

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 9, 1983**

**EVENING SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10**

**Item 1 (continued)**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, just before we called it 5 o'clock you delivered a list of permanent position establishment, which I'm sure had just been typed up in the last half-hour or so prior to our calling it 5 o'clock. Would you mind indicating for me what this purports to be a list of?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, that is a list (my officials advise me) of all the permanent individuals in Executive Council.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, I noted that it appeared not to have a couple of names that I had anticipated I would find. I did not see a Mr. Leddy's name there, and I understood you to say he was an employee of yours.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, there are several people that may have worked for a short period of time and may be working now under what is commonly known as a personal service contract. Their positions and their qualifications and their salary etc. will be part of the whole package that we're working to put together.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Is Mr. Leddy, who you introduced as one of your employees, working on a personal service contract?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — That's correct.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Did you have an employee in your office by the name of Dave Tkach, who was said at one time to be chief of the Premier's staff?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I believe that I introduced Mr. Tkach yesterday, but in any event, he is under a person service contract.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Tkach, who was introduced yesterday as an employee, is also under a personal service contract. Mr. Gil Johnson, as I recall it, is now deputy minister of continuing education. I may be subject to correction. Did he serve in your office as an employee, or on a personal service contract?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — To the best of my knowledge, and we'll correct it, Mr. Johnson was not under a personal contract, but was hired through order in council until December. Subsequent to that, he moved into the position of deputy.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, earlier today you quoted from

the 1979 *Hansard*, and I think in the course of so quoting, you may have misled the members of the House. And I am going to recount the circumstances from *Hansard* and they are available on page 1757, 1767 and following. The circumstances were, as the record will show, that Mr. Collver was asking me about estimates, and he asked about salaries of the top five people, and asked me some questions about Mr. Kinzel. He was being assisted by the then member and the still member for Regina South, Mr. Rousseau. It was clearly very close to 10 o'clock, and that will be obvious in a moment:

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, we want to say that the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) has a specific reason for this. (Asking about the names of employees, etc.) I wonder if you'd do it in a different way; we don't need it just right now. Obviously we're not going to finish tonight. Could you give us the names, salaries, responsibilities and qualifications of all employees of the Executive Council earning over \$25,000 — '78-79 estimates, '78-79 actual, '79-80 estimate. Is that fair?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now the question is the names, salaries, responsibilities and qualifications of all employees of the Executive Council earning \$25,000 or over — '78-79 estimates, actual and '79-80 estimate. O.K. There are some explanatory notes because people moved around in different jobs, and we'll have to do it either by person or by title or both. (Next word on the page.)

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Very clearly asking for something that they weren't going to get before 10 o'clock. Next day April 18, committee starts.

MR. COLLVER: — Has the Premier those figures that I asked him for yesterday pertaining to salaries in the Executive Council?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Sorry, I have given them to Mr. Rousseau — two copies, one for each.

Now that gives the context and there follows detailed questions by Mr. Collver about the salaries of individual employees. I go two or three pages over:

Was Mr. Leeson deputy minister when you paid him a salary of \$30,000? Your estimate was \$22,000 but I noticed that the actual salary paid was \$30,000. Was he actually your deputy minister at that time? (And on and on.)

Just to carry on a little further, I notice you have three people in your office, Mr. Premier . . .

And there were detailed questions about Mr. Dickinson, and what his qualifications are and Mrs. Preston, and page after page the next day.

Following from the information that was asked for at 10 p.m. and was delivered the next day in time for estimates, the discussion proceeded. I am not at all sure that that information was made clear when you were indicating that on one occasion I said that I would provide the information later. That was at 10 o'clock and I provided it for next

day's estimates. I think that that illustrates, and I'm pleased to know that the Premier has said that he will follow the customs of the past. And in order to follow those customs I gave him notice, now 36 hours ago or thereabouts, that I would like certain information and it involved only one year. It didn't involve '78-79 estimates and actuals and '79-80 estimates. It didn't involve two fiscal years — one for an estimate, one for an actual and yet for another fiscal year, estimates.

I would not wish members of the committee to draw the conclusion that it has been the custom for people in estimates to say that they will provide information later and not have it for the next time the committee meets if it were at all obtainable. I invite any hon. members to read the record as it continues from page 757 and then 767 and then onward for a goodly number of pages where questions are asked about the salary and the duties of a substantial number of employees. I noted that Mr. Katzman was involved in some of these discussions and he will probably recall some of them if he refreshed his memory. Carole Bryant, he was asked about and Mr. Rousseau was involved and so on. Mrs. Duncan was involved. She may well recall if she refreshes her memory.

I want to make that clear that the custom has been to provide information on which further questions could be asked. The very instance chosen by the Premier is an exceptionally good one, since at 10 p.m. information was asked in tabular form which would have had to be given orally and it was asked for in tabular form — in written form. It was given for the next day and the questions proceeded apace on the basis of the written information. And I had hoped that I would have received some information so that I could have proceeded, as the Premier said, "in the traditional way."

My question now to the Premier: is a Bonnie Holbird on a contract of personal service in your office?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, a couple of observations before I address the specific question.

The first is, and I said this earlier, the amount of information that the hon. member has requested during a period of transition is a considerable amount of information. It's not typical in the sense that you don't go through a change in government every year. So, when you're looking at the kinds of things that would be requested from a premier that has been in the office from '71 to '75 to '79-80, he can come up with the things, I imagine, relatively quickly compared to a year when you've just taken over from a previous administration, going through with a large change in administrative procedures.

If we want to provide the best information and the most accurate information and the most complete information, that's what we're going to do.

Secondly, the hon. member says, well, he wants it read into the record. He gave it to the member opposite so that he could read, and so forth. So it wasn't read into the record.

Let me say, we have been pulling as much information together as quickly as we can. It's my information that Miss Holbird is under a personal service contract. I've advised the hon. member that we'll pull together all those contracts for him when we get them all together.

Over the supper hour, and for the last several hours, our people have been pulling

together as much information as quickly as they can to make sure it's accurate. I'm getting some of it here now that I am prepared to offer to the hon. member, in terms of the people who are on my staff now permanently, and correspondingly the amount of money that they're receiving.

I don't have it all, but what I am receiving, I'm prepared to give — their positions and their salary. I don't have all the information with respect to their qualifications, or all the information with respect to the contracts, or when some people might have been here for some period but not another period, when they've overlapped and so forth. All that, I don't have. But I am beginning to get some of it.

You've asked some specific questions. I believe you asked one about a Mr. Chamberlin — Grant Chamberlin. He's a senior administrative assistant and I have his monthly salary — \$3,250.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, there is a list of people who I inquire about who are not on the list, and who may be, therefore, in the employ of some other government agency, or may be on these contracts of personal service which are not recorded in the ordinary course of events.

Is a Mr. Terry Leier on a contract of service?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I'll provide that information when we can pull it together. I just don't have it here at hand, right now.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Premier, do you deny, (a) that Mr. Leier is on a contract of service, and (b) that he has been paid or has earned or is entitled to be paid (perhaps is the better way to put it), a remuneration in excess of \$80,000 since May 10?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — No, I'm not denying or confirming that he has been paid any particular salary. What I don't have is the period of time precisely that he was employed or what he received precisely per month or per day or, frankly, with what particular department or agency he might have been employed. I will pull that information together and provide it to you.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Perhaps I can narrow it down. Can you tell me what the per diem arrangement is with Mr. Leier? Is he on a per diem and do you not know it?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — He may have been, but I don't have that information here, and I will provide it with the comprehensive package.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Premier, are there so many people on contracts of personal service at high figures that you simply do not have those figures at hand? Are there dozens of people getting \$300 or \$400 a day in your government?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Absolutely not.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Premier, do you deny that Ms. Bonnie Holbird is getting in excess of \$200 a day under a contract of personal service?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to any of the personal service contracts, as I mentioned earlier. I'll pull the information together in terms of when they started and how long they've lasted and what they're worth, and the rest of that kind of

information. I'll present it all at the same time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — That is a matter of judgment — what they're worth — and we don't ask that. We already know the . . . We know what happens when good sense and judgment is applied — all manner of people get fired. We've already been through all that.

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, approximately, just approximately, how many people work in the Executive Council who are on these contracts of personal service, which are by and large a pretty innovative arrangement? There were very, very few of them before. How many are now on contracts of personal service?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, we're just doing a little bit of research. I would remind the member opposite that again, when you're going through a transitional period, you may not hire people permanently as you're getting some specific jobs finished. It's not a typical year, and I'm sure his experience in the past would suggest that it isn't a typical year. As a result of that, the kinds of arrangements that may take place in the first six months or eight months or nine months or ten months, may not be the case in year two and year three and year four and so forth. While we're pulling together as much of that information as quickly as we can . . . In fact to the best of my ability we'll find out if in fact there were any people under contract under the former administration just to make some reasonable comparisons.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, if the time it takes to find out whether Mr. Leddy is on your staff is any indication of the time it will take to find other information, there is nothing to fear. May I ask whether a Mr. Reg Forsythe was on your staff at any time during the year? Is a Mr. Reg Forsythe a member of the Executive Council staff or has he been since May 10?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, he is on a personal service contract, and I would like to take this opportunity . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . to answer the first question.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I said yes, he is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, he won't miss this. This is the Department of Executive Council list of contracts and consultants, 1980-81. The reason that I'm offering this is that you implied, the hon. member implied that there weren't contracts, personal service contracts, in a typical situation. I just throw it out so that we can understand and so that the public can understand two things: number one, it may be quite typical in a transition year, because we have all that extra work to do in terms of changing horses; and, number two, that it did go, occur and happen in a normal year under the previous administration.

Name, Mr. Eric Howe; date, June 1, '80 to November 10 of '80; amount, \$235 per day from June to November, for a total of \$20,964, plus travel expenses, computer time, clerical and long-distance telephone calls; the reason, for Executive Council, was to prepare economic forecasts for Saskatchewan with use of a Saskatchewan economic model. And, if you added some normal inflation costs, that probably would be higher. Then again he was hired from November 11. He was fired on November 10 and hired on

November 11 — till September of 1981. \$235 per day for a total of another \$18,246.66 to revise the model again, for testing and preparation of forecasts, and so forth.

A Mr. Forresta, International Ltd. of Vancouver, B.C. — September 22, '80, \$5,935.95, plus reasonable travel expenses, clerical and telephone charges, consultant in any aspects — any aspects — of forest resource development.

Mr. Chairman, Insight Marketing and Communications Ltd. — January 1, 1981 to March 31, '81, \$200 per day or \$30 per hour, a total of \$14,880, to develop a communications strategy in the area of mineral development.

Johnson, Lowe and Associates — January 12, '81 to June 15, '81, \$175 per day, total January '81 to March '81, \$14,139, to determine the feasibility of further expansion of community-based services.

One you may recognize Mr. Lowell Monkhouse, April 15, 1980 to June 30, '80, \$200 per day, total cost plus reasonable travel expenses, then hired again July 2 to October 1, and again from October 1 to December 31, and was still on contract, I gather, when we came in.

And there are more and more, I just offer this, Mr. Chairman, as a reasonable suggestion that under Executive Council people have been on contract for several hundred dollars per day or a considerable amount per hour under so-called normal times, let alone when we're going through a period of changing from one government to another, which I believe most people call transition.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, would you mind giving me the same information with respect to your government —now?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — We've been digging up information. I have some more positions. Permanent positions are here their slated title plus the money that they're receiving on a monthly basis.

I would like to share with the public some of the reasons for the work in transition. One of the reasons, for example, is boards and commissions. When we came into Executive Council we found a book listing 178 boards and commissions, which we thought was considerable to study them, to determine what they were for and what they did.

Since that time, we have now identified, with some help of some people on transition, 958 boards and commissions, with over 5,000 positions. We found two more yesterday. Some boards were listed as current as to 1976. In one case — I just throw it out, -Mr. Chairman, to show the kind of research we have do — a listed board member had passed away and has been dead for some time.

