

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 24, 1984**

**EVENING SESSION**

**MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable) (continued)**

**Return No. 19**

**Mr. Lingenfelter** moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Blakeney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 19 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of province trips made by the Minister of Health; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move an amendment . . .

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I'd like an opportunity to speak to the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You should have spoken before you handed it in, but proceed.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Next time, Mr. Speaker, I will do it in the proper order.

The reason for requesting this information, of course, as has been mentioned on a number of occasions, and particularly last Tuesday when we did a number of other motions for return, of course, is to try to assess and to establish the amount of money that the minister in question, in this case the Minister of Health, would have spent in different areas:

(1) number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Health, in each case his destination and the purpose of the trip, (which I think is a reasonable request); the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense. (I think here again that kind of information in other assemblies and in other areas has been given, so this is nothing new or shocking); in each case the total cost of the trip, separated according to cost incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, and miscellaneous.

Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned that in other jurisdictions, namely in Alberta where the Premier has taken various trips out of province, this kind of information was forthcoming to the Assembly in Alberta within six weeks, and I think that having these questions on the order paper, some of them being since last November, in the case of three of them since a year ago, I think we're not being unreasonable in asking for this type of information.

Because I think the public would be interested to know, when a minister goes to China or to Saudi Arabia, the people who go with him, the kind of air fare that is paid, whether it's first-class or whether it's private executive aircraft, or whatever type of transportation they use. I think the public of Saskatchewan, who is paying for the bill, has a right to know. I think they have a right to know, as well, the people who go with them, and what is paid for on their behalf, and also what bills are picked up by the staff who accompany the minister.

I don't think it's out of order for the opposition in this Assembly, or in the House of Commons; and, Mr. Speaker, you will be well aware of the issue made by the opposition in the House of Commons, for example, when the Prime Minister, at various times throughout his career, has travelled to New York, and whether or not the clubs that he attends in New York, the discotheques or wherever he might be, whether it was paid for at public expense.

I think it would be interesting to know what clubs the Minister of Health might be attending, or going to, when he goes to Palm Springs, and whether or not it's paid for at public expense. And I think the Minister of Health, if he were here tonight, would want this question to be answered, because as I understand it, he was down there at the request of someone else, and there's a good chance that a good number of these things were paid for by the people who invited him down. Maybe they weren't. But I think it's the prerogative of the public to ask, through the opposition, for this kind of information, and I'm sure, in most cases, the expenses that are incurred are legitimate.

One may question whether the Deputy Premier should be out of the House for three weeks during a session, in Saudi Arabia, and whether the consequences of that trip are going to be worthwhile, and whether we will have any great amount of business being incurred. I'm not sure whether we're going to export oil there, or what we're planning on exporting to that part of the world. But in the case of the Minister of Health, which this question is directed at, I don't know why he would be adverse to answering the question about meal expenses, hotels, whether it's a 200 or \$300 hotel room; whether there's any bottles of expensive wine or cognac that are being bought. I think the public has a right to know these kind of things.

And in other jurisdictions, for example in B.C., you will remember . . . The members opposite seem to think that this doesn't happen. But in B.C. you'll know the furore that was raised when the expensive wines were put on expense accounts.

And I think the reason you're not giving this information is because you're hiding something. And I say that the public of Saskatchewan would think the same thing. If you weren't hiding anything, why wouldn't you make these expense accounts known to the public so they could make their own judgement?

And I'll ask you in this case, Mr. Minister — and the Minister of Health said a number of times that he isn't one to travel out of the province a great deal — to let this one go, and let the public and the opposition see exactly where the money is being spent on out-of-province trips.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that there's a couple of fairly . . . You can listen. I read the *Hansard* from the Leader of the Opposition when he advanced his theory. I think when you listen to the, listen to the argument of the opposition House Leader today, you ask and really see where the questions are coming from, and where they're coming from, Mr. Speaker.

I read not more than a week ago, Mr. Speaker, . . . I read not more than a week ago, Mr. Speaker, in I think it was the *Leader-Post*, where the leader, the government House Leader of the opposition was being interviewed, and the interview went basically as follows: that we in the opposition are more concerned this session without scandalmongering — we're not looking for scandals. We're really getting down to the issue. We're talking about jobs, talking about how we're spending our health dollars, and how we're spending our education dollars. And that was the thing that they saw as the main focus that they had to come in in this session, Mr. Speaker.

Now let's look at the record; let's look at the record. They have raised a question of jobs, I think two, maybe three times, since last fall — three times in the House, perhaps, Mr. Speaker.

The estimates for the Department of Health, which is exceeding \$1 billion, \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker — one-third of the entire budget in less than half a day — it went from 7 o'clock to 10 o'clock at night. All I say, Mr. Speaker, is we should go back . . . We should go back in this Assembly and perhaps the members opposite should take a page out of history, Mr. Speaker, and study what the Assembly is all about and what parliament is all about. The concept of parliament, Mr. Speaker, is grievance before supply. That's really what we're talking about.

And what we're seeing from the opposition House Leader today is not whether or not the dollars are being spent on health properly, or whether we're doing the proper things for jobs, or whether the money is being spent properly on education, Mr. Speaker. They have this information that they want to go down in finite detail. We can take staffs days and days and days . . . (inaudible) . . . to figure it out, Mr. Speaker.

They're not concerned whether dollars are being spent the right way, they're not concerned whether dollars are being allocated to the right departments and the important vehicles. What they're concerned about is: they read in the paper three years ago that some minister in B.C. had a fancy bottle of cognac. And we heard it tonight; we heard it coming out of them tonight, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we can ask all these questions, get these people working for this information, trying to dig out this information, Mr. Speaker, so they can find a bottle of cognac. I don't know one minister that's bought a bottle of cognac. If we want to, we can maybe try finding that information out, Mr. Speaker. But that's really what they're looking at.

And then they raised the question, really the question they're raising: where's the Deputy Premier? He hasn't been in the House for a week, or a month. He's over at Saudi Arabia. And what's he selling to Saudi Arabia? Oil? Surely, Mr. Speaker . . . Surely, Mr. Speaker, they can come to resolve the members opposite that there is an aspect of our economy, both in this province and in this country, and the most important part of our economy, Mr. Speaker, and that's to be able to sell our product across the oceans — whichever ocean you might look at — and we have to seek out and find those markets.

The Deputy Premier — I've spoken to him on several occasions — has been in Germany, has a very potential market for our product, and as well in Saudi Arabia. Not selling oil, Mr. Speaker, but trying to sell farm machinery, assist in selling farm machinery made and manufactured in the province of Saskatchewan. Those are the areas he's looking at. They raised the same thing. They raised the same issue.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. The motion that we're discussing tonight deals with travel by the Minister of Health, and I would ask the member to get back to the subject.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was simply responding to the issues raised by the hon. member from Shaunavon in the moving of the motion.

I think this matter has been, as I understand, last week raised pretty much all of Tuesday. What we intend to do, Mr. Speaker, is provide the information so that the people can see the number of trips being taken by ministers, wherever those trips might be. That's forthcoming. That information is certainly forthcoming, Mr. Speaker — the type of information I can quite honestly say I didn't see when I was in opposition.

Who was travelling with those people; what members would be travelling on those particular trip; the destination of where you were going; the purpose of the trip; the name of the people accompanying them: that information is there, Mr. Speaker, along with the total costs.

Now they make reference to the Premier of Alberta, and the Premier of Alberta was under some fire a month ago, I recall reading in the newspaper, under some fire for the amount of dollars that he spent on a trip to the Pacific Rim, a fairly extensive trip as I understand.

That type of information is available — is going to be available through these returns, Mr. Speaker, and I would, at this point in time, move an amendment to the motion — that's motion no. 19, Mr. Speaker.

That the motion for return no. 19 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after "trip" in subsection (3).

I so move that amendment, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines, the member from Saskatoon Sutherland.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

### Return No. 20

**Mr. Lingenfelter** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no 20 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Supply and Services; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 20 showing, Mr. Speaker, in part, this motion asks for similar information on out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Supply and Services, and breaks it down into the same categories.

