

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 1, 1980

EVENING SESSION

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 237 (continued)

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, prior to the 5 o'clock debate I was making a few comments on freedom of information and I just wish to add a couple of things and outline exactly what I perceive the freedom of information act would do and how it would speed up or expedite the matter that we presently have in the House today.

The present concept in Canada that we have in force is what is referred to as discretionary secrecy, which means the government of the day has the discretion to keep secret whatever information it wishes so as to protect its own partisan interests. That's basically the law as it sits today and this has come down by a law of custom, I suppose, as to any given rule. The government has that discretionary power of secrecy. As I mentioned before the supper hour, governments throughout many parts of the free world have started to recognize that this principle is wrong. Many of the European countries and the United States in a different way (we're not advocating the American system) have started to recognize that principle and address that problem.

The points I would wish to see in a freedom of information act are about four or five. Number one is a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I've interrupted the member for Kindersley before and I hesitate to interrupt him again, but his discussion of the matter before the House now doesn't in my view tie into the subject before us. It seems to me to be a very thinly veiled attempt to discuss something else and we can't allow the member to proceed on that basis. The member has to relate to the subject before us which is the total amount of money the government of Saskatchewan Crown corporations, or any other entity of the Government of Saskatchewan, has spent or loaned for uranium development since March 1, 1971. Now, I listened to the member carefully before 5 o'clock and since we began at 7 o'clock and I fail to get the connection, at least since we began at 7 o'clock, between the subject we're supposed to be discussing and what he's discussing, so I'll ask the member to get to the subject.

MR. ANDREW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will do that. I think when I mention the third point, which I am coming to very shortly the tie-in will come. As I said, number one is that we have to have a principle that . . .

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that the hon. member is not speaking to the motion; he is talking about freedom of information.

MR. SPEAKER: — The member for Kindersley sees the position I'm in; I have to direct the members to talk about the subject before us. I've just interrupted the member and I believe the Attorney General's point is well taken at this point. The member is not talking about the subject before us. I'll have to ask him to get to the subject.

MR. ANDREW: — I will attempt to. As I say, under the freedom of information and I will

be very short on this, there are six short points required in any freedom of information act. Number one is the concept that we have to acknowledge the right of open government. Number two is that there have to be certain exemptions . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is deliberately determining that he is going enunciate six principles which should be set up in a freedom of information act. That is exactly what he said. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, his remarks have failed to be in line with the subject matter which is the question of uranium development since March 1, 1971, and he does not follow your ruling that the remarks must be to the point to the debate of the issue. You have given him a couple of chances and he persists in talking about freedom of information.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Attorney General's point is well taken. If I have to interrupt the member for Kindersley once more because he is straying from the topic, I will recognize a new member. I will put it bluntly to him.

MR. ANDREW: — If I can perhaps elaborate, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General as he spoke in this debate made reference to many of the questions asked, or the broad range of the question asked in the motion presently before the House. How could it apply to let's say, this particular piece of paper or this jotting, this musing, this little memo, this book, or how we do it to the highways, or that, or to the next ting? Now that was one of the reasons he was advancing as to why he should not support the motion — it was all encompassing.

I come to a third point I wish to talk about, that related to an indexing system. I would advocate the government set up an indexing system which would be published so members of the media, members of the opposition or members of various interest groups, have . . . Mention was made of a fishing trip and perhaps we are down to a fishing trip type situation in some cases. But if there was an index put out by the government, as is advanced in many freedom of information pieces of legislation, if there was a publication of some type of an indexing system, then the people, whoever they might be, who have or deserve or have the right to access of information, know what information is there. And having then known that there is a particular statement on uranium or something on gasohol, the people have the right to zero in and say, what is that document? What is that? Then we as an opposition and everybody else has the right to know what that is.

That is one thing, Mr. Speaker, which becomes important and as I say is the third step of any type of freedom of information.

Now, the Attorney General also makes mention of the fact that we are going to have bring in a wheelbarrow, with all these reams and reams of information. Again, I suggest that any proper freedom of information has to have a free charged for information. Now, it can't be an expensive fee; it has to be something that is reasonable.

MR. ROMANOW: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is your point of order?

MR. ROMANOW: — My point of order is the same point of order I have been rising on now for the third or fourth time. The hon. member (I have been listening very carefully) is attempting to outline his freedom of information speech by making a fourth point on what are the essentials of a freedom of information act. He says, specifically, that there

has to be a fee charged for the information. That may or may not be the case under a freedom on of information bill, I don't know. But how in the world the charging of a fee — those are the words upon which I interjected, Mr. Speaker — applies to a request for the total amount of money, I do not see.

I say the remarks are totally irrelevant to this particular address.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will recognize a new speaker.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, my deskmate moved a motion earlier today concerning the amount of money the Government of Saskatchewan, Crown corporations, or the entirely of the Government of Saskatchewan has spent or loaned for uranium development since March 1, '71. Just to make sure the Attorney General realizes I'm right on the motion, that's what I'm talking about. You don't need to point of order me to try to cut me off and call closure like you have been doing since we got here.

Mr. Speaker, given the uranium issue, the people of Saskatchewan should know the kind of money we have invested, loans, guarantees or whatever. That's what the motion is calling for, not a secretive government like the Attorney General likes to keep. He doesn't want to tell anybody about what's going on; that's just his business and his minister's business, not for the betterment of the people of Saskatchewan; not the people of Saskatchewan's concern, just his concern.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Be honest!

MR. KATZMAN: — The member from the back row yells be honest. It's about time your government got that way, not the members on this side. We always look for the fact; you don't want to give them. I would suggest you be quiet or you will always remember why you got left in the back row.

AN HON. MEMBER: — April Fool's Day!

MR. KATZMAN: — April Fool's Day, the Minister of Revenue suggests over the side. May I suggest the biggest fools sit on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, for several years now, the Government of Saskatchewan has been investing in partnerships and all other different styles of ventures with both private corporations and some Crown corporations federally. In fact, it's interesting to note there is a law in Canada that a certain portion of the industry must be Canadian owned. The federal government is involved; the provincial government is involved. As I have indicated many times before it's pretty tough to go into a hockey game with the opposition team wearing red sweaters and the referees wearing red sweaters and expect to get a fair refereed hockey game. That's the way the Attorney General likes to have it whenever he gets into debate; whenever he has any questions he has to have it all his way . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member for Saskatoon Centre who pretends he's a cabinet minister when he goes out to represent the other side of the House is chatting away. He's not concerned about the people in his own constituency who want to know the information of how much money is being loaned out for uranium, want to know how much there is in loan guarantees . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I wonder if we could return to a bit of decorum in the Chamber,

not have members shouting things across the Chamber which, if not unparliamentary, do break the spirit of good parliamentarians. I want to caution any members about doing that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, as you are aware in Saskatoon a short while ago there was a federal hearing on uranium, the refining of uranium and the possible proposed refinery in the Warman area. One of your own members from your side, one of your backbenchers spoke on this issue — so have I. I didn't see any of your gentlemen there concerned about the citizens of Saskatchewan and uranium. All we ever hear is the NDP want to get that holy dollar. The money is going to come, that's all they are interested in, not the safety of the people of Saskatchewan. So we're asking how much money have you loaned out to sell your soul? How much money have you spent trying to help sell your soul for the holy buck you are always after? Let's find out. Why are you scared, Mr. Minister, to allow the opposition to know the facts? Are you scared it's going prejudice your case? There was a movie (I think) on TV a short while ago. It was supposed to be hypothetical and if I remember correctly there was a hypothetical company (whose name seems to be very similar to company in this province called SEDCO) involved and the suggestion was that they weren't going to tell the public what was going on. Now, I'm not sure if that movie is totally correct or not. I may have my own personal feelings, as I indicated in a speech prior in this House, as to where I think the government is going.

