

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 25, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, and again members of the Assembly, I would like, as I did yesterday, to welcome and introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the members the rest of the group of Grade 8 students from Weyburn Junior High, some 58 in number today. They are sitting in the west gallery and are accompanied by their teachers, Jim Nedelcov and Gloria Garrison. Again their bus drivers are Mr. Johnson and Mr. Hanning. I think it's worth mentioning, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Nedelcov has accompanied this Grade 8 group of students from junior high each year for, I believe, 14 consecutive years. I'll ask Mr. Nedelcov to stand, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it is our wish that their visit here again in their provincial capital and their Legislative Building proves very knowledgeable and pleasant. As I said yesterday, this is another way to celebrate Saskatchewan in its 75th anniversary. Thank you very much.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North-East): — I would like to introduce to you and to the members of the legislature a group of 63 students. They are Grade 6, 7 and 8 students from St. Philip's School located in my constituency. They are accompanied here by their teachers, Mr. Schuba and Mr. Thompson. I hope they have a pleasant experience in the legislature today and that it will not only be pleasant but a memorable and a learning experience. It is my intention to meet with the students and their teachers after 2:30 p.m. and perhaps we will have a chance to discuss the proceedings they will witness for a half an hour or so. Again, welcome to the legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE(Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure I introduce to you and to the Assembly, some 14 Grade 3 and 4 students from Saar School at Kronau. Kronau of course is a very famous community in Saskatchewan, and I think Canada, with a population of approximately 100. It has had four provincial junior curling championships, I believe, in the last three years. This year the provincial junior girls champions were from Kronau. They are accompanied by Mr. Tim Geiger, Mrs. Ferner and Mrs. Euteneir. I welcome you all. I know all members of the Assembly will join with me in welcoming the students and those escorting them, and in wishing them an interesting afternoon and a safe journey home. I look forward to meeting them a little later this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Request for Driver's Licence re Handicapped Case

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, last week I personally gave you a news release that I issued in February of this year. It pertained to a handicapped young man, 18 years old, trying to obtain a driver's licence, class 3 with air. Have you reviewed this case and what are you intending to do with this?

MR. R.J. ROMANOW(Attorney General): — I have not yet reviewed this case. This matter is properly within the jurisdiction of the minister in charge of the highway traffic board. I am lending my assistance as a member of the Executive Council to see what, if anything, can be done on the issue.

MR. GARNER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When Mr. Attorney General, can I have an answer from this council?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I will not bind myself by any specific time. All I know is that I'll be discussing this with the minister in charge, the Hon. Eiling Kramer, whose prime responsibility this matter is, and in due course he will be making a statement to an announcement to the member.

MR. GARNER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Attorney General, I think it's a nuts and bolts question. It shouldn't have come this far in the Chamber. Is it a policy of your government to allow a young man to take a written test and six months later when he comes in to take the driver's test to be told he's not allowed to take the test? A review board from the highway traffic board stated the young man will not be allowed to take this test until he produces a satisfactory medical report. Mr. Attorney General, is the government telling the young man that he has to grow a new arm before he can have the test?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I believe the facts of the case involve an application by a young Saskatchewan citizens to drive what may be described as a transport truck or a very heavy-duty vehicle truck, one that involves air brakes. We all know the size of the steering wheel and the size of the machine that's involved. Clearly, given the unfortunate physical disability the person has, it is understandable that the highway traffic board would want to review all of the facts and circumstances as carefully as they can. I don't begrudge the hon. member raising this in the legislature; quite obviously that's his right. I was somewhat alarmed and concerned when I saw it 10 days ago, two weeks ago on CFCQ television in Saskatoon (the public media) with the member making these statements much in advance of bringing it to the attention of the House. All I can say to the member is that the highway traffic board, under the leadership of the minister in charge, is fully aware of the circumstances. I am looking at it as in effect an assistant to the minister and an announcement will be made in due course.

Western Response to Quebec Referendum

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in light of the announced support of Kevin Drummond, an Anglophone and former Liberal member of the Quebec Assembly to support the separatist cause in Quebec, it would appear this is another indicator of the success sought by the PQ in their quest for independence. Have you or any of your ministers discussed the probable outcome of a separate Quebec in Canada, especially the western premiers? And, if so, what future do you see for Canada without Quebec? If the

PQ loses the referendum, do you agree with the attitude in Quebec will never be the same?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I have naturally discussed with a number of people the upcoming Quebec referendum. We do not, as a government, have any proposed course of action in the event that the yes vote in the referendum prevails. I do not hold the view that this necessarily foretells the withdrawal of Quebec from Canada. I think that will develop or not develop in the months and years following the referendum. Accordingly, to directly answer the hon. member's question, we as a government do not have a contingency plan to deal with that possibility and I'm not aware whether other western premiers do.

MR. HAM: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, when Premier Levesque and his party came to office in Quebec, you stated that all provincial leaders should assist Quebec Premier Rene Levesque in bringing good government to Quebec. Did your government, or to your knowledge any other provincial government, offer or give any assistance to Quebec and, if so, what kind of assistance?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I really cannot answer that question from memory and I suppose all hon. members, at least on this side of the House, are conscious of the fact that we should not rely upon our memory in answering questions. Accordingly, I am unable to answer the question posed by the hon. member as to whether or not any agency of the Government of Saskatchewan may have had since 1976 any dealings with the Government of Quebec which might be construed as assistance.

SGI Limitations

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Mr. Minister, last year specially on November 21, SGI introduced a so-called replacement cost coverage for contents of a residence and you subsequently advertised this to the people of Saskatchewan and the policy holders. I refer to the way you put it, is that the articles can be repaired or replaced at today's prices. In reviewing your endorsement, Mr. Minister, why did you intentionally or otherwise mislead your policy holders? I am going to refer specifically to limitations where the limitations are 400 per cent and further are you aware that private insurance companies do not have any such limitations?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice.

Closing of Kerrobert Courthouse

MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — A question to the Attorney General. On March 20 in this Assembly, in reply to a question of mine, you indicated that your department had no intention of closing the Kerrobert Courthouse and further that employees (in plural) would be kept at the Kerrobert Courthouse. I'm advised by the present staff at the Kerrobert Courthouse (who are two in number) that the sheriff, who is one of them, has been transferred to Prince Albert. The local registrar, who is the other employee, has been given a choice of either moving to Swift Current or to Yorkton, failing that to have her employment terminated. My question to the Attorney General is (that seems somewhat inconsistent) would you elaborate as to exactly what service you intend to maintain at the Kerrobert Courthouse?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I believe what I said to the hon. member is quoted on page 830 of Hansard, March 20, 1980. I think I said:

The plan is not to close down the Kerrobert Courthouse. The plan is to keep the Kerrobert Courthouse open, to keep employees at the Kerrobert Courthouse, but there may be a reorganization of functions.

I think that is substantially what the hon. member said in his question. The present idea is to give the Kerrobert Courthouse a function other than the present court registry function, one which involves a sheriff's function, putting emphasis on that particular approach. A lay-off notice has been given apparently to a judicial officer in the registry, the intention is to place a deputy sheriff in that particular position. Now, as I indicated to the hon. member on Thursday last and I repeat again, I would be prepared to meet with him to receive his views as to what should or shouldn't be done and we would take that into careful consideration.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary to that, Mr. Attorney General. The latest statistical information on the use of various courthouses in the province of Saskatchewan in various functions — 13 in number — would indicate that the use of the sheriff's office in Kerrobert is very minimal indeed. However with the use of the local registrar's offices as a filing place, which as I understand all files are going to be moved up to North Battleford, the judicial center of Kerrobert is indeed quite an active local registrar's office. It is seventh in number of total fees received of the 19 courthouses. It is tenth in surrogate applications and twelfth in Court of Queen's Bench trials. On the other hand the courthouses which seem to be located in places like Shaunavon, Assiniboia, Wynyard are used substantially less . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I take it the member has a question.