The minister will well know that he is attempting to say that the opposition has no right to know in detail, in any detail, the expense accounts of ministers. And I say that this is sheer folly, that he would believe (or try to make anyone believe) the public doesn't believe that they don't have a right to know what their tax dollars are being spent on. Very simply, they don't want to know the total of the trip. What they would like to know very much is the detail of the expenses. And I think that's a legitimate request of any taxpayer - to know what their tax dollars are being spent on by ministers and their staff when they go out of province.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, you will be well aware in the House of Commons in the Parliament of Canada, that day after day your party will question the government on expense accounts of ministers, or on air fare, or whether they're transporting their family to various parts of the world. And it's an important issue. And I agree with you, in the House of Commons it is, and in the Saskatchewan legislature it is an important matter that the public have access to detailed information of expense accounts of ministers.

And I simply fail to understand how you, as part of a Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, would think that it would be perfectly legitimate for your opposition colleagues in Ottawa to question Trudeau on matters such as this. And I agree with them that the NDP and the Conservative opposition have every right to demand for the public of Saskatchewan, or the public of Canada, where the money is being spent. And I fail to understand how you somehow separate yourself — that the government in Saskatchewan does not have the same obligation to the taxpayers of this province.

And in moving this motion, I would hope that you will get up and explain to me how the Minister of Supply and Services doesn't have to tell the public how he spends the public's money when he's out of province on government business, on: air fare, hotels, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses and miscellaneous, if it's for any other reason than to cover up where he is spending the money.

**An Hon. Member:** — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the Minister of Supply and Services is even, in fact,

...

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes reference to Minister of Supply and Services, and I doubt that the Minister of Supply and Services even left the province in the last year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member from Shaunavon makes reference to what the Conservative Party and the NDP Party did in Ottawa with regard to travel. And the most recent one I recall, I think, was before Christmas. And I think it was, in my view, and I think we can look at our own parties, I think it was a disgraceful effort that they put forward, particularly against Minister Axworthy, trying to leave the innuendo — and that's the news story that come out of there, Mr. Speaker — trying to leave the innuendo that somehow Axworthy was being improper with what he was doing because he took someone on his airplane with him who happened to be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, yes, you can talk about making it public, Mr. Speaker. I think, I think the . . . We're not talking about that. He's talking about what the Conservative Party in Ottawa did. I simply say in response to that, that I think that what the Conservative Party did was trying to, trying to scandalmonger. That's exactly what it was, Mr. Speaker — in trying to twist what, in fact, was taking place. And that type of thing I think was absolutely politically improper, Mr. Speaker, because that's the reference they're trying to do.

Now the member would like to believe, or like the public to believe, that somehow this information is not forthcoming. It is forthcoming, Mr. Speaker, that asking how many trips did the hon. member of Meadow Lake, the Minister of Supply and Services, make outside the province. Well we're going to tell the number of trips. We will. That information is going to be provided. Mr. Speaker — where he went, where he went, Mr. Speaker. The name of each person accompanying, Mr. . . . all that information is there, and the cost — and the cost of that trip, Mr. Speaker. That information is being provided. That information is being provided, Mr. Speaker. That's a legitimate question.

That's a legitimate question to ask the Assembly, ask the government, Mr. Speaker. That information is being provided. It simply will be amended to make it proper, to make the information consistent to what traditionally has been disclosed in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. That information is forthcoming to the people. I think it's up to the people to determine — I'm sure the opposition have tried to make the point on several occasions — that all ministers of this government should stay placed. They should stay put in Saskatchewan. Don't step a foot outside the province; that's an improper thing to do. And stay as a province, stay as a province hived in at your borders — hived in at your borders, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's far more important, I think it's far more important that we as a government move to see what other governments are doing, move to deal with the federal government, move, Mr. Speaker, to deal internationally with issues that are important. When our economy rests and rides on how much we export, I don't apologize on minute for the Minister of Economic Development and Trade being over there assisting Saskatchewan business and Saskatchewan farmers to sell their product.

That's the way it gets done, Mr. Speaker. That's the way the economy of this country works, Mr. Speaker. That's the way the economy of this province works, Mr. Speaker. And I for one, and I believe all the colleagues on this side of the House are of the same view; members opposite are not, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite are not. They wish no one to move, Mr. Speaker. They wish no one to travel, no one to travel, Mr. Speaker; all stay here, all sit here; don't go beyond the borders, don't do any of that.

That's really what the issue is. This is what the issue is here today, Mr. Speaker. This is what the issue is to here, trying to find, trying to find, slithering around to find an expenditure here, and expenditure there. That's what they're trying to do, Mr. Speaker, and then twist it, twist it to the population, twist it to the population so somehow they try to build this elusive scandal they've been searching for, for two years. This elusive scandal — every day they're in here trying another

one, find another one. Somebody didn't get a contract with regards to doing an auction sale. There must be a scandal in here somehow, Mr. Speaker, there must be a scandal in here. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we've been through this, I understand, now 18 to 20 times.

I will simply get on with the day, Mr. Speaker, and move:

That a motion for return no. 20 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

I would so move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Johnson:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce some guests to the Chamber. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce through you and to this Assembly, 14 very young Cubs from the great town of Saltcoats. They're in here trying to wear down their three opponents up there who are Gary Laycock, Don Stroshein and Brian Jones. We hope that they enjoy their stay here this evening and learn something from what's going on on the legislative floor. And when you go to bed tonight sleep well because tomorrow is going to be a busy day, I'm sure. And have a safe trip back home again and I'd like to ask all the members to welcome them to the Chamber.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable) (continued)

#### Return No. 21

**Mr. Lingenfelter** moved, seconded by Mr. Engel, that an order of the Assemble do issue for return no. 21 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Social Services; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotel, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of this Assembly do issue for return no 21 showing. Mr. Speaker, this motion as well speaks to the issue of out-of-province trips by various ministers, this one in particular, the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Minister of Social Services, he has said that he has done very little travel out of province and I think that it would be appropriate seeing as he is in the House, to get up and tell us why he is asking the finance minister to amend this motion so that very detailed expense accounts are not forthcoming.

Mr. Minister, I find it curious that you, being the member of the opposition who stood in this very Assembly not more than two years ago and talked about comprehensive auditing, and talked about a better system of accountability of government, talked about a better way of making things more easy to get at, having more access by the public of government documents, are now standing in this Assembly amending very straightforward motions asking for information

for the public, and you would try to down play it by saying that they're not relevant. Well I think that as the days go by and we continue to raise these, Mr. Minister, they will become relevant and you will get letters from the public which will ask these very questions: about why 200,000 or \$1 million a year — I don't know how much the total amount will be when these numbers come in, but it will be very significant — how much money and why you're not giving comprehensive answers to these questions. And I think that it's very important that you, being the member in the opposition who called for more open government, would now be the one who would get up and call for more closed government and say the opposition and the public don't have a need to have access to what has to be public information, because I think the hotels that people stay at when they're on tax money, the gifts, gratuities, entertainment expenses are very relevant, and I'll be asking for that in this motion as it deals with the Minister of Social Services.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief with regards to this. The hon. member, in two or three earlier motions for this information wanted to know whether ministers were buying cognac and I take it the suggestion somehow that the Minister of Social Services in that group is buying cognac with his expense money. That clearly is not what in fact happens, Mr. Speaker. The information being provided, will be provided, Mr. Speaker, will show any trips made by the Minister of Social Services and where he went on those trips, Mr. Speaker, and who accompanied him, what the purpose of the trip was, and what the cost of the trip was. Mr. Speaker, that is forthcoming.

The hon. member makes reference to days when the sides were changed and they were sitting over on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. In those days the information was absolutely stonewalled, Mr. Speaker, stonewalled in the sense that the requests that we asked for was not forthcoming. He talked about comprehensive audit, Mr. Speaker. There was no . . . There was no effort even to allow the matter to be discussed on the floor of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, or in the committees, wherever it might have been.

I would again move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines:

That motion no. 21 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after trip in subsection (3).

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

### **Return No. 22**

**Mr. Yew** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 22 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the minister responsible for the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 22 showing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the Assembly ready for the question? Why is the member on his feet?

**An Hon. Member:** — I wanted to speak to the motion, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I advise the members when they're moving a motion like this, if you wish to speak to it, speak to it before you move it, and then move the motion and sign it and send it here. After you've sent it here, it's too late and the motion is gone. The House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, I understand the hon. member will be moving the next motion and we will deal with his argument when he comes there.

Mr. Speaker, I would move:

That motion no. 22 be amended as follows: by deleting all the words after "trip" in subsection (3).

I so move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

### **Return No. 23**

**Mr. Yew** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 23 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Yew:** — If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words with respect to this motion for return.

