

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 1, 1980

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina Elphinstone): — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to this legislature, a group of students from Kitchener School in the constituency of Regina Elphinstone. They are seated in the west gallery. There are about 80 of them. They are here with their teachers, Mr. Hatlellid, Mr. Kujat, Mr. Samways and Mr. Howlett. They will have an opportunity, I believe, to see something of the Legislative Building this afternoon. I don't know whether I'm pronouncing a name wrong or something else is bringing forth a bit of mirth up there, but whatever it is we're glad to see the smiles. I hope to have an opportunity to see them after the question period. I know that they will enjoy their visit about the Legislative Building and I trust they will enjoy their short visit with us this afternoon. We do bid them a warm welcome.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly, 42 Grade 8 students from Lakeview School sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers, Bill Forrest, Grant Cluff, Jake Janz, and Margaret Bahnuick. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Lakeview School has the distinction of being the school in closet proximity to this building here in Saskatchewan. I hope that the students and teachers will have an enjoyable visit to the legislature this afternoon. I look forward to meeting with them at 2:30 p.m. for pictures, refreshments and discussion.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, permit me to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 23 students from Grade 5 and 6 and their teacher, Barbara Graham from McNiven School in my constituency. I hope they enjoy the question period and find their stay in the legislature both educational and interesting. I'll be meeting them after the question period for refreshments and pictures. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a real pleasure for me this afternoon to be able to introduce a group of visitors from the Northwest Territories who are seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. This group of 18 mainly Eskimo students come from the semi-isolated community of Cambridge Bay and range in age from 13 to 17 years. They are accompanied by two chaperones, Collen MacDonald and Adam Egotike. The Eskimo students are in a north-south exchange vision program co-ordinated by the YMCA and the Inuits of Canada with the exchange being funded by the Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, it's also of interest that the Moose Jaw YM-YW are the hosts with the students staying in the homes of young families in Moose Jaw. Next week a similar group of students from Moose Jaw will travel to Cambridge Bay to stay with these

students in their homes.

It is also significant, Mr. Minister, that not only is Saskatchewan celebrating its 75th birthday, but also so is the Moose Jaw Y. From the Y we have the executive director (from the YM-YW), Peter Whitenck, and someone else I happen to know, Marg Skoberg, who is the president, along with some other Y people who are assisting as the chaperones in the arrangements that were made here today. I'm sure that all members of this Assembly welcome the Cambridge Bay students and their chaperones as we know there is no better way of promoting an understanding and appreciation of what Canada is all about than through these youth exchange programs. Good luck and good travelling.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the members of the Assembly, the member of parliament for Kindersley-Lloydminster, Mr. Bill McKnight. I'm sure that the members of the Assembly will agree with me that Mr. McKnight will, in fact, fight for our causes in the parliamentary forum, and help look after the concerns of western Canada.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Minister, I should like to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly a total of 70 students from Grade 7 and 8. Pleasant Hill School in Saskatoon. I think they're located in the east gallery. I'm always confused as to which is east; it's back there I think. Is Pleasant Hill back there? Great. They are accompanied by, and I hope I pronounce the names correctly, Mr. Trembach, Mrs. Hrytzak, Mrs. McDonald, and Mrs. Leggett. I welcome them to the Chamber. Unfortunately, because of the House business later today, notice of motions for returns, I will not be able to accompany them for pictures and for questions, but I'll ask the whip, the member for Saskatoon Centre (who takes a better picture than I do anyway) to substitute on my behalf. So I say to this group welcome to Regina.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Initial Wheat Payment

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Agriculture. In last Saturday's Leader-Post there's a headline that was something less than accurate.

Argue announces a \$9 tonne rise in initial wheat payments

In fact, Mr. Minister, there's almost a \$50 a tonne decrease, compare to what we're getting for wheat today. Are you satisfied that Senator Hazen Argue is offering the best possible initial payment to Saskatchewan farmers today, or Canadian farmers?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I think dissatisfaction of concern has been expressed by farm organizations with respect to the announced initial payment for the crop year coming up. We have not expressed our concerns to the federal minister. The reason for that is because arrangements are being made for a meeting with Mr. Argue where we intend to question the minister on the most recent announcement. We want to raise with the minister the possibility of any implications with respect to the grain embargo of the Soviet Union and the announced initial price. We note, Mr. Speaker, that wheat prices are down — grain prices are down — at the present time, and we want to know the implications of this downward trend and what position the federal government will take in terms of compensating the producers of Saskatchewan.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, the minister will know, of course, that the farmers of Saskatchewan and the farmers of Canada are in a serious cost-price squeeze situation with interest rates running at 17 per cent, and cost of input is up 300 per cent over the last few years. Would you not agree that this situation is serious enough that it deserves immediate representation to Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member we asked for immediate representation to Ottawa, and we have not had that forthcoming. I indicated to the members the route we intend to pursue and that pursuit is on the way. We will raise these matters with Mr. Argue in person giving him an opportunity to express the policies of the new Liberal government.

MR. BERNTSON: — Final, supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This announcement has been called everything from deception to political flackery, and we all know that under the regime of Otto Lang the wheat board was used as apolitical tool. My questions, Mr. Speaker, is would you not agree that to take the wheat board out of the political arena as was done by Don Mazankowski, where the officials of the wheat board made these kinds of announcements, as opposed to the minister. Would you not agree that's a step in the right direction?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we had a number of meetings with the former minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, and our approach with that minister was to give him an opportunity to outline his government's policy with respect to the board. I think in outlining some of those policies we had some real concern, for we heard the former minister talk in terms of producers having a right to choose, and this had serious implications and serious political implications for the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Our intent, Mr. Speaker, is to treat the new minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board in the same way as we treated the former minister — give him an opportunity to outline his government policies and then we will know what approach we should take in terms of dealing with the new government.

American Grain Transportation

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, a couple of weeks ago you indicated a number of MLAs and a couple of MPs went to Montana to conduct a study in the American grain transportation. Is the minister prepared to inform the Assembly of the results of their

findings?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take a new question.

MR. PICKERING: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. During the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) convention, Mr. Minister, you indicated that a number of MLAs and a couple of MPs made a trip to the United States, to Montana, to conduct a survey into grain transportation in Montana. Could you inform the Assembly of their findings?

MR. MacMURCHY: — This trip to the United States was not sponsored by the Government of Saskatchewan. It was a trip organized by the MLAs and some MPs, and they paid for it themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I expect reports of their efforts will be available. I have not read it thoroughly but my understanding is there's such a report in the Commonwealth and that would be available to the hon. member to consider. I can send him a copy of the Commonwealth paper.

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the member have a new question? Order!

MR. PICKERING: — A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can you assure the Assembly that a Mr. George Burton and a Mr. Jim Leggett from the transportation agency, and a Mr. Garnet Dishwa, paid their expenses on this trip out of their own pockets?

MR. MacMURCHY: — With respect to Mr. Burton, I will take notice of that question and respond to the hon. member.