MR. ANDREW: — My question is, it seems to me the courthouses which are being closed down are the courthouse in Kerrobert, the courthouse in Moosomin, the courthouse in Arcola. Why is it the courthouses that are being closed down are all in seats represented by our side and the ones that are maintained are the ones represented by members on your side?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I have indicated on at least two or three occasions for almost a week now, that I'd be pleased to listen to the legitimate representations of the member for Kindersley or the member for Moosomin on this issue. I want to inform this House I've heard not a word from either of them on this issue other than raised in the House — raised in the context that somehow it's picked on the opposition side, I can tell you that we have proposals which will affect members on our side as well and Assiniboia is one and how that is to work out in due course I don't know. I've said to the member opposite that I'd be pleased to sit down to talk to him about it or let them take just five minutes to jot down their ideas and their arguments.

I'll review the figures. I get my advice based on the Grotsky committee which did a circulation of the province on this issue, based on the law society and based on the representations of my department. If they're in error, we can make some changes. So, I simply ask them to put it down in writing and forward it to me and I'll have my department people give me an explanation on it.

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — A supplementary to the Attorney General. In reply to my question regarding the judicial center in the town of Moosomin, the Attorney General replied stating that no final decision had been made with respect to the judicial center in Moosomin. He had said and I accept his statement at that time, that he would

accept a presentation from myself. Upon looking into matters later on, the next day and the day after that, I find out that in fact the deputy sheriff had been called into the city of Regina. She had been given notice that her employment would be terminated and therefore I have chosen the only means by which I can present a case to the Attorney General — through the Assembly. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order, order! I'll take the next question. The member for Kindersley. Order! The member for Kindersley.

MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — The question to the Attorney General. He indicated in his previous statement that they were acting pursuant to the Grotsky commission and the Grotsky hearing. As I raised earlier, Mr. Grotsky on two occasions was invited to meet with the Kerrobert Bar Association and at no time did Grotsky even attend in Kerrobert to hear the representations of the bar in Kerrobert.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'd like to make a minute or so speech in response, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I can't permit the Attorney General to make a speech. I realize the member was making a speech . . . Order, order! Well, it works this way in case the Attorney General doesn't understand it. If he stands up and at the front of his comments says I want to make a speech in the question period. I'm going to rule him out of order right away. If the member for Kindersley is preambing his question, I'm going to listen to the preamble and after the preamble is over I expect a question. I ruled the member for Kindersley out of order because he had no question, he merely made a statement and that's an abuse of the rules. I'll take the member for Swift Current.

Attitude of Federal Government

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in view of recent events in Quebec pertaining to the referendum, you stated at the time of the PQ (Parti-Quebecois) victory that if the federal government continues an attitude of moving in on the provinces, it would be disastrous for the future of Canada because it would increase existing tensions to the breaking point. Mr. Premier, I agree with that statement but therefore, do you believe that Ottawa has changed its attitude and how do you expect the provinces, especially the western provinces, to react to centralist policies designed to benefit central Canada?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I had detected some change in attitude by the governments at Ottawa as indicated by the successive federal-provincial conferences where governments at Ottawa at least indicated that they would agree to changes in the constitution to which previously they were quite opposed. I do not believe that these indications from Ottawa are sufficiently vigorous to meet the concerns of regions such as western Canada and accordingly it will be necessary for spokespersons for western Canada to continue to press its case. I believe some modest movement is detectable at Ottawa. I do not believe it to be sufficient.

MR. HAM: — This modest response from Ottawa, Mr. Premier — could you give to this House, or supply to me personally, a list of the advantages of changes that have taken place in Ottawa over the last several years that you, as Premier of Saskatchewan, have been involved with?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I clearly will not list from memory anything in this House at this time. With respect to supplying the member with them, I would suggest

that I would be willing to do that. I would think it would be better if I understood to have one of my colleagues do that following the consideration of the estimates of intergovernmental affairs, because there will be an opportunity then to canvass them all and it may not be necessary to list them. Furthermore, obviously a good number of them are questions of judgment, so with that in mind I would say to the hon. member that I or one of my colleagues would be happy to send him a list of changes which have been made. I do not suggest it will necessarily be exhaustive because clearly whether or not a change is to the benefit of western Canada is debatable in many instances.

Future of Judicial Centres

MR. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — A question to the Attorney General. Because the member for Kindersley and I, the member for Moosomin, have not ample opportunity to present a case to you, would you in fact take it unto your self to make a presentation to both of us as to the proceedings on the future on the judicial centers? Since you and your department have chosen to just take action without any consultation, will you now, Mr. Attorney General, look into the matter on our behalf and bring us a presentation? We don't have time to present one. Will you?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. members of the House, and particularly the constituents of Moosomin and Kerrobert, to note the fact that the member says they don't have the time to speak up for these matters of constituency interest and that I should do so. I want to tell the hon. member that the overall policy was announced in the budget speech. That was clearly enunciated by the Minister of Finance — the overall policy. The details of the policy can be debated during the estimates of the Attorney General. More particularly they can be debated during the course of proposed legislation on court merger, which will involve a reorganization of judicial centers and a realignment of some judicial functions — the subject of our debate. Furthermore, if in the interim the two members can find some time to sit down and give me some arguments on some points of consideration, the sooner the better, I would welcome such. I don't meant that in a sarcastic way. I would welcome it. I would like to have the department check what information they have against its own, and would be prepared even to meet with them, but I think it is not too much to ask the hon. member to give me a little note in writing indicating what their points are on this matter.

MR. LANE — Mr. Attorney General, do you take under advisement the information read into this Assembly today by the member for Kindersley, as to the amount of income fees derived at, in particular, the judicial center of Kerrobert, which indicates it is higher up on the totem pole in terms of earning than some of the others where changes are not being contemplated?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess the members simply refuse to put something down in writing and I will have to go to Hansard to take a look at the few figures the member for Kindersley stated there. I will be pleased to take a look at that and if that amounts to the submission I certainly will give it all the weight it deserves and carefully consider it.

MR. LANE — Supplementary. Would the Attorney General be prepared to take in writing the list of figures here (I will give them to him now) and take those under advisement?

Sale of Draglines

MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. Minister, a few short months ago Sask Power Corporation purchased two 90-yard draglines to the tune of \$70 million or something like that — one for Coronach and one for Boundary Dam. I understand (is this correct?) that you are now in the process of the possible sale of one and you are selling the second one. Is this a fact?

HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes, we have found that it is in the best interests of the corporation and therefore the people that the corporation services with electrical power resell those draglines at some substantial profit to the corporation and lease those draglines from a company which will be the owner of those draglines. I would suggest to the member if he wants to pursue this further that a more appropriate time would be during Crown corporations when we will be studying the Saskatchewan Power Corporation's fiscal year activities.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you saying now that SPC is getting out of the coal mining business? Are you leasing these back to the private sector as well?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the corporation will be leasing the draglines from the leasing company and as far as the operativeness of the draglines and the objective which SPC set out to achieve in the coal mining sector, it has not changed in any respect whatsoever, only it is not and will not be the owner of the draglines during the lifetime of those coal operations and the need of those draglines.

MR. LARTER: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, can you tell us what length of lease there is on these draglines? Is it a long-term lease?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, yes it is a long-term lease. I suggested in my initial response to the hon. member that I think it would be more appropriate and I would be willing to give him more precise information during Crown corporations. I think I could best do that at that time and I am sure the member would be satisfied with the government's response.

Drop in Price of Yellowcake

MR. LANE — I would like to direct a question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, on March 19 I asked you a question regarding the significant drop in the price of yellowcake from approximately \$43.80 (U.S.) to \$38 (U.S.) per pound within the last year and whether in light of the softening of the markets, you would be prepared to table for this Assembly and the public of Saskatchewan, the government's marketing studies on uranium? At that time you indicated you wanted the answer referred to the minister responsible for SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation) whose response to me was that to get some idea where the uranium industry was going, to look at the results of the referendum in Sweden.

Now the referendum in Sweden came down on Sunday and it indicated (I think in fairness) a restraint, that the Government of Sweden would be limited to no more than six new generating plants. Keeping in perspective that this is a country which obtains more of its electricity per capita from reactors than any other country in Europe, I think it indicates a restraint and a deep concern about further . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I can't permit the member to go on. He is making a statement; he is not asking a question.