Mr. Speaker, I jotted down a few notes last week during motions for returns portion of the sitting, and I noted with a lot of interest the response and the attitudes of members in government.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with public expenditures — disbursement of public funds administered and appropriated by the Conservative government. While we are dealing and evaluating government expenditures in the interest of the people of this province, we, the official opposition of Saskatchewan, in order that we can do an effective job of ensuring that government expenditures reflect the social and economic needs of the people in this province, we need specific information on what is called for by our motions for return, such as the one in question, motion before the one in question, no. 22 and no. 23, as well as the rest that were introduced here by my colleagues.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to this information — the public of Saskatchewan has a right to this information. They have a right to know how this Conservative government is spending their money, whether or not their appropriations, expenditures, are appropriate.

And rightfully, it is our job to try to determine whether those expenditures are excessive or unreasonable. Mr. Speaker, we can't determine whether or not those expenditures were inappropriate, excessive, or misspent if we don't have the specific detailed information of what is called for in terms of the motions for returns that have been introduced in this legislature. We asked specifically for information regarding the minister's itinerary out of the province. They are:



in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip (that meeting), the name of each person who accompanied him on government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

We have to know what the specifics are in terms of those expenditures, Mr. Speaker, in order to determine whether or not those public expenditures are excessive, unreasonable, or mismanaged. The information that the Minister of Finance is prepared to give the opposition is only a bulk figure which doesn't specify the types of spending that has been incurred by the government, by this government.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government is covering up, it's hiding, and it's withholding public information; it's withholding public information from the people of this province; it's covering up. Rightfully, Mr. Speaker, if they didn't have anything to cover up about, I'm sure that it would have been no problem for them to provide us with this detailed information. There is no sense of co-operation on the part of this government, Mr. Speaker.

Last week I noted with interest, as well, the Attorney General, one of the cabinet ministers that holds a fairly distinguished office for the people of this province — he pointed out that, oh, it's going to cost this government much too much work. Well I say to the Minister of Justice, that at this point in time I see the Government of Saskatchewan wanting to put itself in a positive light with the public, with the people of the province. They sure don't hesitate to put out all kinds of literature, all kinds of political propaganda, and spend all kinds of the public taxpayers' money putting out this type of propaganda. But when it comes down to sharing information with the public, the taxpayers of this province, they're putting hands down on that type of thing.

I want to suggest as well that if it's going to cost work, I want to say to the members in government: we need work. We have 44,000 people on the unemployment line. The unemployment rate is increasing under your administration. So let's give the public a little more work, if you want to spend money in a proper way, rather than paying your multinational corporate friends high interest rates on your \$829 million deficit.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I caution the member that he is not staying with the topic that is in this motion. I would ask him to narrow his comments to the things covered by the motion.

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Speaker, I will so move, seconded by my colleague from Quill Lakes, the return no. 23 showing.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — You know I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in a couple of comments of my hon. friend, the member from Cumberland. Number one, he wanted to know how government spends their money. I simply go back to what I said before, Mr. Speaker, and what the public wants to know. The public wants to . . . That's clearly the part of the parliamentary process.

Now you justify to me, or I ask the members opposite to justify to the population of this province, how they can justify spending three or four times as much time in this Assembly asking this particular question over and over again than they ask about the Department of Health the spending of Department of Health, Mr. Speaker, that spends, Mr. Speaker, a thousand times more money. The never ask questions of almost anything . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member is a long ways off the motion. I'd ask him to return to the motion before the House.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The second thing that was raised by the hon. member, the member

from Cumberland, Mr. Speaker, was that the government is spending a whole lot of money on propaganda. That was the second thrust of the motion that I heard coming from that particular member with regard to this particular information, Mr. Speaker. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the people of this province that know full well, if anybody, if anybody should never raise that subject, the eight people standing over there are the people that should never raise that. They should never have the audacity, Mr. Speaker. They should never have the courage even, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and talk - a—government that had, had wasted, had spent absolutely millions and millions and millions of dollars telling the people of Saskatchewan what a wonderful government they were just prior to being virtually annihilated. And with the thrust that was coming in the House in the last month, Mr. Speaker, they might as well have been annihilated.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore move amendment to the order of the Assembly no. 23, I believe, showing:

Be amended by deleting all words after “the trip” in subsection (3).

I move that, Mr. Speaker, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

### Return No. 24

**Mr. Yew** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 24 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of the Environment; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Yew:** — I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return No. 24 showing. And Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons stated previously by my colleagues and as well by statements I made prior to this resolution, I want to say again that there is no reason why we shouldn't have the specific information that is requested here for the out-of-province trips made by the Minister of the Environment; and

(2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him on government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses

and other miscellaneous costs.

And I may repeat that, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any reason why the government of this province shouldn't provide this information seeing as how it is a disbursement of public funds. And it's supposed to be administered, and appropriated, and spent, for the benefit of the public. And it is the public's right to know the specifics behind those expenditures. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government of Saskatchewan has nothing to hide, if it has nothing to cover up, if it has nothing to be embarrassed about, then they can very well supply this information to the official opposition of Saskatchewan so that we may determine whether or not those expenditures were excessive, unreasonable, within limits, or they were in fact misappropriated

funds by the government of this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, I conclude with that and I move my motion, seconded by the member from Quill Lakes.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will be providing the information as to the number of out-of-town trips, out-of-province trips the minister made. We will be providing the information with regard to who, in fact, went with that minister on those particular trips. We will advise, Mr. Speaker, as to where those trips were, whether they were Calgary, or Ottawa, or where those trips might have been, Mr. Speaker. And we will provide the total cost, all the money that was expended on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan as related to those trips, Mr. Speaker.

To clean up this particular motion, I would move a motion:

That return no. 24 be amended as follows: By deleting all words after “trip” in subsection (3).

I so move, seconded by the hon. member from Saskatoon Sutherland.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

### Return No. 25

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 25 showing:

With respect to renovations undertaken to a suite of offices situated in Regina at 1871 Smith Street and occupied by the deputy minister of consumer and commercial affairs: (1) the nature and extent of renovations undertaken in 1983; (2) the cost of each aspect of the renovations and the total cost of renovations undertaken in 1983; (3) whether or not a water purifier was installed in the suite of offices referred to above; and (4) if a water purifier was installed, the cost and supplier of the same; (5) if a water purifier was installed whether or not it was acquired through a call for tenders.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to preface my motion with very many remarks. It strikes me that the information requested is a fairly straightforward information, fairly straightforward request. I want information with respect to a suite of offices allegedly provided to the deputy minister of commercial and consumer affairs.

In a day when the government is preaching restraint, we assume that they will be happy enough to prove the public that they are indeed practising restraint, and they will give us this information. As I say, I therefore assume that the information will be forthcoming and I will . . . if it isn't, I will respond, Mr. Speaker, and close the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member from Cumberland, that a return do issue for return no. 25 showing:

With respect to renovations undertaken to a suite of offices situated in Regina at 1871 Smith Avenue and occupied by the deputy minister of consumer and commercial affairs: (1) the nature and extent of renovations undertaken in 1983; (2) the cost of each aspect of renovations, the total cost of renovations undertaken in 1983; (3) whether or not a water purifier was installed in the suite of offices referred to above; and (4) if a water purifier was installed, the costs, and the supplier of the

same; (5) if a water purifier was installed whether or not it was acquired through a call for tenders.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear from my information, Mr. Speaker, as to the actual response. That I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, we can provide the members opposite with meaningful information from this particular question. And perhaps we can deal with it next week, and I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### Return No. 26

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 26 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotel, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I have unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, been absent from the House for a few days. And I have read in the newspaper, the . . . I have, Mr. Speaker, read in the newspaper the comments of the minister and the controversy that's gone on with respect to this information.

I am frankly surprised that this government has suddenly decided to be so secretive. As I said in an earlier return, this government preaches restraint. One would think it would be happy with the opportunity to show that it is practising restraint.

I very much suspect, however, that the answers to these questions would prove just the opposite. I very much suspect that in this area, as in so many others, the government practises one thing and preaches quite another. I suspect that we are going to find that the expenditures under ministerial trips are going to fall in line with the kind of expenditures we've seen on senior public servants' salaries, increases in ministers, and so on. I suspect that this is going to, Mr. Speaker, simply repeat a pattern of a government that's living high off the hog for itself and its friends, and imposing restraint on others who can ill afford it.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I move that an order for the Assembly do issue for return no. 26 showing.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with this question, similar questions, for almost an hour now, and I understand for most of a day last week. Without getting into further debate on it, Mr. Speaker, I would move:

That the motion for return no. 26 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after "trip" in subsection (3).