Sale of Maple Leaf Mills

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you may have noted that last week there was an announcement that one of the very largest Canadian corporations was about to take over one of the larger agri-business concerns. I'm making reference to the announcement that Canadian Pacific Investments is about to acquire Maple Leaf Mills for some \$76 million. I'm sure the Premier is aware that Maple Leaf Mills is not exactly a small entity. Last year they had sales of \$719 million and they are in food product processing, flour milling, etc., agricultural products such as feed, seed and poultry.

My question to the Premier is this. This is the first major thrust of Canadian Pacific — perhaps the largest Canadian corporation or certainly one of the largest into agri-business. Therefore, I would ask the Premier for a statement on behalf of the government. Do you view with concern the movement of Canadian Pacific into agri-business?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to reply on behalf of the government.

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think in response to the hon. member, the Government of Saskatchewan would be concerned about any major large corporation getting into agri-business, particularly, Mr. Speaker, if their

influence is going to effect producer operations. I think we have a strong base of producer operations in Saskatchewan. It has been the efforts of this government to continue that emphasis, to fight against vertical integration and if any development by a large corporation would cut into this kind of a policy, we would very strongly oppose.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question to the Premier and he can farm it out to whoever he wants. The Premier may have noticed that it's become quite the fashion in Canada for one large corporation to take over another one and I don't have to relate the examples in the past couple of years for him. Now, Mr. Premier, when we see a large corporation such as is going into agri-business — and I think we'll both agree the Minister of Agriculture missed the significance of the opening questions — would the Premier tell me how his government views this trend in our corporate structure in Canada for a large concern to take over another large concern? Would the Premier agree that this bodes very poorly for western Canada because of the lessening of the overall effects of competition? I might, therefore, ask the Premier, in effect, what representation has your government made in the past, what are you going to make and I guess basically what do you think about it?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the position of our government with respect to the major corporations moving into the agricultural field is well known. It was six or seven years that we introduced legislation to prevent the corporate ownership of farmland by major corporations and that legislature was rather hotly disputed and opposed by members opposite or persons associated with their party. They didn't have any representatives in the legislature at that time, save only the member for Thunder Creek perhaps and the member for Qu'Appelle. We take the view that we deplore the concentration in agri-business, particularly may I say if it's also associated with a railway company where the possibility of having a competitor at a substantial disadvantage is multiplied. We will continue to press the policies of our government which cause us to oppose this sort of trend. We have done this at every opportunity in the past, at federal provincial conferences and the like. We will continue to do so in the future and we will invite all hon. members on both sides of the House to support us when we are attempting to prevent major consolidation of industry and enterprises in this province, support us for example if we tried to see that Cargill might divest itself on some of its holdings in this province. We would welcome support for that proposition.

MR. THATCHER: — Final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take a new question.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Premier, then. It's wonderful how you choose to inject yourself into the question period, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order ! Order! I believe this Assembly has certain rules which guide us in our question period. When those rules are abridged by the members of this Assembly they must be brought to order. Now, one of the rules of the question period and this Assembly at any time is that the members must not cast aspersions on the Chair. Now what I heard the member for Thunder Creek say was clearly as aspersion on the Chair of the House. I will ask the member for Thunder Creek to withdraw and apologize to the House at this time.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there was any aspersion cast upon you.

If there was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will warn the member for Thunder Creek that I am not prepared to take a qualified withdrawal. The record will clearly show an aspersion was cast on the Chair of this House. I want an unequivocal withdrawal from the member for Thunder Creek.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, if it will make you happy, I will give . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I want to say to the House this will be the last time I ask the member for Thunder Creek to make an unequivocal withdrawal of his statement against the Chair and the successive statement against the Chair.

MR. THATCHER: — Well if I may proceed without interruption, for the third time . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Remove him!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I want to warn the member for Thunder Creek, he is setting his feet on a dangerous path at this time. If the member wishes to proceed, there is nothing to prevent the member from proceeding. No member was interfering; no member was raising a point of order. The member has the right to proceed. He has again cast an aspersion on the Chair, quite clearly. The record will show that he has done it three times. He has been asked to withdraw those aspersions on the Chair at least three times. This is my final opportunity for the member for Thunder Creek to withdraw all of those aspersions against the Chair.

MR. THATCHER: — I am quite prepared to withdraw any aspersions against the Chair and I'm not aware of having made any. If you view them as being aspersions, which I don't, I will withdraw them in an unqualified . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I am proceeding under rule 25 of the Rules of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan. Those rules clearly state, in (2):

Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the Assembly or of the committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetitions, either of his own arguments or the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech and if the member continues to speak, Mr. Speaker, shall name him or, if in committee, the Chairman shall report him to the Assembly.

I think the record will clearly show beyond a doubt that the member for Thunder Creek at least three times cast aspersions on the Chair. At least three times I, as the Speaker, in following the rules of the House asked him to withdraw those aspersions unqualifiedly, and he refused to do that. I therefore, name you, Mr. Thatcher.

MR. LANE: — Point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: — What's the point of privilege?

MR. LANE: — My point of privilege is that the hon. member attempted . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. If the members will bear with me for a moment I have to get a motion prepared. Order. I refer the member to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and

Forms, Fifth Edition, section 25 on page 12, naming a member, sub (3):

If the Member satisfies the House by an apology no further action is necessary. If the Member's statement is insufficient, it is the duty of the Government House Leader to present a motion proposing a suitable penalty.

I will refer the members to the penalty section in this particular part of Beauchesne, sub (5):

The penalty common in Canada is suspension for the remainder of the sitting day. On one occasion the House decided upon a seven day suspension for a second offence by the same Member.

I merely raise that for the guidance of the House and no way in an attempt to influence the House about what the penalty shall be.

MOTION

MR. ROMANOW: — It's with a great deal of regret I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Hon. R.J. Messer):

that the member for Thunder Creek be suspended from the service of this House for the remainder of today's sitting.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 36

Blakeney	Mostoway	Tchorzewski
Allen	Banda	Cody
Bowerman	Kaeding	Koskie
Romanow	Hammersmith	Matsalla
Messer	Kowalchuk	Lusney
Snyder	Dyck	Prebble
Robbins	MacAuley	Johnson
Baker	Feschuk	Thompson
McArthur	Byers	Engel
Gross	Vickar	Poniatowski
Shillington	Rolfes	Lingenfelter
MacMurchy	Cowley	Solomon

Nays — 14

Berntson	Rousseau	Katzman
Birkbeck	Swan	Duncan
Larter	Pickering	Andrew
Lane	Garner	McLeod
Taylor	Muirhead	

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 239

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 239 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the municipal financing corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would move an amendment, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 240

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 240 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 241

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 241 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 242

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 242 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Development Fund Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 243

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 243 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 244

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 244 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan FarmStart Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 245

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 245 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words “Since March 1, 1979: in the first line deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 246

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 246 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Government Insurance spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 9, Return No. 246, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 247

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 247 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item no. 10, proposed Return No. 247, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 248

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake

(Mr. McLeod) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 248 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 11, proposed Return No. 248, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 249

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 249 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 250