In this period of transition, we need to have the appropriate staff to go from one administration to another. I will bring all the information on anybody that has been under contract, as the hon. member has requested, and the times that they have been hired and the rate and their qualifications. I don't have all that tonight. I do have an increasing list of people who have permanent positions and their titles and their salaries, if you want to begin to discuss those. I think you've asked for those, Janice Baker, administrative assistant, \$2,075; Sheila Bultitude clerk-typist 3, \$1,470; Keith Lampard, assistant-chief electoral officer, \$4,000; Peggy Sandbeck, accounting clerk

2, \$1,707. I'm getting more of those as they're pulling them together.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I noted Keith Lampard. That's another name that wasn't on this list, which puzzled me somewhat. Is he on a contract of personal service — the one that you just indicated?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I believe there is some aberration between the blue book and the electoral office. They don't jibe exactly, traditionally, from one year to the next because of elections and so forth. Assistant chief electoral officer and some of that within statute doesn't show up every year. There may be some aberration there, but that's the position.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, you have indicated that Reg Forsythe is on a contract. I noted the list that you gave of consultants, and at least half of them were limited companies, which is fairly, fairly common — to have consulting firms doing this or that. I pass that by, because anyone can read that list. You left off the limiteds or put it fairly light, but a fair number of them were. They are just straight consulting firms.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Eric Howe and Lowell Monkhouse aren't.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — No, those two are not. I don't know who Eric Howe is, but I know who Lowell Monkhouse is and Eric Howe is a consultant. None of them have been, with the possible exception of Monkhouse, associated with the Conservative party or the New Democratic Party. Can you say that of Terry Leier? Is that the same Terry Leier who was the federal Conservative candidate in Regina East? Is that the same one?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, if you're asking me the particular persuasion of Mr. Leier, my best guess is that he would tend to be Tory.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, would you advise me whether Mr. Jim Petrychyn is on a contract of personal services? Would you hazard a guess as to his political leanings?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not now under contract for Executive Council.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Petrychyn provides some of the interest in being in opposition when this government is in office, since his movements are so rapid that we can't usually catch him. As my colleague from Regina Centre aptly put it the other day: as soon as he is known to one department, he becomes in great demand by somebody else. He moves, and I take it that he is not now with the transition office, as he undoubtedly was. When he was down at room 113 of the Legislative Building. I'm reliably advised he was with the transition office. If you tell me he is not now there, we'll pursue him in whatever department he has been visited upon for the time being.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That wouldn't be a vendetta you're got going Ned, would it?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Far from it, far from it! He wants to keep him in town.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I just rose to point out again that people may come and go in terms of the timing of their contract, and that's why I said I want to make sure that we've done the research necessary to say when they were hired, when they were released,

and so forth. And Mr. Petrychyn may be exactly in that position. I'm not sure when he might have been hired and when he might have been released, or how much, or whatever, but we'll put that together for you.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Can you advise me what duties Mr. Forsythe performed when he was, and perhaps still is, with you?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I'm advised that he was, or may still be, an assistant to Mr. Livingstone.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, I look on the list and I don't find Mr. Livingstone. Is Mr. Livingstone on a contract of employment, and what are his duties?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Livingstone is on a personal service contract. He has the responsibility to help us deal with the boards and commissions that I had referred to earlier. Perhaps I could just point out that recognizing that there exists a proliferation of agencies directly related to the Government of Saskatchewan and further recognizing that there has been little or no co-ordination in the creation of these agencies, it has been determined that there exists duplication of effort by these agencies resulting in excessive costs to the government. And so we have asked Mr. Livingstone to help us identify what the boards and commissions do, how long they've been in existence, their objectives and activities, their functions, their purpose and some degree of accountability, and to measure the performance of them. That's in a general sense his responsibilities.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — And you advise me that Mr. Forsythe is an assistant to Mr. Livingstone?

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, I call to your attention a letter on the letterhead of the Saskatchewan Executive Council, dated August 1982 and it reads as follows:

Dear Sir/Madam: This is in further reference to receipt of your resume or application for employment with the Government of Saskatchewan. Enclosed herewith please find an application for employment through the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission. Although the employee freeze is still in effect, there are certain positions which are being released and advertised in the four Saskatchewan daily newspapers: Regina *Leader-Post*, Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, Prince Albert *Herald*, Moose Jaw *Times-Herald*.

Please complete an application form should you feel you have the necessary qualifications for any position. Send the completed form directly to R.L. Forsythe, 102 Legislative Building, Regina, Saskatchewan S4S 0B3.

Although you may be employed at the present time, we understand from receiving your resume or application that you would like an opportunity to be employed with the Government of Saskatchewan. If this is a misunderstanding on our part, please inform us as soon as possible.

At the time the employee freeze is removed, the same procedure as outlined above should be followed. You can help us to help you. Sincerely, R.L. Forsythe, Transition Committee



Now, would you care to advise me how this letter relates to a review of the boards and commission which Mr. Forsythe was assisting Mr. Livingstone in proceeding with.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — What was the date of that, please?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — August 1982.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, it would seem to me that at the time the individual could have very well been employed in the transition which might have been many different responsibilities.

You asked today what he did or what he is doing now and I'm saying he's an assistant to Mr. Livingstone. In August . . . And again, one of the reasons why I think it's fair that we go back and put it all together in terms of the time the individuals come in and go out and work, is so that you fully understand what they've been doing and so does the public. But I believe at that time we were in the middle of transition or at least in the first five or six months.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, I'm sorry that the Deputy Premier wasn't here, because in August 20, the same letter was read in the legislature here and the Deputy Premier who has just come in, has said, "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to try to keep it simple. I don't want it to go over his head (and he's speaking to Mr. Hammersmith). The simple answer is, I will take notice of the question when I've had a chance to review the letter. I'm sure when the Premier has had a chance to review the letter, he can deal with the matter you raised in your question. Therefore, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, I take notice of the question." That's certainly simply put and we're still waiting a little answer from that taking notice. What I am asking now, Mr. Premier, is: under what circumstances does a member of the transition committee write to the public asking that applications for the public service commission be sent to the transition committee of the Executive Council and not to the public service commission?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, I believe, Mr. Chairman, you can go back in the . . . the Minister of Finance, Mr. Andrew, did address the question specifically, but from the information I have here, the transition committee, or part of that committee that Mr. Forsythe was working for, was essentially a mechanism of categorizing applications, whether they came from unsolicited job applications or opportunities or kids wanting to come home to Saskatchewan or anybody else inquiring with respect to the new government, rather than send it directly to a crown corporation or to somebody else, they send it to Executive Council. So it's handled by the transition committee because that's what transition is all about. We have the appropriate people in the appropriate slots to carry on the normal functions of government under more typical situations.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I repeat just a little portion of the letter again:

Enclosed please find an application for employment through the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission.

This is not dealing with crown corporations or anything of that nature — through the public service commission. Now may I recall to the Premier's mind the provisions of The Public Service Act which at section 17, subsection 2 says:

Appointments to positions in the classified service shall be made by the commission and shall be made on the basis of seniority, merit and fitness, to be ascertained by qualification examinations where practicable.

The question I ask is: was Mr. Forsythe carrying out some qualification examinations, and what qualifications was he seeking when he was reviewing the applications that were to be sent to the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that Mr. Forsythe was studying the qualifications of applications. And, at the same time, I don't know why a transition mechanism wouldn't also apply to various departments or crown corporations, including the public service commission, when you're going from one administration to another. So to imply that a transition committee wouldn't deal with the public service commission, I don't think is reasonable at all.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, I understood from Mr. Andrew that this practice had been discontinued. I may well have misunderstood what he said. Can you advise me whether or not applications which are to be directed, as I read the legislation, to the public service commission are, in fact, not to be directed to the public service commission, but are to be forwarded to Mr. Forsythe — R.L. Forsythe, 102 Legislative Building, Regina, Saskatchewan, as indicated by the correspondence on your letterhead in August?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well I am relatively sure that the practice has been discontinued and I believe all applications for some time now go directly to the public service commission. You know, if it's possible to go from one administration to another without a transitional team or without a transitional mechanism and everything could be done exactly with each department, including the public service commission, so much the better. But it's a big job in the transition. So, the transitional committee received an awful lot of responsibilities in terms of getting the move from one administration to another. I'm sure now that it's all handled by the public service commission.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, obviously the Premier's staff are adept at historical research, as we have indicated, and I invite them to pursue some similar research and find out whether in 1971, or for that matter, in 1964 when the Liberals came in, whether or not the public was advised that hereafter applications for positions in the public service should be sent to the Premier's office and not to the public service commission. And I would be very, very surprised if your historical researchers can find that in the case of either of the last two changes of government.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, the information that I have here, Mr. Chairman, with respect to just the sheer growth and the size of Executive Council, subsequent to you first becoming premier, hon. member: the personnel of Executive Council increased from 18, under the Liberal administration in 1972 estimates, to 45, under the 1973 estimates of the NDP; that is a 2.5 times increase. Then, I believe, in the next year it went to 54, which is a 300 per cent increase in the size of Executive Council over the previous administration, within the first, well, about 18 months of the administration. Given that information, it seems to me to be a little bit unfair for the hon. member to suggest that we've had people on the transition committee working from changing one administration to another in a period of months.

And, with respect to several of, or I would say a large part of the applications coming

into Mr. Forsythe in the transitional committee, a good number of those are people who were saying, "Are there opportunities in boards and commissions?" Because I'm sure people might have heard us talking about the fact that we found 928 boards and commissions with some 5,000 positions in them. So people say, "Well, what is this all about? Is this normal public service commission requests?" Not really — boards and commissions don't necessarily fit in the public service commission. And I would suspect the hon. member didn't have this tremendous increase from 200 to 300 per cent in his Executive Council filled through applications to the public service commission under his administration.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I don't really want to be led off into a defence of the provincial inquiry centre and those things which were added, and you can dump them if you like, but I think they're . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They certainly were in 1973, when you're talking. Oh, yes. And if anyone denies that, they better do some more research. But what I want to know . . . I'm not talking about the numbers. I'm not talking about the numbers of people you have. I'm talking about the propriety of advising the public that you can't get a job with the Public Service Commission of Saskatchewan unless you send your application to the transition committee. Never mind the public service commission, never mind the provisions which are set up there for impartial public service, never mind the law; send it to Mr. R. L. Forsythe, and he will decide whether it goes on to the public service commission or not. Now, that's what you did, and I say that that was improper, and it's high time it was stopped, if it's stopped now.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, I've already made the point that it was for a relatively short period of time in the transition committee, number one; number two, that it would largely apply to people finding out and making inquiries about boards and commissions, which normally don't come under the public service commission; and, number three, it no longer is the case; the normal applications through the public service commission take place, etc., etc.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I listened to the story and I don't want to pursue all of these alleged many boards and commissions. The great bulk of them are under the Department of Agriculture, as the minister well knows, under all manner of committees which . . .

But leave that aside. What I am asking is this: for people who were seeking employment with the public service of Saskatchewan under The Public Service Act, why were they told that their applications should not be sent to the public service commission, but should be sent to Mr. Forsythe? That was to be true in August, when the freeze was on, and it was to continue to be true: "At that time the employee freeze is removed, the same procedure as outlined above should be followed." This is not boards, commissions, corporations; these are specifically people who are sent applications for the public service under The Public Service Act, and are told, "Here is your application. Send it, not to the commission, but back to me" How do you justify that sort of conduct?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman and hon. members, most of this dealt with boards and commissions. If somebody got a letter of invitation, I can't comment on that — to make an application through the transition committee.

It was designed to deal with applications, to the large extent, becoming publicly known

as hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds — almost a thousand — boards and commissions that are not handled through the public service commission, and I don't believe ever have been handled through the public service commission. Now, if some of these applications for other jobs or whatever come in for the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of boards and commissions. I can't help that.

The process now no longer exists (whenever it finished, last fall or whenever, it stopped). But it was in place to deal with a specific problem.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, here we are asked to believe that Mr. Forsythe was dealing with people who were applying for employment with the boards and commissions. The Premier points out that these appointments are not made through the public service commission. We have Mr. Forsythe sending out a letter: "Enclosed herewith please find an application for employment through the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission."

Well, if he was doing something with respect to boards and commissions, he was clearly incompetent. He ought to have known that this application had no reference to the work he was supposed to have been doing.

If, in fact, he was dealing with boards and commissions and not with employment through the public service commission, his letter is nonsense and I want to ask the Premier whether people of this level of incompetence are still in his employ, either by contract or otherwise, or whether the facts are quite different — that he wasn't dealing with boards and commissions, but was quite competently screening all applications that went through the public service commission.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — The hon. member knows that's nonsense — sheer, utter nonsense.

If I could respond, I believe the hon. member for Shaunavon asked Mr. Andrew this question in the House. I believe that Mr. Andrew said this on February 28, 1983:

That matter was raised, I believe, early in the session, I think within the summer session. At that time I gave the House my thinking that that in fact should not be done. It is to my understanding not being done and ceased being done when the matter was raised in the House. I do not agree with that particular line and I was not aware of it. When I became aware of it, I certainly put a stop to it.

So they were set up for one function. If some people applied to that particular transition mechanism, and it was brought to somebody's attention that that was an appropriate one, he turned around and said, "Well, it no longer exists."

