosophy, it's the same man for Thunder Creek who is behind these motions and supporting them, make no mistake about it. He's part of the fabulous fifty. That is what this attack on the family of Crown corporations is all about. He wants to start undermining public confidence in corporations, public Crown corporations, so that he can start to move on this design of his if they ever should gain power.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan won't let them do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I for one, am very proud of what that family of Crown corporations advertising series is doing because it's a message of Crown corporations, it's a message of co-operation and maybe the members opposite don't go for that but I go for that. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of that. That is money well spent telling the people of Saskatchewan about their Crown corporations. It's their money, they are their Crown corporations, it's their business, Mr. Speaker, and they have a right to publicly know what the corporations are doing, notwithstanding the Liberals and the Conservatives. Mr. Speaker, I will have a lot more to say about this motion, I therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 38

The amount budgeted by each Crown corporation to the government promotion of the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations and the amount paid by each Crown corporation to November 16, 1977.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — As we continue the saga of the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations I will eventually, Mr. Speaker, be moving a motion dealing with the cost of the family of Crown corporations. Now I apologize to the Attorney General when he says he couldn't understand my logic and he fumbled over the word 'bar sinister' and I will attempt to get through this debate using short words and short sentences for the Attorney General. My apologies, the last time I thought he was a little more capable than he showed. Now, he said, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order the debate to the motion that's before us, not deal with debates which have been adjourned or dealt with previously.

MR. LANE: — I was trying to be helpful to the former house leader, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for my attempts. The motion deals with the cost of the family of Crown corporation ads, Mr. Speaker. We have advocated that the Crown corporations could very well do their own ads as they have proven in the past that they are quite capable of it. We have seen in the past that every Crown corporation runs its own advertising campaign. All of a sudden we have a very expensive new advertising campaign. There is only germane one reason for it and to this particular motion as the cost, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the whole ads is simply to bail out the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. Now I would suggest that the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation do take its own ad program because one of two things would happen. Either it would tell the truth in which case the people would rise up and revolt against the government and the Crown corporation or it would tell a glossy story in which case the government would be open and the Crown corporation would be open to a charge of false and misleading advertising. That's what would happen if the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan did

its own ads. And in order to avoid the embarrassing situation the government has had to lump in with all Crown corporations the unwanted Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. We understand, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that the government would agree, if it was not afraid to give an answer to the particular question, that this ad campaign will run in the range of roughly \$500,000. I would suspect if there is an election in the spring that it will be dramatically increased prior to election in which case cost would run even higher. We know, Mr. Speaker, that there was a surcharge placed on the various Crown corporations being forced to pay for the attempt to bail out the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation. The majority of it was paid by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. which is assessed a massive surcharge, I believe if the government was not afraid to give the answer and gave a truthful answer, this surcharge would run approximately a quarter of a million dollars, an assessment, a duty that was imposed on the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Where does the Power Corporation get its money to pay its share of the potash bailout or the family of Crown corporations? - from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, from the rate increases, from the massive increases that have been imposed upon the public in the last few months. Where does Sask Tel get its money to make its levy that's paid. We've had rate increases, justified because supposedly it was necessary. Let me tell the government opposite that if you truthfully answer this question and the public finds out that one cent went from Sask Tel or Saskatchewan Power Corporation to try and tout the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. It will be run out of office at its first opportunity and then you'll find out how to properly run Crown corporations and how to give the Crown corporations a chance to do what they do best and that is supply needed utilities and services, not to be under the political direction and political control of the government office. We, Mr. Speaker, mentioned that these ads were very costly. They bring in a producer, I believe, her name was a Gail Scott. I understand that at least for temporary purposes, she was brought in from Hollywood, I understand that there was a Ron Whittal brought in from Vancouver. Now I don't want to attribute anything to the relationship but I understand that Mr. Whittal has also done some of the A & W Root Bear commercials. Now A & W Root Bear commercials, we know the government tied to the A & W and their liquor licence and, of course, now it doesn't become quite so logical but, of course, we get into the government and its ties with the hard liquor companies of Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't the hard liquor companies that paid for the family of Crown corporations ads, it was the people of Saskatchewan who are made to pay the several hundreds of thousands of dollars. I don't think that's right. And I know the people don't think it's right. And the member opposite the minister responsible for the Potash Corporation says that he's talked to some people, some people that seemed to think that the ads were all right. He very pointedly didn't name them because they happen to be his executive assistant his cabinet and his back benchers that happened to like them and perhaps Mr. Kinzel and Mr. Houston and J.A.C. Struthers like the ads. I'm sure they did, they'd love the ads, they haven't had it so good. Mr. Speaker, they're bound to like the ads. The public isn't bound to like the ads, and the public does not like to see such a blatant abuse of public funds. On the one hand we see rate increases, rate increases from Sask Tel and Sask Power and a denial by the minister opposite to try and assist those in low incomes and senior citizens with a rate rebate when the demand for power increased dramatically last week. They don't like to see their money going to partisan political propaganda when they're getting rate increases.

That's the issue, and that's the true issue and the Attorney General knows that's the true issue. That attempted defence, Mr. Speaker, the attempted defence by the Attorney General, of course ignores the fact and very pointedly ignored the fact that the government is abusing the Crown corporations by partisan political ads is costing the public hundreds of thousands of dollars, is duplicating effort all for chief political

purposes, an abuse of public trusts like we have not seen in this country before, that's what the public sees and I think it incumbent upon the government opposite to answer this question and give to the public the true facts and the true costs and hopefully some day they could take it at least as moral retribution by throwing the rascals opposite out of office and restore some common sense to the operation of the Crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Bailey, the member for Rosetown-Elrose, that return No. 38, showing the amount budgeted by each Crown corporation to the government promotion of Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations, the amount made by each Crown corporation to November 15, 1977, I so move.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have learned in the short time that I have been in this Assembly that whenever a question or a resolution draws the attention as it has this afternoon, dealing with this question, the previous question of the Attorney General it simply means that the opposition and their question has reached a nerve centre which is most embarrassing to the government and so the Attorney General in his very capable style attempts to bail the government out with a lot of rhetoric, with a lot of talk and a lot of emotion without dealing with the topic at hand and certainly the Attorney General is an expert in that particular field. Mr. Speaker, we have asked in these questions very pertinent information, very pertinent information. One of the things that this government does and does extremely well is to use the Crown corporations for their own political advantage, they know it and everyone in this province knows it.

MR. ROLFES: — Are you crazy?