Back to the uranium issue and the loans and the spending. The government has spent money (as a cabinet minister suggested earlier this morning) on roads and they have asked the uranium companies to pay part of the cost. Do we know if the uranium company paid all of the cost of building that road? Do we know if it was built for any other purpose? Was there an assessment charge, so much for uranium and so much for the opening up of the North? We don't know. We are asking that question. How will we ever find that out if the minister is not prepared to give us an answer.

One of the other ministers suggested earlier they cannot give us all the little slips and pieces of paper and every piece of information that crosses their desks. That wouldn't surprise me, that it is not all available, but I assume that you know where you have loaned big money. You know where you have spent money. It all has to be accounted for in public accounts or in some documentation somewhere therefore . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . they've got it all . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — So, the minister for DNS says, you've got it all. Well, Mr. Minister, you suggest we have it all. I'd like to get into a bit of information I have on one department here. I started comparing this evening — just a little bit of information. You might not realize what these are, Mr. Minister, but it is interesting to note that anything in the DNS jurisdiction is not printed in your information. I don't know where you hide it, so I would like to know where everything's going and where the money has been invested in the North. How much money has DNS put in? How much money have the Crown corporations put in? How much money have government investments put it? Where is all the money?

We hear about millions of dollars being spent — we are a partnership here, we took another 30-day option here, and we are going to buy back that six from the federal Crown corporation of Eldorado. We have watched you people move things. We watched you move them around in the budget which came down in a short while ago. It was suggested it was going to be a balanced budget. Several days later we hear about

increases in drivers' licence registrations to balance the budget. We want to know where the money is. We want to know where you're spending it and that is the duty of the opposition! If you go back in the parliamentary tradition you will find that was the job of the loyal opposition, to make sure where the money was spent. That is all we are doing. We are doing what we were elected to do. You are not giving the information and that is what you are supposed to do, not sit there and ignore the deeming of this House.

I see the other minister is back. Perhaps I should repeat a bit of what I said earlier for his benefit . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . he can read? Well I have my doubts about some of you on that side being able to do that; you have proved that in the past and we saw some of that displayed this morning when your memory lapse developed and you couldn't remember a TV camera was somewhere. I'm just worried you won't remember where you spend some of the money unless it's documented. You know, when you talk about a shoebox that developed in DNS several years ago, we don't know what you're doing with the money in uranium. We don't know where you're investing it. We don't know where you're spending it. Why won't you tell the House?

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's very easy to talk in the evening when you get the catcalls but then you must consider the source and remember that's a void so there is no sense answering it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, back to the topic of spending money and uranium and with this government they seem to go hand in hand. Mention the word uranium and they're out to spend some more money. They are paying all kinds of interest for money. They are taking money from the heritage fund, paying no interest. We saw that involved in the potash areas. Will they help home-owners with this money? Will they help the farmers who are being pressed with 17 per cent interest? No, they won't do that but they'll get out and spend it on uranium and they won't even tell us what they are spending it on. How much money did you invest? We don't know how much money you spent, for example in the Warman refinery hearings. We know of one amount that was announced — the government said it would assist one group in making its presentation and gave them X amount of dollars. Then we get into another issue. We hear the minister across the road yell, the Bayda hearings. Well, that's obviously money spent in uranium in the consideration of the member from the other side, the minister.

You know, Mr. Speaker, once again we have the minister responsible for DNS whose departments is in the roughest shape of all departments, I think, getting his nose into an issue when he shouldn't. Yesterday he wasn't willing to get on his feet and debate in the afternoon. The Attorney General had to come to his rescue all day. Now the Attorney General is quiet today. He's all worn out from defending you, Mr. Minister. Why aren't you up today defending him? No bail-out Roy was up all day for you so you better be quiet tonight.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Oh, you hurt me.

MR. KATZMAN: — You can't hurt something which doesn't have feelings and that's where you stand. Now back to the issue and the motion.

My seat mate has asked a very solid, substantial question: where is the money spent? How many loans? That's information. The Attorney General says, we don't have it back that far. But income tax laws require me to keep information back seven years before I can destroy it and then I have to ask permission. Is he suggesting you don't keep information back for at least seven years? They're government funds . . . (inaudible)

interjection) . . . Mr. Member for Regina Rosemont. I would love to touch that comment but I think it would be improper of me to mention that one on the radio.

We have seen over the past years since I was elected in 1975 a continual move of this government to spend money on uranium, spend money any way they so pleased and then say it's not in the public's interest to know. And, if I remember correctly, not in the public interest was a statement made by the former minister of SEDCO when we discussed the Warman refinery many years ago. That's not in the public interest seems to always be coming up from that side. We hear it in Crown corporations. We hear it in this House but you know, in public accounts (I was there one year, Mr. Speaker) the paid officials don't say it's not in public interest. They are willing to give the information in public accounts.

Why isn't the member for Saskatoon Riversdale willing to allow the opposition the information? What's he hiding? Have we got a secret government? Are they doing in the backroom something they don't want anybody to know about? I don't know what's going on. We don't know where our money is being spent. We have the right. Public accounts doesn't show it all because they move it a little bit. You wonder how much money was borrowed by Sask Tel and then loaned to the uranium outfit. We don't know. Do they do that or don't they? Some people say they do. We wonder how much was borrowed by Sask Power and then put into uranium under the Sask Mining. We don't know — does it show up anywhere. We're looking for that information. That's the job of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, to get the information, to make sure the public knows the facts. But as the member for Estevan says, they won't let us have it. It's just that simple.

The secret of government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you know the members from that side like to stand and wait at the opposition and make all kinds of statements. But what bothers the government on that side is the opposition is getting close to the facts and you people don't want them out. That's why you're blocking on the spending of money and the loans for uranium development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — We keep hearing figures being bandied about on the media of investments here and investments there. They want to publicize it all the time, Mr. Speaker. But when we ask for the information, there's no suggestion that they're going to give it to us. The member finds the littlest excuse, the tiniest excuse he can to blow it all out of proportion. He says there might have been a little note in one of the earlier motions or a verbal thing — oh, he always says it's not in the public interest. But he doesn't want to tell us. What's he scared of? Because we know the amount of money that was loaned to one company might jeopardize their position in the market? How can that jeopardize their position in the market if they happen to know what kind of money they were loaned? We didn't ask for the interest rate even so how can we be jeopardizing them?