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 250 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Power Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other

than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, dealing with item 13, proposed return number. 250. I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 251

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 251 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Sask Tel Crown Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 14, Return No. 251, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 252

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 252 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 253

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 253 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the SaskMedia Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, "Since March 1, 1979" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 254

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 254 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the agricultural development corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 17, proposed Return No. 254, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, "Since March 1, 1979" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 255

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 255 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Crown corporation of Celebrate Saskatchewan spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 18, Return No. 255, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 256

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 256 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose. (b) In each instance, whether this printing was tendered, or whether the contracts were awarded in another manner other than tenders, and if so, the method used to determine who should receive printing business.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to item 19, proposed Return No. 256, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 257

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 257 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Department of Health spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance

the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to this amendment, I will be proposing a little longer amendment than the ones I have dealt with earlier here. Accordingly, I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that the words, “Since March 1, 1979” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980, the name and address of each private printing or publishing firm to whom the Department of Health made payments for printing. (a) The number of payments to each firm. (b) The reason for each payment. (c) The amount of each payment.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 258

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 258 showing:

(a) Since March 1, 1979 the total amount of money the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation spent on printing with printing and publishing firms, and in each instance the name and address of the firm, amount of money spent with each firm, and the purpose.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, pardon me, I’ve momentarily lost my place but I think I have it now. With respect to item no. 21, Return No. 258, which is being proposed, I would like to propose an amendment. I move, seconded by the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) the following, that all the words after the word “showing” be deleted and the following substituted therefor, Mr. Speaker:

For the period March 1, 1979 to March 31, 1980 the name and address of each private printing and/or publishing firm to whom the Department of Highways and Transportation made payments for printing. (a) The number of payments to each form, (b) The reason for each payment. (c) The amount of each payment.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): — I no way intend to get into along rambling debate. Perhaps when the Attorney General is closing debate — you can’t close debate on the amendment can you? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, but you can answer the question I was going to direct . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pick yourself up there Roy. My concern with the amendment, and I wish I had a copy of this is that it excludes all but private printing companies. There are — I don’t know, I’m not a lawyer, I don’t know the definition of private. Does that exclude Sask Printing? Does that exclude people who are incorporated in a limited company? Really, it seems to me it would exclude almost everybody except the local little printing press at home. Quite frankly, I think you are denying any information as it relates to this. I stand to be corrected if that’s not the definition of private.

Amendment agreed.

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 234

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 234 showing:

The departments, Crown corporations, boards, commission, or any other Government of Saskatchewan entity that have placed contracts with JAC Struthers and Associates, Ltd., since March 1, 1979. (a) In each instance, the nature of the contract, and the value of each contract. (b) The total value of all contracts by all departments, Crown corporations, boards, commission, or any other Government of Saskatchewan entity with JAC Struthers and Associates Ltd.

Debate adjourned.

Return No. 235

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek) moved, seconded by the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 235 showing:

The departments, Crown corporations, boards, commission, or any other Government of Saskatchewan entity that have placed contracts with Service Printing Company since March 1, 1979. (a) In each instance, the nature of the contract, and the value of each contract. (b) The total value of all contracts by all departments, Crown corporations, boards, commissions, or any other Government of Saskatchewan entity with Service Printing Company.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I have with respect to item 87, Return No. 235, Mr. Speaker, a little amendment to introduce. I move, Seconded by the Hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Cowley) that all the words after the word “have” in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Purchased printing from Service Printing Company between March 1, 1979 and March 31, 1980. (a) In each instance, the purpose of the printing and the amount paid. (b) The total amount paid to Service Printing Company.

Amendment agreed.

MR. COWLEY: — I just want to say a few words on this motion as amended. I’m always interested in the opposition’s interest in Service Printing Company which is a fine, old and venerable institution in this province. It has served the people of this province well. It has served the NDP well, as have many other printers in the province. I want to just say a word of thanks to the members of the opposition because they’ve been doing a tremendous job with the blues here, keeping them nice and thick. There are 96 pages here and they usually run to 10 to 12 pages. It has been keeping Service Printers very busy printing them. I just want, on behalf I’m sure of Service Printers and all the fine people who work there, to put in a thank you to the members of the opposition.

Before they get too excited, I think if the members are interested, I believe that the contract with respect to printing needs was tendered — for the information of the hon.

member for Regina South. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think certainly it will be the pleasure of the government to provide the answer to this question with due dispatch. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed.

Return No. 236

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River) moved, seconded by the member for Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Pickering) that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 236 showing:

All studies, survey, questionnaires, correspondence, reports, memoranda, aide-memoires, recommendations, and any other documents of: (a) Department of Agriculture (b) Department of the Environment (c) Department of Mineral Resources (d) Saskatchewan Research Council and (e) Department of Highways with regard to gasohol, and gasohol production.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, this is a question which is very similar in its form and intent and working, if not identical to one which was dealt with by this House last Tuesday — same question asking for studies, surveys, questionnaires, aide-memoires. In fact, any other documents, if you notice that, Mr. Speaker. You notice also that the hon. member for Swift Current — the Independent — on page 2, item 1 of our motion which was stood today, has the exactly identical format. I think he must have had that written for him as the member for Arm River has had this one written for him by the same researcher from the PC caucus when they were both together as members of the PC caucus. They must have had these distributed to them because the motion was put out at that time. I think the hon. member understands that to be the case.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we defeated a motion like this Tuesday on the argument — I think it's a valid and sound argument — that not only would this be next to impossible to answer by virtue of the impossibility of interpreting the words that are meant, but also there is another important matter and that is, these documents for internal department study. That is what the question is directed to and the long-standing procedure has been to reject those kinds of request for information. They are internal documents, recommendations for example.

I don't know how one could interpret the word recommendations. Does it mean verbal recommendations? Does it mean written recommendations? Aide-memoires — I frankly don't know how that could be interpreted. I assume it might mean any kind of a scribbled note that a minister or some official might have somewhere. This would not be limited of course to the deputy or to anyone else. This is a matter which applies presumably to all of the employees in the Department of Agriculture, in the Department of the Environment, in the Department of Mineral Resources, in the Department of Highways and in the Saskatchewan Research Council. Presumably, aide-memoires would be little notations which would even be made by an officer of the research council at any level, because the question doesn't ask only for aide-memoires from deputies or from ministers. It could be a junior officer. Could it be an aide-memoire of a secretary, saying bring forward file on gasohol research to June 1, 1981? I think one could argue legally that too is an aide-memoire, something which would be an aid to

the recollection of the memory of the person who was involved in the file. I think the hon. members opposite could very easily see from that how difficult it is if not virtually impossible to answer that kind of a question. You could go through scores of files on these various matters. We would have to retrieve them. The Hon. Provincial Secretary also points out these are not only aide-memoires still extant, but conceivably aide-memoires made at one time and destroyed, because that is not a limitation on it as well.