For example, I wonder if this was through the public service commission in '71. A certain individual was appointed executive assistant to the Attorney General, October 22, 1971. He was a defeated candidate in June '71, provincial election.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who was that?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Shillington. Through the public service commission?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, did he apply to the public service commission?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, you're asking us to believe that anyone who was appointed an EA to a minister sent in application for Mr. Forsythe?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Mine did.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Oh, come off it. This is sheer nonsense. Everybody knows that EAs are not appointed through the public service commission, never have been and never will be; have been OC appointments and will continue to be OC appointments. There's nothing wrong with that, because that is a clear indication that you are applying a political screen when you hire your own EA.

What is the point of applying a political screen to people who apply for an ordinary job through the Saskatchewan Public Service Commission? You are quite wrong in suggesting that this letter had any reference to boards and commissions. Mr. Andrew is quite right in saying that when he found out about it he put a stop to it. And what I am disappointed in is that the Premier didn't put a stop to it before Mr. Andrew applied a little judgment and common sense which the Premier didn't show.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only reiterate to the hon. member that I will agree with him that executive assistants, special assistants and people like that are not normally hired through the public service commission. We agree on that. I think we also have to agree that members of boards and commissions are not traditionally hired through the public service commission.

Now, with us discovering something like 928 boards and commissions and 5,000 positions, and you can't handle it through the public service commission, how would you suggest it be handled? Through some sort of transitional committee. That's what was going on. If it got confounded, if the public service commission and the minister found out about it, he'd put a stop to it. And he did; it no longer is the case. That's the end of it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm interested in the smoke screen that the Premier throws up. But he knows that Mr. Forsythe's job was to screen those applications. He knows that Mr. Forsythe's job was to put little tags on them when they went up to the public service commission . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Let's not kid the troops on what was going on around here and I congratulate Mr. Andrew in putting into place some other system. I don't know whether it works as well, but I must say that it has a little more elegance — a little more elegance than the premier's system of saying, "Nobody may apply to the public service commission directly; everybody applies to my staff member." He even is prepared to send that out in writing. He says to send them to his office, Mr. Forsythe's office. He screens them, and then they go to the public service commission with appropriate comments. That's what was going on. I don't know what is going on now, but I'm glad to see that the Minister of Finance has put a stop to that sort of conduct, which the Premier condoned.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, we both concur with the Minister of Finance and the minister in charge of the public service commission for dealing with it. I never said I condoned it; I said I would condone a mechanism to deal with boards and commissions, and that's what it was designed to do and I have nothing more to add.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Premier is no doubt having difficulty remembering the names of people he's worked with, even if they are defeated Conservative candidates. I can understand that shortcoming; many people have trouble remembering names and faces. I want to take the Premier to an area where he has distinguished himself, and where he will have no difficulty with short concise answers. It has to do with the termination of public servants. If you haven't distinguished yourself, Mr. Premier; you've had lots of experience over the last year.

You made a comment this afternoon in the legislature that I would like you to expand on. You were referred to the services of someone who's resigned and who was given what appeared to be a rather generous severance pay, and you said there were circumstances under which a person who resigned might be entitled to severance pay. I wonder if you would tell me, in your view, under what circumstances is a person who resigns entitled to severance pay?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman and hon. member when people are terminated there is a mechanism whereby they're paid so much in terms of a month or two of salary, plus an accumulation of the years that they've worked and some degree of agreement between management and the individual.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm surprised that took 10 minutes for the Premier to find. I may say that I agree with your comments. When a person is terminated, when the departure is not voluntary whatever form it may take, whether he is fired or his resignation is asked for, severance pay is not unusual.

I want to remind the Premier of what your minister said. I do not know if you were in the House. That gives me an obvious advantage over you. I try to attend. I do not try to avoid the House. Let me tell you the circumstances under which Mr. Cousineau left, according to your Minister of Government Services. I want to read to you a couple of questions and answers.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. (It's an old subject; they've gone over it once or twice before.) During estimates on government services, the minister informed the Assembly, gave a great long explanation about why Mr. Dennis Foley has been replaced by Mr. Wallis Cousineau from Ontario, and said what a great job he was doing. Can she now inform us when Mr. Cousineau informed her that he would be leaving that position?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Perhaps the member is not aware (Aha! The reorganization. Finally got it) that there are plans for reorganization within government (she might have saved the Minister of Rural Affairs some embarrassment if she had told him a little earlier), in particular, the Department of Government Services and the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services. Mr. Cousineau's resignation is a result of the reorganization which has proceeded.

Mr. Lingenfelter, trying to bring the discussion to a conclusion, asked a succinct question:

Mr. Speaker, a new question. I asked the minister if she could inform us when she knew that Mr. Cousineau would be leaving his position. Can she tell us that?

Clearly, if she didn't find out until he left, it was voluntary. She would have known ahead of time, had it been her decision. Equally as clearly, if she knew ahead of time, before the resignation, it may not have been voluntary. The minister said that he tendered his resignation on Friday afternoon, the 25th. According to her information, she found out not before he tendered his resignation, indicating that that resignation was voluntary.

I accept the word of the hon. minister as being correct and accurate and honest. I wonder how, Mr. Premier, you can justify paying that degree of severance pay to someone whose departure was evidently quite voluntary.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, it's pretty difficult for me to speak on behalf of every minister, or any individual minister, with respect to staff that may come and go. All I can say is the normal mechanism, when we get into these, is some degree of recognition for the level they have, the amount of years they've worked, the qualifications and the rest of it, and a mutual agreement to go separate ways. I mean, I couldn't add any more than the minister's already added.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, does the Premier agree that if his departure was his own idea, and was not brought upon him by the Minister of Government Services, that no severance pay would in the normal circumstances be offered or accepted? Does the minister admit that his resignation could not have been voluntarily done if he was given severance pay?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well I don't talk with individual cabinet ministers about their individual staff and all the staff that they have. I didn't in this case. I am not sure that I fully appreciate the consequences of, or the differences with respect to, if a person decides, well, I guess it's time that I did something else, or you call it termination with severance. I mean I think you're getting into being fairly subtle.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I may say, Mr. Premier, that I would have thought you could have shirked the responsibility of virtually anything else but the conduct of your ministers. I would have thought that would have rested with you.

We are faced with one of two possibilities, Mr. Premier. Either your minister was less than candid in dealing with this House, which I do not believe, or she offered him or he was offered severance pay in circumstances which must be unique. If he voluntarily decided — to use your phrase, “he wanted to do something else,” then he must be the first person in the history of the public service that's ever been offered severance pay.

I'm wondering if you could tell us why a person who decides he wants to do something else would be offered something above and beyond his salary to leave.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well I don't think I have much more to add to this in terms of the details with respect to the termination of an individual. I would have to study the case in some detail to know about whether the severance package was reasonable or unreasonable or whatever.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I want to say, Mr. Premier, again, in your absence in this House, I tried putting some of these questions to the minister in charge of the public service commission, because I thought, perhaps, he might want to take some responsibility for the general policy of this government in treating and in dealing with its public servants. He continually deferred to you, sir. Every question I asked him about

public service, he says, “You’ll have to ask the Executive Council.” So I am taking his advice. I’m asking these questions of Executive Council, of your policy with respect to public servants.

Is it the policy of this government to offer severance pay to public servants who decide they want to do something else, and who leave voluntarily.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, I’m not sure that what you just said about the minister in charge of public service commission is accurate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I’d want to understand exactly what that meant. In terms of fairness, are you suggesting that there never should be severance?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — If you want to appoint me as your minister in charge of the public service commission, I would have to ask my colleagues . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would have to ask my colleagues and I might not want to join such a distinguished group of parliamentarians. I might say that I might prefer to stay with this group, but I’ll tell you I will give you some assistance, if you want, in drawing up some guidelines for dealing with public servants. I know this is a problem that this government has had an endless amount of trouble with.

Can you give us any other instance? And again, I take the minister’s comment as candid: she didn’t find out until he tendered his resignation. I take that as being a candid comment. If that was said in error, then that fact should be revealed and we can get on to something else, if that comment was made in error. But I’m taking that comment as being wholly candid, that she didn’t know until she got the resignation.

Can you think of any other example? And man, you’ve had lots of experience with people who want to leave. That’s one thing that you’re not short of experience in. do you know of any other example of someone who has decided “he wants to do something else”? Madam Minister, I want to do something else; it’s been pleasant; so long, goodbye and good luck.” Can you think of any other person in this government who said that, who has got any severance pay, and can you give me any reason why severance pay would be offered in such circumstances?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Leader of the Opposition offered several courses of action to the people that the, what will we call, removed after the election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just a minute. Let me finish. One, they could stay and take their chances, or two, they could elect to be terminated, which included severance.

Now if those are the rules under Mr. Shillington’s public service commission or whatever, that their individuals are offered several courses of action, one, to stay and take their chances or, two, have the choice of deciding to do something else but elect to be terminated, which along with that goes from what I understand, and that’s normally the case, some severance, well, then, under the previous administration they were offered the choice of whatever they might like to do. And certainly as a former cabinet minister I suspect that you would understand what that means. And you’ve probably had many more years of experience in it than I have and you certainly have no corner on being righteous.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I tell you when it comes to dealing with public servants, this government has no corner on it either. This government has no corner on being righteous.



Mr. Premier, may we simplify this problem? Is it the policy of this government to offer severance pay to people who want to leave and who want to “do something else.” The example you quoted is obviously quite different. I began by asking you a question which took you some 10 minutes to answer, but to your credit, it’s one of a handful of questions you’ve answered accurately tonight. You said, “If a person is terminated he may be entitled to severance.” Yes, if a person is terminated. But that was not what we were told happened. We were told he came in without any foreknowledge on the part of that minister and offered his resignation.

Now that minister is either extremely decisive . . . That’s not been the pattern in the past, but that minister either has a remarkable degree of decisiveness about her or that resignation was unexpected and was his idea. So I suggest to you, if your minister’s answer was candid, then he, left voluntarily, and that is a very different situation than the one you just described. I would ask you one more time: can you refrain from obfuscating on this question, and give us, in simple terms, yes or no — do people who leave voluntarily, of their own accord, of their own volition, get severance pay with this government?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — In the year of our Lord of 2001, when we leave government, we will offer government employees the choice of staying and taking their chances, or electing to be terminated.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I do declare! I do declare, Mr. Premier . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I think we may find ourselves getting more, perhaps, out of the Minister of Government Services in the estimates that are yet to come up tonight.

I want to ask you some other questions. Now these are going to be easy. I promise you, there’s nothing tricky about the ones that are going to follow. They’re straightforward; you’re bound to know the answers. One of them is — I do not want to be taken lightly — a question with respect to your government’s policy on travel. Again, these questions have all been deferred to you by other ministers. That would annoy me too, but that was the position they took. I would think they might have done better to answer them themselves, but they didn’t: “Ask them in Executive Council.” So we’re here, asking them in Executive Council.

What is this government’s policy with respect to payment of air fare for people who are not employees? That covers a diverse group of people. It arises because we put the question on the order paper, and your Attorney General suffered from that mysterious disease that afflicted your Minister of Rural Affairs the other day. He could not get off his feet to answer some questions.

The order for return asked for air fare paid by Executive Council from the period May 8 to — not the present date, the date the order for return had been filed — but for our purposes, let’s say May 8 to March 9. He amended that to give us the air fare paid on behalf of employees by Executive Council. I said that I could understand that there might be some circumstances; he might not wish to disclose all the information. And I gave him the example of social services, who routinely pay for welfare recipients to go for medical care, and so on; it would be a very long return. But I said there were some legitimate questions.

So I would like to know under what circumstances Executive Council will pay for air fare for people who are not employees. It includes people on contract, it includes spouses, it

includes people who might be travelling with delegations. Could you give me that in concise terms? Because your Attorney General gave up the opportunity to reply in due course.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I can only give a general indication, and one example that I can recall now, I'm sure we'll get more information. Generally, when individuals ask to fly with, say, government air services, coming along — and I recall this example when I was going to North Dakota to meet with the governor — one or two members of the media asked if they could go along. It meant that we might have to take another airplane, or depending on how many of us went we would take one airplane or two airplanes. So the Minister of Revenue advised me that we would calculate the total cost of the trip, divide it by the number of members that are going including government staff and the media, and the appropriate simple average per individual would be billed to the members of the media that are coming down — CKCK, or CTV, or whoever. Now that is the general policy. With respect to non-government members, but family members and employees . . . I have taken my wife, or a daughter, or a son to Saskatoon and back, or going up for a public function and so forth. Beyond those two examples I would have to get more detail, and I'm prepared to dig up whatever are the rules and regulations under different circumstances.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Okay, I'll take that undertaking and look forward to receiving that. The question — and I may not have been very succinct in asking it — the question was under what circumstances does Executive Council pay commercial air fare? I say I may not have been very succinct in asking the question, Mr. Minister. Although I am interested in your undertaking and I'd like that information as well, that wasn't the question I asked.