The spending — maybe there you're scared, Mr. Minister, that we might discover that you're helping one little area of the industry, one company and not helping the other. Maybe we'll find you're playing favoritism on how you spend your money on uranium. If that's what you're worried about, I don't blame you for not allowing us the information because you're scared we're going to embarrass you. But if that's not your problem, Mr. Cabinet Minister, why won't you give us the facts? Is it a fact then, if you refuse us the facts, that you are admitting that there is something wrong back there and therefore the

opposition was not supposed to know about it. That's what you're indicating. You're scared that there are facts there that are going to embarrass you. Well, obviously, Mr. Minister, if you weren't scared of that, you would be willingly standing up and saying this is an open government, we'll give you anything you want to know. That's what you say every time there's a motion that you want to get credit for.

Earlier today, Mr. Minister, a comment made by the minister: we will be pleased to answer any responsible question on uranium. You suggested this afternoon you were willing to answer questions on uranium and then you moved down to this topic which was uranium — now you don't 'want to let it out. Mr. Minister obviously we must assume on this side the reason you won't tell us is that you played the game unfairly and you don't want anybody to know the way you've been playing the game.

Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible is going to sit on his . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . whatever.

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, over the years, SMDC has been getting involved in more and more joint ventures in the North. I think last report there was something like 245 ventures in the uranium industry, despite all the warnings that have been projected to the government's side. I think one of the most recent was the Financial Post seminar held at Saskatoon which the Premier, the Minister of Mineral Resources and the Attorney General attended, and at which they all spoke. It came out loud and clear through every speaker, every expert on uranium (and they were from all parts of the world — not only from Canada — from Great Britain, and I think from other places) that the uranium industry was facing a downturn in the '80s. In spite of all of these warnings, the government has still proceeded with taxpayers' money on a risk venture and no one knows where it's going to end up. I think this is probably one of the reasons for this motion. I think the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know how much money has been spent on uranium mining since 1971. It's a risk venture that should not have been taken by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

It should have been a venture the private sector handled if it truly is a risk venture. It has been proven that Australia in the mid '80s is coming on stream with enough uranium to match the world sales or uranium today. They are coming on stream in the mid 80s right about the time Saskatchewan will come on stream with its first uranium mine. I'm saying this government has embarked on a risk venture with taxpayers' money that has been proven by experts to be the wrong direction. Because of their philosophy and what they believe in (that government should control everything) they are going on this venture, in spite of all the warnings, in spite of all the experts that are warning them we are into a soft market on uranium until the 1980s . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

That's all right. If you want to get on the potash warnings, the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake has mentioned the potash warnings . . . I can tell you, Mr. Minister, if the people of Saskatchewan had their money invested in other than the potash mines — you've shown something like in four years, \$132 million profit; in those same four years, if you had been drawing interest on the interest free money you were using you'd have picked up \$193 million, and don't you forget that. You're into a venture in which we could have had more money if you had stayed out of it. We had that money in spite of you.

So I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, this government is into this uranium venture. They know it's a high-risk venture. They are afraid to talk about it in their constituencies.

They know it's wrong. They are in it with taxpayers' money. Mr. Speaker, I think if these members opposite don't support this motion, then they are saying gungho on taxpayers' money on this high-risk venture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J.A. HAMMERSMITH (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the member for Rosthern for the statesmanlike way he welcomed me to this debate. I am always impressed by the statesmanlike qualities projected by that member.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this particular motion, the incredible positions taken by the members opposite, telling this House (and I assume that they are asking us to take them seriously) that out of a total of 200 motions accepted, the third one rejected — 200 to 3 — that's an indication the government is unwilling to provide information. They will only answer 200 questions out of 203. What a preposterous position on the part of the government!

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, not one word on 200 motions accepted but a two-hour or more harangue on the third motion objected to. It is a typical hunt for a headline on the part of the members opposite. They still haven't accepted the fact their former leader, from his holiday in Arizona, can still attract greater attention in the press than the sad performance by the members opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Unless there is uranium in Arizona I am going to declare you out of order.

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I agree, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize.

I want to say, the members opposite continue to refuse to give the specifics of what information they want. It is not unlike their unwillingness to debate the specifics on other matters. They have provided no evidence of any sincere, honest attempt at even one iota of superficial research. They haven't done enough research to ask one specific question on what is admittedly an extremely important issue. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a sad performance by the members opposite.

I think it is important in examining the childishness and the shallowness and the emptiness of this motion to take one example, just one example, of what the members opposite ask.

They ask for information back to 1971 on all expenditures on uranium. I want to relate to this House the various branches in one department of government, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, which may from time to time be involved in a meeting, writing a letter, making a loan, in having something to do in relation to uranium. The personnel and training branch may be training and placing people with regard to uranium. They would have us go through that branch and determine what part of each letter, typed by each secretary, may have had something to do with uranium. What proportion of that person's time, what proportion of that person's salary, went into that paragraph and that letter and add that on to the total? The member for Regina South said yes, if it has to do with uranium, we want it added into the total.

The extension services branch, producing a radio program called The Northern News doing interviews throughout the North, producing a magazine, will have various

percentages of various people's time which may, in one way or another, relate to uranium. The member for Regina South says yes, find that out and you have to roll that into the total expenditure for uranium.

The health services branch may have one of its many people at any given time of any day talking with somebody about uranium (the opposition says, yes, that has to do with uranium, that's a government expenditure, roll it in, find it out); social services branch the education branch; continuing education branch offering training programs where someone might be training as a heavy equipment operator, and some of the training will relate to building a road to a uranium mine. The member for Regina South says we need to know how much of that instructor's time, how much of the secretary's time, how much of the finance and administration branch's time, how much of each person's time relates to that 5 per cent of the training program that's an expenditure on uranium development.

The economic development branch may make a loan to a company or an individual to purchase a crawler tractor. Sometime during the life of the tractor, it may do some work related to uranium and therefore we need to go through the entire economic development branch — every worker, every secretary, every accountant — and find out what little percentage of their time relates to the small percentage of expenditure from the loan which related to uranium development. We have to go back not only through the existing employees in the department, but back to 1972 when the department was created. Then we have to go back into 1971, before there was a Department of Northern Saskatchewan, take it employee by employee, fraction of time by fraction of time and determine whether or not any time worked was in some way related to uranium development. If we don't do that, according to this motion, we'll be accused of misleading the House. If some secretary, in 1972, typed a half of letter that related to uranium development and somehow it gets missed in the preparation of the answer to this question, that will be sufficient reason on the part of the members opposite to accuse the government of misleading the House of providing misinformation.

I say it is a question that is impossible to answer. It's question which indicates their shallowness and their laziness. It is, Mr. Speaker, a question that can be cast only in the category of complete irresponsibility and stupidity and the motion should be defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Mr. Speaker, can't I get back up?

MR. SPEAKER: — No, I'm sorry, you can't

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, I have a couple of things I forgot and I would like to ask him now. Can't I ask that question?