I find we can question "any other documents" as well. I don't know how the member for Regina South would interpret any other documents, but I can think of literally hundreds of documents, Mr. Speaker, which involve the notations of telephone calls, even telephone messages. I am referring now to any other documents. They could be aide-memoires took but I think maybe what they could be are any other documents. I don't understand how that would work. It would be almost impossible; in fact, it would be impossible to answer that.

Note also, Mr. Speaker, the request is of all surveys, questionnaires. What constitutes a questionnaire? Is a questionnaire what the word means in its normal and ordinary course, a mail-out to somebody or other asking for opinions, or is it a question asked, or a series of questions asked by a person?

When I had a couple of department people look at this question, I said, leaving aside for the moment the policy, could this be answered. The answer I got, to a person was that it would be impossible.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, there is a second point (the first point being the impossibility of the form of the question) the very important matter that we would have to reveal, for example, all the correspondence. It is conceivable that somebody from the outside world, who is interested in gasohol production or interested in gasohol matters, might have written to one of these agencies in confidence, maybe even having to put out a point of view which would require a very careful consideration by department officials.

I think if we had to table that, we would have to table the kinds of correspondence which members who write to the public believe to be in confidence, all of a sudden to find that correspondence is heretofore obligated to be made public. For example, I get letters, as the Attorney General, on subject matters which relate to a number of people on a number of issues. For example, I am now getting letters relating to (not many — I think I've received about three or four) dealing with a case which has been made popular (if I can use that word; it is not quite the right word to use) — the Mr. Randy Wangler case. And these are people who have written to me, expressing a point of view, some for and some against the proposition taken.

I think it is understood, under those circumstances, that the letter writer has the right to believe the information tendered as opinion or as advice to the member ought not to be made public. I think the member for Rosetown-Elrose was a former school trustee, if he received letters from parents on a particular issue and was compelled by some mechanism to release the correspondence on this, he would say, look, this is something which the letter writer has written to me in the belief and knowledge that that which has been written will remain confidential. When you are talking about the issue related to gasohol and gasohol production with its technological and scientific ramifications and implication and perhaps even financial implications, I think members on all sides of the House can very easily see the degree of difficulty and jeopardy that might very well attach to that. I don't think the member for Rosetown-Elrose, when he was a former trustee, would have condoned that kind of thing and quite

properly so. I don't expect him to adopt a double standard now that he has left that elected position and moved into another elected position.

Then, Mr. Speaker, finally there is the other important issue as well and that is the issue of making sure that ministers get the best possible advice they can in matters related to policy. Over the years, the rule of good government has been that deputies and directors and other people advise government on the understanding that that which they tender by way of advice is not subject to potentially unfair scrutiny. The hon. member for Kindersley talks about freedom of information. I say to the hon. member for Kindersley that even in the Jed Baldwin Freedom of Information Act, if he looks at it carefully, these kinds of things were excluded from right of review by the public. It couldn't have worked otherwise. Government would have halted it. Otherwise, deputies (I'm sure the member for Bengough-Milestone will understand this) will couch their words in phraseology which they'll want to have in case their words or phraseology hit the floor of the legislature. Then some ill-intentioned MLA (I'm not accusing any of the members opposite of being ill-intentioned) at some point, maybe even on this point, would seize that word and take it out of context and thereby get the deputy or the advising official into trouble as well.

I think the process of advising a government could very well come to a near halt if you had the officials and the officers putting everything down in couched terms which would be there to protect the potentiality of that report coming out in the open. Again, I say, none of the members, I'm sure, in this House but some less scrupulous members could misinterpret the word or phrase. Therefore, that is the basis for the very clear, well thought out policy view that matters of advice to government are kept confidential. Even under all kinds of freedom of information legislation and all kinds of other legislation. I think his accordingly is also very important consideration to take into account.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, before I take my place, two other points must be made. I think both are very serious points; I'm not sure that on a fundamental policy basis they are as solid as the points I've just made on the principle of ensuring the best advice available to a minister or department should be there; nevertheless they are important points. These two other points are:

First — this return would have all studies, surveys, questionnaires, and related documents . . . now let's assume (and I give this to the member for Regina South to ponder) that the Saskatchewan Research Council has engaged a consultant to do a study for it on gasohol. Let's assume the study was made on the contractual understanding between the research council and the person doing the study that it would be confidential . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the member asks, why? Mr. Speaker, I can think of at least two reasons why. One reason is because the study may very well incorporate sensitive, scientific and technological data the consultant possesses which he does not wish his opponents to receive. That's one good reason. But the motion does not ask that. I'm saying if this happens I don't see how we would be obligated under the order. I'm sure the Hon. House Leader as it were, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley would understand this point because I think I'm not making my point well to the member for Regina South; at least he doesn't seem to quite understand it. This kind of a report tabled might pose a breach of contractual obligation.

I don't think we want to put our agencies, or departments who might have had those kinds of arrangements into such a position. I think this is another good reason why this motion should be defeated as we did the ones last Friday, without, may I add, dissent

from the members on either side of the House. Perhaps I'm taking the time of the House unnecessarily, Mr. Speaker, forgive me if I am. If it was non-dissent last time I can assume it will be non-dissent this time but I felt we should put the position on the record because the House will take down this note for the hon. member who may not be aware of these reasons why we think this motion cannot be passed.

Second — there is one other very important reason which I'm sure must be of concern to all of us as legislators. That is the cost if this motion was to be answered as it was put — let alone policy, confidentiality, agreements, difficulties — those points I have made. If it was to be passed the man-hours that would be involved (and I draw this to the specific attention of the member for Bengough-Milestone whom I know is especially interested) the cost in this area would be very, very onerous indeed. I don't know how much it would cost by man-hours or what kind of an approach it would take. This question can't be taken in isolation because we have already passed some 100 to 150 of these orders for return. I hope I am wrong, but I predict we'll almost have to bring in wheelbarrows to provide the written information for the opposition. This question would, if not produce a wheelbarrow, certainly produce a very large financial cost for the taxpayers of Bengough, the taxpayers of Indian Head, the taxpayers of Rosetown-Elrose (I'm assuming the member for Rosetown-Elrose is concerned about his taxpayers; I believe him to be concerned about them), for the member for Kindersley and the member for Rosthern. I think he, too, is very concerned about the taxpayers' cost.

You see the point I'm getting at is the question lacks a precision as to what is really being sought. The question here in its lack of precision also indicates a fundamental concern. I say this to the hon. member for Arm River who asked his question. You're the one who asked this question. I'm just saying why I'm recommending to the members of the House we should turn down this motion. I don't mean this in any negative sense, but you were out just a moment ago when I was saying there are substantial costs involved.