I would so move, seconded by the minister responsible for Supply and Services.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

**Return No. 27**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 27 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Co-Operation and Co-Operative Development; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move a motion:

For return no. 27 be amended as follows: by deleting all word after “trip” in subsection (3).

And I so move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

**Return No. 28**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 28 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Labour; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to cost incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the motion for return no. 28 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after “trip” in subsection (3).

I so move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended negatived.

**Return No. 29**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 19 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Culture and Recreation; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels,

meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I do move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 29 showing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion? Did you not call question?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mistakenly, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the motion for return no. 29 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after “trip” in subsection (3).

I would so move, seconded by the hon. member from Meadow Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended negatived.

### Return No. 30

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 30 showing:

Regarding the period of April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Urban Affairs; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 30 showing, seconded by the member from Cumberland, all properly filled in.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move:

That the motion for return no. 30 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after “trip” in subsection (3).

I would so move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we have had many protestations that the government opposite will give us the information. When we asked for extended information, they decided that wasn't necessary, but they would give us the restricted information.

We're about to find out whether they will give us the restricted information — whether they will vote for what they said they were going to do, or whether they will sit mum in their seats and vote against what their House Leader has said they would give us. Twice now they have not done what the House Leader said they would do. We will see what they are going to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 31

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 31 showing:

Regarding the period April 1, 1983 to December 7, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister responsible for Sask Housing Corporation; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move:

The motion for return no. 31 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after “trip” in subsection (3).

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 33

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** moved, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 33 showing:

With respect to air fares paid by the Department of the Executive Council for persons who, during the period May 8, 1982 to December 8, 1983, flew on commercial airlines: (1) the total dollar amount paid for air fares; (2) the names of each person for whom an air fare was paid; (3) the destination of the flight which each person took for which an air fare was paid; and (4) the total dollar amount paid in respect of each person for whom each air fare was paid.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we have a different issue before the House at the moment. This does not concern the travelling expenses of any cabinet minister, but concerns air fares paid by the Department of the Executive Council. It's very straightforward, simply asks for the air fares paid by the Executive Council, for whom, the total dollar amounts paid on behalf of each person — doesn't even ask for the individual payments on behalf of each person, but simply asks the total dollar amount for all air fares; the names of each person for whom an air fare was paid; the destination of the flight; and the total dollar amount for each individual for whom air fares were paid. I think it is . . . will not be of particularly onerous, there won't be that many, since it is confined to commercial airlines and does not cover the use of the government aircraft, the CVA aircraft, and accordingly, will cover only commercial airline flights. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my colleague, the member for Shaunavon, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 33 showing.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, with regard to this particular motion, I can advise the members opposite that we will be providing them with meaningful information in response to this particular question. That information will be forthcoming in due course during this session, and at this point in time I would ask for leave, Mr. Speaker to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### Return No. 34

**Mr. Lingenfelter** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 34 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to December 8, 1983 the name and position of each individual in every department, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan who was dismissed and the reason for dismissal.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 34 showing, Mr. Speaker, this question basically asks for the period May 8, 1982 to December 8, 1983, the name, position, of each individual in every department. Crown corporation, and agency of Government of Saskatchewan who were dismissed, and the reason for the dismissal. And, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, you will be well aware of the reason for wanting this, so we can correlate the amount of money which has been spent in the whole operation as opposed to the number of people who have been dismissed. And also the reason, because I think there's a good number of people who have been let go by your government, which has meant, basically, that the civil service of Saskatchewan is much the less for your actions.

Not only this, but I think, Mr. Minister, you'll be aware as well that a number of very good employees, even at the deputy minister level . . . And you have heard over the weekend of another deputy who's fleeing the province. What you have done is set in motion an action through your firings that is scaring off what has to have been the best professional civil service in North America. And not only the firings that you're doing are creating that kind of an atmosphere, but you're losing a good number of people who are simply not being fired or not being let go, but of leaving the province — afraid of the fact that the day will come when they will have to deal with the axe being wielded by either yourself or other ministers.

We would like this information. And I would appreciate it if you would not adjourn this, but get that information to us, because it's for a period which is now long since past and we would like to have it.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would . . . With regards to this information, I think it's again the type of information that I suppose was the political battle of the first year in office as the number of people being dismissed by this government. The members opposite took score with us on every one that was dismissed, and perhaps the media did as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think that any government taking office has to make changes. Those changes were, in fact, made.

All that information, Mr. Speaker, all that information — the hon. member asked us to provide this type of information so he can tally up what the severance package was, Mr. Speaker. That's clearly been set out with regards to the OC people that were terminated, Mr. Speaker. They've been through that process. We laid it out. It's in the papers. They want to crop the whole question up again.

The information has always been before the public, Mr. Speaker. We've indicated that we believe that we had to move with regard to certain members of the civil service, Mr. Speaker. I believe that morale has recovered.

The hon. member makes reference to the departure of certain deputy ministers. I might suggest to the member opposite that he is sadly mistaken, and he might talk to the deputy minister. He might also find out, he might also find out, Mr. Speaker, the amount of remuneration being paid by that deputy minister in his new job is significantly higher than I'm sure anybody in this Assembly would propose that we would pay any deputy minister, Mr. Speaker.

I would encourage all ministers to vote against this particular motion, to negative this particular



motion in the interest of keeping things going.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak very briefly on this. It is remarkably difficult to figure what could be the public basis for rejecting information. It simply asks: during a period from May 8, which was the date of the last occasion when asked this information, to December 8, which was the date that this order was put on the order paper. There is nothing significant about the dates, except that we simply did not wish the government to repeat the information they had already given us. So for a period up to December 8, the name, and the position of each individual who was dismissed, and the reason for the dismissal.

The information itself is totally neutral. It simply asks information about the persons who were dismissed. Whether or not the list would be short or long, will depend upon the actions of the government, and what information . . . What use is made of that information on the hustings is no concern of this legislature, if the information which we ask for is proper information for the public.

And I submit it is proper information for the public to know who is dismissed, and the reasons for the dismissal. And if that information is available in simple form somewhere else, I would be delighted if some other member will stand up in this debate and tell me where I can get that information in simple form. And I submit it is nowhere to be found in simple form . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I'm happy to have the member for Regina South, the member for Revenue and Financial Services, seemingly contradict me. And I know he will enter this debate and tell me where I can get a list of the people who were dismissed and the reasons for the dismissal. I fancy he won't do that, because he can't do that, because it doesn't exist. And I suggest that it's perfectly reasonable and proper for the public to wish to know this information, and for us as an opposition to ask for it. If the government feels that the dismissals were all proper — and I'm not now debating that — they will have no difficulty giving that answer in reply, if somebody seeing this information feels otherwise.

But certainly, the mere fact that the government cannot mount an argument in defence of his operations, or in defence of the information, is no reason for denying the information. And I don't think that's the case. I think the government can mount an argument. I think the government can give reasons for the dismissals. I don't think that they are ashamed of the reasons for dismissal. I don't think they're ashamed of the numbers. And accordingly, I am at a loss to understand why, when they indicate that they're in no way discomfited by the number of persons dismissed, and they are in no way discomfited by revealing the reasons for the dismissals, which they state are all proper, if in fact.