MR. LANE — Would the Premier now be prepared to table the marketing studies the government has with regard to uranium mining and world markets which the province is looking at?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation to deal with that. By way of a comment on the preamble I think the significance of the Swedish referendum was that they now have six reactors and the vote was that that move from six to twelve. They now have six operating reactors, Mr. Speaker. The vote was that they move from six to a maximum of twelve. That was the vote. Whether or not that is restraint is a matter of judgment. Clearly it is a doubling and more than doubling because the newer reactors are larger than the current ones in place; a more than doubling of the capacity of the Swedish system based upon nuclear power.

With respect to the marketing reports, I will ask my colleague to respond.

HON. E. L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think the answer with respect to market reports has changed any from the last time the member asked the question. With respect to the Swedish referendum, I think it is widely viewed as a positive step with respect to nuclear power. It will more than double the requirements of Sweden for uranium. I think the vote was about three to two. I haven't got the exact figures. With respect to marketing studies there are several firms and agencies around the country, including some United Nations' organizations, that produce public information with respect to the future forecasts for uranium. Obviously companies have their own private information as well. If the member is interested in the forecasts of some widely respected bodies, I suggest he look at some of the information such as the United Nations, etc.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Payment to Hog Producers

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform this Assembly that a payment of \$156,775 will be made to hog producers enrolled in the Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns program (SHARP).

MR. MacMURCHY: — Payment is for the marketing period October to December 1979. Approximately 510 eligible producers will be receiving cheques on 34,219 market hogs. The average payment will be approximately \$300 per producer. This is the first pay-out under SHARP since it was introduced in 1976. The payment was triggered by the combination of lower prices and increased production costs, due primarily to higher interest rates and increased feed costs.

Pay-outs occur when market prices drop below the SHARP support price. The support price for the fourth quarter of 1979 was \$59.82 per hundredweight dressed, while the market price for the same period averaged \$56.76 per hundredweight dressed. The total cost of production was calculated at \$65.26 per hundredweight dressed.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in the hog industry has changed dramatically over the last year. Market price for the fourth quarter of 1978 was \$76.29 per hundredweight dressed, and total cost to production was calculated at \$56.38 per hundredweight dressed. Not only have market prices dropped about \$20 per hundredweight in the past year but production costs have increased significantly during the year due to interest rates, utility rates, higher feed costs and higher construction costs.

Mr. Speaker, SHARP is a voluntary program available to all Saskatchewan hog producers. It provides a reasonable minimum price based on the cost of production. Producers contribute to the plan and those contributions are matched by the provincial government. SHARP is backed by the provincial government and administered by the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission on a fee-for-service basis.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, it is likely that all hog producers will be eligible for payments under the Federal Agricultural Stabilization Act for the 1979-80 fiscal year, but the amount of the federal payments will not be known until sometime later this spring. I have in the past asked that the responsibility for agricultural stabilization rest with the federal government. It should not rest with the province. Nevertheless we have a program in place in this province which I have announced will expire December 31, 1980. I think it is important to point that out. I intend to meet with the federal Minister of Agriculture in the very near future to determine whether he plans to introduce an improved federal stabilization plan incorporating many of the similar outstanding features which are in operation in the Saskatchewan plan. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, participants in SHARP are now benefiting from premiums paid into the SHARP Fund by themselves, and by the Government of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Minister of Agriculture. I think he deserves a degree of credit for the payment to the hog producers but I don't want him to rest too comfortably. The fact is the plan is voluntary and contributory so he is, to a large extent, giving the hog producers their own money. Secondly, we had the value added by secondary industries in Saskatchewan such as kill plants, processing plants etc., the cost of production, the cost of transportation, etc. would be less, and to a large extent, the mess that the hog industry's in today wouldn't exist

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

SPEAKER'S RULING ON A POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: — Before orders of the day, I was asked yesterday to peruse the verbatim record of the House and come back with a comment for the member for Thunder Creek. I took the opportunity of perusing the Debates and Proceedings, as I hope all members did who were involved in any questions with regard to the rules yesterday. I find that the member for Thunder Creek had asked me why he was denied questions with regard to the "conversations behind the rail with the member for Arm River." I examined the record and I find that upon examining the record, the decision I made at that time that the member was out of order, is quite in order. The decision I made at that time was in order. Essentially it is that questions must not repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused. Just to clarify it completely as the member, I know, will want to go back and check the precedence, I'll cite Beauschesne's parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, chapter five, Rule 171 sub (c) and (d).

Sub (c) says:

Multiply with slight variation a similar question on the same point.

And sub point (d) says:

Repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused.

I will also cite for the sake of the member for Thunder Creek, May's Parliamentary Procedure, Eighteenth Edition, page 319 to 331, and in this particular instance I'm referring to sub (g).

Questions must not repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused.

I hope that will satisfy the member and the members of the House as to the validity of the ruling yesterday.

MR. THATCHER: — May I comment on your ruling, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — No, no. Does the member have a point of order?

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that Hansard doesn't verify what you've just said.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order . . . order! I think I've made my ruling with regard to the matter. I've examined the record very carefully, and I stand by my ruling I made yesterday that the member was out of order at that time. That's why he was not permitted further questions. Examination of the record by any fair minded person will show that.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Annual Report — Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

MR. SPEAKER: — Before orders of the day I want to take this opportunity to suggest to the members that the eleventh annual report of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association will be laid on their desk probably later today. I would ask all members to keep April 9, Wednesday, open for the annual CPA dinner and meeting.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 33

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin) moved, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33 showing:

(1) The names, objectives, descriptions and budget of all Department of Co-operation and co-operative Development programmes in force on March 1, 1980; (2) whether since March 1, 1979 there were any programs (a) curtailed, (b) discontinued, and in each instance the reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the motion which I have before the Assembly — a fairly simple motion, I think. It's not asking that much from this government. But what I have observed, Mr. Speaker, is that we have now 562 motions for return (debatable) and I am finding that the Attorney General, as House Leader for this government, is taking all questions and moving them to motion debatable. There seems to be no desire, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I think we better not go on any further, unless we clarify what we're talking about at this time. The question before the House is motions for return (debatable) and it's that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 33, dealing with the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. If I allow the member for Moosomin to discuss the actions of the Attorney General with regard to a multitude of items before the House, then obviously I have to allow the Attorney General the opportunity to respond. I'm not prepared to allow the member for Moosomin to do that or to allow the Attorney General the opportunity to respond. So, the member will have to confine himself to what's before the house at this time.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, if I may just make a note on a point of order then. Are you saying that I, at this time, cannot speak on this motion?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The member has begun to speak and when the member is out of order I will make an attempt to call him to order. Until such a time as he's out of order, I'll allow him to speak.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, Mr. Speaker, then I will proceed. Unfortunately, it would seem that you, as Speaker of this House, did not follow my remarks as they were relating to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The member is now commenting on a ruling that's made by the Chair. He's in effect challenging the Chair and the member is not permitted to do that. The member may speak to the motion before the House. If the member is in order, I won't interrupt the member. As a matter of fact, I will make every attempt to prevent other members from interrupting if they try to do that. So I ask the member to go ahead within the rules of the House and talk about the item that's before us.

MR. BIRKBECK: — All right, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, with reference to the motion that I do have before the House, simply asking for names, objections, descriptions, and budgets of all Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development programs that were in force on March 1, 1980; and whether since March 1, 1979 there were any programs curtailed or discontinued and in each instance the reasons.

I would find, Mr. Speaker, that that would be reasonable information to be seeking from this government — reasonable information on behalf of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. Surely if we're to do our job as an opposition, then we're going to be questioning the minister with reference to his department. I am, Mr. Speaker, the critic for co-operation and co-operative development, therefore it's understandable that I would ask questions of the minister on this particular department. That is why I have put these questions before the Assembly. Those are simple reasons for wanting information. Surely, it must be understood by this Assembly that the members of the opposition as well speak for the various departments of government and that not just government is the holy master of all departments, Mr. Speaker. Surely, with these numbers of resolutions before this House, it is an indication to this Assembly that this opposition is clearly concerned

about all departments of government and is scrutinizing those departments.