There is also the question involved of potential confidentiality agreements which might exist. The example I gave, Mr. Member, was the Saskatchewan Research Council entering into a contract with an outside consultant to give it a report on the technology and the science related to gasohol. You understand that? Thanks. If that report contains confidential scientific information, can you imagine the kind of difficulty it would put the consulting firm in which might be phonying up information only it has, but which its competitors inadvertently might have? I think that's a very important factor as well. So, Mr. Speaker, I have put before the House the five reasons I can think of why this motion should be defeated, as the last motion last Tuesday was defeated. And I think rightly so. I think the members on all sides of the House acted responsibly . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — No, no, this is serious. I'm being very serious on this. I think all members acted very responsibly in defeating the motion unanimously last time around. I'm confident the members will see this again this time around — more I suppose, for the edification of the press than for anybody. Since we all voted to defeat this motion last time around. I felt I should put forward these reasons for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take any more time of this legislature unnecessarily since we have another 400 or 500 motions yet to go today. I hope I've been pithy in my comments, pithy in substance and to the point, and not repetitious or too tedious. If I

have, I beg indulgence of you, sir, and the members of the House. I urge the members of the House to defeat this motion as they did last Friday. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Attorney General I would first say I think some of his comments are well taken on this side of the House. However there were some of them, Mr. Attorney General, I could hardly accept. On the comment which your seatmate from the back made to you about destroyed documents, surely everyone in this House realizes we are not trying to request any destroyed documents. How you get destroyed documents I'll never know. In my terminology, once destroyed it is destroyed. So I can't see that type of a comment coming into his answer at all.

He also talks about recommendations. I made notes and I heard him distinctly say, would you be wanting us to give our verbal recommendations? Well if you look at the motion, Mr. Speaker, it says, documentation. What is the documentation of something which is verbal? These are written things.

I wonder, when I hear the Attorney General go on and on with his story, if really you do keep files in some of these departments. It would seem logical to me that correspondence, questionnaires, surveys or whatever there may be, would be filed and would be easily accessible. As far as little notes from secretaries go, I don't know if you file those or not. But there are such things as interdepartmental memos, memos within departments, and I think those are the kinds of things we want to know about.

Now the Attorney General goes on and on, on this motion, Mr. Speaker, as if the concept of gasohol has been around since the founding of this province, as if there is a ponderous file on gasohol. I think you know, Mr. Member over there, the whip, the concept of gasohol, as an alternative to energy in this province, is rather a new idea. The reason we are asking the question is to find out if you people are sincerely looking into this as a method of saving energy and saving costs to the people of Saskatchewan. That's what we want to find out. And it isn't something that has been here since Noah's Ark as the Attorney General points out. He says, we don't want to spend the tax money. He says the people in Rosetown, the people in Indian Head don't want to spend the tax money on these sorts of things. I will tell you the people in Indian Head and Wolseley and Rosetown and in Riversdale are interested in alternate forms or energy saving and that's what we want to find out — if your government is seriously looking or considering this type of thing.

Now he points out about contractual arrangements and breaches of contracts. I would just like to quote back to March 6, 1969, in Hansard, when a certain Mr. Romanow from Saskatoon Riversdale was saying the following to the government.

It seems to me that when members of the House ask for information pertaining to contractual arrangement that 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 respecting the particular transaction involved.

That's the same man who I heard two or three minutes ago say to me, we can't let you know about contractual arrangements. And here, ten years ago he was criticizing the

government opposite.

Now, all we and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan want to know is how you fellows are spending their money and if you're spending it wisely. You talk about co-operation in this House. Last Tuesday night I heard you go on in rather a rabid fashion. Mr. Attorney General, about our questions. You went on and on. I remember being in this House last Tuesday. We allowed you to amend questions you did not think were posed the right way. To me, that's co-operation. That's trying to find information in a meaningful fashion I withdrew some motions which were not worded correctly, and I admit that. I think that is co-operation. But I think we on this side of the House have every right to ask you as many questions as we want to ask as to how . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll tell the member for Indian Head-Wolseley I'll allow him to continue providing he sticks with the subject under discussion, but he's getting into the area of the conduct of the business of the House and I think that's not a proper subject here.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I only have a couple of suggestions. I'll give them at this time or if it's your ruling. I'll wait and give them at another time but I assure you, I'm going to give them. I only have a couple of things I want to say on this general topic. I think the Attorney General was in a rather wide-sweeping discussion too.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I listened very carefully to the Attorney General and it was my judgment and it apparently was the judgment of all other members in the House that he did not stray from the topic because I heard no points of order raised about the Attorney General sticking to the topic. The topic is very specific. Every time the Attorney General discussed questions. I gather he related it back to the subject matter. That kind of diversion is quite in order because the member is using it to make a point but the member for Indian Head-Wolseley is specifically dealing with the conduct of the House and how co-operative he may or may not have been. I think that's off the subject.

MR. TAYLOR: — I'd like to continue with a couple more points here pertaining to the motions for return (debatable), Mr. Speaker. And again I turn to the Hansard of March 6, 1969 where this same Attorney General says the following regarding questions.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have witnessed tonight, now I think, a second attempt by this government to cover up people's information. This government persists in hiding information. It reveals in a concept that the people's business is somewhat restricted only to the cabinet chamber and cannot flow onto the floor of this legislature.

That is what I mean to have here, Mr. Speaker. The business of the people of Saskatchewan should be flowing onto the floor of this legislature.

The other night we were again questioned about the number of questions that we have put forth, inferring that this is a preponderant amount and a terrible burden to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. I would like to refer to the Leader-Post on April 3, 1967 in which it says:

The opposition members asked 298 written questions and managed to put forth 120 orders for return for a total of 418.

And the year before that, in 1966, there were 403 questions.

So I don't think, Mr. Attorney General, what we're doing is out of line at all. I think we're asking questions that are of benefit to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan so one way or another we can find out the operation of your government and that's what we will continue to do, Mr. Attorney General. I don't think these questions are so out of line or costing the taxpayers of this province the amount that you're wanting to lead them to believe it is.

MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on the motion and the amendment that's before us. I listened with interest to the speech given by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. I listened with interest to his discussion of the purpose and form of the questions. I think when the members look at this question it says all studies, surveys, etc. for five departments. I think that members on this side of the House and the public can be somewhat suspect about the member's sincerity with respect to the question of how many questions he has on the order paper.

It is one thing to do what the member said some former opposition did, ask 400 and some different questions pertaining to the government; it is quite another thing to do what the present opposition is doing. For example, orders for return (debatable) numbers 2 to 85 by the member for Maple Creek are essentially the same question asked 84 times. The members say, no, this is how we were told to do it. But if you look at number 86 which is asked by that same member who asked the 84 separate ones, now you have one that says the departments, Crown corporations, boards, commissions, or any other, and instead of 84 questions we have one.

I think the members saw earlier on in the day when we were making some minor amendments I submit to some of those motions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I have yet to hear the Provincial Secretary mention gasohol or very much in relation to the motion before us and I'm trying to keep the member for Biggar in order as I was trying to do for the member for Indian head-Wolseley. You'll appreciate it's a difficult problem. I don't want to restrain the debate. That's not my purpose for being here. I would prefer to have wide-ranging debate on the topic.

The place for wide-ranging debate happens to be the budget speech and the throne speech mainly. Otherwise members have to be specific and deal with the subject that's before us. The member for Biggar is getting into the area of talking about the conduct or the business of the House. It appears that members on both sides want to discuss this. Somebody should put a motion on the order paper that we limit the number of questions, or that we endorse the proposition members can ask as many questions as they want, and then we can air those thoughts I've been hearing from the members on both sides of the House on this important subject. So I've asked the member for Biggar to hew right to the line, and talk strictly about the subject that's before us now.