MR. SPEAKER: — Not while I'm here. Even if you do it nicely, I'm not going to let you do it.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 327

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 327 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the amount of money the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs has spent on advertising in the form of televisions advertisements, newspaper advertisements, radio advertisements, indoor and outdoor display advertisements, and promotional literature. (2) In each instance, when the advertising took place, the nature of the advertising, the person who authorized it, and the person who designed and planned the advertising. (3) The names and addresses of any advertising agencies that were commissioned or contracted to purchase or design advertising mentioned in parts (1) and (2), the date, and the cost.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be tendering an amendment to this motion because not to tender an amendment would leave it virtually non-understandable. I don't want to sound like a tired out, broken old record, but if one looks at item 91, Return No. 327 —again, I don't know to whom I'm directing this because obviously nobody on the opposite side is paying attention to this and I doubt very much if members of the media are paying very much attention to this. But, the fact of the matter is that if you take a look at the question and just contemplate for one moment what is being asked, one can see how clearly ill-thought out it is and how much of a fishing expedition is being embarked on by the members of the opposition.

Look at proposed Return No. 327, Mr. Speaker. They want to know since March 1, 1979 the amount of money the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs has spent on advertising (how do you interpret advertising, Mr. Speaker?) in the form of television advertisements, newspaper advertisements, radio advertisements, indoor and outdoor display advertisements, and promotional literature. Secondly, in each instance, when the advertising took place the nature of the advertising, (what is meant by that?) the person who authorized it and the person who designed and planned the advertising. Then it goes on to indicate other aspects.

Mr. Speaker, I think it will be clear from just a careful momentary glance at the question, that it is the kind of question which in its present form cannot be answered. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, before I make the amendment I want to indicate to the members of the House that this question repeated approximately 50 times which we are now about to embark on, will make it a very onerous task for the government to answer. In the case of intergovernmental affairs it may not be a very big answer. I don't think it is. But the next one, item 92, to use by way of example, will be onerous. I don't know how many notices the Department of Labour under labor standards acts or women's division bureaus or otherwise puts out. Take the next one, item 93, the liquor board one. Mr. Speaker, there is a statutory obligation by law on the liquor board to put out advertising notices on almost a daily basis with respect to the function of the liquor board. And while it is not specifically under governmental affairs that would be the case time and time again, over and over again on the statutory requirements of the departments for this answer to be fully completed.

I don't know when our officials can be expected to do the job. I don't know how long it will take. I'll be very interested in knowing how many man-hours or man-years depending on the measurement that will be used in this area, it will take to complete this kind of question. I don't know what kind of volumes of paper it will take even in the amendment form I've produced. But I say to this House one last time, there can be nothing more evident of the irresponsibility and the directionless approach of this opposition than is symbolized by item 91, proposed order for Return No. 327 multiplied 50 times over at taxpayers' cost in this Assembly and in the computation of that answer. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is indeed very, very unfortunate.

Well, we have to make do the best we can and we shall try to provide the answers as best as we can. Accordingly I will have to try to clean up the motion in order to put it in presentable form to at least make a stab at answering it. Therefore I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary with respect to item 91, proposed Return No. 327 that all the words after the words "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) From March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980 the total amount of money spent by the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs on advertising in the form of (a) television advertisements (b) newspaper advertisements (c) radio advertisements (d) indoor and outdoor display advertisements and (e) informational and promotional literature. (2) For each category a general description of the purpose of the advertising and the approximate time period for the advertising. (3) The title of the official who authorized the advertising. (4) Where the advertising was designed in house, the section of the department that did the design. (5) The names and addresses of any advertising agencies that purchased or designed advertising and the amount paid to each agency.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 328

MR. R. L. ANDREW (Kindersley) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 328 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the amount of money the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs has spent on advertising in the form of television advertisements, newspaper advertisements, radio advertisements, indoor and outdoor display advertisements, and promotional literature. (2) In each instance, when the advertising took place, the nature of the advertising, the person who authorized it, and the person who designed and planned the advertising. (3) The names and addresses of any advertising agencies that were commissioned or contracted to purchase or design advertising mentioned in parts (1) and (2), the date, and the cost.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Item No. 92, proposed Return No. 328 I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that all the words after the word showing be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) From March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980 the total amount of money spent by the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs on advertising in the form of (a) television advertisements (b) newspaper advertisements (c) radio advertisements (d) indoor and outdoor display advertisements and (e) informational and promotional literature. (2) For each category a general description of the purpose of the advertising and the approximate time period for the advertising. (3) The title of the official who authorized the advertising. (4) Where the advertising was designed in house, the section of the department that did the design. (5) The names and addresses of any advertising agencies that purchased or designed advertising and the amount paid to each agency.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 329

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I intend to move this but prior to speaking on this particular motion, it is my intention to try to expedite the operation of this House. I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when I introduce these questions I was under the impression, and I think rightly so, that it was a written question you produced. When you put a written question before the Assembly you are required to deal with one year and one department. The written question once put will be answered, I believe, in 48 hours. I am clearly not an expert on the rule and stand to be corrected on that. Anyway, that's the reason I advanced the particular written question as was presented.

The government, of course, has the option to convert it into a motion. Now that's the procedure and to go through 80 of these I don't think accomplished a great deal if we simply go from one to the next. So what I'm prepared to do is to draw up each of the motions until the last one and then have the member for Souris-Cannington (if the House will spare us some time to prepare it) advance an amendment on that in keeping with the amendments advanced by the Attorney General for the other two questions. Being a motion now it can take in the year under review we're dealing with in each of the departments. We can simply vote it off as it goes from there. So having said that I'd be prepared to drop motion 329.

Motions 329 to 360 withdrawn.

Return No. 411

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley) moved, seconded by the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 411 showing:

(1) Since March 1, 1979 the amount of money the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs has spent on advertising in the form of television advertisements, newspaper advertisements, radio advertisements, indoor and outdoor display advertisements, and promotional literature. (2) In each

instance, when the advertising took place, the nature of the advertising, the person who authorized it, and the person who designed and planned the advertising. (3) The names and addresses of any advertising agencies that were commissioned or contracted to purchase or design advertising mentioned in parts (1) and (2), the date, and the cost.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I understand the Attorney General has some concern with the way these questions have been laid out, and so in the spirit of co-operation the Conservative Party is prepared to follow up on his suggestion and lump them all together so he can provide the answers with the greater ease he has indicated would result from that particular move.

I would, therefore, move an amendment to the resolution, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) that all the words after “showing” be deleted, and the following substituted therefore: I take this straight from the Attorney General’s amendment and apply it to all that were following.

From March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980 the total amount of money spent by all government departments, agencies, boards, and commission and Crown corporations of the province of Saskatchewan, except the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Department of Labour.

The reason for those exceptions, Mr. Speaker, is they were dealt with in previous motions:

on advertising in the form of (a) television advertisements, (b) newspaper advertisements, (c) radio advertisements, (d) indoor and outdoor display advertisements, and (e) informational and promotional literature. (2) For each category, a general description for the purpose of the advertising. (3) The title of the official who authorized the advertising. (4) Where the advertising was designed in House, the section of the department that did the design. (5) The names of addresses of any advertising agency that purchased or designed advertising and the amount paid to each agency.