There is no mysterious reason why I seek this information. There is not one of these members who has done some evil, some wrong that I am trying to get to and I say that to the Attorney General. This information is very clear cut. It is difficult if not impossible to get it any other way from the government. That is why it is before the House and that is why I feel this government has a duty, a responsibility to the taxpayers, the people of Saskatchewan, to reply — not to move every question in this House into an area of delay by making them debatable.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave the responsibility with this government. I am going to leave the responsibility with the member responsible for the department. I have the question before the House and want to leave that responsibility with this government and with this minister responsible. If he is unprepared to answer these questions, let that be his responsibility. And he laughs and he doesn't even laugh well, I might add, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't even laugh well. He doesn't dress well. He doesn't laugh well and he doesn't speak well. He should be in a well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this government is irresponsible. Count the issues we have put before them. Count the issues we have on this government and I say very simply, Mr. Speaker, that is a responsibility of government and that is the responsibility I am putting to you today. There is the question. It is a simple question and I would appreciate the answer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move Return No. 33.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 34

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 34 showing:

- (1) The names, objectives, descriptions and budgets of all Department of Northern Saskatchewan programs in force on March 1, 1980; (2) Since March 1, 1979 whether any programs were (a) curtailed (b) discontinued, and in each instance the reasons.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 35

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin) moved, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 35 showing:

- (1) The names, objectives, descriptions and budgets of all Saskatchewan Housing Corporations programs in force on March 1, 1980; (2) Since March 1, 1979 whether any programs were (a) curtailed (b) discontinued, and in each instance the reasons.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'll be asking the members of the House to vote in favor of this

motion as we have the others. I do simply, however, want to point out to the members of the Assembly that this and the other two orders which we have just passed will necessitate a massive amount of work on the part of the governments and the agencies involved, keeping in mind that what's being asked by Return No. 35 are names, objectives, descriptions and budgets of all housing corporation programs in force on March 1, 1980 and then a curtailment of that. Mr. Speaker, I fully expect that the documentation will be very extensive indeed and large. I fully expect it will take some time for preparation.

Those who would argue that this is simply asking don't understand the process and the breadth and depth of this question. I think in some ways, looking at the estimates for the years under review, probably coupled with the annual reports, would get all the information necessary for the members in this regard. It would be a simple matter of doing your homework and looking at the annual reports for 1979-80. The annual report when it comes down to 1980-81 — compare the estimates. There you will have a budget description of the estimates, you've got your information and the questions can then be zeroed in. But the member does not see fit to do it that way. The member wants us to in effect set out these matters. We'll do it but I simply tell the members of the House, it will be a very large volume of work. We'll work at it as quickly as we can but it will be quite some time before we can achieve the necessary operation.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 36

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown —Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 36 showing:

The amount of money the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development has spent on
(a) renovating (b) redecorating his office since March 1, 1979.

MR. ROMANOW: — I'll be introducing an amendment to the motion proposed to be passed by the hon. member for Moosomin. The amendment will redirect the sum to the effect of requesting for the moneys spent by the Department of Government Services for each capital renovation project undertaken as part of long-term regeneration programs of the Legislative Building, project description and total project cost. The Department of Government Services I am advised maintains records on a project basis and not on the basis of individual ministerial suites. There is as you know a game plan of a long-term strategy for renovation of the entire building involving the Assembly, opposition offices, Leader of the Opposition's offices and the like. These are apparently done on a project cost basis and that is the way the information can be provided. Over and above that I would simply point out if we were to be technical in this answer, I suppose we could agree to it and then answer it as nil since the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development spends nothing on the renovation of his office; it's spent by the government services ministry.

In an effort not to prolong the proceedings of the House and to get at what presumably members opposite want to try to get at, if we can provide that information I would move, seconded by the member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) that all the words after the word "money" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

spent by the Department of Government Services since April 1, 1978, for

each capital renovation project undertaken as part of the long-term regeneration program for the Legislative Building: (a) project description and (b) total project cost.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Attorney General, your amendment obviously will affect the next question on the list because it's asking for another department. You will either make a similar amendment or suggest that it is covered by your present amendment to Return No. 36. If you are suggesting that, can you or can the Department of Government Services suggest they did five ministers' offices and the cost for the five of them was X amount of dollars? Can they answer in that way so that we can say O.K., for the four ministers' office they did in this wing the cost was X amount of dollars. I believe from my past experience with government services they can answer it that way and then they can say O.K., for the three offices in this wing it cost us so much money to redo that wing. Well, when you do the whole second floor you, I assume, can suggest how many offices were in it and what the costs were. Maybe the Minister of Labour can get in and give us some information.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 37

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 37 showing:

The amount of money the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan has spent on (a) renovating (b) redecorating his office since March 1, 1979.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated in previous debates and I shall indicate it again here that I've given the statement with respect to the information as we think it is available. I cannot elaborate any further on that. I would say to the hon. member and the hon. members opposite that one way they could handle this is to withdraw these questions — the subsequent questions starting with No. 37 of this kind.

Our options, as a government are twofold. We could defeat it on the argument that what information is available, as it's been indicated to us, would be provided in the earlier return, if possible (although the ministerial suite matter is a different issue), or we could pass it. If we pass it our answer here would be nil, because as I said earlier, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan does not spend any money on renovating; it's the Minister of Government Services and that's covered in the amendment. So perhaps the members opposite could do us a favor — when these kinds get up, to withdraw. If not, as far as I am concerned, it doesn't matter whether we accept it or otherwise; there's no real relevance to the thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best situation here would be to defeat this motion and hope that on the subsequent ones the members will withdraw them.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 38

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 38 showing:

Whether Norcrush Inc. received any grants or loans from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 39

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for return No. 39 showing:

Whether Norcrush Inc. received any grants or loans from the Department of Highways. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 40

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 40 showing:

Whether Norcrush Inc. received any grants or loans from SEDCO. If so, the amount and purpose.

MR. ROMANOW: — I would simply like to have it on the record that the government has some concerns about the overall policy of answering questions of this nature, as they relate to SEDCO. I am not going to urge the defeat of this motion, but I do indicate that members on all sides, government and opposition, should contemplate the question of SEDCO — which in effect acts as a banker — revealing information that is pertinent to its dealings with business clients.

We have articulated on other occasions our concern on this. If you have some businesses and you are involved with SEDCO — and it cuts all ways whether you are in government or in opposition — I think a good question really has to be raised as to whether or not, as a principle, the banker should be obligated to provide those kinds of details. We have taken the position that this should be very jealously guarded, so with respect to this matter I would not want it to be read — I want to make this clear — as a precedent, that the government by agreeing to the passage of this particular matter is agreeing thereby to a new policy for SEDCO. We will reserve the right to take a position in future cases relating to SEDCO information as they should arise on the question of privilege. But I say on a general point, I think it is not a desirable direction to head and perhaps members could reconsider thrusts in this area.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't mind making a comment on this. I agree with the Attorney General that in banking procedures there are certain things you shouldn't know. If it is current business this is true, but in the case of SEDCO — many times we are referred to the Crown corporation of SEDCO, and as you know we can only get information on the year under review. Most of the time, or a good percentage of the time, the information we are trying to obtain from SEDCO is about an account which has become delinquent. We are not attempting to get into the business of the person who has borrowed the money from SEDCO. I just wanted to make this observation because lots of times we are referred to Crown corporations and this is the reason a question like this would come up in the House, not necessarily referring to this

question.

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the comments the Attorney General made. SEDCO, as I understand it, was structured as, and is, a lender of last resort. It is not a bank out in the market, competing for the type of business that other banks or other financial institutions compete for. Furthermore, SEDCO is handling taxpayers' funds, public funds, and when we ask for this kind of information I think it is very responsible on our part to do so, to know where and what loans and for what purpose they are being made.

I can't agree with the Attorney General at all in stating that it is a matter not in the public interest. I believe any time that the government, through a Crown corporation or any of the departments, is handling public funds, it is certainly a matter of public interest. Inasmuch as the Crown corporation of SEDCO is supposedly not competing for this kind of business, but is there only to accommodate when so needed, I don't think the Attorney General makes a case at all.

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Referring to the secrecy of some of the information with respect to SEDCO, I am concerned as to the types of questions and when the questions are asked with respect to certain clients within SEDCO. I don't think there is any doubt about it that if the questions were related to projects referring to SEDCO which are current and not bothersome to the point where the client is delinquent and what not that answer would be given. Because the questions are related to clients who are in trouble it is very difficult for SEDCO's information to be made public. Owing to the nature of the particular question it might jeopardize the position of that particular client and the enterprise which he is involved in. We are there to protect both the client and the enterprise which he is involved in. Therefore that is the problem. It is true that we refer you to the Crown corporations because at that point in time the people of the organization are there are we can give you more information on the year under review. But if you ask a particular question with reference to a client's involvement, that's his personal business.