MR. COWLEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize, having listened to you, that I was in error and I was straying from the topic. I certainly shall do my best to restrict my comments to the question that's before us, which is the motion by the member for Arm River with respect to all studies, surveys, etc. with respect to gasohol and gasohol production.

I want to say again and reiterate I think some of the comments of my colleague the member for Riversdale, in the broadness and the sweepingness of this particular

question. I recall a month or two ago talking with the Minister of Agriculture who, at that time I believe, and I may have the numbers wrong, had already received 139 letters or inquiries or whatever with respect to gasohol and gasohol production. Obviously they all had responses, and obviously if they were asking questions there would be inter-office memos between people and so on. You are probably talking about just from the Department of Agriculture, just with respect to the correspondence from the general public, over 1,000 pieces of paper a month of a month and a half ago. It's undoubtedly increased since then. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of this question is not to garner information but it's rather more of a fishing expedition to see everything that's out there. There's no point to the question. It is as the Attorney General said not precise. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think for the reasons that we've advanced, the motion should be defeated.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Attorney General that the questions I seem to be putting on the order paper upset him, and he doesn't seem to want to answer them. Perhaps I'll have to shorten them up and make them so they'll suit him, but I would like with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to answer some questions that he asked me on this matter on Tuesday last. I would like to answer these questions if I have your permission.

When debate was closed last Tuesday and, Mr. Speaker, I refer to page 1117 in the Hansard, No. 24B

...

MR. ROMANOW: — The hon. member says that he is going to rebut my remarks on this particular motion on Tuesday last. I believe this motion was only up for the first time today and I just finished my remarks. So he must be referring to some other debate and is therefore out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Point of order well taken. The Attorney General, according to my record has not spoken except today on the subject.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I accept that, Mr. Speaker, that's why I asked your permission to do this. If I can't, I guess I can't. All I say is, on your remarks I can't see why you cannot answer the question that I have put in. I don't see anything unreasonable about this at all ... (inaudible interjection) ... yes, because the remarks you made today are the same thing you said the other day, exactly. Now answer them that way then. This is exactly what you said to the questions. Quote from the Attorney General: "What are they going to do with this information?" You said that today. Tell the public and let them decide if it's useful information or not.

Here is another question you asked today as well. How are they to handle it? In a proper manner. Another question you asked: where will this information come from? From official public documents we hope. We surely hope you've got them. You must have them. Another place we will use them is at the electors' door during the next election campaign. Another thing he said today: What approach will the opposition take once this information is provided for them? My answer: the usual Progressive Conservative approach and that is to tell the public the way it really is — not mislead them the way the NDP has been misleading them for the past many years, and the past nine years in particular.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have answered all the relevant questions put forth by the learned Attorney General, I presume he will get on with the job of answering all my question and see that his colleague, the Provincial Secretary, places the orders for

return request on the table of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, what has really brought on these great outbursts from the normally cool and collected member for Saskatoon Riversdale? Now I say today that he was very cool and quiet but I'm referring to the outburst from last Tuesday. Well, I'll give you an answer to that question too. You see, the Attorney General has up until now been able to keep the opposition under wraps by being very convincing and smooth in his handling of this side of the House. Well, now the old con game is over. We are on the move and nothing but nothing is going to shut us off. We are not going to be content until we get all the facts out in the open, be it our own family of Crown corporations, the consolidated fund, the heritage fund, the \$6 million the provincial auditor says was spent without authority or whatever, and the question I asked today. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied without a shadow of a doubt, especially after the ringing of my phone all last weekend that the public thinks it's long overdue that we as the opposition are continuing our efforts to obtain information about the public, the taxpayers', the citizens' business, especially through tax dollars. Mr. Speaker, the public is fed up with stock answers they are reading in the papers and hearing elsewhere when the government says it's not in the public interest to disclose terms of contracts in regard to insurance, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just one more thing in reply to the Attorney General and his oratory regarding public information. Just keep on making those speeches. We love them, because I know now you're not the tiger I was led to believe when I first came to sit in this legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General wishes — he said he wants to take this motion right out. Would you make up an amendment and see if we'll accept it? You have been making amendments all the way through but if you don't want to I'll make the amendment and put it.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 237

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River) moved, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) that an order of the Assembly do issue for a Return No. 237 showing:

The total amount of money the Government of Saskatchewan, Crown corporations, or any entity of the Government of Saskatchewan has spent or loaned for uranium development since March 1, 1971.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the incompetence of the opposition is almost totally frightening as witnessed by this order for Return No. 237. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks in this vein in this regard speaking to this order for return. Mr. Speaker, look what the question asks. I'm going to read it.

The total amount of money the Government of Saskatchewan, Crown corporations, or any entity of the Government of Saskatchewan has spent or loaned for uranium development since March 1, 1971.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that incompetence is one thing in the framing of this question but going back to 1971 is compounded by irresponsibility which makes it a double

difficulty. Take a look at this, Mr. Speaker. This question is a motion which is impossible to answer. Mr. Speaker, the total amount of money spent — what and how are we to compute that?

Mr. Speaker, I say this to the member for Regina South, are we to compute expenditures that have been incurred with respect to the staff? That's money spent by the Government of Saskatchewan for uranium development. Are we to include expenditures in central agencies in this regard, Mr. Member for Regina South? Are we to go through virtually every employee's time and arbitrarily assess the amount of time that employee may or may not have spent on work related to uranium development since March 1, 1971? Mr. Speaker, it would almost amount to making a guess. That kind of a request is, as I say, absolutely impossible, absolutely ludicrous, Mr. Speaker. Now comes another series of questions related to this area.

Expenditures — I remind Mr. Speaker, again, about what the motion say so of money by the government, Crown corporations, or any entity. Is the Bayda inquiry an entity of the government? Do we have to put that in there? Is the assistance which has been given to various groups to prepare their presentations to inquiries — are they entities of governments — to be included? Are we to compute, Mr. Speaker, matters related, for example, to road construction or winter roads to Uranium City. Are we to compute the expenditure related to meetings with people at federal level on uranium development? How in the world are we to compute that kind of an expenditure?

I say the incompetence is absolutely frightening. If Beauchesne had a mechanism of moving non-confidence in the opposition it would give me the greatest pleasure to do that, Mr. Speaker. But I can't do it.

Then, on top of that, I say some of the members opposite are frankly very negligent in their duties as MLAs when they ask this question. Large portions of this question can be answered (not totally, obviously, because of the details I've raised) by somebody over there on the opposition side looking at an annual report. That's all it takes, for them to take a look at an annual report of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, which probably accounts for 85 per cent or 90 per cent of a certain type of expenditure related to uranium development. These large expenditures can be easily discovered. If somebody in that Conservative opposition who drafted these questions would simply take the time to read the annual reports, this question would not be necessary.