MR. BAILEY: — No, no I'm not crazy, Mr. Minister, not at all, not at all crazy. Let me ask you this question. During the debate of bill 1 and 2 the potash, all of a sudden by some strange coincidence Saskatchewan Minerals started advertising, just by some strange coincidence? I want to tell the gentlemen opposite in their seats over there, they are much more intelligent to believe that the advertisement from Saskatchewan Minerals came on the air just all of a sudden on its own without government interference and government pressure to do so. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this province who knows anything about the political setup in this province and the government's use and abuse of Crown corporations will be able to say in answering this particular resolution that the government is not using Crown corporations for a very narrow political purpose for which this government wants to use them for. It's as clear as clear can be, not only to members on this side of the House, but to members on that side of the House as well. Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I asked a question concerning interim billing for resorts, to those who are resort owners and I want to suggest to you. Mr. Speaker, that there is every likelihood that from every owner of a cabin or a cottage at the lake, who makes use of that cabin or cottage for a period of three months, the government could well be taking \$45 of their money right now, and that maybe is the answer.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker, let's say that the resort owner who pays his resort telephone bill for June, July and August, pays at the 1st of September and that bill each year is \$60, but now, Mr. Speaker, in order to pay for these ads we'll ask that resort owner to pay \$15 in December, \$15 at the end of March and \$15 in June, \$45 goes to SPC before he's consumed one kilowatt of electricity. Maybe that's the answer, maybe that's where the money is going to sponsor this ad. Mr. Speaker, the government knows full well, despite the rhetoric of the Attorney General that the people of this province know full well that you are using and manipulating the Crown corporations of Saskatchewan for your narrow political purposes, you can't deny it the people of the

province know it. Mr. Speaker, I think its incredible, I think its totally incredible to take on to themselves for their own political purposes the key as an election comes closer they can increase the ads, if there is no issue then they drop the ad altogether. When the potash issue was on we had to have Saskatchewan Minerals advertising at the same time. I haven't heard the ad on the radio since. You people ought to tell the people of Saskatchewan in all honesty that you, in fact, do not use the Crown corporations for you own political advantage. Stand up in this House and say that and you won't get a soul in Saskatchewan who will believe you. Not a soul, not one individual even you backbenchers who are so brainwashed with your philosophy, you yourselves can't even believe it.

Mr. Speaker, it will be very interesting indeed, to see the minister add or try to change the question right here. The people of Saskatchewan deserve an answer. Let's see if they have got the political courage to give the answer.

MR. COWLEY: — You always know, Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives are in trouble because you get Bail Out Bailey.

Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy debates in this Legislature which centre around Crown corporations. One knows where the Liberals stand, one is rapidly finding out where the Conservatives stand, somewhere to the right of the Liberals. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that while the Liberals might keep a couple of Crown corporations around, the Conservatives are so biased, so fixed in their image of Crown corporations there undoubtedly wouldn't be a single one left if they had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to be the government of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government fully intends to give to the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) the answer to this particular question. I was interested in some of the comments that have been made in the course of this debate by the member for Qu'Appelle about the 'Hollywood Producer'. Well, the 'Hollywood Producer' was Mr. Bob Howard who is a resident of Regina, he's been here for a long time, he was the producer of that series of ads, the family of Crown corporation ads. I know the members opposite, you can always tell when they are in a little bit of a snit that there was a problem. They probably thought the ads were pretty good, expressed very well the objectives and the purposes of the Crown corporations, seeing as they had in the back of their minds that they were going to dismantle them, that they were going to sell them out to their private enterprise friends for as little as they could. Undoubtedly they are worried about the successful story of the Crown corporations being brought across to the public of Saskatchewan, so they wanted to know who co-ordinated the campaign for the various Crown corporations. Certainly I am prepared to answer that question. It was co-ordinated by the government finance office which is, itself, a Crown corporation and that was the agency which discussed with and arranged with the various Crown corporations to put together this particular ad campaign which all of the Crown corporations contributed various shares towards.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the majority of it was paid by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is simply and utterly inaccurate. For the most part what the Crown corporations contributed with respect to this campaign came out of regular advertising budgets which for the most part they would have spent anyway. Some of the Crown corporations added or found additional funds which they put towards the campaign but for the most part it came out of their regular advertising budgets. This, Mr. Speaker. I think is a reasonable way for a family of Crown corporations to go. Certainly I think there is nothing sinister or unobjective about the Crown corporations advertising as a

group, the general purpose for which they are put together and the general objectives in which they have. No more than there is something objectionable about a group of companies, the CP Companies for example, or any others, advertising with respect to the particular group of companies.

Mr. Speaker, the member said, "The Potash Corporation should have its own ad campaign," and I want to tell the member the Potash Corporation is participating in this particular series of ads with respect to the Saskatchewan family of crown corporations. It is also running its own advertising campaign. When we tabled our annual report we ran ads in the weeklies and the daily papers in this province telling a little bit about our story, also indicating to the public of this province that we would enjoy it if they would send in and ask for a copy of our annual report which we would be pleased to provide to them, the public being the shareholders of the Potash Corporation. I am proud of that ad campaign. I am proud of the things that the Potash Corporation is trying to do to make its shareholders fully aware of what it's doing. I am unhappy, Mr. Speaker, at the way in which the Conservatives are, I think, unethically attacking that particular report, attacking it in such a way that even chartered accountants, Mr. Speaker, say that they are bordering on libel with the kind of comments they make, chartered accountants who are prepared to say this in public whereas the members of the Conservative Party, of course, say it only within this House where they are protected from those charges of libel.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know there are a great many, 11, I believe, people in the Conservative caucus who are all would-be accountants. Ten and one-half the member for Saskatoon Centre says. I know they indeed would like to have had the Potash Report read different than it did, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately seeing that it didn't they decided to try and cloud the issue and apply rather than funny money some of their funny accounting to it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that the Crown corporations advertise, tell their story, just as it is important, undoubtedly, for private companies to advertise and tell their story. I think a series of ads represented by the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations is a series of ads of which I am proud, a series of ads which are well done and I think put forward the story in a fair and objective way. I think, Mr. Speaker, they put it forward in a fair and objective way and I measure that by the reaction that I have received and other ministers have received from the public. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I have not received one single letter, directed to me or to the government finance office from any individual or group of individuals complaining about bias or complaining about political connotations in this series of advertising campaigns. The Attorney General said he had one from the PC candidate from Prince Albert. I haven't had a single one, Mr. Speaker, not a single one and that advertising campaign has been running for two months and I am sure that if there was the kind of groundswell of opinion that the member for Qu'Appelle says there is and that the member for Rosetown-Elrose tries to imply there is, somewhere, somehow, at least one person in this province would have found out who the minister in charge of the ad campaign is and might have written him a letter or given him a phone call.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the members know that these ads present the facts as they are; present the story of the Crown corporations well and clearly and concisely. Because they are opposed to Crown corporations, because they want to sell them to their private enterprise friends for less than they're worth, they are opposed to the ad campaign. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the members opposite can be serious in the kind of charges

that they are making. They are politically motivated, they are politically inspired, they're designed by the members opposite to undermine the advertising campaign of the Crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, they want to undermine, not only the Crown corporations ad campaign, but they want to undermine the very people working for those Crown corporations. They don't like advertisements which tell the people of this province of the kind of work that the people do in the various Crown corporations every day for the people of this province.