I would ask the members opposite if a private banker is involved with an enterprise, if we have the right to go and ask the bank about a particular client he has and whether the bank will give you information?

I am sorry about that. I have never had the opportunity to go to a bank and ask the banker about my friend opposite, what business he is involved in and any particular interest in his business. But that is absolutely not true.

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, and the minister in charge of SEDCO, it seems to me that quite often SEDCO puts out news releases pertaining to grants and loans made to various business people throughout the province. I see no difference between them releasing information, than for the members on this side of the House, as duly elected members of this legislature, to ask for that information.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I think the point the Attorney General made is that this was not to be considered a precedent and that all circumstances, this particular information, would be given out. The point is there may indeed be circumstances where it's neither in the individual's interest (be it an individual or a company), nor in the public interest, for that kind of information to be provided because of timing or whatever.

With respect to the comments of the members opposite that you can go to a bank and

find out how x, y, z company owes to the bank, that's a bunch of baloney. There is no way I can walk into the Royal Bank and ask them how much x, y, z company owes them. There is just no way. That's the kind of question which is being asked here — the amount and the purpose. There is no banker who would give you the amount and the purpose of a loan that someone else has with the bank unless you had some direct interest and there was a reason why the banker should give it to you. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the government has indicated (as the Attorney General said), it is prepared to answer this question with the proviso which the Attorney General put on it.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, a question on this point and I think the member for Biggar has set it out, that is, sometimes we will give you the information; sometimes we wish to withhold the information. The big question becomes, who is to decide what is in the public interest and what is not in the public interest? That clearly becomes a question of the minister. That clearly is the whole basis of the argument of freedom of information. That is, the bill presently that was put before the parliament, was to have an information commissioner, not the government itself, and not the minister who made that judgment. That's what the freedom of information legislation is all about — is that person, whether in the classification of an ombudsman or somebody else, would make that decision and not the minister. Obviously the minister will make the decision when it is in his interest to do, like the minister said in his press release. When it is not in your interest to do it then no information will be forthcoming and that is the whole basis of freedom of information.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 41

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 41 showing:

(1) Whether Doug Anguish was ever employed as the executive assistant to the Hon. Neil Byers, Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, and if so, the dates of his employment and termination. (2) Whether Mr. Doug Anguish was ever employed by another department, Crown corporation or agency, of the Government of Saskatchewan, and if so, the location, date and capacity. (3) Whether Mr. Doug Anguish has ever been the recipient of any contract, grant or loan from any department, Crown corporation or agency of the Government of Saskatchewan, and if so, its nature, the amount, the source and date.

MR. ROMANOW: — Again, I don't propose that the members of the Assembly defeat this motion, but I do simply want to indicate to the House that when the government is preparing its answer, particularly under part (3), we will not be interpreting 'contract grant' in such a wide basis as to indicate that a Sask Telephones contract for the provision of a telephone — which is a government agency perhaps in the minds of some. I don't suppose it is; it's a Crown corporation, it is not an agency — is the kind of thing that should be revealed. I don't think that's what's intended but it does point out, Mr. Speaker, almost universally the degree of imprecision with which the questions are phrased, and with which the government must struggle to produce an answer — also whether Doug Anguish was ever employed by any department, Crown agency, etc. In this case it so happens that by common knowledge we all perhaps know who the Doug Anguish referred to is, but when you go back to 1905 and the employment record of that, it could be a horrendous job just for this one person. I don't want it to be

interpreted as a precedent with respect to Mr. Anguish to urge the House to allow this motion to go through unamended, but that's the way all things can be handled with respect to all employees. I put that caveat on these and urge the members of the House to vote for this motion.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 42

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 42 showing:

Whether Ile X Construction of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan received any grants or loans from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 43

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 43 showing:

Whether Ile X Construction of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan received any grants or loans from the Department of Highways. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 44

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 44 showing:

Whether Ile X Construction of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan received any grants or loans from the SEDCO. If so, the amount and purpose.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again I want to attach the same caveat with respect to this respect on SEDCO information that I have with respect to order of the Assembly No. 40, dealt with earlier — that it is not to be viewed as a precedent. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in some quarters it has been said, I have heard, that the proposed PC federal bill on freedom of information would allow an information officer to decide, as opposed, to government, whether or not matters related to grants or loans from institutions such as SEDCO should be decided. That, Mr. Speaker, for those of you who may have read or heard of those arguments articulated elsewhere, is simply not true. That would mean that a commissioner of information under Canada's proposed law would be able to go to federal development bank, IDB, or the farm credit corporation and find out all the details. Why it would not be true also, Mr. Speaker, is that I could not even believe the PC government would be so duplicit as to allow people who deal with the government banking institutions to be at the mercy of politicians while protecting the chartered banks on the other show. Mr. Speaker, that proposition simply cannot be advanced. With that caveat, with those reasons, I wanted to state again the concern that I have on this as a principle. We will deal with it on a case-by-case basis. On this one I would urge

the Assembly to pass it.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that I'll put my caveat on this too. We've had comments from both sides of the House on so-called legislation which is somewhere, and I think it has very little relation to the subject we're talking about, so I'm going to be very tight on that from now on.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 45

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 45 showing:

Whether Bougie Construction Ltd. of Uranium City, Saskatchewan received any grants or loans from the Department of Highways. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 46

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 46 showing:

Whether Bougie Construction Ltd. of Uranium City, Saskatchewan received any grants or loans from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 47

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 47 showing:

Whether Bougie Construction Ltd. of Uranium City, Saskatchewan received any grants or loans from SEDCO. If so, the amount and purpose.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I attach the same caveat and observations which I have with respect to the previous orders on this request for information from SEDCO as well, but would urge the Assembly to approve the order in this instance.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 48

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 48 showing:

Whether Voyageur Transportation Corporation received any grants or loans from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 49

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 49 showing:

Whether Voyageur Transportation Corporation received any grants or loans from SEDCO. If so, the amount and purpose.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I again want to attach the same caveat on the principle with respect to this order for return No. 49 as I have on the others and treat this as an individual instance. In this case I urge the members of the House to pass the motion.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 50

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 50 showing:

Whether Voyageur Transportation Corporation received any grants or loans from the Department of Highways. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 51

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 51 showing:

Whether the Northland Development Corporation of Uranium City, Saskatchewan, received any grants or loans from the Department of Highways. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 52

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 52 showing:

Whether the Northland Development Corporation of Uranium City, Saskatchewan, received any grants or loans from SEDCO. If so, the amount and purpose.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on Return No. 52 I attach the same caveat about the matters related to informations pertaining to SEDCO as I have on the earlier orders dealt with today.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 53

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 53 showing:

Whether the Northland Development Corporation of Uranium City, Saskatchewan, received any grants or loans from the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. If so, the amount and purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 54

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 54 showing:

Whether Mr. Doug Anguish ever made representations to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan on behalf of any of the following: (a) Voyageur Transportation Corporation (b) Northland Development Corporation (c) Ile X Construction Inc. (d) Norcrush Inc. (e) Bougie Construction Ltd., and if so, the date and nature of the representation.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a brief amendment, seconded by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy), that the following words be added after the word ‘representation’ in the last line:

and the result in each case.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 55

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 55 showing:

Whether Mr. Doug Anguish ever made representations to the Minister of Highways on behalf of any of the following: (a) Voyageur Transportation Corporation (b) Northland Development Corporation (c) Ile X Construction Inc. (d) Norcrush Inc. (e) Bougie Construction Ltd., and if so, the date and nature of the representation.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to move a brief amendment, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy), that the following words be added after the word “representation” in the last line”

and the result in each case.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 56

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 56 showing:

Whether Mr. Doug Anguish ever made representations to SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) on behalf of any of the following: (a) Voyageur Transportation Corporation (b) Northland Development Corporation (c) Ile X Construction Inc. (d) Norcrush Inc. (e) Bougie Construction Ltd., and if so, the date and nature of the representation.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to this motion, I would also like to make a brief amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) that the following words be added after the word “representation” in the last line:

and the results in each case.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — I’d like to make a couple of comments here I think we’re going to do our very best to answer these questions, but one of the difficulties obviously is whether or not any individual — pick any you want — has ever made representations to some body or individual. What does one mean by representations? I suppose if you were walking by them in the street and a guy said, hey, I hear somebody is trying to get a loan. I hope you’ve give him a good hearing. Is that a representation or something more formal than that? Obviously we can only deal with things that we have some record of, and it is very difficult in this kind of a broad question to get the answers. We’ll do our best and give all the information that we have.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 57

MR. J. W. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for return No. 56 showing:

Whether any of the following people reside in property owned by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation: (1) Robert Bouvier, Beauval, Saskatchewan; (2) Ron Anderson, P.O. Box 1557, Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan; (3) Roger Sicotte, P.O. Box 153, Buffalo Narrows, Saskatchewan; (4) Eugene Hood, P.O. Box 24, Beauval, Saskatchewan; (5) Gilbert M. McKay, P.O. Box 62, Green Lake, Saskatchewan; (6) Louis Regan, P.O. Box 117, Green Lake, Saskatchewan; (7) Ted Ratt, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan; (8) Ken Pederson, Buffalo Narrows, Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 58

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Souris-

Cannington (Mr. Berntson) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 58 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 59

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 59 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Continuing Education on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 60

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 60 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Social Services on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Some members may argue that being in this Chamber is a gamble. I think we should not formalize it regardless of the amount of the sum by placing bets in the Chamber. It lowers the decorum. Wise or unwise . . .

Motion agreed.

Return No. 61

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 61 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Premier on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who

accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 62

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 62 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Attorney General on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 63

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 63 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Mineral Resources on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 64

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 64 showing:

- (1) Between March 1, 1979 and March 10, 1980, the methods used for purchasing furniture, equipment and appurtenances or other articles for Government of Saskatchewan offices. (2) Where purchases were made in bulk, whether tenders were called, and (a) if not, cases in which they were not called (b) if so, whether they were by public advertisement or by invitation and if by invitation, how the names were supplied.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 65

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 65 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 66

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 66 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 67

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 67 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Telephones on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 68

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 68 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Return No. 100

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 100 showing:

The amount of money spend by the Minister of Urban Affairs on (1) renovating (b) redecorating his office since March 1, 1979.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 69

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 69 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Culture and Youth on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 70

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 70 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Health on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 71

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 71 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Rural) on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 72

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 72 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Consumer Affairs on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 73

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 73 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 74

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 74 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Finance on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 75

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 75 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Provincial Secretary on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 76

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 76 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Highways and Transportation on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 77

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 77 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Agriculture on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 78

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 78 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of the Environment on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 79

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 79 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Government Services on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each

instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 80

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 80 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Labour on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 81

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 81 showing:

Since March 1, 1979 the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban) on official Government of Saskatchewan business. In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the names of the people who accompanied him at government expense, and in each instance the total cost of the trip (including airfares, hotels, meals, etc.).

Motion agreed.

Return No. 82

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 82 showing:

As of March 10, 1980 the name, salary range and function of each member of the staff of the Executive Council of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 83

MR. D. G. Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) than an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 83 showing:

The amount of money spent by the Minister of Consumer Affairs on: (1) renovating (b) redecorating his office since March 1, 1979.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member wasn't in the House at the time I made my remarks with respect to the first one of this kind of question. I think it was item no. 4 on today's order paper. I made an amendment to no. 4 the effect of which was to describe the project and the project cost for the entire legislature. The other observation I made was the way the question is worded, even if we could answer it, we can't answer it because the questions all asked how much money was spent by consumer affairs and the next ones, Attorney General and agriculture. I spent no money on my office. I'm simply saying that what we ought to do here is to defeat the motion because it's a meaningless question. I'm advised, so far as is possible, it has been covered basically by the earlier amendment.

MR. KATZMAN: — The Attorney General indicates that the first motion, and I believe he refers to item 4, which was moved by the member for Moosomin earlier today will cover the situation in this case. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if that's totally correct. If I remember your motion said all money spent by the government services within the Legislative Building, If I remember on this list of question that we are going to see later on, there are some minister's offices that are not within this building. And his motion strictly was within the Legislative Assembly rather than within the Department of Government services spending on minister's offices. Would he be prepared to make an amendment or suggest an amendment to cover all offices? Then we would just include the 51 right through to I believe it would be about 60 which are not in the Legislative Building. His first motion indicated only for the Legislative Building and I put that question to the minister; maybe he can respond if that will solve the problem.

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, the member is in a difficult position; he can't respond because he has already spoken once in the debate. I think I can shed some light on this. I believe there is only one minister, the Minister of Education, who is not in the building. What I would suggest the members do, is for the building he is in — 2220 College Avenue — that you ask a question for that building in a similar manner to the amendment the Attorney General made and you will pick up this member. I think the problem with these questions is that as they are worded, the answer to all of them I believe is nil. My office spends nothing whether it is renovated or not; it is all done through government services and I think the amendment takes care of that. I think that perhaps was an oversight on our part but in order to look after that particular problem another question or order for return along those lines of the other one with respect to that building at 2220 College would look after that particular problem.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in this House must realize the purpose of these questions that I have been submitting is to find out information and I will continue to do this. However, if they are in the wrong form, that is another matter. As far as the Attorney General wondering if I was in my seat or not, I most certainly was in my seat and have been all day today. I was not here yesterday and the reason I didn't rise on it was I wanted to see if you were following the blues. What I will do is, I will withdraw these to 101 and will be submitting them in another form.

MR. SPEAKER: — The question before the House is on Return No. 83. Is he withdrawing it?

MR. TAYLOR: — Withdrawing that and withdrawing the subsequent questions of the same nature, Mr. Speaker, right through to Item No. 69, Return No. 101.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think I will deal with it in two parts. The member has asked leave to withdraw the item which is before us, notice for motion for return.

Returns No. 83 to 101 inclusive withdrawn.

Return No. 102

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 102 showing:

Whether Jean Paul Bougie of Box 218, Uranium City, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again I'll be urging the members of the House to pass this request for order for return. I would like to tender one relatively small amendment which would allow the government to put a date line, a benchmark, on this. The amendment I would like to tender in a moment is that we date it to April 1, 1977. Accordingly, if the amendment would be adopted, it would be whether Jean Paul Bougie has been employed since April 1, 1977 by the government, etc. as it goes. I'll be doing that for the balance as well — it puts a date line on it. So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Secretary, the member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley), that the word "ever" be deleted, and that the following words be added after the word "agencies" in the third line:

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 103

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 103 showing:

Whether Ted Ratt of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) that the word "ever" be deleted and the following words be added after the words "agencies" in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 104

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 104 showing:

Whether Louis Regan of P.O. Box 117, Green Lake, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 105

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 105 showing:

Whether Gilbert M. McKay of P.O. Box 62, Green Lake, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 106

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 106 showing:

Whether Eugene Hood of P. O. Box 24, Beauval, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. A.W. ENGEL (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose my first name and the member’s last name confused you a little bit. It’s a pleasure today to introduce a class of Grade 11 and Grade 12 students to you., Mr. Speaker, from Rockglen. They are accompanied by their teachers, Ted Scharman, and their bus driver, (I thought he was there; yes, he’s there Lyle Lamontagne. They are touring the building — a similar group was in earlier that’s sponsored by the co-ops and they again have a co-op sponsor with them I’m sure their tour is going to be informational and educational. Today is private members’ day and we’re dealing with questions as you’ll see in the next few minutes. I’ll meet with them later on the day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate resumed on Return No. 106

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 107

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 107 showing:

Whether Roger Sicotte of P.O. Box 153, Buffalo Narrows, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 108

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 108 showing:

Whether Ron Anderson of P.O. Box 1557, Meadow Lake, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 109

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 109 showing:

Whether Robert Bouvier of Beauval, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 110

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 110 showing:

Whether William Armstrong of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 111

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 111 showing:

Whether Max Morin of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 112

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 112 showing:

Whether Jim Favel of Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 113

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 113 showing:

Whether Louise Tanton of Box 87, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 114

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 114 showing:

Whether M. De La Gorgendiere of 400-337-25th St. East, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 115

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 115 showing:

Whether James Johnson of Uranium City, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 116

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of Assembly do issue for Return No. 116 showing:

Whether Leonard Larson of La Loche, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 117

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 117 showing:

Whether Larry Fiss of Uranium City, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the word “ever” be deleted and the following words be added after the words “agencies” in the third line.

since April 1, 1977.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — I’d like to amend the amendment or offer a subamendment, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter):

that 1977 in the amendment be deleted and 1960 be substituted therefore.