What I intended to ask and may not have was: under what circumstances will Executive Council pay commercial air fare for people who are not employees? I would assume by way of example (although the Attorney General), as I say, sat there like a tree stump and wouldn't even tell us why he wouldn't answer the question) that someone who is on contract (Mr. Leier, whom you've had such great difficulty remembering his existence) I assume he travels, say for the government (I understand he's putting in full time here) I would assume that would be paid for by Executive Council. I don't know, but that's the kind of answer that I want. I'm also interested in knowing if the commercial air fare is paid for spouses of ministers — for your spouse. If it isn't, all well and good. If it is, does this herald a different policy with respect to elected members, because heretofore there's been only one rule for everybody. That is, they're not paid, So I would like your answer with respect to commercial air fares.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, as far as I know this evening, it would be very rare that the government or Executive Council would pay for somebody else to travel on private airlines. Now somebody under contract may have a contract plus expenses, which means that they're doing something in terms of mineral production or forecasting models or whatever it may be, that's included in the contract. With respect to wives and families, I don't believe that they're included at all with respect to cabinet ministers in private. I would say that I have given some serious consideration with respect to the ability to take my wife as an ambassador for the province, particularly because I think she is a good ambassador, being bilingual in French and German and English. I feel that the province could well afford to pay for her transportation into various countries we're going into and so forth, and I may raise that, I think she'd be an excellent ambassador.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, okay, I'll leave the subject shortly. One more question and then I'll make a comment. I take it by the Premier's comment, that to your knowledge no spouse of any member of Executive Council has, to date, travelled and had their commercial air fare paid by Executive Council. I take it, not to your knowledge has that happened.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I don't have any information to suggest that they did.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, let me just say Mr. Premier, if we can raise this for a moment to the level of a serious debate, that I think it should be considered if it is in the context of all members. Heretofore the rule has been uniform throughout, that is, no wives travel at the expense of the public purse . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No spouses travel at the expense of the public purse. They may travel at the expense of the Commonwealth parliamentary Association on occasion, I don't know; but heretofore they have not travelled at the expense of the public purse.

May I just say, and I will leave the question at that: if it is going to be reconsidered, it ought to be reconsidered in the context of all elected members. I'll leave it at that.

I have another question which relates to an order for return. If I have the House Leader, whom I do not see at the moment . . . If I had your undertaking that you're going to answer the order for return — item 9, return 66 — if I had your undertaking you're going to answer it, I'd leave it at that. But we don't yet have any indication . . . What is it? It's with respect to your own vehicle. If you're prepared to answer it, I'll leave it and get onto something else. I don't particularly want to spend a lot of time on it, No. 9, return 66.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — To the best of my knowledge, and we're still checking on it, if the question is about the vehicle that I drive, the CVA vehicle, it was purchased for me by the government in the city of Estevan, and I believe it was within the limits that are allocated by conventional . . . you know, whatever it is, and certainly if it was any more than that, I made sure that it wasn't the public that paid for it.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Okay, I take it since that is all the question asks is the make . . . I asked for the guidelines respecting the make, model, and cost of the motor vehicle. The question does not specifically ask for the details of your vehicle. It asks for the guidelines respecting the purchase of such vehicles, the length of time they're used and any changes that were made since May 8 and if I have your undertaking to provide that information, I'll leave it.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I don't think the guidelines, from the information I have, have changed from the previous administration. If there are, we'll certainly let you know. It was unit 314997. It's a 1982 Buick LeSabre wagon. Number of kilometres on it is 13,000. It was purchased December 2, 1982.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I have another question, Mr. Premier, and this time it's with respect to the deficit that your government has incurred — apparently getting worse. I'd remind the Premier that you took over an administration whose financial history and financial records were impeccable — among the best in North America. There had been some three occasions, I think, since the war, when deficits had been run and those pretty modest.

There were, I think, Mr. Premier, two classes of provinces. There was Manitoba and provinces east which traditionally ran large deficits, some of them running as large a

deficit as they could reasonably borrow, and there was Saskatchewan west which generally had a reasonably good record. We now seem to be in the process of joining Manitoba east, those provinces which habitually run deficits. I would hope that that isn't the case. I wonder when the Premier foresees Saskatchewan returning to balanced budgets.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, let me just read this. The Conference Board in Canada has an economic analysis publication called the *Econoscope*. In February of 1983, last month, they projected that over the 1982-86 period, Saskatchewan will lead all provinces in the following: (1) real growth, (2) growth in both residential and non-residential investment, (3) retail sales growth, (4) in the lowest level of unemployment, (5) in the highest personal savings, and would be second only to the province of Alberta (6) in current dollar growth, (7) in employment growth, (8) in growth and personal disposable income.

This general pattern is expected to continue from 1986 to 1991.

Now, if we as a province are going to lead all provinces (except we may be tied in one or two positions with the province of Alberta) from 1982 to 1986 and it continues to take place from '86 to '91, I would expect, despite international oil cycles or international business cycles, that we will do better than most provinces which mean seven to date. When our NDP neighbors to the east have a deficit which is closely approaching a billion, and all other provinces have extremely large deficits per capita — ours is the lowest in the neighborhood of \$220 million — but given this projection by, as the Leader of the Opposition says, “the very astute and reputable conference board,” and the latest one (and I point this out to the members of the media) that we will lead in all these indicators, then I would suggest that in general economic terms Saskatchewan will be extremely strong with respect to deficits, with respect to growth, with respect to employment, etc.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I don't know if the Premier's got a hearing problem, or if someone around you is talking to you when I'm asking questions, but that wasn't the question I asked. I subscribe to that publication; I have it. I noted that that publication did not predict an end to your deficit financing, and even if it did, that wasn't what I wanted. You, sir, are an economist. I assume that this is something that you can grapple with. I assume that you can give me an estimation as to when you think our budgets are going to be balanced.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — All I can suggest is: as the hon. member well knows, that given all the economic forecasts, we are expected to do better than nine-tenths of the provinces, or the best of any provinces in Canada, we will come out of a deficit situation as quickly as any other province in the country. And certainly it will depend on two things primarily, which you know you are very significant in terms of revenues for the province of Saskatchewan.

Number one is the American farmer. The American farmer has much more discretionary income in his pocket when corn prices and bean prices go up. The state of Ohio, the state of Iowa and Illinois and Wisconsin will buy a lot of potash from Saskatchewan. When our sales in potash to the United States go back up from where they were at a couple hundred million (and now they're down to \$30 million) it's a significant difference — when those turn around, depending on what the U.S. farm economy does. Number two, when the oil markets stabilize because there is a couple hundred million dollars in oil export tax . . . But when oil prices drop, you know, down to

the 75 per cent level and there's no tax, well I am sad, if you will, that I can't control international oil prices, or I can't put more money into the American farmer's pocket. When those two things begin to readjust in cycles, as they do, we can easily generate 200, 300, 400 million dollars in revenue that we don't have today, and the member knows that.

So, given the economic indications of the fastest area of growth, the most sustained area of growth in housing, in agriculture and in jobs among anybody else in Canada, given that, plus improvements in the international positions, the sky is the limit for the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Premier, I get that publication. It is reputable and it has been saying the same thing about the province of Saskatchewan for some time. It may surprise you to learn that what is said about Saskatchewan before April '82 is not very different from what is said about Saskatchewan after April '82. You people are guilty of a sin that many governments are guilty of — you overrate your own importance. Their prognosis on Saskatchewan has not changed and did not change with the election. They were saying the same thing when we were in office.

Do I take it from your total avoidance, never mind of the question of the issue, that you have no timetable by which you hope to balance your budget?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — It's our intention to balance it as quickly as possible given such international economic conditions as U.S. farm income, that dictates to a large extent our potash sales, and international oil prices, which dictate to a large extent our tax on international oil revenues. So if I can't predict those, how can I predict when we are going to have another \$300 million or \$400 million in revenues? I'm saying all the indications internally that we control, we have an impact on. It's saying that we're open for business, providing the tax targets, encouraging people to be employed here, and the only province creating jobs. And, in housing (I think it's interesting to point out because the members' riding is here) Regina's construction industry is doing considerably better this year than last year at this time, despite a recession, if issued building permits are any indication. The city issues \$14 million in building permits in January compared with \$11 million last year. In 1982, according to monthly statistics released from Regina City Council regular Monday meeting, among the largest increases were permits issued for single-family dwellings. The city issued \$2 million worth of housing permits in January '83 compared with only \$542,000 a year ago under your administration.

Now the recession across the world hasn't got better, and in North America it hasn't got better. But the conditions in the province of Saskatchewan, despite the recession, confirm exactly what the conference board is saying.

All those things that we can have an impact on internally, we are, and externally, we have to cope. But we're prepared to deal with international pricing conditions or international income conditions of the American farmer. And we're down there doing some things that I believe are pretty important, like moving the sales office from Atlanta, Georgia, where they don't buy potash, up to Chicago, where they do. Given the same per capita income, I will forecast that sales out of Chicago will be higher than they will in Atlanta, Georgia, for the American farmer.

So, let me just summarize by saying the internal conditions that we can control are very positive. We have to cope with international conditions, and I believe that we will.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Do I take it from that answer, stretching almost five minutes in length, that you have no date by which you're going to balance the budget? You'll do it whenever it becomes convenient?

I would remind the Premier that prosperity does not bring about balanced budget without some exercise of will. The Province of Ontario went through a sustained period of prosperity and during all that period of time had a deficit budget. The Government of Canada had precisely the same experience in the '60s and '70s. This country experienced unprecedented prosperity and unprecedented deficits. There's nothing about prosperity which brings about balanced budgets. I say it takes an act of will and I gather from your comments that you have no will, at least you have no timetable.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, if the member admits that Saskatchewan has very little control over American farm income or international oil prices, I think he would have to agree to that. Would the member agree to that? He accepts that? All right, let the record show that Mr. Shillington accepts the fact that we don't control international oil prices or the American farm income. Now given that, is he suggesting then that we should increase the amount of tax burden on the Saskatchewan public at this time — during the recession internationally, North American? Is he suggesting that we should increase the tax to the public? I just want him to confirm that. Is that what he's asking?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I don't want to give the Premier a lecture on the function of this House — never mind the rules: the function of this House. The estimates of the opposition are not before this House. Our estimates are not before this House, Mr. Premier. You are not being asked to decide whether or not any sum of money should be voted to the opposition. That takes place in a different forum. You are asking us to vote a sum of money, and it is us who seek information from you. I did not ask you about any of the issues you raised. I asked you: do you not have a timetable by which you're going to bring these deficits to an end?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that the public understands what the member opposite is asking. He's asking us to balance the budget tomorrow. Now, Mr. Chairman, the only way that the member could be suggesting that we do that is . . . Do you want us to put the tax back on gasoline? Do you want us to raise the sales tax? Do you want us to do the kinds of things that you have suggested that you favor? For example, in the province of Manitoba, they're increasing tax.

I guess what I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, is if the member agrees, and he has, that we don't control international incomes, and we don't control international oil prices, therefore clearly that means that we don't control a good part of our revenues. If he agrees, and I think he has suggested in this House, that we spend public money for jobs . . . Does he agree with that? He's nodding his head in the affirmative. For schools, and for hospitals. He wants us to spend money to create jobs. Mr. Chairman, the member for Shaunavon said his constituency was prepared to spend \$50 million on a pipeline — his constituency. They're prepared to do that. And he wants us to spend more and more public moneys, and he's just recognized that we don't control international economic conditions. So the only thing in between is to raise taxes. Now I want the public of Saskatchewan to recognize that the members in the opposition want the Government of Saskatchewan now to raise sales tax, and to raise income tax, and to raise gas tax, and to raise corporate tax, because that's the only way they're going to do it, given these two alternatives.

Now if that's what they want, I want everybody in Saskatchewan to recognize that they're asking for tax increases.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — If the Premier can find in *Hansard* any one of those comments he just attributed to me, I will eat that desk with the electrical cord still attached! It is not there, Mr. Premier. I said no such thing. What I did say was that prosperity, which you are assuming, will not bring about, in and by itself, balanced budgets. That takes an act of will. I have never been impressed with the financial management of the Government of Ontario. But I will say this in favor of the late Larry Grossman, before he departed from that post he set a timetable — four years. I don't think they'll make it, but at least they had a timetable and some exhibition of will to balance it.

What I see this evening is no timetable, just a blissful assumption that somehow or other the tooth fairy, or someone else, is going to balance this budget for you. I suggest that isn't going to happen unless you decide it's going to happen. And I ask you again: do you have no date by which you'd like to balance it? Never mind when you think it will balance. Give any date by which you'd like to see it balanced, apart from the trite answer as soon as possible. That's no answer at all. Surely the Premier has some timetable which he views to be desirable.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, we would all like to see a balanced budget. The members opposite say they want to see a balanced budget, but they won't tell us how they would plan to do it with increased public spending on one hand, international revenues falling at the same time, except to raise taxes.