They only talk about the ads being out there to sell the Potash Corporation. Well, Mr. Speaker, if anyone looks at those ads they are pretty hard pressed to find the Potash Corporation in the ads. What you see in those ads are people from Sask Power, Sask Tel, the Sask Transportation Company. Those are the people featured in the ads; those are the people the ads are talking about; those are the people that the ads are showing the people of this province the kind of job they're doing for them. Strangely a rather weak and inadequate argument put forward by the member for Qu'Appelle that somehow this ad campaign is selling the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. I think it is one of the weakest and sickest arguments I have ever heard in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take some time to review the remarks of the member for Qu'Appelle, the member for Rosetown-Elrose. I am going to have more to say about this debate at a later time and I beg leave to adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 39

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No 39 showing:

The origin and destination, the time and place of departure and arrival of each flight of government aircraft charged to the Executive Council in each of the years 1975, 1976, and January 1, 1977 and the purpose of each flight and the passengers aboard each flight.

MR. LANE: — If I had the assurance, Mr. Speaker, that the government would be quickly giving me the information I asked for I would be glad to take it as read.

MR. MERCHANT: — Why don't you . . .

MR. LANE: — I did the first time. The next motion, Mr. Speaker, deals with the annual question, I believe, about the origin, destination, time and place of departure and arrival of each flight of Government aircraft charged to the Executive Council in each of the years 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977 and the purpose of each flight and the passengers aboard each flight. The reason for the question, however, I suspect is a little different and may surprise the government. There is a feeling among an awful lot of the people that we are not co-ordinating our transportation activities of the government and I think members opposite have heard the complaints about the old days before we eliminated the government cars, all the government cars going to Saskatoon with one person in, when in fact some way of co-ordinating it probably would have saved the taxpayers an awful lot of money.

Now the question on the aircraft is mainly with the time and origin and destination of

the flight because we suspect that there is a great deal of duplication on the flight of the government aircraft when in fact we could be using private sector carriers especially in the province. If the government is prepared to approach it on that basis and give us the information. I suspect that it would lead to a review by the government of its scheduling activities, because somehow in the matter of government transportation and the transporting of Cabinet ministers, government members if it applies and civil servants the government is going to have to take control of the situation. I suspect that there is a great deal of waste, a great deal of inefficiency and if the government has the courage to give us the information, and I know the hon. member responsible for Government services is just chomping at the bit, to give the opposition the information requested. We will be able to determine very, very quickly, Mr. Speaker, whether the government is prepared to look at what we believe to be a matter of waste and to allow the opposition to then make some constructive suggestions in later debate. I therefore, move, seconded by the member for Swift Current . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It is highly improbable.

MR. LANE: — I'm sorry that the hon. member for Saskatoon Centre says it's highly improbable because we know his record on waste and his approach to government mismanagement and that is he would rather turn a blind eye but I don't attribute the same thin, two blind eyes. I'm sorry. I would not attribute the same position to the minister now responsible for Government Services so I therefore move, seconded by the member for Swift Current for Return No. 39 showing.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Regina Centre): — Eventually I am going to be asking the Assembly to adjourn the motion. Only one of the member's statements was in any way accurate, Mr. Speaker, and that was the statement that we are chomping at the bit to give them all the information we can. That's true. The rest of it was a lot of nonsense but that statement was quite accurate. We are prepared to give the opposition what information we can. One of the reasons why I want to adjourn this is that I'm not sure we can give them all the information they have asked for. I am not sure for instance, that we can reconstruct the purpose of each flight. That is one of the things that I want to look at. I suppose we could give it to them on that basis. I doubt though if that is what the hon. member asked for, or wanted. I might add that we have, over the last year or so, been attempting to do precisely what the member has suggested, and he may well have been aware of that. We have been attempting to co-ordinate flights, and we ask ministers to do that, we ask the officials out at the hangar to do that and they do a reasonably good job of it. We also ask ministers to take Norcan Air when it is convenient and we find them fairly co-operative. I think when the hon. member gets this volume of information, he's going to get a lot of it — hundreds of pages of it. I think he is going to find that the record of the government is pretty good. I certainly wouldn't be so unkind or so ungenerous as to compare the record of this government with the former government and the use of their aircraft.

MR. McMILLAN: — Just hand us the log book.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I suppose that's one way of doing it. I doubt though that that would provide the information that they request. Mr. Speaker, we will be delighted to give them what information we can. I'm not sure yet what we can give them, and I want an opportunity to consider this further. I would ask the Assembly to adjourn this motion.

Debate adjourned

Return No. 40

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 40) showing:

The Treasury Board approved vehicle establishments of each government department, agency, commission or crown corporation in each of the years 1975, 1976, and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the next motion follows from a question that the Treasury is asking the government for the Treasury Board approved vehicle establishments of each government department, agency, commission or crown corporation in the year so set out, because I think the minister well knows that the reason is obvious.

My understanding is that every government department, agency, etc., has an approved establishment which vehicles are allotted to the department, but the vehicle establishment does not reflect the true number of vehicles actually used by the department, and which in some cases could be considerably less I understand, in major departments like Health. But when the government, and the minister in particular announced that he was reducing the government fleet by five or six hundred. I believe six hundred, I stand to be corrected on that, I believe it was six hundred, that in fact, there was no reduction at all — that we reduced the supposed vehicle establishments. But the number of actual operating vehicles has in fact, increased, and I'm sure that the minister would be more than pleased to give us this information and correct any erroneous impression that we may have in the opposition, and I'm going to give him that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, I move for an Order that the Assembly do issue for Return No. 40 showing, seconded by Mr. Bailey, the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, we on the government benches are indebted to the opposition for this opportunity to brag about our record in the Department of Government Services, and the very efficient department we have. It seems to be a popular topic, Mr. Speaker, not only on the government benches but on the opposition as well.