MR. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — I intend to vote against this motion. The members must realize that the question with respect to this is, “was ever employed by the government of Saskatchewan or its agencies”. Going back 20 years with temporary employees, casual employees, changes of departments from DNR and DNS — I think the members must realize that going back that far with respect to such a broad sweeping question as this in terms of employment in the government or its agencies is extremely difficult if not impossible. It means every single government department, every single government agency, would have to search its records with respect to casual, temporary and permanent employees and contract employees, presumably all the way back for 20 years. And if you think of an agency the size of the Department of Health and how many people have likely worked in the Department of Health over a 20-year period, it would number in the tens of thousands with the changes that take place. For the member to ask this question, I think, is totally unreasonable; to go back three years is a large enough job in itself. I think the members would be irresponsible and misusing public funds in the worst way possible if they passed this subamendment. So I urge the members to vote against it.

Subamendment negatived.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 118

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 118 showing:

Whether Douglas Anguish of 1348 Grey Street, Regina, Saskatchewan, was ever employed by the Government of Saskatchewan or its agencies, and if so, the dates of his employment, salary, position and department.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I think an argument could be advanced that this question is covered by Item No. 9, Order for Assembly No. 41. I think it really is unnecessary. This will require a lot of work as it is. I think the words of the Provincial Secretary on the previous motions were words very well spoken indeed. I just simply think if we were denying this information which we’re not — it’s been covered in item 9 — we would pass this. Under the circumstances, I think it’s not necessary to essentially

pass the same thing twice. So again for cleanliness in this thing, I would suggest we defeat this motion.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 24

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 24 showing:

The complete file from the Department of Highways or highway traffic board on Mr. Randy Wangler of Wilkie, Saskatchewan, Driver's Licence number 09755281.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to call on all members of the House to turn down item 87, Return No. 24. Note what the return asks. It asks for the complete file, which is in the hands of the highway traffic board, of one Mr. Randy Wangler. The licence number is listed. I think this would be a very unfortunate and dangerous precedent, to say the least, for the legislature to adopt an order to deliver the complete file of an individual from the highway traffic board over to the Legislative Assembly and thus to the public property. My point can be made by striking out the words "Mr. Randy Wangler" and put in the name of Mr. Jim Garner of Wilkie, Saskatchewan. Or if you will, strike out the name Jim Garner and put in the name of Mr. Bob Larter or Roy Romanow.

I think this is a practice which really we have never permitted in the situation with respect to Saskatchewan, and I think we ought not to permit it in the future. I think our position here is very clear. People who come before highway traffic boards, very often, are there for disciplinary reasons or for driver testing reasons, for medical reasons. There are files which relate to people who are senior citizens, who have examinations which need to be taken in and viewed. Is the precedent such, if we passed this, that we would now leave vulnerable every person — senior citizen included — who might have his medical record, which he has heretofore felt should be dealt with in confidence by the highway traffic board, made public and a subject of public debate? I frankly think that would be doing a gross disservice, not only to Mr. Randy Wangler in this particular case, but a gross disservice to the people of Saskatchewan and to those who have confidence that matters, which are submitted in confidentiality to the highway traffic board, will remain confident on that basis.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we all are familiar with what the hon. member for Wilkie believes to be the case here. I don't think that is the proper course to follow. I think if an administrative tribunal should want to be reviewed, there are avenues for doing this. The ombudsman, as an independent agent of the Legislative Assembly, might be asked to view the individual file of Mr. Wangler or somebody else and have a report forwarded, which report might very well become fully open and knowledgeable. That's another mechanism which is open I think the position of the PCs here is regrettable to say the least, Mr. Speaker, because it in effect indicates that no longer are drivers' licence files, as the policy of the PC Party apparently, to be viewed confidentially. They can place an order on the question paper related to virtually anybody's driver's licence on this side of the House or the other side of the House or who is in the province of Saskatchewan. That's the principle we are debating here. I think that is carrying freedom of information to its ridiculous extremes if I may put it bluntly. That's not freedom of information, that's an invasion of

privacy. That is a setting about of a snooping — of an SS-like police force state to view these matters and individuals.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite may very well have not known what he was getting into here. I hope he would perhaps realize the question has too many consequences to it. I ask him and all the members opposite to defeat the question. May I say before I sit down, on this particular question, that in some quarters we hear about freedom of information and this is relevant because those who argue freedom of information always fail to argue the other side of the coin —the right to privacy. For every mechanism which opens up the opportunity for people to find out information on Mr. Randy Wangler or Mr. Speaker, John Brockelbank, or whoever it is in the House, there is the concurrent legal responsibility of the rights to privacy. They are always simply stressed in the open, in the broad.

I say that is an undesirable way to go. I really invite the PCs to reconsider what they're doing here. On the Randy Wangler situation, the matter is being reviewed by the highway traffic board and the minister. I'm sure some further announcements are to be made in the near future. But as a principle on this thing, members of the House should defeat this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — I think perhaps the Attorney General tried to twist the question of the member for Wilkie. The member for Wilkie, as everyone knows, has been fighting very vigorously for this young man — without an arm, without a limb — who has been denied the right to have a vehicle licence to make a livelihood. I think the question the member perhaps would suffix to his request is that it is young Wangler who requested that he find this information for him. Clearly, nobody is suggesting we should have the right to obtain information. When the Attorney General referred to freedom of information —the bill that is presently or is about to be advanced before this House — it of course was turned down; but it just today has been published. I wish to read this in response to the Attorney General and that relates to section 30.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member is getting in to an area which I cannot permit. If the member is going to relate it directly to this and it's not discussing something on the order paper, he can go ahead.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, it's clearly in reply to the Attorney General and to state the position of the PC Party as it relates to freedom of information and as it relates to the giving of information on personal matters. There are various things we propose should not be made public and to spell it out in clear detail, section 30 would read as follows:

An agency (and agency means any agency of government) shall refuse to disclose a record, the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy of an individual which is unwarranted by the public interest to be served by that disclosure; private letter and writings which are donated or delivered to the Saskatchewan Archives Board, provincial library, except in accordance with the terms and conditions of which those letters are donated or delivered; a record of correspondence of a minister and the agency with the person which reveals the identity of that person or which the agency or minister would be entitled to refuse disclosure under the provisions of this act.

Now, this act clearly sets out our position and under freedom of information we would

simply propose that if the government information be provided, one of the exemptions, one of the key and most important exemptions is of personal property. In fact, that's a reverse of freedom of information which basically says you must protect on the one hand the privacy of that information, yet on the other hand be able to provide the information that the government holds so secret.

Now I think the member for Wilkie is clearly saying and I think could adjust his motion or his request to say that with the consent of Mr. Wangler, which he has, he would be prepared to provide that consent of Mr. Wangle that the information should be delivered to Mr. Garner prior to the department or prior to any department giving it. Now that is the matter — income tax does that and various other people do that before that information from government can be given. I think the member for Wilkie is not professing to make anything further of this than to advance that information so that he can better fight for the cause of the young man at Wilkie. Maybe in the end the young man can get a licence so that he can go out and earn a livelihood and not be prevented from doing that simply because of the fact that the man is handicapped by accident, this type of thing. I have other things to say on this and I would beg leave to adjourn debate on this matter.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 25

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 24 showing:

A copy of operating authority or letter of intent from Highway Traffic Board for Voyageur Transport.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 26

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 26 showing:

Copies of all tenders and contracts let by any department, Crown corporation or agency of the Government of Saskatchewan to the following: (1) Northland Development Corporation; (2) Bougie Construction Ltd.; (3) Ile X Construction Inc.; (4) Norcrush Inc.; (5) Voyageur Transportation Corp.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'll be proposing a brief amendment which is consistent with past decisions of this Assembly on the question, particularly as I understand it, of releasing of copies of contracts. And I think it may also be, although it's not a uniform policy with respect to copies of tenders, but certainly with respect to contracts I am advised that the policy has been not to reveal these. Accordingly, I would move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley), that the word "copies" after the word "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

the number and purpose

So, it will read 'the number and purpose of all tenders and contracts let by.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 27

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 27 showing:

1. The number of square feet of building space that was (a) owned (b) rented, by all departments and Crown corporations of the Government of Saskatchewan, as of March 10, 1980.
2. The amount of space owned that is not occupied.
3. The monthly rental rate and location of the rented space not occupied.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'll be tendering an amendment to this. I think it should still provide much of the information the opposition wants in this area but tries to set a bench mark for a date, namely March 1 rather than March 10 as the proposed order is worded and a few other wording changes. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that all the words after 'showing' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

1. The number of square metres of building spaces that was (a) owned (b) rented by all departments and Crown corporations of the Government of Saskatchewan, as of March 1, 1980.
2. The amount of space owned by location that is not occupied, the date of last occupancy, the reason for the vacancy and the expected future use.
3. The amount of space leased by location that is not occupied, date of last occupancy, the reason for the vacancy and the expected future use.