Now, I know that's their solution. It's to tax, and to tax, and to tax. I don't think, during these times, it's a good idea, as you might, to raise income tax, and to raise sales tax, and to raise taxes and taxes when you know the international economic conditions are beyond your control, and you're asked by the opposition at the same time to spend money on public projects.

So, we'd all like to have balanced budgets. Given the international economic conditions and given what we're doing today . . . Perhaps I could add that it says here in the same publication, just to give you some hope so you have a positive attitude — a good positive attitude . . . For the Leader of the Opposition who just came in, I'm quoting the conference board, that prestigious organization that you quoted the other day, and its February issue of the economic analysis publication, the *Econoscope*. And it notes:

Saskatchewan's economy contains many of the basic ingredients for strong growth in the 1980s.

And I just point out that we are going to lead in eight different categories from 1982 to 1986, and likely continue to lead in those eight categories from '86 to '91. It's in *Hansard* now.

It says that Saskatchewan has substantial mineral resources.

Its single most important industry, agriculture, appears poised for strong growth during the next few years. Its government has a low debt burden, and the benefit of substantial energy reserves. Finally, the provincial government is intent upon attracting private sector investment as a stimulus to economic development with high tech industries as the main candidates. It is on this

basis of these positive factors that Saskatchewan's gross domestic product, GDP, is forecast to grow at a rate second only to Alberta's in the entire decade.

Now, may I just reiterate? All those things, internally, that we can do to encourage economic growth and development in terms of public spending for employment, tax reductions to encourage investment, and to help people have a good positive attitude, we're doing. The member opposite admitted that we do not have any control over American farm income, and the subsequent demand for potash, or international oil prices. Both have a major impact to the tune of probably hundreds of millions of dollars on our revenue. So, subject to that, subject to the things we are doing here, we would all love to balance it tomorrow, but we'll balance it when these economic conditions come together.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, and when I win the lottery, I'm going to retire, too. I think it's all going to happen at about the same time. I'm going to leave this subject, but I think it's fair to say that having been invited to do so over a 20-minute period, and since you were unable to articulate anything in the way of a timetable, I think it is fair for the public to assume that you don't have a timetable by which you would like to see this budget balanced. It's just whenever the economic conditions are going to make it convenient for you. I suggest you'll be long gone from office. In a brief period of time, even if the time span that you believed happened, I suspect you wouldn't balance your budget.

While the debate is at a reasonably high level, I want to ask a question. I want to say by way of background that I am not muckraking by answering this question. I have known the member for Thunder Creek as a personal friend for many years. I have known his father as a friend and neighbor. And I feel a tragedy has beset him in a way, I think, as personal as anybody in your caucus. Having said that, this city is rife with rumors about his resignation. I want to ask you a question, Mr. Premier, for the record, really. Will the Premier confirm for the record the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines had absolutely nothing to do with any improprieties, financial or otherwise, with regard to the performance of his duties as a minister of the crown or as an elected representative?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, I can only reiterate, Mr. Chairman, what I said at the time, I believe when I was in a news conference, with respect to the resignation of the cabinet minister. He and I had a conversation and we mutually agreed that given his financial and family responsibilities, it was best at this time that he stepped down from cabinet. And we agreed that that should be the case and that's exactly what happened.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I want to remind the Premier before I leave the subject. I'm not going to spend long on it. I phrased the question with great care because there are rumors to the effect there were improprieties involved with his ministry or with his performance as an elected representative. I repeat the question and I say to you, Mr. Premier, if you refuse to answer it you are simply going to fuel those rumors. Now let me repeat the question for you. Will the Premier state clearly for the record that the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines had absolutely nothing to do with any improprieties, financial or otherwise, with regard to the performance of his duties as a minister of crown, or as an elected representative?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — It had nothing to do with improprieties.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. I want to get on to a question I raised with the minister in charge of the public service commission. Again I would have



thought this to have been his responsibility, but it apparently is not. It apparently is yours. It has to do with the public service firings. I suggested to the minister in charge of the public service commission that the ongoing firings, the fact that you're cutting the dog's tail off one-eighth of an inch at a time is creating some very severe problems within the public service. I do not have any statistical data but I do have some experience and I want to relate it to the Premier.

I used to be able to meet public servants and say, "How's it going, Bill?" (to pick a name out of the air). And they would under normal circumstances tell me what they're doing in their department, what's new, talk about the latest project they're working on, something they're interested in. I often kept in touch with what was happening in the department in a way that it did not involve any sort of political interest.

Now you ask any public servant, "How's it going?" The answer is universally the same. With sort of a wry grin, they say, "Well, I'm still working." That's the standard response of any public servant. That's all they are thinking about at the moment. The continual, ongoing firings, Mr. Premier, are decimating the morale of the public service in Saskatchewan. I ask you in the name of all that's decent, when are you going to bring this process to an end?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't buy the argument at all that morale in the public service is as described, as the member puts it. I think if you look up the morale of the public employees in Prince Albert-Duck Lake, for example, and if you go through the riding, and if you went through the ridings today and through the cities, in particular the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon, you'd see that the morale was good. The morale is better and it's getting better. So, I don't buy the argument that there's any kind of a problem, as implied by the member opposite. They expect some positive changes to be made, and they have been made.

If the hon. member wants to court rumors — he may like to — that's his prerogative, but I just don't buy the story.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, once again, I'm having great difficulty making the Premier understand the question. I want to know, Mr. Premier, when these firings are going to come to an end that keep going on and on and on and on and on. I may say, with respect to Prince Albert-Duck Lake, there weren't enough public servants in that riding to materially affect the outcome. I may say I met a public servant. I knocked at the door and I said, "I'm Ned Shillington here on behalf of Jerry Hammersmith." The response was, "Well, I'm a public servant and I guess that tells you how I'm voting, doesn't it?" I said, "Thanks." He said, "You're welcome. I'll be sure and be out." That was as long as the conversation lasted. And he did. In fact, that public servant, I suspect at very considerable risk to himself, put up a sign for Jerry Hammersmith.

That was the response and that is the mood in the public service. I do not expect you to acknowledge that the morale of the public service is as low as it is, freakily. I do expect you, in the name of all that's decent, to bring this process to an end at some time and to say, "We are finished with the transition period and we are going to discontinue the ongoing firings which continue on almost a daily basis." When, in the name of all that's decent, are you going to let the public service of Saskatchewan get down to work and stop worrying about their necks?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, the public service commission is working right now. They're working in crowns and in departments. The member keeps using the word

“firings.” We have had a freeze on, which meant we haven’t been hiring. I think the general public will — as they don’t want to see the size of government grow any more than it had been over the last 10 years because it doubled in size . . . They say that in Prince Albert and they say it in Regina and Moose Jaw and Swift Current and Melfort: don’t have this thing growing more and more so we have to raise more taxes to pay for it. So, we have said that we don’t want to see government grow. We want it to be efficient and effective, get the services finished, and provide the services to the public at a reasonable cost, and that’s what we’re doing.

With respect to adjustments or changes in a direction or modifications to a department or a crown, the members opposite were involved in modifications to crowns and changing them or redirecting them or cancelling them or building them or whatever. That goes on in government. It went on year after year after year after year. “The firings” is a misnomer. There have been very few people moved, percentage-wise. I think in total government, in crowns and in departments, there’s something like 27,000 or 28,000 people, which is a large number. We have put a freeze on hirings. We have moved some departments like DNS into some others, and so forth at the will of the people, and I’m sure it’s very popular. We’re still providing the service. The attitude is one that we can build; we can continue to build to provide the service but not at an undue cost or tax burden to the public. I believe the attitude is better now than it was, certainly than it was prior to the election. It’s getting better, as evidenced by the reaction, as I mentioned, in Prince Albert.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, do I take it from the Premier’s response that this process is going to continue? (Use whatever term you want.) I say, Mr. Premier, you have fired those you can and laid off those you can’t fire. But the process is the same. You are weeding out those who, for some reason or other, you feel aren’t going to be loyal to you. I may say, I’m not going to get into the names, but a goodly number of the people you laid off, fired, terminated, use whatever phrase you want, would have loyally served this government, and served this government as loyally as they did the last government.

Do I take it again from your inability to articulate a timetable over a 10-minute period, that these firings are going to continue — layoffs, firings, terminations — are going to continue into the indefinite future? I remind the Premier that it is ongoing, ongoing; it continues. Every day we hear more of it. Do I understand the Premier to say that this process which is now ongoing is going to continue into the indefinite future, and you really don’t have any idea when it is going to come to an end?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it’s fair to point out that some departments, some crowns, and some agencies are growing, and some are declining in terms of emphasis. We have expanded a department, for example, like economic development and trade. As a result of that, we are bringing in new people because we have a new thrust. We may do the same in some other areas. Certainly some of our potential reorganization will be the growth of some thrusts into areas where we feel we have the greatest strengths for the province. That will continue.

So, in fairness, I think the member should look at the total picture in balance, about the growth in some areas, expansion in some areas, as well as the decline in others, and that process continues on and on. The net result may not be any particularly dramatic change at all in the total level. I will say though, that I doubt very much whether the size of government, the total size of government, is going to grow anywhere close to the rate

of increase of the previous administration, and I believe that's the will of the folks, the will of the voters, that they don't want to see a massive increase again in the public service. So we're increasing some departments, there will be a reduction in others, and on balance, it's up or down, whatever. So I just think it would be fairer if he would at least recognize in some cases we are bringing on new employees when in other places departments are being merged with others.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Premier, I want to get on to a different subject since I'm patently not going to get an answer to that one either.

The next subject I want to deal with is minimum wage. I am not going to deal with the level of salaries paid to the political personnel which you hired, apart from reminding you that those salaries represent a very substantial increase over what was paid previously. If that's going to be an issue, I'll give you some names. But I assume it isn't going to be an issue, and I won't. The level of salaries you pay to the political personnel is a very considerable increase over what was there before.

I am not so much concerned, Mr. Premier, with your generosity to your friends, as your niggardly attitude toward those who apparently are not. I am referring to those on minimum wage. Mr. Premier, I wonder how on earth you can justify not giving any increase to those who are at the bottom of the ladder, at the very bottom of the ladder, when your assistants are deserving of increases as high as \$20,000 and \$30,000 over the incumbents in those office previously. How on earth do you justify keeping those at minimum wage at the same level since last January? That's how long they've been there. You have ignored the recommendation of the minimum wage board, and I wonder if you would give us your justification for treating those people so shabbily.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I am tempted to make some comparisons between '72 and '73 but I will refrain from doing that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm talking about salaries in Executive Council when I'm talking about this. I'll just say with respect to minimum wage, the members opposite are asking time and time and time again to have more done to encourage both the public and the private sectors to employ more people. Would the member opposite agree that there is some relationship between the level of salary of individuals and the number of people employed?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — None at that level; I don't know a reputable economist who believes there is at the minimum wage level. Minimum wage is not paid, I would remind the Premier, minimum wage is not paid by large businesses. They are normally unionized; they normally pay more than minimum wage. The vast majority of those on minimum wage are employed by small businesses who do not make that sort of a sophisticated calculation saying, "Now if minimum wage goes up by 5 per cent or 6 per cent that's going to increase my labor costs so I'm going to have to lay off some people." That isn't how the clothier or the other small businessmen who hire minimum wage make those hiring decision. That may be how large industrial or commercial concerns make those decisions, but that isn't the mental process of a small businessman. He says to himself, "Can I possibly get along with that employee?" and if the answer is no, he hired them.

I suggest to you that the level of employment of those at minimum wage is, within reasonable limits, unrelated to whether or not they are given a 6 per cent increase. If you doubled the minimum wage, that might be different, but I suggest to you that the minimum wage recommended by the minimum wage board last June would not have affected the level of employment of people on minimum wage by one iota.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, that shows me that the hon. member doesn't understand the economy at all, because you would find very few employers in Saskatchewan or in Canada or in the United States that don't say the number of people employed is very highly correlated with wage rates. So to the extent that we look at it, and if I remember my figures — I'll stand to be corrected — up to 70 or 75 per cent of the people on social services today in the province of Saskatchewan have less than grade nine education. A large number of those people would fall into something close to the minimum wage category.