I move, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) as soon as I finish writing it out.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make one of two brief points. First of all, the hon. member says he tenders this amendment in the spirit of co-operation and greater ease in answering. Now what I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that lumping all of the departments and agencies and Crown corporations together does not make the answering of the question any easier, with the possible exception that we don’t have to go 50 times to amend line by line, department by department, with this amendment.

But the remarks I made in the previous debate are just as valid in this debate with this amendment. I repeat again that this amendment is always introduced to put in a manageable and understandable form such agencies as liquor board and highway traffic board. Just stop to consider those two, Mr. Speaker, where there are legal advertisements required by statute which those members opposite would have us review in detail and table. That obligation still remains unchanged Attorney General’s department — that obligation remains unchanged. Surely that was not what was intended by the opposition. Maybe it was. If it was, my comments of irresponsibility of

the highest order are still valid. My comments about the amount of work which needs to be done on the consolidated motion are still valid. My comments with respect to the hours of work and the material which is to be brought here is still valid. It is not to be indicated otherwise.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this does nothing to alleviate what is surely the highest area of irresponsibility in question-asking I have yet seen in the legislature . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, Mr. Chairman, the members opposite say we did the same thing. I would challenge them to show me where we did the same thing, but in any event, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to waste my breath on them because clearly they are not interested in that side of the matter. Accordingly, I think the amendment is O.K. I don't know what impact it will have, however, in the lumping together in this area. I would like to have some time to consider it. Therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 412

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 412 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are out-of-scope employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, this is a pick-up of a set of identical questions which were partly dealt with at last private members' day. Tuesday last, before the assigned order by Mr. Devine to the opposition member in which way they should tender their question was disrupted by the questions on advertising just recently dropped. Now they are recurring here again — the questions drafted by Mr. Devine and his staff in the opposition office. You will recall we tendered a series of amendments to these motions by Mr. Devine at the last session on Tuesday. I will be doing the same thing with respect to these amendments as well.

I indicated at that time to Mr. Devine . . .

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It's very clear to me and anyone who can read that these motions are on the order paper under the name of Mr. McLeod, the member for Meadow Lake and not Mr. Devine who is in no way able to have motions on this order paper.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. That's not a point of order. It's an interesting debating point but it's not a point of order.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I believe the record will show me as saying that these questions I allege were drafted by Mr. Devine. I acknowledge they have been placed by Mr. McLeod. I didn't know the members were so touchy about my accusation that Mr. Devine would be developing these questions. I would have hoped the hon. member who asked this question would have told Mr. Devine that last Tuesday when we asked a question about the Prairie Agricultural Machinery institute, the House unanimously turned down that question. Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, I explained to the

hon. member who asked the question last time, is a one-third, one-third, one-third corporation, independent of the government established on a tripartite, tri-province agreement between Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I would have thought the hon. member would have taken that information back to Mr. Devine and obtained the appropriate instructions to drop this particular item number 177. He apparently didn't get the message.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I must tell the member again, regretfully, since the government has no control or direct access over the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, this being an independent corporation, we have no other choice but to urge the members of the House to defeat the motion.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 413

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 413 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the provincial auditor's office. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are out-of-scope employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley), with respect to item no. 177 proposed Return No. 413 that all the words after the word "employees" in the first line be deleted and the following substitute therefor:

employed by the provincial auditor's office who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent out of scope and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 414

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 414 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Transport Agency of Saskatchewan. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are out-of-scope employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley), that all the words after the word "employees" in the first line be deleted and the followed substituted therefor:

employed by the Transportation Agency of Saskatchewan who were (a)

permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent out of scope and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item no. 179, proposed Return No. 415. I move . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the Attorney General is out of order there. The question before the House is on 414. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

MR. ROMANOW: — I tendered an amendment to 414. Have we not voted on that?

MR. SPEAKER: — I voted on the amendment but I haven't voted on the motion as amended. A fine technical point and we have to do that.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 415

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 415 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Department of Urban Affairs. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are "out-of-scope" employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, are we on 415 now? Thank you.

With respect to item 179, proposed Return 415, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley), that all the words after the word "employees" in the first line be deleted and the followed substituted therefor:

employed by the Department of Urban Affairs who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent "out of scope" and their names and positions.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, just a couple of remarks on the nature of the amendment. The only significant change, the only change that is made to the motion by this amendment is the fact that it will not give the names of the people on contract. It will give the number of the people on contract but not the names. If I can paraphrase some words of the Attorney General when he was sitting in the opposition, something to the effect that the government was a trustee, a trustee of public information, and this is getting a little away from the paraphrasing — but why you should guard it so jealously unless you have something to hide, is beyond me. Why will you not provide us with these contracts as was laid out in the original motion? This is a direct quote from the Attorney General on March 6, 1969.

(The Hon. Mr. R. Romanow, Saskatoon Riversdale, in response to the Minister of Agriculture who offered an amendment to a similar motion that was on the order paper by the then opposition — and soon to be again.) It seems to me

when members of this House ask for information pertaining to contractual arrangements, two of the most important aspects are to determine, first of all, who the parties of the transaction are and, secondly, the financial terms of repayment, or payment, respecting the particular involved.

He goes on to say:

In here, the amendment to me in effect attempts to do the following: hide (and there is no better word) it hides such vital information that we as legislators must know, for example, the name of the purchaser, the length of repayment with respect to any particular deals, etc., etc.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who said that?

MR. BERNTSON: — The Hon. Roy Romanow, Saskatoon Riversdale, when he was in opposition.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment is simply to remove that portion of the information we want that the same Attorney General criticized the government of that day so very, very seriously for, I think it is a shameful display that is put on the Attorney General, today.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 416

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 416 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Wascana Centre Authority. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, again the opposition has displayed its incredible incompetence and naiveté by the introduction of this motion dealing with an independent body like the Wascana Centre Authority. This, as members have already been advised on a number of occasions in oral question period and otherwise, is not a direct agency of the government. It is a tripartite involvement with the University of Regina, the city of Regina and the Government of Saskatchewan, parallel to the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute. Accordingly, I would urge the members to defeat the motion.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 417

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 417 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the workers' compensation board. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are "out-of-scope" employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I advocated last Tuesday and adopted by the members unanimously last Tuesday, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley), with respect to item 181, proposed order for return 417, that all of the words after the word "employees" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Employed by the workers' compensation board, who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent "out of scope" and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 418

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 418 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the potash corporation. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are "out-of-scope" employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, this is a slightly different amendment, but identical to the one introduced last Tuesday and passed unanimously by all the members of the House. I would, accordingly, move with respect to item 182, proposed return for 418, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley), that all the words after the word "showing" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

(1) As at March 1, 1980, what was the total number of employees of the potash corporation. (2) How many were permanent. (3) How many were non permanent. (4) How many were out-of scope.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am amending this as to form because the amendment says "how many" and the form in which the amendment appears should be "the number that." So, I have made that minor amendment.