The record which we will provide — incidentally, I'm going to ask the Assembly to agree to this motion as it reads. I want to say though, before I do, the record will prove that we didn't reduce the vehicles, the number of vehicles by six hundred, but we did reduce the number by four hundred and fifty. I thought that was a good saving, a good saving of money and I'm sure that the hon. member will be fair enough to report to his constituents and to his public that we did reduce the vehicles by four hundred and fifty. I'm sure he would be delighted to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly agree to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Return No. 42

MR. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 42) showing:

The number of non-government employees who used government owned

vehicles in each of the years 1976, and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977 and the reason for such usage.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask the Assembly to adjourn this one. Again it is a question of what information we can provide. We only keep records — a certain kind of records. I don't know how many vehicles, if any, are involved in this. There may be odd circumstances where vehicles are made available to members of the public who aren't in the government services. I believe, for instance, that we made available a vehicle at one point in time to the chairman of the Legal Aid Commission when he was doing a lot of travelling setting up the legal aid activities. A rare circumstance. I'm not sure how many are involved. I'm not sure if the records are complete. I'm not sure, for instance, if we can give the reasons for such usage. I don't know if we have those records around. I need an opportunity to consider this question and I would ask the Assembly to adjourn debate on this.

Debate adjourned.

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 43 showing:

The names of companies or individuals or partnerships contracting with the Government of Saskatchewan for the supply of personal services to which were assigned or leased government vehicles or the names of shareholders of such vehicles who were assigned or leased government vehicles.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I mentioned before, I am not sure that we have the information. I am going to ask the Assembly to adjourn the motion.

Debate adjourned.

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 44 showing:

The amount budgeted and spent to November 15, 1977 for the government promotion of the Saskatchewan Family of Crown Corporations and the advertising agency or agencies who produced or placed the advertisements and the amount budgeted for on each ad agency and the amount paid to each agency as of November 15, 1977.

He said: Mr. Speaker, back on topic.

MR. ROMANOW: — Shame, shame.

MR. LANE: — Shame, says the Attorney General as we get back into his old nemesis, the political propaganda question. All we have simply done in this particular question, of course, is ask the government the amount budgeted for the ads generally, the advertising agency or agencies who produced or placed the advertisements and the amount budgeted for each ad agency and the amount paid to each agency as of November 15. The interesting thing about this is, Mr. Speaker, now we have the opposite side in that the government and I beg your leave to say how glowingly the government has spoken of these ads in the past, and how necessary they are and how vital they are to the proper and efficient functioning of the Crown corporations that the government, of course, would be very pleased to supply to the opposition the

information requested because we, too, would like to know the ad agency. I'm sure it is an independent organization that got the promotion by tender, and I am sure that the government will be most pleased to supply the information to us. So I move the motion, as shown, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey).

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan): —

A comment, Mr. Speaker. You know I really want to answer all of these questions asked today and I am a very unpolitical person as all members across the way know and I thought if the member for Qu'Appelle hadn't got into all this debate I had my amendments all ready which were going to give him more information than he asked for and we could have had them all done today and I could have got busy answering those questions. Instead, the member had to raise these political issues and slow down this whole process. The member obviously wasn't really interested in the answers. He tried to supply us with all the wrong answers which he had along the way and what the member has done is slow up the process of the government, cost the public a great deal, and we could have had these answers out quickly and we could have had 10 or 12 more done today.

I know the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) he wanted to speed up the process too. Well, Mr. Speaker, all these political issues have been raised and, not being the kind of person that sort of thought about those ahead of time, just looking at all the details and answers I am going to have to consider them before I get around to responding to the member for Qu'Appelle's request for information and to see if indeed there isn't even more information I can give him than he has requested, so he will have all the true facts before him and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 45 showing:

The rate per mile charged the Executive Council by the Central Vehicle Agency for use of each of the government air crafts in each of the years 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977 to November 1, 1977.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the question asked is the rate per mile charged the Executive Council by the Central Vehicle Agency for use of each of the government air crafts in each of the years 1975, 1976. The rate per mile I think is a very simple answer for the government to give and I am sure again that they would be more than prepared to expeditiously as possible supply the information to the opposition. I, therefore, move the motion as shown, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey).

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be asking the Assembly to adjourn debate on motions 14 and 15 and I will give my reasons now for both and then I won't bother rising to my feet again on No. 15, if I might.

Such aviation enthusiasts as the member for Cannington and the member for Prince Albert, will know that the rates for many aircraft are not charged per mite but are

sometimes charged per hour. Sometimes they charge per mile and sometimes they charge per hour. I am not sure the information which you want can be provided in the form you ask. I am going to adjourn it and have a look at it and then we will pick it up when we have had a chance to review the record.

Debate adjourned.

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 47 showing:

The names of c companies or individuals or partnerships under contract with the Government of Saskatchewan to supply personal services and copies of each contract, and if such contract is verbal, the dates of each contract and the amount of payment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the government has embarked on a practice which is becoming very, very prominent in governments and I don't suggest that it is an unnecessary or not a good practice, but one in which the government hires individuals or companies to do research or specific work or supply personal services. We believe that those type of contracts should all be brought under the scrutiny of the Legislature and we have asked. as public expenditures are involved, we have asked for the names of the companies or individuals or partnerships under contract to the government of Saskatchewan to supply personal services and copies of the contract and the amounts paid to date. I, therefore, move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 47 showing seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

MR. ROMANOW: I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 49

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 49 showing:

The amounts paid by the Government of Saskatchewan to any real estate companies in 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977 to September 30, 1977 and the work done for each payment and the project for which the work was done or the transaction giving rise to the payment.

HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, again I am going to be asking the Assembly to adjourn this, I think the member is going to get of information that he doesn't particularly want. I would ask that my department, what we use real estate firms for, I was told that the government makes, I was told that we don't have any real estate firms on a consulting basis. We don't pay fees to real estate firms, except when we ask them to do estimates, when we are purchasing land, we normally require a real estate firm, or some estimator to give us an appraisal of the value. We do pay fees for that. And that information we are quite prepared to give you, if it's what you want. The other use we make of real estate agents, this is the hooker in your question, is that I gather that some real estate agents receive the rents for buildings and the hon. member will know that we have a long standing practice, as in previous administrations of not disclosing the rents that we pay for leases. That is kept confidential. We had this out on many occasions before. I don't think I need to repeat all the reasons why we don't

disclose the rents. Because it will give others who are bidding on lease space the advantage that we don't want them having. I'm told that question no. 17 may disclose a great deal of information about the rents that we are paying for lease space and accordingly, I am going to ask once again, Mr. Speaker, leave to adjourn the debate to consider it and perhaps we could amend it and give the member what he wants.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 60

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 50 showing:

The payments made, if any, outside Saskatchewan for repairs, gas or maintenance, etc. for government vehicles from January 1, 1977. (a) The number and charges made out of Saskatchewan for repairs, gas, oil and maintenance. (b) The employees who were assigned to each of the vehicles at the time of such maintenance or repairs or gas or oil purchase.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — For the last time, I think this is the last one. Once again, not once again, this time we have a somewhat different problem, I sometimes think that to some of these very difficult questions, we ought to simply add another clause, and that is disclose the cost of providing the answer, so that opposition members who ask some of these questions could take the responsibility for the very considerable expense that they sometimes put the government to. This question, I am told, to get this information is to leaf through each of the cards individually of which there are hundreds of thousands during this period and to pick them out and to disclose them. And there are good and legitimate reasons why vehicles leave the province. The hon. member, for reasons that completely escape me, put on in a number of instances, the same questions twice. And I spoke on this the other day. Perhaps repetition gives emphasis to his point, I don't know, but I spoke on almost a similar motion the other day. I pointed out that there are good reasons why vehicles leave the province. We took part, this summer, shortly after I was appointed Minister of Youth and Culture, we took part in the Olympics for the handicapped, in Edmonton. We did so on a very limited budget because quite extemporaneously the federal government pulled out in terms of funding. We had to try and pick up the pieces. We did so on a very limited basis, there was no way we could afford to fly the athletes to Edmonton. What we did was, we got a couple of vehicles and drove them to Edmonton in the CVA vehicles. So there are some good reasons why vehicles leave the province, but the cost of getting this answer would just be horrendous. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, there is some way that we can give the member what information he wants. I don't think he wants to put us through this kind of expense. Maybe all he wants is a little wee teensy-weensy bit. Perhaps, I might, Mr. Speaker, adjourn debate on this, and perhaps the member can indicate to me what he's after. We have to somehow scale down the scope of this question. The cost of providing it now would just be horrendous. So I'm going to adjourn the debate and perhaps the member and I could get together and try to iron out what he wants.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 52

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 52 showing:

The number of mailing lists supplied by the government in Saskatchewan to individuals or groups in each of the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and January 1, 1977. (a) The names of the individuals or that such lists were supplied and the source of each lost. (b) The amount charged or paid for each list.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is similar to a question I had asked the government in the past with regard to the number of mailing lists, I might add that when the government replied a few years ago when I asked the question that the mailing lists were supplied to people that by and large had a good reason and I am frankly, doing a double check because I don't like the idea of anyone having his name being spread around either by private companies or the government or anything else for outside agencies to use as they see fit for mailing unwanted advertising or anything else. I would like to say generally, if I can, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of supplying information to the opposition has not been a consideration in the past. I am surprised that all of sudden today it comes up. I believe the Attorney General was in the House when the centre table was filled on a question asked by the then opposition, that costs several of thousands of dollars to prepare and months to collect and I think that's fair. I think it's the right of the opposition to ask questions. I don't think that the question across has been brought up before and I'm frankly a little disappointed that all of a sudden it rears its head today. But it's not been a matter in the past in this House and I'm sure that the hon. member who had brought the matter to our attention, if he checks the record in the past, that there were some substantive costs when his party was in the opposition. And again, I think it's fair, I'm not critical of what happened in the past, I'm as I say a little surprised it came up today but the government had supplied me the information on the mailing lists in the past and again as I say to the Attorney General, the present house leader, that it's a question that had come up in the past, and I therefore, move for Return No. 52 showing, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point with respect to this return because it was raised by the member for Qu'Appelle. I do not intend to adjourn the debate, it will continue on as far as I'm concerned on this one. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that something must be made clear to the members of the House and that is the question of cost. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle says that cost should not be a factor. The member for Wascana by his seated position speech simply agrees. I want to surprise the member for Wascana to say that I generally in that proposition agree as well. The difficulty is this. This is the second or third question in this series of questions, Mr. Speaker, which, in effect, ploughs over old territory. Member for Qu'Appelle gets up and he says, "I'm asking this question which goes all the way back to 1974, 1975, 1976, right up to November 1, 1977, you know I have the information already in the past, you provided it for me, but I'm doing it only because I want to double check." Those are the exact words that he used, we heard it just a few minutes ago. I'm advised by the minister, who will be moving an amendment that will provide the question to be asked the same way in which it was answered a few years ago. This information was tabled all the way back to 1973. Now I think up to last year when the thing was passed last year or two years ago. You could have very, very simply — Yea, the member from Sutherland, you know, I guess he can be excused because he's still a relatively new coming guy but take a look at the ones on lawyers, the number of lawyers. You ask that question every year going back to 1973 you want to know the names of lawyers and the amounts. You ask this question every year, you go back to 1973, names and amounts (no not order), I'm speaking to the point that was raised by the member for Qu'Appelle, when he said that costs should not be a factor in answering this kind of question. And I'm saying that costs should be a factor in this operation because the opposition's got a