But certainly, the mere fact that the government cannot mount an argument in defence of his operations, or in defence of the information, is no reason for denying the information. And I don't think that's the case. I think the government can mount an argument. I think the government can give reasons for the dismissals. I don't think that they are ashamed of the reasons for dismissal. I don't think they're ashamed of the numbers. And accordingly, I am at a loss to understand why, when they indicate that they're in no way discomfited by the number of persons dismissed, and they are in no way discomfited by revealing the reasons for the dismissals, which they state are all proper, if in fact those two facts are right, that they do not think they have made any errors with respect to the numbers, or with respect to the reasons, I am at a loss to know why they will not give us the information, information which, as they say, is totally harmless so far as they are concerned, but will assist us and I suggest assist the public assessing the conduct of the government.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

**YEAS - 6**

Blakeney  
Lingenfelter

Koskie  
Lusney

Shillington  
Yew

**NAYS - 38**

Muller  
McLeod  
Andrew  
Rousseau  
Pickering  
Hardy  
McLaren  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Baker  
Schoenhals  
Currie  
Sandberg  
Klein

Embury  
Dirks  
Maxwell  
Young  
Domotor  
Folk  
Muirhead  
Petersen  
Bacon  
Parker  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)  
Hopfner  
Myers

Rybchuk  
Caswell  
Hampton  
Gerich  
Boutin  
Schmidt  
Meagher  
Glauser  
Zazelenchuk  
Johnson  
Weiman  
Morin

**Return No. 35**

**Mr. Lingenfelter** moved, seconded by Mr. Shillington, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 35 showing:

With respect to the purchase by the Saskatchewan government, during the period May 8, 1982 and December 8, 1983, of automobiles for use by members of the Executive Council, permanent heads, and personnel employed by each agency, board, commission, committee, corporation, department, and office of the Saskatchewan government: (1) the number of vehicles purchased; (2) the year, model, style, and type of each vehicle purchased; (3) the total dollar cost of each vehicle purchased; and (4) the name of each person to whom each vehicle has been assigned for use, including assignment for personal use.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly for a return no. 35 showing:

This motion basically asks for:

With respect to the purchase of the Saskatchewan government during the period from May 8, 1982 to December 8, 1983, of automobiles for use by members of the Executive Council, permanent heads, personnel employed by each agency, board, commission, committee, corporation, department, and office of the Saskatchewan government: (1) the number of vehicles purchased; (2) the year, model, style, and type of each vehicle purchased; (3) the total dollar cost of each vehicle purchased; and (4) the name of each person to whom each vehicle has been assigned for use, including assignment for personal use.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this needs very little explanation. I think it's a routine question that has been asked by other — by other groups, by other administrations, and by previous governments in the province. And I think it's pretty straightforward. And we would expect that information to be available with very little difficulty.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, we're going to again propose some amendments to this particular motion. And I hear the members opposite talking cover-up, cover-up. This type of question was asked last year, Mr. Speaker, as well, and a lot of people put a lot of effort and time into providing those returns, to deliver to the House. And now they go back, Mr. Speaker. Now they go back and ask as of May 8, 1982 — that exact information was provided from May 8 to March 18 of 1983. Mr. Speaker, the information was provided. The information was provided, Mr. Speaker, last year to them.

The members opposite obviously have talked about cover-up. They obviously have not even read the material provided to them, Mr. Speaker. Therefore we're going to have to amend it so we don't have to go all back over it to provide the information all over again, to take it all the way over to give it to them, Mr. Speaker, only for having to stick it up on their shelf and draw more dust for another year, Mr. Speaker. They talk about using the dollars properly. Hardly, Mr. Speaker: hardly, Mr. Speaker, when they don't even read the information provided to them last year.

So what we will do, Mr. Speaker, is amend that information to become effective from March 18, 1983, rather than having to go back and provide another heap of material to them. Mr. Speaker, this just simply is a waste of paper and a waste of people's time to have to provide that particular information . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, the member opposite says, well if you gave it to us last year, how much time are you wasting to give it to us again? Next thing they're going to ask us to have somebody come over and read it to them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to move that an amendment to that particular motion to clarify, Mr. Speaker, to clean it up, and I would hope when the information is provided that the members opposite will, in fact, read it. If they're doing this simply to be able to say — ah, cover-up, cover-up, where somebody's buying cognac, and they don't even read the information, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

If, Mr. Speaker, they say — the member from Shaunavon now says they want to check it to make sure the information is right. If they didn't read it the first time, how would they know? They probably lost it, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I would move:

That the motion for return no. 35 be amended by substituting:

March 18, 1983

For "May 8, 1982," by deleting the words after "permanent heads" in the third line of the return, and by deleting subsection (4):

Therefore the motion will read:

With respect to the purchase by Saskatchewan Government during the period March 18, 1983 to December 8, 1983 of the automobiles for use by members of the Executive Council, and permanent heads, (1) the number of vehicles purchased; (2) the year, model, style, type of each vehicle purchased; (3) the total dollars cost of each vehicle purchased.

Mr. Speaker, that information is forthcoming. I hope the members opposite that that information and read the information, Mr. Speaker. I am convinced beyond any doubt they're not going to find another scandal that they are so desperately looking for throughout all of these questions,

Mr. Speaker. I hope they read it, Mr. Speaker.

I so move that amendment, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister will well know what he's attempting to do here when he says, "The opposition is calling cover-up." It's with good reason on this issue. The minister will know that what he's amending here is changing the whole . . . (inaudible) . . . and will get the information that we asked for in the original from last year.

Mr. Minister, your government amended it last year to change from Executive Council permanent heads, personnel employed in each agency, board, commission, committee, corporation, department, and office of the Government of Saskatchewan. You did not give us a complete list last year. You amended it to say, "Executive Council and permanent heads," the same as you're doing here tonight. For you to stand here and say that you gave us the information we asked for last year, is not true. You didn't give it to us. You amended the motion to delete part of it and to say only, "Executive Council and permanent heads," and that's why we are coming back and re-asking the original question of this other group of people, namely, personnel employed by each agency, board, commission, committee, corporation, department, and office of the Saskatchewan government. And also, the fourth point, the name of each person to whom each vehicle has been assigned for use, including assignment for personal use.

Now, Mr. Minister, you will see the distinction between the two questions, and you will now know if you didn't before (and I find it hard to believe that you didn't) that the list that you will give us, if you would accept our motion, will be quite different than what you amended last year and what you are amending this year. And you ask, next year we will have a similar question on asking for the period from May 8, 1982 to that period which will occur during the next session. Because, once again, we are not getting the whole story, and once again we're getting a cover-up on the number of vehicles and the persons they are given to in the province of Saskatchewan. And here again, there can only be one explanation for it, and that's because you are embarrassed as to who has cars and what kind of cars they have, whether it's in the Crown corporation sector, or in the department sector. You will know what I am talking about. The press will know what I'm talking about, and I say the public of Saskatchewan will know that you're attempting, once again, to cover up your number of vehicles and who they are given to. So for you to stand up here and sanctimoniously say we're asking for the same information again is unfortunate, but I think the public will be very clear on what you're attempting to do in attempting to mislead this Assembly.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 36

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 36 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982, to December 8, 1983: all recommendations made by the minimum wage board to the Minister of Labour respecting the provincial minimum wage.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, this information was asked I believe last year as well. The issue before the Assembly, I think, on this wider question, is whether or not the government is going to increase the minimum wage, or leave the minimum wage at the point where it is, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Labour has spoke to many, many people on that type of information, and the recommendations being . . . (inaudible) . . . To the minister, Mr. Speaker, that type of information is internal as to what recommendations are made, and I would simply ask all

members to vote against.

**Mr. Shillington:** — It is extremely difficult to know why it is the public interest that this information should be kept confidential. This is not some comments made by a deputy minister to a minister. This is a publicly appointed board who, presumably with some degree of independence, provide the government with recommendations with respect to minimum wage. And, indeed, have hearings. And I'm just fazed to know why it is in the public interest that these recommendations should be kept confidential.

I can think of reasons why these recommendations — why it would not be in the government's interest to disclose these recommendations. Because I suspect that the minimum wage board has joined a growing list of Saskatchewan people who find that this government's treatment of those on minimum wage to be harsh and intolerable, and I suspect, not in the best interests of an economic recovery.

The recommendations made by the minimum wage board have been made public in the past, indeed that has been done in the past, and I just simply don't understand why it is not in the public interest that this be disclosed. I think it's obvious this is a move by the government to limit the amount of publicity and the amount of ammunition those who oppose their policies have.

It's another example of a government that is fast becoming a highly secretive government who keep to themselves anything that they think might conceivably do them any harm. I suggest to the minister that the motion should be passed in its present form.

Motion negatived on division.