If you are suggesting to me that we would employ more people by raising their wages, and at the same time say that we can have an increase in the number of people employed in that category which is the most difficult, and at the same time raise their wages, then it flies in the face of every economic relationship that I have seen with respect to employment and the level of employment. To put it another way, I think the hon. member would realize that as the price of something gets more expensive, people tend to use less of it. He says, as he shakes his head, that that isn't the case in labor. I would say if you look at the employment pictures around the world where the settlements are coming in at 3 per cent, 5 per cent or zero per cent, in U.S. steel or some other place where they're coming in at less than that, then you see people employed and you tell me that we can make an increase in most of those people. Seventy to 75 per cent, if I'm correct, in social services with a grade nine education or less, would fall into that category. That we would improve their lot by raising the minimum they have to be paid, expecting more people to hire them — well, I guess I just have to say that clearly you don't understand the economy.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Premier, you relate (I certainly have to give you high marks for innovation in this economic period) a level of employment of people on minimum wage to the employment levels. And you say we'll employ more. Yes, okay, I therefore assume that there are not enough people at the minimum wage level employed to raise the minimum wage. That seems to be what comes out of your comments.

I assume that in some fashion, if there's any logic to what you're saying — and the answer to that may well be no — but I assume if there's any logic to what you're saying, it is that given the rate of unemployment, you don't want to increase the minimum wage, because it might exacerbate the unemployment problem which we all admit we have.

Is that what you're saying — that given the level of unemployment, you don't want to increase the minimum wage?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, if the members agree that unemployment is a significant problem in Canada, and it's higher in Saskatchewan than we'd like it to be, then it's hard, or difficult, or somewhat confounding to me that they're asking to have the wage rates increased. At the same time, they want to employ more people, when those folks that have to hire them are telling me that it's difficult enough now to make income. And you're saying that the bankruptcies may be increasing because they haven't got more money, but you want them to pay more. I mean it's a circle that you just get caught chasing your tail. I mean you can't have it both ways. If you want to increase the number of people employed, you can't ask for significant increases in salary. There is a relationship.'

In the public sector, you've just asked: when are we going to balance the budget? Well, if you had asked, say, that we should increase the minimum wage . . . Shall we increase

the minimum wage, which means we've got to raise more taxes to pay for that? That's going to mean that we're going to have to look at a change in the deficit position. Again I have to go back and say, if you want them all hired in the public sector, you'd have to ask us to raise taxes. And if that's what you're asking, I would say fair enough, but I don't agree with you.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — All right. Since the refusal to raise minimum wage is tied to unemployment levels, will you then tell the House: how low does the unemployment level have to fall before you're going to raise the minimum wage?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Are you admitting there's a relationship?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It's your theory, not mine. I'm just asking you to draw it to a logical conclusion, Mr. Premier.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, when we get to a position where unemployment is no longer a problem, or when we're making vast strides across Saskatchewan, and indeed, the country, and generally, people are finding jobs readily and quickly, and the demand is there, what happens in many, many cases, if employers are looking for people, they no longer want to pay the minimum wage. They'll pay above the minimum wage to attract those individuals. Most people in the province of Saskatchewan want the maximum wage, not the minimum wage. And quite frankly, it's my theory that the million children that have left this province did so because they didn't want to be stuck on minimum wage. They wanted to go to another province to get maximum wage. And the province of Saskatchewan is going to be one of positive attitude, so that you can get \$5, \$10, \$15, \$20 an hour, and not be stuck at the minimum.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I take it the Premier has no timetable by which he's going to raise the minimum wage either, except I suppose it'll come about . . . (inaudible) . . . full employment.

Harry Truman used to say that there's nothing new in this world, just history you've not seen. And I say this is an old movie. In 1964, the CCF government left office after a period of prosperity, and they left office with a high minimum wage. The Thatcher government left office after a difficult period in terms of the economy, and had the lowest minimum wage. Now, during the '70s, when the former administration was in office, the minimum wage went from being one of the lowest to the highest and that was during a period of prolonged prosperity. I say what we're going to see is history revisited, an old-line party in office which will freeze minimum wage. You will come into office with the highest wage in Canada. I'll predict you'll leave with one of the lowest. And you will fail to achieve any of the prosperity which you claim.

There are so many parallels, Mr. Premier, between your administration and Mr. Thatcher — so many parallels. I was interested to see a conference hosted by the late Mr. Thatcher. You'll never guess what the theme for the conference was — open for business. There are so many parallels. There are so many parallels, Mr. Premier. Unfortunately that is not remembered as one of the better periods in the history of this province. I'll make the prediction that your administration will not be fondly regarded by the people when it's gone, either.

I want, Mr. Premier, to get on to the issue of jobs. I asked you a question the other day

and in a half-facetious manner, asked you to spare this province another conference, the last one having been so disastrous. Your response to that was a somewhat rambling apology for all the problems that had fallen on your head. And you talked about the oil price and the price of potash, and the U.S. farm market. And I'll admit that you don't have sole and exclusive control over the international price of oil. I'll admit that there are some of the other things, some of the other problems you claim may have some claim to legitimacy. I put it no higher than that.

But there is one thing you could have done with respect to jobs, Mr. Premier. You could have enhanced spending in the public sector, and that simply didn't happen. That simply didn't happen, Mr. Premier. That simply did not happen. Mr. Premier, the level of spending in the public sector was abysmally low. The overpass at Moose Jaw, which you and I go through every time we go back to the districts we grew up in, I thought was symbolic of the level of public expenditures in this province. A truck ran into that overpass in May, damaged it; one lane was closed off. And it wasn't fixed until October. And you and I drove under that overpass all summer long. It wasn't because the engineers in the highway department couldn't figure out how to fix it — that technology has been with us for some time. It was because the money wasn't available.

And that example occurs throughout the length and breadth of this land. There was, by the admission of your Minister of Government Services, a freeze on spending, on public spending in her department for a good part of the summer while she analysed the budget and reviewed it. Your minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation put a hold on the power project at Nipawin during most of the construction season. It wasn't until September that that was lifted, after most of the construction season had passed. The motto which you people borrowed from some commercial enterprise was: "There's so much more we could be." Mr. Premier, there is so much more you could have done and you didn't do it. I'll admit you can't control oil prices but you could have controlled the level of public sector spending in this province and created some more jobs.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, a couple of observations. Number one, we found . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . would the member for Shaunavon like to . . . I want to remind him of this. They took over in 1971. As a result of minimum wage changes from 1971 to 1972, the January to January figures, you may have increased the minimum wage but you dropped 8,000 employees. Those figures were pointed out last night. And if you can show me or anybody else that there's a positive relationship between the height of wages and the number of people employed, I'd be glad to look at the evidence. And anything that is close to that borders on being ridiculous.

In terms of public spending (and your own track record shows it), the hon. member knows that we have spent money on schools, on hospitals, on nursing homes, on water, on housing, farm purchase programs, by the hundreds of millions of dollars — public programs. Now admit it. We're not just building buildings for the sake of building buildings. We're investing in a rural gas distribution program. We saved \$10 million by renegotiating the Nipawin hydro project, and that's \$600 million or \$700 million under way. The natural gas is \$350 million over 10 years, and it's a major expansion. And schools and hospitals and nursing homes — those things are going on.

Public expenditures on one hand, and at the same time incentives in the private sector to encourage people to come and work and operate here . . . The combination is that we're the only province in the country creating jobs, both public and private. The balance of both (which I'm sure he's looking for, unless he admits he doesn't like any

balance at all but a combination of public and private investment) is causing us to be the only province in the country creating jobs.

And I predict — I predict today — that over the years ahead our wages will be higher and our income will be higher, and the growth in person discretionary income and family income will be higher and higher and higher and higher. The people at the bottom will go to the top — will go to the top and will quit going to the province of Alberta.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I thought Aesop had died some 2,000 years ago. I see there's still fairy tales being invested which would put him to shame.

With respect to public sector spending, I know you will stand up and deny that the sun is going to rise tomorrow morning, and you would also stand up and deny . . . But it is a matter of public record in those estimates that you did build schools. You did all the things you said you did, but you did it at a level well below what this province has customarily spent in previous years.

Your . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Which you didn't start. Which you didn't start, Mr. Premier. It was scheduled to start last year. You put it on hold. Not a pipe has been welded. Not a thing has been done. Not a thing has been done, Mr. Premier.

If you had . . .

**MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN:** — Order. Let the member . . . Order! Let's let the member do his speaking. We want to get through these estimates tonight.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — If you had just gone on a vacation and done nothing, the expenditures which were budgeted would have been well above what actually occurred. We would not have had the deep-freeze into which this province sank during the summer.

I want to ask a couple more questions. These are minor questions. The first one is: I know the Premier of Alberta has a clothing allowance. Does the Premier of Saskatchewan have a clothing allowance? If so, what's the amount of it?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — No.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I gather there is a Clerk of the Executive Council — Mr. Gren Smith-Wilson. Have I got the name right?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Windsor.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Windsor. Is there an apartment rented for Mr. Smith-Windsor's benefit, at public expense?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I'll get that information and let the hon. member know.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I'm amazed, Mr. Premier, that you don't have . . . These estimates are not a very new phenomenon. They have been going on for some decades without a lot of change.

One of the features which used to be standard was the officials would bring along some briefing books with some fairly standard information. Ask the gentleman to your right. I

am amazed that your officials have not had sufficient foresight to bring along such information as the perks attached to the Clerk of the Executive Council. I am just amazed to see that that is something that you didn't bring with you.

I am not going to refight the battle so well fought by the member for Elphinstone, when you did not know the existence of Mr. Leier without a bit of prodding, the existence of a number of other people whom you must see on a daily basis. I'm not going to repeat that battle and I'm not going to try and bring your stonewalling to an end. I am going to ask another question with respect to that issue which I would ask you to respond to and that is: if there is a suite or an apartment, or some premises leased for the Clerk of the Executive Council, are those premises customarily available to any member of your Executive Council?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I just don't have that information with respect to the individual or anybody else. I'll get the information and provide it to the hon. member.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, just a couple of questions. As I understand it, we have the undertaking of the Premier to give us the information set out by request in a letter, Blakeney to Devine, dated March 8, 1983. Am I correct in that?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes, sir.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I would ask the Premier whether he will include in that (and I understand he has already given us that commitment) people who are on, and I have asked that, contracts of employment. And here I would advise the Premier that we are not looking for ordinary consulting contracts of short duration where you do not have the exclusive use of an individuals' time. There must be many of those (I suppose somebody may come in to fix a water purifier or something like that). That may indeed be a contract of personal employment. We're not looking for that; we're looking for the other information already indicated.

I would ask that the Premier particularly indicate whether the following have been in the employ of the Executive Council by appointment or by contract, and I mentioned Dave Black, Ian Disbery, Reg Forsythe, Garnet Carven or Garven, Jack Harrington, Terry Leier, Scotty Livingstone, Jim Petrychyn, Paul Robinson, Harvey Rothecker, Ted Walters . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You'll never make it.

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, I would also like to request the amount paid in fees and other payments to the law firm of MacPherson, Leslie and Tyerman, or any members thereof. I am here assuming that Mr. Ron Barclay and Mrs. Marjorie Gerwing are members of that firm — that's not the complete list of the members. I ask whether the Premier has that information available.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I've already answered in the affirmative that I will provide the information that is requested in your letter, which includes all the contracts for people and for services rendered, or to be rendered since May 8. I'll note your caveat, or your qualification that, where it was a combination or a short-term, somebody who might have been employed with somebody else, and in and out, it might not be what you're precisely looking at. I don't say that in a fashion that I won't include those who are still employed. But I'll provide that information, including the names of the individuals that you listed and so forth, if they're there and if they are employed.



With respect to the attorneys and lawyers and so forth, I don't have that information to date, certainly not the amount of money that might have been paid, or the remuneration, but I suspect that without too much difficulty we can provide a good part of that information.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'm sorry I missed that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just at the end, I'm really just firming up what we think our commitments are with . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, that's right. I never did smoke so I don't get one of your big red posters, I'm sorry . . .

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would you also include in the list those people who are employees of the chief electoral office? We have noted that while the expenditure appears in the blue book, the dark blue book, the number of employees is not specifically identified. We've already indicated that Mr. Chamberlin or Mr. Lampard are employees, and would you include those in the information you provide?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, I suspect that we can provide those individuals in the total package we are putting together. Within the statutes associated with elections and so forth, they are a little bit apart from what normally goes on, but we'll provide the information to the best of our ability on who's there now and what they do.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I would hope, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, you would regard that (and I ask you to do so) as an addition to number one, saying the names of persons who are, or have been on the staff of the chief electoral office, and just as if it were there, in that form.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I think that we can co-operate.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I just want to say, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Premier, that I have sat here through a number of hours of questioning and I want to say that I had a number of questions which I felt important to ask the Premier. I want to say that I sat here and listened while we attempted to get information and I think it has been the worst display that has been given by any Premier in the history of this legislature. Absolutely no information, and I think that lack of information is either deliberate or what people are starting to say is in fact, true. The Premier is not a bad guy, but many people in the province are concerned that the Premier really isn't running this province; he's not the Premier; he doesn't know what going on. And so my questions are going to be very brief because you are providing no information whatsoever. And I think it's a waste of the taxpayers' money to continue the questioning with the lack of information that has been exhibited here today.