duty to be responsible. And the opposition's not responsible, but yet this information, the same information which this question is asking for here again and they want the government to go all the way back again, reduplicate the information and check it out again. Why? Because some opposition member doesn't want to take the time to read the information tabled on the legislature this session or last session, because he wants to double check. And then he gets up and lectures us about not talking about cost. I think the taxpayers have a right to know that it costs money, it costs civil servants time, it costs the taxpayer money to go through again over and over and over these checks just because some member wants to get up and say double check it. And then they have the audacity to get up and lecture us about and waste and government and spending waste on government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that there are many questions here that will undoubtedly take lots of time and we've got a duty as a government to answer them as they are amended, but I say the opposition's got a duty to at least look at some of the answers that we tabled year after year and to stop coming up with questions like the hon. member for Qu'Appelle asked. Now this is Return No. 52 and I think he's had all 52 virtually on them. A lot of them coming back over the same ploughed over ground because he feels that somehow the government's got a duty to double check the information. Now I said, Mr. Speaker, earlier, and I repeat on this notice of Motion for Return debatable. This reflects a very significant departure in attitude by the Conservative caucus, this series of resolutions. A member can get up and he can say whatever he wants, double check or whatever, but this is a significant change in attitude. It's an attitude which, I think, frankly was an unhealthy attitude as exhibited by the Liberal Opposition. And now when the member for Qu'Appelle moves his seat over from the Liberals to the Conservatives, they pick up the unhealthy attitude and the same old kinds of questions and that kind of a muck-raking mentality, some sort of a scandal under each one of these operations, permeates the thrust of the questions. And not only that but he wouldn't read the answers that were given to him on this question. He read the answers that were given to him in the past. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that is a high degree of irresponsibility, a high degree of irresponsibility, and I guess there's nothing we can do but to go back to 1974 and prepare all that information for them again, table it for them all again, so that this spring you can come up, ask us to update it this spring and go all the way back to 1973 or whatever. Mr. Speaker, I repeat again to you, Sir, and to the members of this House, that this is irresponsibility, this is an abuse of Private Members' Day, it's an abuse of taxpayers money and what they're asking us to do, not a very good situation for legislatures of this province to be preoccupied with, as the member for Qu'Appelle would have us to do. And that's exactly the thrust of the Conservative questions in this area; they'd be better spending their time reading a few of the answers and thinking up some good debating points and good debating subjects on topics and bills rather than ploughing over this frivolous and useless ground. And no doubt, the Liberals opposite will support them in this thing, lock, stock and barrel, right on because they were supportive of the member for Qu'Appelle when he was one of them, there's no reason why they should stop their support now that he's one of them, of the PC's. You can shut your eyes, Mr. Speaker, just listen to the member for Qu'Appelle and if you didn't know where he was sitting you wouldn't know if he was a Liberal or a Conservative. It would be the same message on Crown corporations, the same message on this, absolutely no difference, Mr. Speaker, irresponsibility.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose as I've listened all afternoon to the NDP and the Tories hurl themselves back and forth at each other which seems curious for current bed fellows in the main matter, Bill 47. Well, it's an irrelevant aside, Mr. Speaker, but I must say the most interesting debate that we seen in

this house has been the NDP trying to get the Tories off their coattails on Bill 47, turning their support away, won't take it, don't want it, don't want anything to do with it. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. Attorney General that you can't with such a wide swat say that all of the . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — It won't take all of them . . .

MR. MERCHANT: - . . . with that wide swat to just say that cost is the issue and cost is the question. I agree with the Attorney General that to use a day in the life of the Legislature to ask these series of old questions is a questionable use of a day, a questionable use of our time but I wouldn't like to see the government fall into the trap of thinking that they can hide behind the cost of preparing an answer and then say because it may be costly to prepare an answer, we're not going to provide the answer. Of course, the area where the Attorney General is the most entertaining of all is when he says, "Isn't it terrible, here we have a repetitious question, the member for Qu'Appelle asks a repetitious question. The answer is in the order paper from last year, you can get that answer, all you have to do is open the book and you find the answer. What are we going to have to do? We're going to have to go back to 1974 and spend all that time and money getting the answer again." Well, I assume that's the way the Attorney General would tackle the problem. I'm sure that his public servants will go to the order paper and find the answer the same way he suggests the hon. member for Qu'Appelle would have done.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He wants to double check.

MR. MERCHANT: — Well, there is no need to double check they just go to the order paper and they regurgitate it again and I don't think it will be that costly. Now, I am pleased, I guess, that the quality of the public service is higher than the quality of the approach that the Attorney General would take if he were faced with this problem. So, the problem is solved, we got the thing worked out for the Attorney General and all you have to do is sit here and lift your head from the Christmas cards for a minute or two and you can figure out these simple solutions.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the hopes that my kind comments and my non-political offerings of information to the member for Qu'Appelle on how to handle question period of the day and to the hon. Attorney General on how to run the government as he seems to need some help, in the hope that that might avoid any further comment, I would like to consider my brilliant thoughts further and adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 66

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 55 showing:

- (1) The cost of electricity per K.W.H. to commercial and residential users in 1970. (2) The cost of natural gas per t.c.f. to commercial and residential users in 1970. (3) (a) The price changes that have taken place since 1970 to

the present date in both (1) and (2); (b) the dates. (4) The price of natural gas per t.c.f. to residential users in Maple Creek. Saskatchewan. (5) The price of natural gas per t.c.f. that SPC is charging to the City of Medicine Hat, Alberta.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of talking briefly to the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and I believe he would agree with an amendment that WOULD PROPOSE. I therefore propose that Mr. Nelson's motion that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 55 be amended by:

(1) Striking t.c.f. where it appears in the 2nd, 5th and 7th line and substituting m.c.f. therefore and (2) by deleting all the words after the word 'Saskatchewan' in the 6th line.

I so move, seconded by Mr. Whelan (Minister of Consumer Affairs).

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 61

MR. R KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 61 showing: 043

The number of boilers (heating) and the size of each licenced by the Department of Labour: (a) 1966 showing Steam 1 to 25, 25 to 100, 100 and up, horsepower; Hot Water 1 to 25, 25 to 100, 100 and up, horsepower; (b) 1971 showing Steam 1 to 25, 25 to 100, 100 and up, horsepower; Hot Water 1 to 25, 25 to 100, 100 and up, horsepower; (c) 1976 showing Steam 1 to 25, 25 to 100, 100 and up, horsepower; Hot Water 1 to 25, 25 to 100, 100 and up, horsepower.

HON. G. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, Order for Return No. 61 presents a couple of problems. The question first of all asks for the number of boilers and the sizes of each licensed by the Department of Labour for the years 1966, 1971 and 1976. The first problem that the question raises is complicated by the fact that a large number of the records of the boiler and pressure vessel units for 1966 and 1971 were lost in the flood which occurred in 1975. Accordingly, a number of those records are not currently available.

The second problem which is created is the fact that records are kept on a fiscal rather than a calendar year basis. Accordingly, in order to provide as much information as we can for the hon. member I am moving, seconded by Mr. Messer, that all of the words appearing after the word 'boilers' in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Inspected by the Department of Labour according to horsepower ratings, 1 to 25, 25 to 100, 100 and up; the total number of boilers in use according to horsepower ratings and the number of inspection certificates issued in the fiscal year, 1976-77.

I so move, seconded by Mr. Messer, the member for Tisdale.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 63

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 63 showing:

The number of investigations by the labour standards branch into wage and benefits which have been undertaken or completed without signed complaints (routine) in the years: 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 to date; and the number of investigations by the labour standards branch into wages and benefits which have been undertaken or completed with signed complaints (special) in the years: 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 to date.

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, the same problem arises here with respect to this order for return, as the previous one that was amended. As I indicated before, the records of the Department of Labour are kept on a fiscal rather than on a calendar year basis and accordingly I move, seconded by Mr. Messer, that the motion be amended:

That in the third line the word 'fiscal' be inserted before the word 'years' and in the third and fourth lines delete the following - 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972.