#### Return No. 37

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 37 showing:

Regarding the hiring of defeated political candidates: (1) for the period May 8, 1982 to December 8, 1983 a list of all individual employed by any department, Crown corporation or agency of the Government of Saskatchewan who are defeated federal and provincial Progressive Conservative candidates; (2) the department, Crown corporation or agency in which each individual is employed; (3) the annual salary of each individual.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do move an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 37 showing, seconded by the member from Pelly, without whose support I could not have carried on.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, obviously the information that the hon. members are looking for is not a long list, obviously. By judging from . . . (inaudible) . . . the benches, that type of information — pertinent answers to that information — will be provided. With regard to this particular question of the exact details of it, Mr. Speaker, there I want to check into, and I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### Return No. 38

**Mr. Lingenfelter** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 38 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a

written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Health; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 38 showing. The question asks for:

The name of each person whose services were retained after May 8, 1982 under a written contract, under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Health; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms, conditions or remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualification of each person retained under contract; (5) duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

Mr. Speaker, here again the minister will know that the answers will be important to the opposition as well as to the public. We have already talked of one contract was given to a Manitoba company by the Department of Health, to review parts of the department, one of the principles being a Conservative MLA from Manitoba.

And these are kinds of things I think are important for the public of Saskatchewan to know. Therefore, I think it important that these questions, in particular return no. 38, be given to the opposition and to the public of Saskatchewan, because our job here as an opposition is to find out information for the people of the province. And I think the minister would be ill-advised to continue his tactic of voting against these important questions being answered.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, this question's been asked on many occasions in this Assembly over the last five or six or seven years. The response, Mr. Speaker, has always been the same. And I would simply go back to the identical question from *Hansard* last year, the response made by the Hon. Mr. Berntson, then minister of agriculture and government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to urge all members of this Assembly to vote no on this particular question. Mr. Speaker, this resolution asks the same question on a broad base as return no. 9 asked for, and quite frankly, each subdivision in departments have had to search the records to obtain this information. There is no guarantee it's precision or accuracy of the record. The method of record keeping I point out, Mr. Speaker, had been established long before this administration took office, and had the last administration been asked these questions, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure they were, they would have had the same problem. It's virtually impossible to pull together and I would therefore urge all members to negative the question.

This question has been asked on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the contracts. The answer, when we asked that particular question, was, that's not the proper form to pose these particular questions. I think the answer then was by and large held up, Mr. Speaker. I would simply advise all members that the . . . I would suggest to all members that the similar question being put on return no. 38 showing, and then each return thereafter sequentially, through return no. 60, asks for the same type of information, Mr. Speaker. I would urge all members of the Assembly to negative that particular request.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we've heard the Minister of Finance say that this information wasn't available. I noted he quoted the member for Souris-Cannington, the Deputy Premier, saying that if this question had been answered, he supposed the previous government would have had difficulty . . . had asked the previous government would have had difficulty

answering. That's an interesting speculation, but for many years the member for Souris-Cannington and the member for Kindersley were in a position to answer this question.

I am amazed, genuinely amazed to hear the Minister of Finance say that there would be a great deal of difficulty amassing the list of persons who were hired under contract. And pretty obviously they are going to be people who are relatively permanent employees, because they're entitled to get an amount of \$1,000 per month or more. These are persons whose services were retained under a written contract and where they were to be paid a \$1,000 a month or more. Now these are not casual employees. These are . . . It would not take the Department of Health very long, if the Department of Health were properly administered, to know how many people it has hired on written contracts of employment which involve a payment of \$1,000 a month or more. And I simply don't accept the belief by the minister that this list would be long and difficult to gather up.

We know the use that this government has made of written contracts of employment where they do not wish to disclose the basis on which they pay persons who they have hired. We know that in at least one famous case they were paying \$410 a day. We know other cases of \$350 a day, and these are on contracts of employment the details of which are still not revealed, notwithstanding promises so to do.

There can be no reason why, for example, this government would not give us the terms of employment of a person who was hired at \$300 a day. There's just no reason. If the minister felt that \$1,000 a month was too low a threshold, he could have moved that the threshold be \$2,000 a month. He didn't do that. He suggests that it be negated in its entirety. And he suggests that on the theory that the list is going to be long.

And I ask the ministers across the way to think, how many people do they have on their payroll who are getting more than \$1,000 a month, who are hired on a written contract, but who are not regular employees? And I ask them: is the list a long one? Or is it a short one? If it's a short one, why won't you give it? And if it's a long one, why is it a long list? Why are you hiring this number of people outside of the normal hiring practices, outside of the Public Service Commission, outside of all of the rules that govern the employment of persons in the Government of Saskatchewan?

And for the minister to say that the list is a long one is for the minister to admit that he's hired a great number of people who he can't get through the screen of the Public Service Commission who he cannot get on the payroll in any legitimate way. And he has a long list of people who he has hired by contracts which he will not disclose to this House, the terms of which he will not disclose; the number of hours that they have to work for this \$1,000; whether it's a day or two days or five days or 10. None of this will he disclose.

Why? Because he says the list is too long. The list may not be complete. Very difficult when you're hiring all of these people — dozens and dozens of them. And who knows whether you get them all? That is an admission by the minister of what we have suspected, but have been unable to establish.

I remember my colleague, the member for Regina Centre, trying to find out where Mr. Petrychyn worked, and on what basis. And I believe he did work for the Department of Health for a while, although on that I may be in error. He worked for a good number of agencies as he went from place to place. I believe, on a contract, we certainly couldn't find them anywhere in the public service records. I again say to the minister, consider your position. Consider your position when you admit that the number of people that you are hiring — by these back-door methods of contracts of employment outside of the public service — is so large that you are unwilling to give the list. Unwilling to give the list, because it is so long, so likely to be in error, so numerous that how can anyone expect to have them all right.

That is the minister's argument. It is not a good enough argument. No one will believe that argument. The only reason that the minister even makes the argument is that it is the best one he can think of, rather than the actual argument. The actual argument is that he doesn't want to tell use who he is hiring and on what terms of employment. And if I were hiring people at \$410 a day, as the government opposite is doing — I don't know whether it's true in the Department of Health; I do know it's been true in other agencies — I don't think I might want to disclose it either, but nonetheless I would think that the public had a right to know and I would disclose it. And I invite hon. members opposite to find instances where this information was not disclosed in the past. Mr. Speaker, I hear this argument saying there are many, many instance of this. Mr. Speaker, you know and I know that if they could lay their hands on the information they would bring it in. After all, this is not new on the order paper; it's been around since December.

The minister probably has half a dozen EAs on contract (which he's unwilling to disclose) who are given the job of going through the *Hansards*. If they had found all of these instances of this information being denied you can be assured that would be before the House. You can be assured of that. You can be assured of that, but the minister does not use that as an argument. He does not use the fact that there is any legitimate reason for, public reason for not disclosing this as an argument. What he uses is that the numbers are numerous and mistakes would be made. It's not good enough. No one will believe it. The real reason is that you don't want to disclose the information. We understand that, but you should disclose it just the same, and you should pass this order for return.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS - 6**

Blakeney  
Lingenfelter

Koskie  
Lusney

Shillington  
Yew

**NAYS - 40**

Muller  
Birkbeck  
McLeod  
Andrew  
Rousseau  
Katzman  
Pickering  
Hardy  
McLaren  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Baker  
Schoenhals  
Currie  
Sandberg

Klein  
Dutchak  
Dirks  
Maxwell  
Young  
Domotor  
Folk  
Petersen  
Bacon  
Parker  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)  
Hopfner  
Myers

Rybchuk  
Caswell  
Hampton  
Gerich  
Boutin  
Schmidt  
Tusa  
Meagher  
Glauser  
Zazelenchuk  
Johnson  
Weiman  
Morin

**Return No. 39**

**Mr. Lingenfelter** moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Blakeney that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 39 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a



written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the departments of government services and Supply and Services; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 39 showing. Mr. Speaker, this is similar to the motion that the government has just voted down on the Department of Health, where we were asking for contracts for individuals who had been hired under contract in the Department of Health. In this motion we are asking:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Departments of Government Services and Supply and Services; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualification of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

And for all the same reasons as mentioned earlier and elaborated on by the member for Elphinstone. In this case I think it's even more direct. One could say that a Department of Health where the need for that kind of hiring process, or that kind of a contract in process may have some relevancy. I see in the Department of Government Services and Supply and Services the number should be, in fact, very, very short.

And I would ask your desk-mate, possibly he could get up and explain why this list in those two departments would not be forthcoming. Because I think it's fair to say, and possible the rumors are right, that good numbers of people are being dismissed and others being brought in under contract, and really the cost to the government in terms of people hired and many of the political people, very political people, is much more than what it was under the previous administration. I believe that to be true. That in each department you have large numbers of political-type people out there wandering around doing your political work, being paid for by the taxpayers of this province.