Amendment agreed.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, the NDP for the last little while has put out information, supposedly on the number of civil servants. Of course it is in their interest to reduce the number or keep to a minimum the information given to the public to show they in fact have the number of civil servants under control. We all know the reason the NDP don't want to give the information as to the number of employees is that it will put

the lie to all their advertising and will in fact show that if we include the Crown corporations and the agencies the number of civil servants would probably exceed 40,000 in the province of Saskatchewan — well over double what the government is attempting to portray.

I was a little surprised quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, to see the difference in position and the obviously contradictory positions of the Attorney General from when he was in opposition to today when he is in government leading the stonewall of information. I suggest we have seen today an attempt — not an attempt, I say a successful action — by the Attorney General in stopping politically embarrassing questions, the same Attorney General who, when he was in opposition, sweat blood in this Assembly saying how vital that information is to the public. We've had the quotations as to the Attorney General's B.G. (before government) position as opposed to his A.G. (after government) position, and I think they bear being read into the record. We're assuming for precision the R. Romanow of Saskatoon Riversdale referred to back on March 6, 1969 is the one and the same R. Romanow of today, the Attorney General and House Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you sure?

MR. LANE: — We're making an assumption. I can see why the Attorney General would want to deny it. I'm going to do it for emphasis to show how silly the Attorney General's performance today is. I'm going to read into the record the contradictory position of the Attorney General.

It seems to me that when members of the House ask for information pertaining to contractual arrangements that two of the most important aspects are to determine first of all: (a) Who the parties of the transaction are and, secondly, the financial terms of repayment of payment respecting the particular transaction involved. In here, the amendment to me in effect attempts to do the following: hide, and there is no better word.

Now those are very profound words, Mr. Speaker, stated by the Attorney General. And I think what we have seen is staging by the Attorney General, an attempt to in fact avoid politically embarrassing questions that is what we have seen all day long. The Attorney General, of course, is taking a completely different position from what he took in March 1969. I'd just like to tell the Attorney General what happened to the last government that he accused of "hiding that" (using your phrase). You're doing exactly the same thing. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope the public will ask why the Attorney General is the House Leader and why the government is afraid to answer very specific question asked by the opposition. I think the answer is clear, Mr. Speaker, that if the public had the information requested and had the complete facts, the Attorney General would be House Leader only until the next election.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 419

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 419 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the rent appeal commission. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they

are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 183, Return No. 419, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. MacMurchy) the amendment as follows: that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the rent appeal commission who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 420

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 420 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Saskatchewan Archives Board. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I will have the same amendment to introduce to this motion as I have on the earlier ones which, Mr. Speaker, it will be noted on the most immediate prior motion was voted yes by all the members of the opposition. There was not a yes from this side or a no from this side. It was the opposition who voted for the motion which was most immediately tendered to you — the amendment — and approved it. In other debates it has been suggested that in 1969 I had some harsh words about a resolution; I had harsh words for the amendment to that resolution.

In 1969, Mr. Speaker, however, unlike tonight, the opposition of that day voted against the amendment, which is proposed by the government. The opposition tonight is the only side of the House which is voting for the amendment proposed by the government. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, some of the quotations with which I am very proud to be associated, are not surprisingly, given the level of incompetence displayed by the Devine organization here, taken out of context.

I don't blame the hon. member for Meadow Lake for having been thrust this question by Mr. Devine and asked to answer it. Perhaps he should have given some thought as the member of the Assembly to the form and the nature of the question. But he didn't and you know, Mr. Speaker, the 1969 quotation that the hon. members are quoting very conveniently does not indicate the complete and total difference in the motions which are being asked. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, this is the question which was asked: (1) the total acreage of Crown land sold under the Saskatchewan government land selling program since January 1, 1967; (2) the government's objective, if any, of acres of land sales for the year 1969; (3a) the name of each purchaser of land up to December 31, 1968; (3b) the number of acres purchased and the location of each purchase; (3c) the

total selling price of each purchase; (4a) the amount of down payment on all purchases that were not fully paid for on date of purchase; (4b) the length of repayment in terms of years, of purchases that were not fully paid for; (4c) the interest of the unpaid balance.

Mr. Speaker, the government of the day, a Liberal government in which one of the leading advisers was the then Liberal, current member for the Legislative Assembly for Qu'Appelle, one Mr. Gary Lane (he was an executive assistant to the Attorney General of the day when he was acting as Liberal) proposed an amendment to that motion which I have just read, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what the amendment by the Liberal government of the day sought to do? It sought to delete all words after the word "sold" and eliminated it with a very short amendment relating to the number of purchases exclusively. I followed the amended motion which was made by the minister and I said this (which conveniently is never quoted by the members opposite) quote (myself now):

Mr. Speaker, with respect to Return No. 9, frankly I am somewhat puzzled by the intention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. MacFarland, with respect to the proposed amendment. Mr. Speaker, members will notice the proposed amendment deletes everything after the word "sold" in paragraph 1, then purports to in fact emasculate totally paragraph 3 and paragraph 4 is just deleted entirely.

Then the remainder of the quote which is attributed to me and which I proudly agree to is the one used by the PC opposition.

You see, Mr. Speaker, what they failed to point out in this debate is that in 1969 the government of the day, of which one Mr. Gary Lane was a very active advisor in its amendments (with which no doubt he had a great deal to do in helping to advise the officials) deleted totally three essential parts of the resolution. I objected to that. We are not in our amendments deleting parts of motions. I don't know mention it to the press because I dare say it's of no interest to them and if it was they would not report it. But those are the facts. We are indeed not deleting as the Liberal administration formerly did. Of course, they very purposely ignore that. As I said, Mr. Speaker, at the time, we opposed what the Liberal government did by way of their amendment. But I notice tonight the PCs did not oppose what we did by our amendment. In fact I think it's correct to say they were the only ones who voted yes in the immediately preceding motions, the only ones, Mr. Speaker, I say that this terribly incompetent, ill-motivated opposition; this opposition which hides its leader, which has no respect or confidence in its leader; this opposition which is suffering from two major defections to a would-be annexation party, Mr. Speaker; this opposition of which the question is being asked in the country, who is next? This is the best that can be done, Mr. Speaker; I say this is indeed a very bad performance.

As usual, it is a very misleading proposition put forward by the hon. members. I'm sorry to see the show put on by the member for Qu'Appelle in the last motion. When he's not yelling, apparently he assumes it's not a debate. The only way he and some of the Conservatives operate is by confrontation and being thrown out, albeit some press reports would have it indicate being thrown not by yourself, Mr. Speaker — but again I don't expect the media to necessarily carry the message. We'll have to do that ourselves, unfortunately, for this very sad day and this very sad performance put on by the members opposite. So, Mr. Speaker, I can only assume the amendments, which have been agreed to unanimously by the PCs opposite, (the last one) will be the same amendments agreed to unanimously this time round. I can only assume that, but it could be the wrong assumption because after all it has been all of a minute and a half

since we had a vote in the first matter. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, one can never be absolutely certain what the voting pattern will be. I want to see the day when Mr. Devine comes to the House because, finally, we may have some leadership shown by somebody there. So, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of that leadership I am prompted to move the amendment which has seen the unanimous approval of the opposition to date. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Last Mountain-Touchwood (Mr. MacMurchy), with respect to item 184, Return No. 420, that all the words after the word "employees" in the first line, be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

Employed by the Saskatchewan Archives Board who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent "out of scope" and their names and positions.