It is just a matter of converting fiscal years from calendar years.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 80

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 80 showing:

(1) Whether the former general manager and exploration manager, namely Cliff Berg and John Knebles, are being remunerated in any way today by Saskoil or any of its subsidiaries in Alberta after their separation from employment. If so, the amount of monies in fees and remuneration, at or since separation, that have been paid to Cliff Berg and John Knebles. (2) Whether Kywan is an Alberta subsidiary of Saskoil.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't witch hunting when I put these questions on the paper. I would say that it would be something similar to item 16, that it took Saskoil quite a long time to find a manager and I believe the manager they found in Cliff Berg and then the exploration manager John Knebles. I think they were quite highly qualified men and respected in the oil industry. Now I notice by an item in the paper the other day, probably released by the minister, that Kywan is a subsidiary of Saskoil and it gave their profit picture in the paper the other day. But really in this first question I am interested in finding out if these truly were very valuable men and if they are in fact working for the Saskoil subsidiary of Kywan. This is the reason I would like to know just what is happening in the way of expenses now that they are not working for us and still indirectly are working for Saskoil.

I, therefore, move, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue a Return No. 80 as showing.

HON. J. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, let me firstly assure the member for Estevan that we have all very confident people working for

Saskoil. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not he wants to gauge their competence by the salary that is being paid to them only, but I am sure that if he undertook to acquaint himself with the Annual Report just tabled several days ago, he will be aware of the significant success that Saskoil has had in its two or three years of operation. The members to your left, Mr. Speaker, chuckle and I take it that they haven't had the opportunity to really acquaint themselves with that Annual Report showing some very significant net returns for a newly established company. I would be pleased to hear them explain to the general public what they find so funny about a company that is able to do something that a good many other private companies haven't been able to do in two or three years time.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to entirely satisfy the member for Estevan, I want you to note that the first sentence of (1) asks for the remuneration today and the second sentence of (1) asks for remuneration at or since separation and I think that is somewhat ambiguous and I want to clarify that so that there will be no question about the information that he gets.

Also in part (2) of the motion the member asks whether Kywan is an Alberta subsidiary of Saskoil. Kywan is a Saskoil subsidiary and it is incorporated under part (1) of the Canada Corporation Act and is registered to conduct business in Alberta.

I also want to provide to him some additional information which will indicate that it is registered to conduct business in the jurisdictions of British Columbia and the Northwest Territories, Yukon Territories, as well as Saskatchewan, so that he can closely follow if he so desires their successes in those jurisdictions.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, move, seconded by Mr. Romanow, the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, that the member for Estevan's motion to move that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 80, amended, by deleting all of the words after 'showing' and substituting the following:

(1) Whether Clifton Berg and John Knebies have been remunerated in any way by Saskoil or any of its subsidiaries in Alberta after their separation from employment. If so, the amount of moneys in fees and remuneration at or since separation that have been paid, and too, whether Kywan is an Alberta subsidiary of Saskoil.

Motion agreed to.

Return No. 81

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 81 showing:

The total monies spent by Saskoil in each of the years 1976, 1977, and January 1 to October 30, 1977, (a) The total spent, proportionately, on administration for Saskatchewan and Alberta. (b) The total spent by Saskoil on the acquisition of properties in Saskatchewan and Alberta. (c) The total spent by Saskoil on the direct exploration in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to find out just how much Saskoil has slowed down the oil industry in Saskatchewan and do some comparisons on how much is done by acquisition of properties and how much by exploration? I, therefore, move

seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington that an Order of the Assembly do issue Return No. 81 showing.

MR. MESSER: — There again so that we can straighten out the facts for the member for Estevan, I would like to move that we amend the motion, so that he in fact has some significant date so that he will hopefully terminate his undertakings to try to mislead the general public in relation to what Saskoil's real achievements really are. I might say that the first sentence of his motion asked for money spent in the years 1976, 1977 in January 1 to October 30, 1977 and I believe what he means is 1975, 1976 and from January 1, 1977 to October 30, 1977, rather than have the figures for both years, especially since he has moved this motion prior to the end of the calendar year, 1977. I don't know whether that's an error or just a display of the member's intelligence. However, I want to undertake to amend it so that we can better inform him of what, I assume, he is asking for unless he wants us to do a little crystal ball gazing as to what we expect Saskoil to be doing in the remainder of 1977.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Saskoil's fiscal year of April 1 to March 31 does not coincide with the calendar year, therefore, it would be of some considerable burden to gather statistics on money spent by calendar year as requested by the member for Estevan and I would like to amend the motion so it is more practical for us to answer. Also, Mr. Speaker, the (b) portion of the return asks for money spent on acquisition of properties in Saskatchewan and Alberta. It is not clear whether the member for Estevan is only referring to producing properties or all properties including land and, therefore, in order to clarify what I believe he is undertaking to obtain, I will ask that the member for Estevan's motion to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 81 be amended by deleting all of the words after 'showing' and substituting the following therefor:

The total monies spent by Saskoil in each of the fiscal years 1975-1976, 1976-1977 and 1977-1978 to October 31 of 1977. (a) For each of the three fiscal years the total spent proportionately on administration for Saskatchewan and Alberta. (b) For each of the three fiscal years the total spent by Saskoil on the acquisition of properties including land in Saskatchewan and Alberta. (c) For each of the three fiscal years the total spent by Saskoil on direct exploration in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

I will so move, seconded by Mr. Byers, the member for Kelvington.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — I am surprised, members of the House, to find that I have been following the member for Estevan's questions with some interest primarily because I, as well, represent an oil constituency. I would like the opportunity to make some remarks on this particular question in case of some future date and I would like to beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 82

MR. LARTER moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 82 showing:

The total production in barrels per day by Saskoil and (a) the total production per day in barrels from reserves purchased in Saskatchewan and Alberta by

Saskoil; and (b) the total production per day in barrels from discoveries in Saskatchewan and Alberta by Saskoil.

He said: Mr. Speaker, again I am attempting to find some information here and according to the oilmen that the oil industry gets back exactly what it puts into an industry and that goes for exploration as well. Oil people recognize that for the little moneys that are being spent in Saskatchewan at the present time, the government is getting back exactly what they are after and that's very little. What we are attempting to do is to find out here now how much of our exploration and return is coming from Alberta over Saskatchewan and as I say even some government people have recognized that our return is just as economical in the amount of drilling we do in Saskatchewan here as it is in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 82 showing.