And here again, Mr. Speaker, these kind of rumors can only be laid to rest by the government opening up and telling us and giving lists of these kind of contracts that it will have. And I say, Mr. Minister, for your own benefit, I don't know why you wouldn't. Because in these two departments I would suspect the number would not be long. But if you turn this one down, then you will confirm the worst suspicions of people, and that is that the list is very long, that political people are being brought in, that they show up on no accounts of the government, and taxpayers money is being used to re-elect a Tory government which the refusal of this kind of information will make very, very difficult because your expression of arrogance tonight is not to be believed.

I'll tell you that in Ottawa, if this kind of a procedure was carried on, and the answers not given like you're doing tonight, it would hit the headlines of every newspaper across Canada. And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that this kind of secrecy should not be tolerated and will not be tolerated by the people of this province.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — just a brief comment on this, Mr. Speaker, before we vote on this particular question. The member opposite makes reference to the fact that you can somehow as a government go out and hire a whole lot of people and send them out into the field and you'll guarantee your re-election. That was a strategy, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP used 1978, Mr. Speaker, through to 1982 — hundreds and hundreds of civil servants, so-called, Mr. Speaker, rapping around, knocking on doors, knocking on doors, re-elect Allan Blakeney, re-elect the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, the 1982 election proved beyond any doubt, Mr. Speaker, you don't win elections in this country, in this province, by hiring a bunch of EAs and sending them around to somehow tell people, organize people, that's how you're going to win elections. That's not what happened in 1982, Mr. Speaker. We don't believe in that system, Mr. Speaker. We don't believe in that system, Mr. Speaker. We have members all around this Assembly and they go back to their ridings and they talk to their people.

We got organizations, Mr. Speaker. We have got organizations, Mr. Speaker, not put together by bureaucrats. We got organizations put together by normal people, Mr. Speaker — by citizens in this province. And all you have to do is look around, Mr. Speaker, at the nominating meetings. It wasn't bureaucrats that put 2,500 people into North Battleford to a nominating meeting. It wasn't bureaucrats that put another 1,200 people into Whitewood for a nominating meeting. It wasn't bureaucrats that put 2,500 people into Saskatoon for a nominating meeting.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I believe that the example that we see the Minister of Finance going through is a good indication of what happens when the mover of a motion wanders when he speaks to it. It causes the wandering to occur on the opposite side of the House as well. And I would ask members on both sides of the House to stay within the bounds of the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I've advanced before on item no. 38, I simply ask the members of the Assembly to negative this particular motion.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to talk about federal nominating conventions. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. I will talk about those in the proper time.

What I want to talk about is the motion that's here — the motion that's before us which plainly enough, the member for Kindersley didn't recognize was not dealing with federal nominating conventions, but rather was dealing with people that he and his colleagues have hired on contract.

Now my simple question to the Minister is: why won't you tell us who you've hired on contract? You have had another opportunity to explain it as you just spoke. You have given no intelligible explanation. Whatever it is, it has nothing to do with whether or not people are traversing the countryside or whether or not they're going to nominating conventions. There must be another reason you have not given it. Please tell us why you feel it is not in the public interest that the public know who you are hiring on contract. Can you think of one — just one — reason which makes any sense as to why you should withhold the information as to who you're hiring, and the terms under which you are hiring them. You know, and I know, that if you hire people under the employment of a Clerk-Steno III are, know what the salary range is, or it's readily obtainable. For your own ministerial assistants, you have agreed and properly agreed, to make that information a matter of public record at the office of the Executive Council, and you've filed those records along with orders in council. And that's proper.

What you have decided to do is say: yes, there are people who are in the public service, and we will tell you about their terms of employment. Yes, there are people who are in ministers' offices whose presence we cannot deny because they're seen about, and we will tell you what their terms of employment are. And we put a chit in, go along with orders in council.

But there's another group of people who may, or may not be sighted in this building, who may or may not have their locus of work here, but who are paid out of the public purse in reference to whom we will tell you nothing. We will not tell you their names, we will not tell you their terms of employment, we will not tell you how long they have to work, what their hours of work are, we will not tell you how much you pay them. That is what you are saying, and you have offered no explanation. No explanation can be offered . . . I ask you to reconsider.

Motion negatived on division.

**Return No. 40**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 40 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I would just offer the additional explanation for someone who was a former chairman of Public Accounts Committee. The member would be aware the Public Accounts does contain salaries of public servants over a certain limit. That's readily available from Public Accounts. I wonder why the minister doesn't feel that the same information couldn't be provided with respect to people who work on contract.

I suppose one explanation is that the minister didn't think this out very well before he came into the House with this response. I think a more — probably a more — accurate answer though, is that the minister would not be very proud of the kind of information it might reveal. Because I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that some of these contracts are rather lucrative. And I suspect the government wouldn't want the public knowing how much they're paying per day. That information did become available with respect to a relatively few people on contract. First of all, the candidate for the Tory nomination in Regina West was one. But I suspect that the government wouldn't be very proud of the information. I suspect that's why we're not getting it.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 40 showing.

Motion negatived on division.

**Return No. 41**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 41 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such a person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Labour; (2) the date on which each contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 41 showing.

Motion negatived on division.

**Return No. 42**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 42 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I do issue for return no. 42 showing.

Motion negated on division.

#### **Return No. 43**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 43 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Saskatchewan Liquor Board; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I move that order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 43 showing.

Motion negated on division.

#### **Return No. 44**

**Mr. Shillington** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 44 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Culture and Recreation; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 44 showing.

Motion negated on division.

#### **Return No. 45**

**Mr. Lusney** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 45 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Rural Development; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms

and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Quill Lakes, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 45 showing.

Motion negated on division.

#### **Return No. 46**

**Mr. Lusney** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 46 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Telephones; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member of Quill Lakes, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 46 showing.

Motion negated.

#### **Return No. 47**

**Mr. Lusney** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 47 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Highways and Transportation; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member of Quill Lakes, that an order of the Assembly do an issue for return no. 47 showing.

Motion negated on division.

#### **Return No. 48**

**Mr. Lusney** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 48 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Saskatchewan Highway Traffic Board; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person

retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member of Quill Lakes, that an order of the Assembly do an issue for return no. 48 showing.

Motion negatived on division.

### Return No. 49

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** moved, seconded by Mr. Engel, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 49 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Executive Council; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I propose to just say a word on this one. This one has to do with the Executive Council. Please understand what we're turning down now. We know that people have been hired. We know that people have been hired at \$410 a day and terms undisclosed. We know that speaking of federal nominating conventions that that particular person has contested too. We know that other people have been hired at \$350 a day and we know that they were the organizers for the Progressive Conservative Party and you know that too. We know that other people have been hired, but we don't know who. We don't know on what terms or the . . . We don't know in any written form the terms of their contract.

Now you are saying that we are not entitled to know what you paid Mr. Leier. We're not entitled to know the terms of his employment. We're not entitled to have a copy of the deal you made with Mr. Leier. That's an interesting proposition, that you can hire someone who was a Conservative candidate, who subsequently was a federal Conservative candidate. You can hire him for \$410 a day or perhaps more. And I know that he probably no longer worked for Executive Council. I think he works for CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) and I suspect that the Minister of Finance will know more about that than I do. I leave that aside.

I'm talking about Executive Council and I am asking the Minister of Finance whether he believes there is any basis for saying that the public are not entitled to know what your deal is with Mr. Leier. Or I take Mr. Harrington. I hope it will not be denied that Mr. Harrington was the chief organizer for the Progressive Conservative Party and, obviously, a good organizer he is. And obviously he was a deserving organizer because he was hired at, I believe the figure was \$350 a day but, once again, I don't have a copy of that deal, and I suggest that the public are entitled to know what your deal was with Mr. Harrington. And those are only two of a lengthy list — two of a lengthy list.

Once thinks of Scotty Livingstone; one thinks of others — people who are active in organizing your campaign. For it's no law against that, who might have accepted employment with the Government of Saskatchewan. And there wouldn't have been particularly a law against that if they qualified for a job. But obviously their qualifications were other than that which would have satisfied the Public Service Commission, because you hired them on contract. You have not disclosed their qualifications and not disclosed how much you're paying to them. I believe it is \$410 a day. That's my belief. But I ask each of you: is there any basis on which you can say the public is not entitled to that information?

You were elected to uphold the system of government we have and I'm not going to preach at

you, but you know that it is incumbent upon ministers of the Crown to make available to the public information for which there is no justifiable reason for withholding it. There is no public reason for withholding that information. And you know it, and each minister of the Crown knows it. And yet you're not coming across with it. And it is information which the public are supremely entitled to have.