I want further to say that you came into office with a lot of hopes and aspirations in this province, and I think that the callousness of your government toward human beings, professional civil servants, the massive firings and the depth of the highest unemployment that this province has seen is a disgrace. I think that I'm going to direct two or three questions and sit down, because I think that the performance of the Premier has finally been exposed to the public — that he doesn't know the facts. He's not in fact running the government. He has a transition team who is running the government, not him.

I want to ask just in respect to minimum wage. And what I want to ask as a follow-up, listening to your discussion in respect to minimum wage: has the government considered, is the government considering, has it during the past ten months

considered establishing a minimum wage differential, that is, for the young employees, a separate wage and a higher wage for the experienced employees for employment? The reason I ask that is that Ronald Reagan has recently indicated that he intends a proposal of reducing it down to \$2.50 an hour for young people, and I wonder if in fact the Premier can indicate whether he has any policy in respect to this.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, I can say that I have considered the implications of a staggered minimum wage, not for young but for students because a large number of students across Canada, indeed in the province of Saskatchewan, have decided to go back to work and are very concerned about employment. And again I go back from my economic studies and analysis — there is a relationship between student employment and the level of wage. And other jurisdictions in Canada, jurisdictions of your political persuasion, have dealt with a staggered minimum wage that would have an effect, a possible effect with respect to students, not young or old; students can be of any age. So, yes, I've given it some consideration because the major problem, as you I would suspect agree, is employment. So we don't want to jeopardize any possibilities for student employment by doing something that may harm or jeopardize an employer hiring students. And in that context I have looked at a lot of things, including staggered wages.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Premier. I just wonder what success the other provinces are having with their staggered wages for students. Obviously you have indicated that this province in the past has had the lowest unemployment rate with the highest minimum wage. And I think it is really dependent upon basically the economic will of that government and the extent that that government is prepared to stimulate and to maximize the economic activity in the province. I think that's where we had success in the past and I wonder very much as to the success that they've had in stimulating this economic activity in other parts of Canada — the Maritimes, Ontario and so on. So I accept what you say and I thank you for indicating that you're considering it.

I just want one other piece of information. Your government recently increased the number of Legislative Secretaries and I think it has been increased to ten if I'm not mistaken and I would like if you could provide me with a list of the Legislative Secretaries (I have an idea who they are but it's convenient with the question), a list of the Legislative Secretaries and all the related expenses that have been paid in conjunction with their legislative duties. Could you provide that?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — If I could just make one comment with respect to employment before I answer this. I think the hon. member will agree that history will support the following argument. You may have said that Saskatchewan had the highest minimum wage in Canada and that you had low unemployment at the same time. Let me remind you, sir, that no other jurisdiction in Canada or the history of Canada ever exported more children than the province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mostly under the jurisdiction of a party that believes that there is no relationship between wage and employment (and clearly they don't believe there's any relationship), Saskatchewan lost thousands and hundreds of thousands of students and young people to go find jobs in other provinces rather than here. I just want to remind them of that when they are bragging about having a high minimum wage at the same time of having low unemployment when they're exporting all the employables.

Second part of the question: Birkbeck, health, August 16, 1982; Gordon Dicks, Executive Council, June 10, 1982; Tim Embury, finance, June 10, 1982; Rick Folk, industry and commerce now economic development and trade, June 10, 1982; Lorne Hepworth, agriculture, June 10, 1982; Ralph Katzman, agriculture, August 16, 1982; Colin Maxwell, labor, June 10, 1982; Miles Morin, energy and mines, June 10, 1982; Gerald Muirhead, environment, August 16, 1982. I will provide the member with their accumulated expenses or associated expenses with their responsibilities in the near future.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you. I would also ask the Premier whether any MLAs other than Legislative Secretaries who may have acted on any committees have indeed been provided with expense allowances, travel allowances, or the like.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, not to my knowledge there wasn't.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I just want to comment on your other statement in respect to the minimum wage,. Mr. Premier, I just want, as my colleague indicated to you, that what you should do, as I urged the Minister of Industry and Commerce when he was talking about the economic strategy of this province, is to go back to 1964 to '71. Same policy — Saskatchewan: Open for Business. There is no doubt that the minimum wage dropped during that period and that there was the largest exodus of people from Saskatchewan ever in the history of the province during that period of time. So I think what I want you to do is to go back, review the record from '64 to '71. Exactly the same philosophy, in fact many of the same bloodlines running the government and so I invite the minister to do that, because the Minister of Industry and Commerce wasn't even aware of what government was elected from '64 to '71, nor did he know about the economic strategy at that time. I take it the Premier may be aware of that, and I would invite him to take a look at it.

I want to ask another question in conclusion. I'm not sure, since the Premier in effect organized the transition team which performed its massacre of the public service, I presume that the transition team headed by the Deputy Premier probably also had your hand in the ill deed of the massacre of many professional crown corporation employees. Could the minister advise me whether the transition team was also involved in the selection of those to be fired in the crown corporations?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — In answer to the first part of your question with respect to reviewing the record, I think it would be fair to point out to the hon. member that after 10 years of reviewing the record, the people of Saskatchewan reviewed the record of the members opposite on April 26. Then, again, they reviewed the record of the new administration on February 21. Both those circumstances offered a fair review of the record, and they speak for themselves.

Number two, with respect to the transition team and its dealing with crown corporations, I would think it would be fair to say that the boards of directors of the crown corporations made many of the management decisions. I think it would also be fair to say that they may have been in discussion with people involve in Executive Council and/or transition. Well, I can't add anymore than that.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — One final question. I wonder, Mr. Premier, if you could provide this information. Could you indicate the total cost in respect to the settlements of the employees of the crown sector that the government has paid out to date? In the public

service commission, the Minister of Finance indicated that there was, I believe, \$1.3 million in respect to public service employees who were dismissed and severance was given. I wonder if the Premier could provide the total amount that was paid in respect to the severance packages of crown corporation employees who in fact were relieved of their duties.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I believe that despite the fact that it doesn't apply to Executive Council, we can get most of that with a couple of caveats, except for perhaps by agreement the individuals didn't want it to be released, they've asked for that, and I would respect that confidentiality. But under the normal run of things, I expect we could provide most of that.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — One final piece of information that the Premier could advise, since he's getting into the mood of providing information: could he provide the total number of pending lawsuits against officials, chairmen of crown corporations and/or public service employees? I'd like to know the total number of pending legal actions by employees who have been dismissed.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Chairman, I was tempted to say yours or ours, but I won't do that. I will take note of the question and gather the information to the best of my ability. I think that we can provide that information.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 10 agreed to.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10**

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 10 agreed to.

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **LEGISLATION**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 21**

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 21 agreed to.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**

#### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**LEGISLATION**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 21**

Items 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 21 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**LEGISLATION**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 21**

Items 2 and 4 agreed to.

Vote 21 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**ENERGY AND MINES**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 23**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 23 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**

**SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**ENERGY SECURITY DIVISION**

**ENERGY AND MINES**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 47**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 47 agreed to.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE  
THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 22**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 22 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**  
**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**  
**THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD**  
**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 22**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 22 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**  
**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**  
**THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD**  
**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 22**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 22 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**  
**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**  
**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**  
**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 16**

**Item 1**

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Deputy minister of highways, Mr. Chairman, Jack Sutherland.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, previously when we did highways, I'd asked you for the names, salaries of any executive assistant or special assistants you may have. You said at that time you had one executive assistant. That may be changed now. Could you give me the names of any executive assistants or special assistants that you may have, or people under contract to you?

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Well, if it's okay we could get that and send that to you. Is that okay?

We'll send you the complete information of the staff to date. Is that what you're asking for? You got it — personal staff, you got it.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — The minister doesn't have that with him at the present. Is that what

you're saying, that you don't have that information with you?

You have an additional expenditure here of 2.8 million on one page and 3 million on the other. Could you explain what the additional costs were for?

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Okay. Basically, under item 1, vote 16, 5, there is \$100,000 for additional grid road legal survey work to reduce the backlog in this program. Vote 16, 8 — there is \$1,150,00 for accounts payable; \$1 million to offset maintenance costs — increases for abnormal unseasonal late spring and early fall ice and snowstorms.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — The announcement that the minister made just the other day on March 2 of \$1.6 million, is any of that money included in the supplementary estimates/

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — No, it is not included in this. These were dollars that were left over because of some of the weather problems we had on completion of some grading projects for '82.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

Vote 16 agreed to.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

### **HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION**

### **Capital Expenditure — Vote 17**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 17 agreed to.

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

### **POTASH CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN**

### **Vote 58 — Statutory**

#### **Item 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, just the one question. I was curious to note the view of some of the people at the potash corporation that the delay in proceeding with the Lanigan expansion would save money rather than cost money, and I don't know whether the minister wishes to comment on that. If not, I will seek another occasion.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Your question was the fact that it was delayed?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Right.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — We spent some time wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether we should carry on with the completion of the expansion and I realize that that delay did have some impact. However, we have decided to go ahead and complete the project and we understand that we'll still come in on time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister.

**CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

**SASKATCHEWAN POWER CORPORATIONS**

**Vote 52 — Statutory**

**SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

**ENERGY SECURITY DIVISION**

**SASKATCHEWAN POWER CORPORATION**

**Nil Vote**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Just one short question. This used to fund a Warm Up Saskatchewan program as I recall it. What has happened to that program? Does it still exist?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Chairman, yes it does still exist.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**LABOR**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 20**

**Item 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I think if we can wait a moment, I think my colleagues, the member for Regina Centre had a question or two. I can fill in the time or else we can all sit down . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I thought you'd opt for that, Jim.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I want to ask the minister a few questions and I'm not going to turn this into any sort of federal case. I want to ask the minister some questions about the minimum wage board report. I understand you said it would be available in a few days. I had some difficulty getting a precise definition of what a few days means in times past, Mr. Minister. May we expect an announcement by you on the disposition of that report by the end of this month?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Chairman, it is fully my intention to have that report out before the end of the month.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Okay, I shall leave it at that. I don't think you can do better than that.



Now with respect to the final report of the workers' compensation board. You will recall, Mr. Minister, that we dealt with the interim report of the workers' compensation board. With respect to the final report which you said you are reviewing, would you give me the status report of your review of that report?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Chairman, that report . . . What we wanted to do was get a complete . . . If we implemented the whole report as it was presented to us, what kind of an impact monetarily-wise it would have on employers and their contributions to the workers' compensation board . . . We have done that. I haven't had the figure yet, although I understand it's almost ready for us. We'll be reviewing the report. There's going to be probably some things that we agree with, that we can implement, which won't be a large monetary item. But we are a little afraid of doing a lot of it this year with the economic conditions the way they are. The major one would be the rehab centre and we're doing some investigation work along with the Minister of Health in that area.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Do I take it from the minister's comments that at least some of the recommendations of the report would result in either a deficit in the fund, which that fund has never had to date, and I hope this government wouldn't set any precedents by beginning a deficit in that fund, or alternatively, an increase in the rates charged to employers. Do I take it from the minister's comments that some of those recommendations . . . Wait, wait till we get to CIC if you think this is agonizing, Mr. Minister.

With that interjection aside, do I take it, Mr. Minister, that some of those recommendations would result . . . Let me try this again. Do I take it, Mr. Minister, that some of those recommendations could not be paid out of the existing fund without an increase in rates? Is that what you are telling us, that some of those recommendations cannot be paid out of the existing fund without an increase in rates?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Well, what I said was that there is probably a number of items in the report that are not monitored that we could implement if we felt that it was a good thing for the worker out there. As far as the . . . We did have an increase this year. There has been an increase go through in the workers' compensation board assessment; some higher than others. But the increase has already gone through. We did that starting the earlier part of January.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Do I take it that you will implement any increases recommended by the final report of the workmen's compensation board which do not require any abnormal increases in the assessments to employers?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — I'm not saying at this point what we will or won't implement. We'll be looking at all the report; and any items that we feel that we can accommodate, we will look at and implement. As I say, we haven't gone through it point by point and decided which, if any, we will be doing this year. If it's a monetary thing, we've already put the increases through, and I agree with you, we don't want to be in a deficit position in the fund.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Do I take it that there will be legislation introduced at the next session? Do I take it the minister expects to introduce legislation at the next session to introduce at least some of the changes in the final report of the workmen's compensation board?

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — If you are referring to the spring session, Mr. Chairman, I'm not

aware that I can get that in right now. Our slate is pretty well full.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, you know, if it's . . . Well, I won't get into it now. When there's a more appropriate forum, I think a more appropriate time to have this little hair-pulling session, I'm going to be hard to convince. I'm going to warn you that we cannot spend the extra day it would take to introduce those amendments. They're going to be hard put to be so convinced that there isn't time to deal with those people who are among the most unfortunate in society.