I've come to the conclusion this question is made necessary by the wilful refusal by members opposite to do their jobs. The result is they would have the government do their job for them. I, for my part, Mr. Speaker, think it's not the role of government to assist the opposition in framing questions when we would not know in what area they wanted the question asked. When we tender amendments to motions, we tender amendments in order to put the question in answerable form. This question is unanswerable. I think this question has been asked because of its fuzziness. It's been asked because it reflects the fuzziness of the Devine PC Party on uranium as a whole. The Devine machine in the PC party as exemplified by this question, Mr. Speaker, does not know where it stands on uranium development; or if it does is not willing to tell anyone. Therefore you find a question which is so all-embracing and all-comprehensive. I think the result is that the morale of the PC Party is down. Defections have wracked the party. Two members have left it, I think means this kind of a question — an inability to come to grips with a specific. I think, Mr. Speaker, when you see the various wordings which can be attached to this — it would not be up to me to try

to answer this question and put my own interpretations on what is meant by expenditures. I think it results in an opposition which unfortunately is ill-disciplined in its questions.

This question is an example of that — an opposition which is in the minds of an increasing number of people in Saskatchewan, totally ill-disciplined in this House and outside. Today is a very sad day because of events which I cannot refer to. Obviously I'm straying, Mr. Speaker, but today is a very sad day to have seen a member take the kind of action which was taken. The result, Mr. Speaker, is this fuzzy, inarticulate, impossible-to-answer question. I can only say to you and to all members of the House, there is but one option to deal with such a spurious and incompetent question, which symbolizes the majority of the questions asked, and that is to defeat this motion, Mr. Speaker. Defeat it for the barrenness and the paucity of policy which it reflects here on the part of the Devine PC organization as reflected by this caucus.

I would close by saying, Mr. Speaker (and in particular to the member for Meadow Lake who I know is especially interested in this matter) I would ask him to vote with us in defeating this motion. I would ask the hon. member for Meadow Lake to read the report. Read the SMDC report and then having read it, come back with specific, precise questions — say 1977, '76, a manageable time frame — '77 I think is a fair time frame. Come back with specific questions. I think this is good advice. I would tender it to the member for Rosetown-Elrose and the member for Regina south sitting beside him. Don't leave this to your researchers, read the reports. We are paid to do our job, to read reports. Please, members read them and then come back with a question — not like this question, Mr. Speaker, but a question which is precise and direct. Read them I say to the hon. member for Indian Head. Show that you have the ability to ask questions which are specific and to the point. I say that because this question, for the reason I've articulated which anybody who would consider it with any degree of objectivity would agree, simply cannot be answered. Mr. Speaker, we will be pleased to answer any reasonable question on uranium development. I would even be pleased in answering that question to know where the Devine PC Party stands on uranium development. I would be pleased to know this and we are willing as government to answer any questions answerable in this area. Unfortunately it is not and I think it reflects an incredible degree of incompetence in the opposition. One can only hope in subsequent sessions there will be a crispness, a clarity and a precision of question answering something to which, regrettably we have not experienced to date.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to start out by saying my heart bleeds for the Attorney General. My heart bleeds for the government opposite. I listen to the Attorney General today and notice his adrenalin isn't flowing too well. I'm wondering what effect his day in this legislature had on the man yesterday. I don't see the Attorney General with a crying towel and the theatrics he has put on this afternoon — the phony type of regrets coming from the other side. It really touches me and touches me deeply.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. We only have a few more minutes to go. I would ask the members to give the member his opportunity to speak and I think we'll make it through the night here.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General is wondering what areas we are looking for; he is wondering why we are looking for 1971 until now; he's is wondering what right we have to ask a question like — how much money we've spent? Let me tell you, Mr. Attorney General, under your rules and regulations I lived for many

years having to keep records so when your inspectors came over to check my books they had to be there. If it was matter of six minutes spent on a particular job, the records had to be there and if they weren't I was penalized.

Are you trying to suggest to me and the members of this House the government keeps no records? Are you trying to tell us, Mr. Attorney General, you don't know how much the Bayda commission cost you? Did your government not pay the cost of the Bayda commission? I can't understand the silliness of the remarks made by the Attorney General. What do we include? Well, you include everything spent for uranium. That is what you include. We want to know and the people of this province want to know how much money you have spent on uranium development in this province and on research and whatever area it was you spent it on.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General seems amazed all this work is going to be so difficult. On one hand he says it is an impossibility. We don't know what to look for. We don't know what records they want us to dig into. We don't know how much staff was involved in whatever little tidbit he is talking about. Then he turns immediately around and says, you can find the answer yourselves, it is in the annual report. He says 95 per cent of it is in the annual report. If it is, if as you say that the 90 per cent or 95 per cent of it is in the annual report, then all we are really asking you for is the other 5 per cent or 10 per cent to come up with. Is that so difficult? He makes reference that it's not the role of the government to assist the opposition. Well, I would like to suggest to the Attorney General, it is also not the role of the government to hinder the opposition. The question put forth in this Assembly is a very legitimate question. It is a matter of the dollars and cents your government has spent since 1971 on the development of uranium. We ask you, very legitimately so, how much was it?

The Attorney General is asking if it should include road construction to these mines? If it's involving mines, yes it should. He wants to know if it should include the meetings held because of uranium development? If it was pertaining to uranium development, yes. If you pay for it, yes it should include that. We are asking you in that question how much money did this government spend in the development of uranium? That's the answer we want. That's the answer we expect you to give us. That's the answer the people of this province want. If you want to hide it from them, then you be responsible to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General suggested if there was a way of voting a non-confidence motion against the opposition he would do it. We can do it for the government. I am very tempted at times to do exactly that. But the fact we would be defeated on it by the mere question of numbers makes there hardly any point in it.

He suggested the question should be precise and direct — precise and direct. Well how much more precise and direct does he want it? We asked him directly how much have you spent? We are asking you to tell us. If any member today votes against this motion, then he is telling the people of this province, the taxpayers of this province, whose money it is that you have spent it is none of their business, that you don't have to account to the taxpayers of this province. That's what you will be voting when you vote no on this motion. I urge you to think very, very carefully. Vote this motion down and you are telling the people of this province it's none of their business.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I can't believe the . . . Yes, I guess I can, of the members opposite I can believe it. The member says he just wants to know. He doesn't really know what he wants to know and won't be specific about what

he wants to know — for example, the question of roads. There are indeed some roads in northern Saskatchewan built solely and only for uranium development. There are many other roads built partly for uranium development, partly to get to a community, partly for tourism.

MR. KATZMAN: — For timber.

MR. COWLEY: — For timber, the member for Rosthern says. How do you divide the cost of that road among these? The member doesn't deal with that question. The member doesn't deal with the question of the Department of Mineral Resources. It does have and has had in the year since 1971 some programs directly related to uranium. I can recall there was a radio metric survey done about 1974. It was a program run in conjunction with the federal government. That's very clear and easy to deal with.