When you are making private, under-the-table, sub rosa deals with people who are very high in your party, that spreads an air of uncertainty and, I would say, suspicion on the arrangements you are making with these people. If they're above-board, tell us what they are. That's what we're asking. We're asking in this resolution that you tell us the terms on which you have hired people under contract with the Executive Council. It is a proper request. There is no proper basis for denying it. I ask you to vote with us in passing at least this motion for which you and I both know the information ought to be publicly available.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my colleague the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, Mr. Engel, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 49 showing.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS - 7**

Blakeney  
Engel  
Lingenfelter

Koskie  
Lusney

Shillington  
Yew

**NAYS - 39**

Muller  
Birkbeck  
McLeod  
Andrew  
Rousseau  
Katzman  
Pickering  
McLaren  
Garner  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Baker  
Schoenhals  
Currie

Sandberg  
Klein  
Dutchak  
Embury  
Dirks  
Maxwell  
Young  
Domotor  
Folk  
Muirhead  
Petersen  
Bacon  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)

Hopfner  
Myers  
Rybchuk  
Caswell  
Gerich  
Boutin  
Schmidt  
Tusa  
Meagher  
Glauser  
Zazelenchuk  
Weiman  
Morin

**Return No. 50**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 50 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the department of mineral resources and

Energy and Mines; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, this is the same sort of motion as we had debated. This one has to do with the minister of mineral resources and with the Department of Energy and Mines. And I think it covers the period where the department bore two different names, the same department. But the minister is here. He will know whether there is a problem with this. If there is a problem with it — if he has got some people sequestered away that he doesn't want to tell us about — he'll be voting against it. If he sees no a problem with it then he will be voting for it.

If the minister says that the list is so long, as the Minister of Finance has said, that he can't possibly compile an accurate one and he wouldn't want to give us inaccurate information, then we will understand that. The list is long. Somehow I think that this minister does not have more than a dozen or two tucked away and, therefore, he could get an accurate list. And I suspect that he could give us this information and I know that he will, since there is simply no reason for not doing so.

And accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my colleague, the member for Quill Lakes, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 50 showing.

Motion negatived on division.

### **Return No. 51**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** moved, seconded by Mr. Engel, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 51 showing:

(1)The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Departments of Revenue, Supply and Services and Revenue and Financial Services; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, my colleagues here are engaging in some merriment. But the motion I have is deadly serious and I direct this particularly to the member for Regina South, because this one asked that the department of Revenue, Supply and Services, and Revenue and Financial Services, disclose the number of people they have on contract. And I don't know whether this list is long; but I doubt it. I don't imagine there'd be more than six or eight or perhaps 10 people, that the minister has on contract. And I have no doubt that he could compile that list accurately and competently and let us have it.

So the argument made by the member for Kindersley, the Minister of Finance, that the list would be long and errors would be made, won't apply in this case. And I invite the member for Regina South, the Minister of Revenue and Financial Services, to support the motion. And I'll also invite the Minister of Supply and Services, who is, in part, a successor to the previous department, to support it as well. I doubt whether this is going to present a problem. I doubt whether this minister's list of contract employees is long. And accordingly, I'm going to ask him to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 51 showing.



Seconded by my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

Motion negatived on division.

### Return No. 52

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 52 showing:

(1)The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of the Provincial Secretary; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, in the same category, but it covers the employees of the Provincial Secretary. And I have the greatest difficulty in thinking this list would be long — the greatest difficulty thinking that an accurate list could not be compiled. And accordingly, although I could be in error, I simply don't know where these people are lodged, and accordingly, I may stumble and, therefore, I may have stumbled upon a department where there are 15 or 20. But if, in fact, there are only one or two or three, I know that members opposite will be supporting it.

And so I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 52 showing.

And this is seconded by my colleague, the member for Pelly.

Motion negatived on division.

### Return No. 53

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** moved, seconded by Mr. Shillington, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 53 showing:

(1)The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Crown Investments Corporation; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, this is a motion of the same kind, but this concerns the Crown Investments Corporation. And here we know there are some.

Here we know there is a man by the name of Leier, I believe unless I'm in error, he is placed there. He certainly was there. And I think . . . I don't think anyone who was on the board of CIC will deny that he was an employee of CIC. That whether or not he's on contract is, I suppose, a matter which is debatable. I don't know. He left the employ — if that's the word — of Executive Council on or about December 31, 1982, as my information — ineffective and defective as it is, since it doesn't stem from any documents which the government is prepared to table. And he joined the CIC. Whether or not he is there on any contract, and the circumstances of his employment, I think we are entitled to find out. And if, of course, he's not there on contract, there is no problem.

We had a person by the name of Bruce Flamont, who I believe was employed by the CIC. But again, we may be in error. Our information is that he was retained by the CIC. But perhaps it was one of the corporations that retained him to do his valuable work in organizing another native organization to compete with the one with whom your government does not seem to be getting along as well as you would wish.

And there are others. I wish I knew the list. It is for the purpose of finding out the list that I move this motion. There are an interesting group of people assembled over at CIC. There was a former cabinet minister in the Manitoba government, Don Craik. I believe that he was doing work for CIC. I believe he was doing that on contract. Again, we may be in error. But if, in fact, Mr. Leier is there, and if he's not you will correct us; if Mr. Flamont is there — formerly on the organizational staff of the Progressive Conservative Party immediately prior to the election in April; if, in fact, Don Craik was there, as I believe he was; if, in fact, people of that ilk are there, I think it is not unreasonable for the public to know a few of those facts.

And I think that members opposite would be hard pressed to say that it isn't in the public interest for this government to disclose the terms upon which they employed Don Craik — pretty hard to say that that's not in the public interest. Pretty hard to say that the public has no right to know that. But I suspect you may well say the public has no right to know that. And we are about to find out. I will not prolong this debate. I will move the motion which calls for you to disclose the details of the contracts of people who are on contract with the Crown Investments Corporation with respect to personal services. And I move, seconded by my colleague the member for Regina Centre, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 53 showing.

Motion negated on division.

#### **Return No. 54**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 54 showing:

(1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Finance; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, here, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, we have the request for the same information concerning the Department of Finance.

Now, we have heard the explanation that the minister feels that the list is so long that errors will be made. While that may be an explanation with respect to some of his colleagues whose departments are not known for their attention to detail, the Minister of Finance does not bear that reputation.

I feel that if he gave us a list, it would be accurate. And that I feel that his staff is such that they would have no difficulty compiling the list. The Minister of Finance has rightly said that he is served by a first-class staff, some that he has acquired since assuming office and some that were with the department prior to that. We'll concede that. The staff he has are a good staff. The staff he has could compile this information without the reasonable possibility of error in a short time.

The only reason why this information would not be given is not because of any difficulty in its compilation, but rather the difficulty that the minister sees, perceives, in its disclosure. And I

invite the minister to think before he decides that he doesn't want to tell us how many people he's got tucked away, that he doesn't want to say how many people he has employed on contract.

I think that he's got nothing to hide. I think he is fronting for some of his colleagues who do have something to hide. And I think it's really a shame to see this minister having to take cover when he has really nothing to take cover for, except to try to shield some of his colleagues who are less discreet in these matters than is he.

I think that, while he certainly owes some loyalty to his colleagues, he does not owe them the failure to disclose affairs of his own department simply to shield the Minister of Revenue and Financial Services who, perhaps, has a good deal more to hide. And, accordingly, I invite the Minister of Finance to support this.

I move, seconded by my colleague, the member for Cumberland, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 54 showing.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS - 7**

Blakeney  
Engel  
Lingenfelter

Koskie  
Lusney

Shillington  
Yew

**NAYS - 39**

Muller  
McLeod  
Andrew  
Rousseau  
Katzman  
Pickering  
Hardy  
McLaren  
Garner  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Baker  
Schoenhals  
Currie

Sandberg  
Klein  
Dutchak  
Embury  
Dirks  
Maxwell  
Young  
Domotor  
Folk  
Petersen  
Bacon  
Parker  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)

Hopfner  
Myers  
Caswell  
Gerich  
Boutin  
Schmidt  
Tusa  
Meagher  
Glauser  
Zazelenchuk  
Johnson  
Weiman  
Morin

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move that this House do now stand adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 10:07 p.m.