That rephrases the question the way it should have been asked in the first place.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, in view of the words of the somewhat sad, tired, and I should add deflated Attorney General who keeps amending the motions, the only thing I can see that he is amending is who are the people who have contracts. I ask you, Mr. Attorney General, what is wrong with that question? What is wrong with the opposition knowing who the people who have contracts with the various government departments are? What is wrong with the people of Saskatchewan knowing who have these contracts? That's what you're trying to hide, and I go back to your statement again You may be proud of that. This is what you said; there are two things in contractual arrangements that two of the most important aspects are to determine first of all who the parties of the transaction are. That's all we're asking you. You also go on to say, secondly, the financial terms of repayment. We're not asking for any financial terms of repayment. We're asking, who are the people that have the contracts? Simply that. Not a difficult question and a question I believe the opposition should know and the people of Saskatchewan. Why won't you answer it?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. The question before the House is on the motion as amended. I put the motion to the House and I heard no response to the motion. Now, I intend to put the motion to the House again and before I do that I intend to tell the House what I shall do in the event that I don't hear any response. I shall do as speakers are wont to do, they shall vote to preserve the status quo. The question before the House is on the motion as amended. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion as amended?

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 421

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 421 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Saskatchewan Science Council. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number

of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. SPEAKER: — Perhaps we can send everybody home and I can finish up the day here.

MR. ROMANOW: — With respect to this motion I would simply like to say that . . . I say this in anticipation of an argument which may be raised by some members, perhaps the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley might raise this. Before he gets up and makes a fiery speech that the amendment denies the information of people respecting employees on contract, I think, Mr. Speaker, he would be well advised to read the motion that Mr. Devine has drafted for the hon. member for Meadow Lake and got the member for Meadow Lake to table and I would ask that he note the motion as worded says:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees (forget about the agency drop down, Mr. Speaker, to) (3) the number that are on contract, who are they, and the nature of their contract.

Now there is a deletion, I acknowledge that readily, with information provided in the amendment which the opposition has supported again, albeit less vigorously in that preceding motion than they did in the most immediately preceding one before that.

MR. SPEAKER: — I am going to have to bring the Attorney General to order because we cannot go back and review a vote that has been taken. I think, in essence that’s what the Attorney General is doing so he will have to phrase his remarks in such a manner that he won’t have me calling him out of order.

MR. ROMANOW: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was about to say that I anticipate the whole-hearted degree of support by the Devine Conservatives who I am sure have seen the fact that this information is essentially that which is asked. I would say to the Conservatives opposite that the resolution provides the information that is asked, and accordingly, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Saskatchewan Science Council who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Again, Mr. Attorney General — and I want the answer to this question — I don’t know how many times I’m going to have to ask why you feel it is not in our interests or in the interests of this legislature to tell us who are the people who are on contract.

MRS. DUNCAN: — He’s hiding patronage there.

MR. TAYLOR: — I will continue to ask you that question until we get an answer, Mr. Attorney General.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 422

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 422 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Saskatchewan Sheep and Wool Marketing Commission. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Saskatchewan Sheep and Wool Marketing Commission who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

MR. TAYLOR: — Here we come to an item, as I have pointed out to you, Mr. Attorney General — and you’d better turn around Mr. Minister of Agriculture, because I mentioned this to you the other day also — that rings especially close to home with me because I’m a member of the sheep growers of Saskatchewan, and we’re being totally ignored by this government. I pointed out the other day, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, that you can’t even buy a thermometer in this province that gives you the temperature at which you cook lamb. That’s the way you treat us — and you talk about diversification in agriculture. The ex-minister knows this is right.

What help has there been for sheep growers in Saskatchewan? Here we are, again not telling us who the people are that you have under contract. You’re giving us little or not help at all to diversify in agriculture. The sheep industry is just getting no consideration from this government whatsoever. You won’t answer me tonight; I know that. But let me tell you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture and Mr. Attorney General and any of you other fellows sitting over there, that I will go out tomorrow morning and I’ll tell every sheep producer in this country what your attitude is to sheep marketing and to diversification and to sheep; and that you won’t even answer the questions asked in this House as to who have contracts with a simple organization like the Saskatchewan Sheep and Wool Marketing Association. I say shame on you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it not true if no one replies, if we don’t support the amendment, if the government doesn’t say anything and if we don’t reply, it is dropped from the order paper? Is this a fact?

MR. SPEAKER: — Could the member run that by me once more?

MR. LARTER: — If we don’t support the amendment, if the government doesn’t say anything, the government members don’t say a word when the vote is called, is it true that is dropped from the order paper?

MR. SPEAKER: — It is not true, because the amendment is supported by the Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture, primarily. Other members may choose to rise and support it vocally, as the Attorney General did when he presented the amendment, or they may trust the fact that the intention will carry itself and they don't need to support it. So it doesn't require anybody speaking in favor of it except the putting of the motion by the moving of the amendment by whoever the mover is — in this case, the Attorney General.

MR. KATZMAN: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the point of order?

MR. KATZMAN: — Am I correct to understand that once the motion or the amendment is moved and nobody else speaks automatically it is passed, is approved, because the Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture have spoken in favor of it? Therefore, in the motion portion after it is amended that they are saying yes even though they don't say a word. Am I correct?

MR. SPEAKER: — It is not automatically passed until I call for the vote of the House. If one person says yes and nobody says no it is passed. If 15 say yes and 3 say no, it is passed or any such arrangement of figures whether they say yes or no, or whether members in the House — and I treat them not as one side of the House or the other, but just members anywhere — they could be all over the House and every other one could be saying yes and every other one could be saying no, or could be avoiding saying anything. So it doesn't make any difference.

MR. KATZMAN: — On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Just to make sure I understand you — if no replies of any kind are said, there is silence, does that indicate that because it has been moved and seconded it will be automatically approved because there are two members by designation who speak in favor of it?

MR. SPEAKER: — It does not mean it is automatically passed. We get into the situation we got in a short while ago where no one said anything and I told you what I would do. I said, if I hear nothing then I will vote the way the Speaker is by tradition encouraged to vote and that is with the status quo, which means I would vote no, because the status quo is for no change. So that is what would happen. I hope that point is clear.

I have taken a little more time on that one because that is the first time in my 16 years in the House it has arisen. Well, we are learning something new every day.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 423

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 423 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Agricultural Development Corporation. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on

contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “showing” be deleted and the following substituted therefor (I’m following here the Speaker’s direction on an earlier motion.)