MR. MESSER: — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

RETURN NO. 83

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 83 showing:

Regarding the employees employed by Saskoil: (a) the number of geologists; (b) the number of geophysicists; (c) the number of employees who are Saskatchewan people; (d) the years of experience in Saskatchewan of geologists and geophysicists; (e) the number of seismologists; (f) the number of landmen; and (g) the total number of employees employed by Saskoil.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact that a great many of our professional people and geologists and geophysicists and many of the other people connected with the oil industry have left this province over the last few years. This attempt is to find out just how many of these people Saskoil does employ. This recent discovery in northern North Dakota was discovered by seismologists and we just wanted to find out how many professional people Saskoil does employ.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in order to again provide the member with more detailed information and I must comment that I don't know who is writing the questions for him, quite likely he's writing them himself because they are ambiguous and confusing. And it certainly isn't clear in this instance what the member for Estevan means by 'Saskatchewan people'. We wonder if he's referring to people who were in fact born in Saskatchewan or people who are residing in Saskatchewan or how many people from outside of Saskatchewan have now joined the corporation and are perhaps now living in Saskatchewan. And I know that he wants to have all of the information that we can provide so I move, seconded by the Attorney General, Mr. Romanow, the member for Saskatoon Riversdale that the member for Estevan's motion to move that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 83 be amended by deleting all of the words after, 'showing' and substituting the following therefor:

Regarding the employees employed by Saskoil as of November 1, 1977 (a) the number of geologists (b) the number of geophysicists (c) the number of employees born in Saskatchewan (d) the number of employees residing in Saskatchewan (e) the years of experience in Saskatchewan of geologists and geophysicists (f) the number of seismologists (g) the number of landmen and (h) the total number of employees employed by Saskoil.

I so move.

Motion agreed to.

Return No. 86

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 86 showing:

Whether the Department of Highways will be installing proper lighting and a pedestrian overpass on the Trans Canada Highway freeway section through Swift Current in 1978. If so, the projected commencement and completion date of the overpass and lighting.

He said: Mr. Speaker, just a comment or two before I move the motion. I am not sure whether the minister and his officials are completely aware of the facts that substantial building development has taken place in Swift Current on the north side of the Trans Canada Highway through the freeway or over the freeway and on a regular basis the children of that area must pass around the freeway or walk some distance away from that crossing area to get to school or, of course, cross the highway and the highway has since built a fence to stop that. As well the freeway in the evening or in the darkness is exceedingly dangerous and we have attributed one and possible two deaths to the fact that it is so dark.

I so move this motion, seconded by the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck).

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on item No. 37 I would like to raise a point or order if I can. My point of order relates to the form of the question. I note the question asks whether the department of Highways 'will' be installing, etc., etc., in 1978, if so the projected commencement and completion date of the overpass. If one checks anyone of the other turns on the blues here, any of the ones that we have dealt with, 94 of them which is pretty high, I believe I am correct in saying this is the only one which deals with a prospective matter, speculative matter, the future intention of government policy. All the others talk about the number of automobiles written off and names and addresses of leasing and the question of rates charged for electricity — just go through them — the number of averaging orders. My understanding of notice of motions for returns debatable is precisely that, that we deal with matters under our administration that have been dealt with and for which we are responsible. We are asked here about whether or not we will be installing. The easy answer is to deal with that in Committee of Finance or to put it by way of a resolution urging the government to do this or whatever. Therefore, I argue to you, Mr. Speaker, that notice of motion number 86, order for return, is out of order.

MR. WIEBE: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I must say initially that I must agree with the comments made by both the member for Swift Current and also the Attorney General for the province. You know I believe that lighting is definitely needed on Trans

Canada Highway but I also agree that this is not the proper place to bring up the question as the member for Swift Current has done. I am sure that had he taken the other route of looking after the concerns of his constituents I am sure that he would have contacted the Minister of Highways and hopefully lobbied that Minister of Highways to solve the problem that now exists within his constituency. I know that this is the approach that I would take if that particular section was located within my seat. If I was not successful in obtaining that through dealing with the department and the minister in charge I would then take the other option of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think the member is debating the issue or the technique rather than the point of order which was raised by the Attorney General as to whether this is a legitimate question. Are there any other comments on that?

MR. HAM: — Speaking to the point of order this particular motion originally was asked in written form as a question. I thought it was very simple and straightforward and I can't understand why in this particular case, I can't get an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: While I would agree that the return requested is speculative and I haven't made an exhaustive study of past returns to see if that has generally occurred or ever occurred. However, I would suspect there are a number of avenues open here, one that the member for Morse has suggested on his non-point of order, one which could be that the government could say that we want the item defeated, or the government could answer and say that the government policy will be announced in due course. And I don't think it's up to the Speaker to rule whether in fact it's not desirable to ask speculative questions on order for return. The number of avenues opened to the government and the opposition in dealing with this, and I think I'll let it go ahead on that basis.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — I might just ask one question for clarification. The member for Swift Current has indicated that the question was put in a simple form, in a written question form and I want to know if the government did not have any intention of answering the question in that form, then why did they move the question from the written question category, which they did not have to answer if I understand the rules properly, to a motion debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry I can't answer for the government.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to this motion, it's a very simple question and that is that when the question is put on the order paper our options are fairly limited. We either answer it the way that it's asked, we convert it to a debatable or we convert it to an order for return. The choice that we took here was to debatable in order to raise this point of order. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak to the point of order because I assume . . . I'm not clear just on the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Still speaking on the point of order did you say that this question is in order, is that the ruling that you made? I wasn't clear on that. Our challenger here didn't hear it, didn't understand.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, perhaps I was unclear. I think probably the best plan on this particular item is to consider the matter further and bring forward a statement to cover the matter sometime in the future. I had merely speculated or had said that I had made an exhaustive examination of the record and I didn't feel that it was desirable for me to rule it out because it was speculative. However, I haven't checked the record and if the members so wish, I will check, if there are any precedents to support it being in or out of order, I will bring them forward at a later time. I would ask the members to

consequently stand that particular item. Do I understand the Attorney General right, that he was speaking on the point of order and not speaking on the motion?

MR. E.A. BERNSTON (Souris Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I think we've got a bit of a procedural hang-up here because as I understand it the motion was moved on the last item, that is and then stood. Does it not have to be adjourned to be dealt with later?

MR. SPEAKER: I suppose the point of order may be legitimate in that someone should be adjourning the debate and I quite frankly, if some member wishes to adjourn the debate then we can come back at a later point and decide.

MR. ROMANOW: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 o'clock p.m.