But the question of the staff of the Department of Mineral Resources, how much time they might or might not spend on uranium, that calls for a judgment. Mr. Speaker, a question, if it's a good question, if it's a good question from the oppositions; point of view even, should not call upon or I would say allow the people you're asking to make those kinds of subjective judgments. That's a bad question. It's a bad question from the opposition's point of view. It's a terrible question from the point of view of the person trying to answer it because you have no idea what you're looking for.

The Department of Environment — how much of its activities in the last nine years have been related directly or indirectly to uranium? If it's just the cost of the Bayda inquiry that's wanted, that could easily be asked. Is it how much time the deputy minister spends on the estimates you want with respect to uranium development? Mr. Speaker, loans for uranium development — if it's money loaned to SMDC for uranium development, that's very easy to get at. But the government puts out millions and millions of dollars a week in short-term money; from the pension funds there's long-term money. Some of this may have been, I don't know this, loaned to Gulf Minerals. Do the members want to know that? It's hard to know. I presume they do. There are, I would guess Mr. Speaker, 200 to 300 companies involved in northern Saskatchewan. It's almost certain the Government of Saskatchewan or some entity attached to it has loaned money to somebody who's directly or indirectly involved in uranium development. Obviously you want that because you ask for it.

It wasn't loaned with respect to being loaned for uranium development; it was simply loaned to that company because there was an attractive rate for a pension fund or whatever. And the company went out there and bought it. It would be on a public market so it wouldn't be any of the small companies.

Mr. Speaker, the question is impossible to answer accurately. If the members want to know how much money this Department of Mineral Resources has spent on programs associated with the development of uranium in northern Saskatchewan we could answer a question more directly related like that. But this kind of question is impossible to answer because I suppose one could argue that 7 per cent or whatever of cabinet's time has been spent on the question of uranium development or 2 per cent, whatever it would be. One would obviously have to prorate that.

The Attorney General said 85 per cent approximately (or more —who knows?) of the money the government has likely spent on uranium development has been by SMDC. Certainly, there's no problem with the question if the members want to ask it; the total

amount of money the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation has invested in uranium development and uranium-related activities because it's neatly divided up within SMDC. We can do that. But, Mr. Speaker, we can't answer the question as put forward by the members without making all sorts of subjective judgments.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you want a ball park figure then ask for a ball park figure. The ball park figure you should say then. Now you want to ask for it, ask it. You just move the amendment. You just move an amendment which says, give us the ball park figure for the amount of money the Government of Saskatchewan has spent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY: — You move the amendment, I'll support the amendment and we'll give you the answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: — The Attorney General always in his same way tried to make a man of straw. He puts up his man of straw for any question. He says, you have to be crisp and you have to be concise, or we won't give you an answer. We can't answer that question.

Last fall I asked a question in this House and here's how specific it was, Mr. Speaker: a copy of the contract between Raymond Moriyama and the Government of Saskatchewan or its authorized party regarding the development of plans of Meewasin Valley. Now, that was asked last fall. There is the Attorney General saying, all you have to ask is this question. My question is, how could you be more precise? I simply asked him for a copy of the contract between the people's government and architect they were dealing with. But do you see that information forthcoming? Not a chance. He says it's on the order paper. How many answers are we going to get? They will decide how many answers we get. You throw up your man of straw as to how the question is answered. What we should be looking at, as members of this Assembly, is the flow of information. The Attorney General talks about the freedom of information.

What is particularly the trouble with some freedom of information? I say to the members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, on the question of the freedom of information: What would freedom of information do to this process today? What we could do is go to the government under the proposed bill, (the bill proposed by Jed Baldwin), and say, this is the information we want. We don't have to go through this process. We could go to the government. But I'll tell you. You get \$10 for each question. You do pretty well. But the most important thing about that freedom of information is you boys have to answer the question. That's what you don't want to address. So you throw up — oh, you didn't put that question quite the right way. We're not going to answer that. Or the Attorney General is going to say, we can't support that type of a motion. The net result, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. They're not going to answer the question. They don't want to answer the question because this is probably one of the most secretive governments in this whole country.

Are we going to have freedom of information? I doubt it. We have our public accounts which started today. Well, toss it in a room in the basement with doors barred to the media. That's open government? Another example of good honest open government by the boys opposite. Ask the media. Do they give you the information up there? Same as

they give us. It's a secretive government. They worry about a little question.

So, I say to the people of this Assembly, the purpose of the rules is this: A member is to have a right to submit a written question and that written question must be specific to one department and it must be specific to one year. That is what we have here — the written question. Sure it is to find information and the reason you have to go through this type of a rigmarole is because we don't have a system. We don't have a system where you can go ask the Minister of Labour, for example, can I have this information? If he says it's O.K. you can have it; but if he says no, it could be politically damaging, you could use that against me so I won't give the information to you . . . That is the type of system we use in this country.

I say to you people if you're interested in expediting things you will give serious consideration to the freedom of information law. I heard the Attorney General and the press the other day . . . we're starting to consider it now . . . the province of Ontario has . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not your bill in a month of Sundays!

MR. ANDREW: — Oh, he doesn't like the bill. The bill proposed is the same type of bill advanced by Jed Baldwin. Now it's Jed Baldwin's bill that is not effective.

MR. SPEAKER: — I was under the impression the item before the House was a notice of motion for Return No. 37 moved by the member for Arm River, seconded by the member for Rosthern, on which the following members have spoken: the member for Arm River; the member for Saskatoon Riversdale; the member for Regina South; the member for Biggar; and now the member for Kindersley. But I am unable to relate the remarks of the member for Kindersley to the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . ball park figure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDREW: — Oh, the Attorney General is talking about a ball park figure; he throws out a ball park figure and then he wants to talk . . . he's shouting it down . . . the member for Redberry wants to advance something about a ball park figure but what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is this . . . the Attorney General is standing in his place as have most of the people in the House for a lot of the period today.

And this is why I say the freedom of information does have application, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General makes light of any question that has to be advanced — well, I don't like that one, or I don't like this one. It doesn't say this, or it's not precise enough, or it's too wide ranging. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the whole basis and the whole thrust of what he is saying is that the questions aren't right, they shouldn't be this and we can't give that information. Clearly this has to do with freedom of information. Clearly this ties into the whole process because what we are interested in and what this whole debate is about is, what questions do the opposition ask and what information is the government required to give to the opposition? This is the whole questions, Mr. Speaker, and this is what the basis of freedom of information is. I think it has great application in addressing ourselves to how the question is asked and how the question is to be answered. Giving it in that vein, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it does have a great deal of application to this particular question and this particular motion — whether it be about uranium or whether it be about gasohol.

The way the law is now in this country and particularly in this province, I suggest, differs

from most countries in Europe. Sweden has freedom of information; West Germany has freedom of information; Belgium, Great Britain, France, Austria and on this continent the United States . . . The province of Ontario has done major research and is ready to come out with a report in the next two weeks or so. The bill before the House in the last administration, supported by Mr. Broadbent and his people in Ottawa, the Ontario NDP are . . .

Mr. Speaker, I have more to say on this. I will call it 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.