As at March 1, 1980 the number of employees of the Agricultural Development Corporation. (1) The number who were permanent. (2) The number who were non-permanent. (3) The number who were out-of-scope.

MR. TAYLOR: — I notice that you’re changing your tactic this time in your amendment. Before you would say the number of contracts, you wouldn’t tell us who they are: now you won’t even tell us the number of them. Is this going to be the stance that you take from here on in? We can’t even find out the number of contracts you have?

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 424

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 424 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Department of Agriculture. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) with respect to item 188, Return No. 424, that all the words after the word “employee” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Department of Agriculture who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 425

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 425 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Alcoholism Commission. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope”

employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. Item No. 189, Return 425. I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Alcoholism Commission who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 426

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 426 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Attorney General’s Department. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Attorney General’s department who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 427

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 427 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the SaskMedia Corporation. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 191, Return No. 427, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “showing” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

As at March 1, 1980, the total number of employees of SaskMedia

Corporation. (1) The number who were permanent. (2) The number who were non-permanent. (3) The number who were out of scope.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 428

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 428 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the board of examiners. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Minister, here we have a motion dealing with the board of examiners. Unfortunately the motion is inadequately worded and I have to again tender an amendment as I have in the others. I would move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the board of examiners who are (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

It's only too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley is not here at the present time to make a flaming speech about holding back information on the board of examiners as he did in an earlier debate. I am told, respecting the sheep wool marketing commission people — same principle, of course.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 429

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 429 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the board of revenue commissioners. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I risk being terribly attached for denying information respecting the board of revenue commissioners but, with that great risk at hand — and it's only too bad that some of the members who would be inclined to make this comment or not in the House right now, but I will take the risk, I guess, from the

group of Devine Conservatives who are perched over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you see the news tonight?

MR. ROMANOW: — I did see the news. I felt the news was very bad today.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy), at great risk to myself I realize, that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Employed by the Board of Revenue Commissioners who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

MR. JOHNSON: — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether this is the tenth, the fifteenth, or the seventh motion moved by the member for Meadow Lake and seconded by another member, but in none of the motions so moved have they made any statement about them for the past while, and I don’t think they understand what the motions are asking. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 430

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 430 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Communications Secretariat. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Co-operatives and Co-operative Development (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Employed by the Communications Secretariat who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 431

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 431 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Department of

Consumer Affairs. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 195, proposed order for Return No. 431, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Department of Consumer Affairs who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 432

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 432 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Department of Continuing Education. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Department of Continuing Education who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 433

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 433 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Crown corporation responsible for Celebrate Saskatchewan. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — On this one, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “showing” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees of Celebrate Saskatchewan. (1) The number who are permanent. (2) The number who are non-permanent. (3) The number who are “out of scope”.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, before I tender the motion, Celebrate Saskatchewan is proving to be one of the most exciting aspects of Saskatchewan life. I regret to have read somewhere the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley apparently does not agree. He alleged words to the effect it was a propaganda machine. I regret (if I read correctly) that conclusion because, Mr. Speaker, the Devine Conservatives might see Celebrate Saskatchewan as a propaganda machine, but the fact is there are hundreds, I would say thousands, of people of all political beliefs, people who come from all walks of life who support what Celebrate Saskatchewan is all about. I find regrettable the suggestion made by some members who are Devine Conservatives that Celebrate Saskatchewan is a propaganda arm. I hope I’m in error and the hon. member for Indian Head will correct the words he has in Hansard respecting Celebrate Saskatchewan being a propaganda arm. I wish the member would because I think Celebrate Saskatchewan is turning out to be a very great prospect for Saskatchewan.

I hope the members opposite will see the wisdom of this and accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I will tender the amendment I have proposed.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 434

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 434 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that item 198, Return No. 434, be amended that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 435

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 435 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are "out-of-scope" employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word "employees" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

As of March 1, 1980, the total number of employees in the Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan, the number who are permanent, the number who are non-permanent and the number who are out of scope.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 436

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 436 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the cultural policy secretariat. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are "out-of-scope" employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word "employees" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the cultural policy secretariat who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent out of scope and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 437

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 437 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Department of Culture and Youth. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are “out-of-scope” employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 201, proposed Return No. 437, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Department of Culture and Youth who are (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent “out of scope” and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 438

MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 438 showing:

As of March 1, 1980 the total number of employees in the Department of Education. (1) The number of permanent employees. (2) The number of casual or seasonal employees. (3) The number that are on contract, who they are, and the nature of their contract. (4) The number that are out-of-scope employees, who they are, and the nature of their job.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that all the words after the word “employees” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

employed by the Department of Education who were (a) permanent; (b) casual or seasonal; (c) on contract and the nature of the contract; (d) permanent out of scope and their names and positions.

Amendment agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, again I think I have to draw to the attention of this House that I just can't believe what I am seeing here. There are what I think sensible, down-to-earth, honest questions that are not asking for anything we don't have every right to know and the people of Saskatchewan have every right to know. These questions consider an important department like the Department of Education, One of the important departments of this government that affects the lives of every person in Saskatchewan at some time — their children, their grandchildren.

I think I stand here, in this Assembly, voicing the opinions of these people; they want to know, Mr. Speaker, how their money in the Department of Education is being spent. To sit here and discuss department after department of this government — culture and

youth, Celebrate Saskatchewan, you name it. There must be something in these that we can find out this information. Why will you not tell us these contracts? Simple questions like contract with Mr. Moriyama, a contract that was signed and which has been dealt with by this government. One of our members asked for this contract — no, we can't see this. I have never seen such a situation snowballing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think the member is out of order because he is referring to something that is another subject and he can't. I realize the member is getting into it.

Does the Attorney General have a point of order?

MR. ROMANOW: — I have a point of order. The hon. member is saying — I am not sure whether it is intentionally misleading or not. I don't think so, but I would not accuse him of intentionally misleading. The point of order I raise, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member says the government has turned down the request respecting the Moriyama contract. The fact is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! It is not a point of order I am afraid. I will allow the member to continue.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, Mr. Speaker, getting back to this motion again and trying to get across to the Attorney General and the people on the other side of this House, that I don't think there is anything out of the usual asked in this motion about the number employees of the Department of Education. I think every taxpayer in the province of Saskatchewan has the right to know the number of employees in the Department of Education. I can't see anything wrong with that. And (2) the number of permanent employees — surely we need to know this.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I would like to know, if I can, how it is the hon. member can misrepresent the position to the House respecting the Moriyama contract, which is yet to be decided by the House. I don't understand that, sir. I think that's a gross misrepresentation on the part of the hon. member, and surely that is out of order. Am I in error there?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the member is possibly out of order because he's referring to another subject. I would have to check the record at this point because I'm not sure of everything the member said. If he is referring to a notice of motion or an order for return, then obviously it hasn't been dealt with and will be dealt with somewhere else, or it has been dealt with and it shouldn't be dealt with again. So the member should confine himself to what is before us on Return No. 438.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, in my last words I was talking about the Department of Education.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:05 p.m.