MR. TAYLOR: — There is one area here that was omitted and that is the rental rate of these leased areas. There is no mention of that. Could that be included?

MR. KATZMAN: — The member for Indian Head-Wolseley put a question to the mover of the amendment. I would ask would he accept our putting forth an amendment asking for the rental rates as well as the information which he left out in his amendment? He's indicated the change in date; that's acceptable. But he's left off the monthly rental rate in his amendment. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, in a minute I'll have a motion for you — an amendment for the amendment.

I move, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) that the amendment be amended by adding the words:

the monthly rental rate for each thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: — We are dealing with the amendment to which a subamendment has been offered. Moved by the member for Rosthern, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington that the amendment be amended by adding, 'the monthly rental rate of each' thereto.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 28

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 28 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979, the amount of money each minister including the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, spent on entertainment such as receptions, banquets, dinners, luncheons and any other form of official entertainment that was paid for by the Government of Saskatchewan. (2) The manner in which this money was spent, the dates and the purpose.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 29

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 29 showing:

(1) The occasions when a cabinet minister employed or otherwise arranged for the services of a free lance or contract speech writer or speech writer of any kind. (2) In each case (a) minister, (b) fee, (c) occasion of the speech and location made, (d) writer. (3) Total cost to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for all speeches mentioned in part 1.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make a big deal out of it but I do want to again simply point out the difficulty which many of these questions present to the government. Take for example, the one we are dealing with — proposed Order for Return No. 29. We are asked to give to the House, the occasions when a cabinet minister employed or otherwise arranged (whatever those words, otherwise arranged, mean) for the services of a free lance or contract speech writer (whatever the differences are between free lance or contract speech writer) or, get these words, Mr. Speaker, speech writer of any kind. Now I don't know what the opposition means there but maybe they are judging my speeches as the hon. member for Indian head says. I hope he is not judging my speech by using his standard of speeches in this regard. But you see the difficulty that's there. In each case the fee, the occasion, the location, the writer, the total cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us think rationally and calmly about that question for a moment. I think I must have 10 speaking engagements a week on the average — I'm sure of it — at openings or any kind of government function. When I ask my executive assistant to prepare me a little note as to what I should say about the particular opening I don't know whether or not that is 'a speech writer of any kind.' I can tell you one thing for sure, I do not know all of the occasions at which I may have uttered something or other which can be classified as a speech or otherwise. Furthermore, I am obligated by this order for return, if it passes unamended, to go back to 1905 and check to see what all the cabinet ministers from 1905 on did with respect to these speech writers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite can say they didn't intend that. It can be said about a previous debate which some may have heard about, we didn't intend that about

Mr. Randy Wangler but these are questions which are asked precisely for a purpose. Just to find out information, mind you. They are not looking for anything, it is just finding out information. So, what I am going to do is go all the way back to find out what speech writer of any kind has assisted me. The second point I would like to make (the first point being the obvious convoluted, misdirected nature of almost all of these questions necessitating, we will see when they are tabled, in volumes of work) is that I will not want to be bound by speech writer of any kind. I'm hoping that the hon. members opposite don't mean those words literally because if they mean those words literally we have no other option but to defeat this motion, Mr. Speaker. Because I don't know how one can describe the number of people who may have contributed to any kind of a speech, some being employees and some being free lance or contract employees. I'm assuming that what they really want is all of those many occasions where we have engaged high-powered, high-priced fee for service contract speech writers, which I can almost with certainly predict not to the members opposite will be zero. Nevertheless I am assuming that is what they want and I am also assuming, Mr. Speaker, that they won't take too much offense if I put a time limit on this, namely to April 1, 1979. I would be very interested in knowing (some day we should ask, I suppose it would be against the rules) who it is that they have hired, employed or otherwise arranged for the services of their free lance or contract speech writers or speech writers of any kind. I would be very interested in knowing who they are and what contractual arrangements they have made and when they have been written and just go down that. I invite the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley to use this test. I invite the press to use this test. Pick up 92 and say O.K. it is asked of the government. But let's turn it around and ask the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley to answer that question. If he can tell me in each case, the fee, the occasion, the location, the writer of the speeches he has made, I'll eat this book. He can't do it. It is ridiculous so. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Particularly when he ran as a political leader.

MR. ROMANOW: — And he ran as a political leader, he must have spoken all over the province. I don't have to date it to 1905; if I dated it to 1977 you can see the direction of this question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will notice what the government has done on these motions. Almost all of them have gone through with very little amendment. That is the policy we intend to follow wherever we can. But that is an example of the kind of hard-hitting, tough researching, pointed and direct opposition which this government is faced with today. Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't want to blame the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. Frankly, he is one of the better guys on that opposite side. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that somebody in the backrooms has whipped up all of these motions for them without thinking very much. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know it is not the member for Qu'Appelle because he would not be involved in this kind of an escapade. He has been around political circles too long and he's too wily to get into that kind of situation.

I do say to the hon. member for Indian Head, I don't blame him personally, I know they just drop these things in front of him; he signs them without thinking about it. That is the problem we have on this kind of occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the member for Indian Head treats my remarks in the spirit in which they are given — friendly advice, friendly co-operation, in my capacity as a friendly House Leader to the members of this Assembly, in my many years of great service to both government and opposition — great service, Mr. Speaker, if not consistent

service.

I am going to make one small amendment which will at least put a time line on this and limit it to April 1, 1979 which will be a massive task in itself. I say that quite seriously to the members opposite.

I would move, therefore, seconded by the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Cowley, that the following words be inserted after the word 'occasions' in the first line:

since April 1, 1979.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 119

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 119 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Department of Urban Affairs involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Department of Urban Affairs.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I will be urging the members of the House to adopt this one, however I do want to put a caveat into the record otherwise I would have to bring in an amendment. I suppose that is what I should do to be absolutely precise lest somebody somewhere down the road accuses me of apparently misleading them. There are a couple of aspects of this question which we will do our best to answer as fully as we can, wherever it is applicable. They may or may not be applicable, I don't know.

I note, particularly (e) actual result of the poll (whatever the words actual result mean). If there is a poll and there is a result of the poll, that result will be given and that is the interpretation that we intend to attach — the result of the question.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this will require a certain degree of interpretation of applicability. That question, with that understanding and perusal, short of redrafting it the way that we would want it drafted and clearly understood by the members opposite . . . I would suggest that the members adopt this motion.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 120

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 120 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 121

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 121 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Department of Social Services involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Department of Social Services.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 122

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 122 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 123

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 123 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject

matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 124

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 124 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 125

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 125 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Crown corporation involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Crown corporation.

Motion agreed.

Return No. 126

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley) moved, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 126 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the number of public opinion polls ordered, performed or commissioned by the Department of Rural Affairs involving the expenditure of public funds and, in each case the (a) name of the pollster, (b) amount of the fee involved, (c) date of the poll, (d) subject matter of the poll, (e) actual result of the poll, and (f) cost of the poll. (2) In the same period, the total cost of all polls involving public funds that were commissioned by the Department of Rural Affairs.

Motion agreed.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.