Mr. Minister, with respect to a differential wage rate, would you tell us whether or not you are considering a differential wage rate? By that I mean a lower rate for students or young people or, whatever, you want.

**HON. MR. McLAREN:** — Mr. Chairman, I think I mentioned in the House the other day that the minimum wage board in their survey recommended that we look at the two-tier system. I am not convinced myself yet that we will do that. I'd like to remind the members opposite that every jurisdiction in Canada, including the federal jurisdiction, has a two-tier system. It's been there for a number of years, but I'm not going to say tonight whether we intend to implement that or not.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, I will say this, Mr. Minister, and then I'll leave this as well. I sincerely hope that you do reconsider that, and I sincerely hope you don't do it. I think there can be no justification for paying young people less. That is simply rank discrimination on the basis of age. If you have a more humanitarian instinct, and I'm prepared to accept the fact that you do, I sincerely hope that is not among the recommendations you bring in.

I just want to make one final comment about the much-discussed reorganization. I hope the report on the reorganization with respect to the women's division is precisely what the Minister of Rural Affairs said it was with respect to the Department of Rural Affairs. I hope it is absolute nonsense. I hope you are not going to further down . . . I'm not going to repeat the comments I made in your estimates; suffice it to say, the differential and the discrimination against women in our society is something that we should be deeply ashamed of. I hope you don't exacerbate that differential and that discrimination by doing away with the one agency of government which seeks to promote their interests. I hope that the downgrading of the women's division is not part of the reorganization. And, I in this caucus am going to be most upset if that is part of what comes out in the reorganization which I assume we will see in the budget.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe I have any further questions of these estimates. I will save any further questions for your estimates which will be coming up in six weeks time.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 20 agreed to.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

### **CROWN INVESTMENTS CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN**

**Vote 65 — (Statutory)**

**Item 1**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister introduce his official please.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes thank you, Mr. Chairman, on my left, Mr. Steve Barg, who is the acting chief executive officer of CIC.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Minister, I believe you indicated that in respect to the Wolfgang Wolff crown corporation review commission that total cost was somewhere around \$600,000. Would the Minister provide me with the membership of that committee and the per diem that was provided to each member?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like just to correct the statement that he made. I didn't give you that information. You may have got it from someone else, but it wasn't from me. However, the information you have asked for, we will provide, but we don't have it with us.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Do you have the total cost of the commission?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I would presume, Mr. Chairman, that the information was provided to the member by the Minister of Finance or the Premier, but it wasn't given to you by myself and I don't have it with me, and I don't know what the amount is at the present time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What's your question? Are you asking what we spent, what it cost us? I don't know. I'll get you that information.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, why don't I write you a letter and then forget all about it?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, if the member wants to write me a letter, I'll be very happy to reply to his letter. The estimate is called for here on a statutory vote. If he wants to get into other areas, I won't refuse the opportunity to give him the answers. But, I don't have it; I'll provide it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to get through as much as anybody else. But the other day, Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan — this statutory vote — came up. The minister asked to adjourn that consideration of the Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan. And tonight we come back after he adjourned it the other day, and I ask him some questions and he has no answers. All I am saying is that it's reducing it down to not being very meaningful.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If he wants an answer, I just had it; we didn't pay for it. It's paid for by the Department of Finance.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, do you know the per diems?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No, again it was paid for by the Department of Finance. They'll have the information and if you didn't ask the Minister of Finance at the time when you had the opportunity to ask . . . However if it's at all possible I believe we can get the information. I'll check it out. I believe the information can be made available. But I want the member to understand I'm not committing the Minister of Finance in my offer. I will do what I can for you.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, fine and dandy. Do that. And certainly there are other ways of receiving that information, if you don't have it.

I'd like a list also of all the persons that were either fired or whose employment was terminated since May 8, 1982 by the present government in respect to crown investments corporation. I'd like you to give me their positions and the salary which they were receiving at the time.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You said crown investment corporation, you're talking about the one corporations? We will provide that information.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — And, Mr. Minister, can you also provide us then, if that's obviously the route we're going, a list of all the persons who have been transferred from CIC to other government departments or crown corporations?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — To the best of our recollection and mine as well, I don't believe there were any transfers. However I will take notice of that question as well, and provide you with the information if there was.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — And I would ask the minister, in respect to the per diem received by the board of directors, could you indicate whether there is a per diem? It's all ministers, is it?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, you've answered your own question. That's right, there's no per diem.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like also to know who at the present time is the chief executive officer, if I may call that, in respect to CIC?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I just introduced him a few minutes ago. Acting chief executive officer.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — And, could you provide us with the salary of the chief executive officer?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question is no, we won't be providing that information.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Can the minister indicate why he is not prepared to give this information? Without asking the Deputy Premier.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, I suppose I could give the same answer they gave us for three years, but Mr. Chairman, the information that we can provide, and in fact it's in the annual reports, is the total amount of salaries paid to all of the executive management team in each crown corporation. We could do the same for CIC, but we won't provide the chief executive officer's salary.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Can you indicate whether or not you have, on contract or whatever arrangement, a consultant from Manitoba, or have you had a consultant from Manitoba, an individual that previously was in the Sterling Lyon Department of Finance?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — . . . (inaudible) . . . give me the name of the individual that you have?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Don Craik.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Would you also provide the details in respect to the contract and the rate?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, we'll take notice of the question and provide details.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — A couple other questions, Mr. Minister. The report that was provided to the government from the report of the crown corporations review commission . . . One of the essential threads of emphasis in the report, the central thesis of the report, is that the only real test of earnings or return on investment is the amount of dividends paid by a crown corporation to the province.

Are you in agreement with that central thesis as propounded by the report?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, to answer that question — and he's asking for my opinion — well, my opinion is clearly that the return on investment (I think was the question) or dividends paid is definitely an important criterion.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I take it that there are others. I was wondering whether the minister would indicate, having reviewed it and being the head of CIC, whether or not he would indicate some of the other considerations that one might look at in evaluating the value of a corporation.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would be appropriate for me to discuss tonight what other criteria I think are important. We are reviewing. No decision has been made on the Wolfgang Wolff report and until cabinet has made a decision on that, I would reserve any further comments as to my opinion of what it should be.

I may or may not have any influence on the decisions. We'll wait until cabinet has made a decision on that report.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — When I direct a question to the minister, I want him to understand that I'm not asking for your opinion as Paul Rousseau, the individual. I'm asking you as a policy of government, as the chairman of CIC.

I hope that you're answering it in light of that proposition.

I just want to say that in respect to that report, that in reviewing it, as I said the central thesis of the report is that the only real test of earnings or return on investments is the amount of dividends paid by the crown corporation to the province. That is the essential thesis of the report.

I want to say that we on this side totally disagree that that should be the essential. There are many other factors that should be looked at. It appears that income doesn't count; retained earnings don't count; growth and assets don't count. No reference is made to the market value of any investment. The earnings retained by PCS are of no direct significance to the provincial budgetary process until actually paid to the province.

And, I want to say that any private sector would, in fact, consider some of the other factors which I have mentioned equally as important as the payment of dividends. What I want to say is my view that the report is again a detraction and intended to be against

the encouragement of the position of crown corporations in respect to this government.

I hope that the minister will, in fact, in reviewing the report. use whatever business sense he has and will make the evaluations on other criteria as well as the central theme as set out in the Wolfgang Wolff report.

Having said that and the hour growing late, I know there will be other occasions, and we shall meet again. I indicate, Mr. Minister, that I have no further questions.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**

### **SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS**

#### **RESOURCES DIVISION**

#### **CROWN INVESTMENTS CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN**

#### **Vote 35**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 35 agreed to.

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

#### **Vote 48 — Statutory**

#### **Item 1**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my right the acting chief executive officer of Sedco, Mr. Wayne Thompson.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was a little concerned when the minister rose so quickly. I thought he was going to take notice of my question.

What I'd like to know from the minister: last day we were in industry and commerce, I asked some questions about the lending policy of Sedco, and at that time he had asked that we leave it till a later date. So I'll take the opportunity, even though the hour is late, to ask only a few short questions. If we get the right answers, we can go very quickly.

Mr. Minister, will you give me the government's policy on loans that are presently in place at the present time with small business people who are finding themselves in ever-increasing financial problems as a result of the fact that Sedco is refusing to refinance loan which the business people and small businessmen are currently paying in some cases in the area of 16, 17, 18 per cent? What I want to know is: what is the government's policy at this time? Are you considering renegotiating these loans? Are you anticipating that your open for business philosophy does not apply to the business people who are already here?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The first comment I'd like to make, Mr. Chairman, is: I'm a little

surprised at the comments made by the member for Shaunavon. He's well aware of one very large loan that was made in his own constituency to keep a company viable and alive. We are certainly going to address the problems the small businesses are having in Saskatchewan, as we did the one in his own constituency. I'm surprised that he would make that kind of a comment, that we are not concerned about the problems that some of these small businesses are faced with today.

To the second part of his question, I repeat again the answer I gave him the first time. That is that we are no different than any other lending institution. We have made a contract with the firms. The contract was signed by both parties. We've lived up to our agreement and we will continue to do so. That agreement includes . . . If they wish, they can borrow the money from any lender they so desire, and pay us out.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that in doing so there will be no penalty to any of the clients.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, as you will know, under the philosophy of the previous government, we encouraged small business to establish in Saskatchewan, and in many cases these were individuals who had gone to the traditional lending institutions and had been turned down. They then came to Sedco and arranged loan with that organization. Now you're telling them that the new Conservative government does not have the foresight to come forward and renegotiate these loans, so that these people will be able to stay in business.

I know of a couple of cases where small companies, because of the policy of this government, are facing bankruptcy. I'm wondering whether the minister is saying here tonight that he is giving no consideration to renegotiating loans that Sedco has with companies and businesses that are facing tough economic times.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If I understand, Mr. Chairman, the member's first comment, it sounded like he was saying that when they were the government that Sedco was a lender of last resort — that all of the accounts they had, and the clients that they had, went to the private sector and as a desperate move, finally went to Sedco. I think that's exactly what the member said, and I know that the previous minister and the previous government vehemently denied that they were a lender of last resort. But, that's exactly what the member opposite was saying a minute ago.

Again I remind the member, as well, that the contracts that were signed were signed by the former administration, except for those that we have signed since we've been there, but the bulk of them, of course, would have been under the previous administration as a contract. Now, I ask the member: if they were so benevolent as they seem to think they were and seem to claim they were, why didn't they make the loan a floating loan at the time?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They didn't want it.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Oh, they didn't want it. I see . . . Well then I guess he's answered his own question, Mr. Chairman. They didn't want the loans changed. They wanted what they got and we're living up to our agreement.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the business people of Saskatchewan will be very interested in that comment when I get a list of the names from him of the business people and small companies who are paying at the present time interest rates in excess of 13 per cent. Can you get that list for me?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I don't think so, Mr. Chairman, because I know when I asked for that list when I was in the opposition, I wasn't allowed to receive that information from the government of the day. It is confidential information and I think the member knows that.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, the minister is saying that he is not going to give the information and I'm sure the reason why is because he doesn't want to admit that his policy in dealing with these companies and individuals who are attempting to renegotiate their loans is not one that he's terribly proud of and I can well imagine why. Because what I am seeing happening out in Main Street Saskatchewan is that many of these people who supported the Conservatives at the time of the last election are very quickly having second thoughts. First of all we have a huge Open for Business conference where foreign investors are invited in to be wined and dined by the cheer-leading crowd of Saskatchewan, but when the business people from rural Saskatchewan come in to have their loans renegotiated there's not a person around to listen to them. And I'm sure if the minister won't get me that list, I can get it myself. That's all the questions I have.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I would just ask the minister if he would indicate what indeed is the policy of providing loans to the business community. Is it in fact the policy to be providing loans as a last resort? Is that as a policy, or could you outline exactly what is the policy of Sedco? Do you follow the question, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I will offer the member the document that we have recently approved by cabinet and by the board of directors of Sedco, which is the new mandate for Sedco. I'll do it as soon as possible. I'm not too sure of the time frame. We haven't made it public yet, but it will be very shortly. I'll provide you with that, if that'll be of any benefit. But to answer your question, the specific question that you asked: no, certainly not. Sedco is certainly not a lender of last resort under our administration.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I would appreciate when you have it established as a policy if you'd send me a copy.

I would like the minister to provide the total number of loans made during the past fiscal year and the total value of the loans.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — In 1982 I take it? I'll take notice and provide you the answer. And I might add that it will also be in the annual report which will be tabled at the end of this month. But I'll provide you with that answer.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — The problem I have is I don't have the report. And would you also provide the total number of loan failures and/or defaults in loan repayments? Without identification.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll provide that to the hon. member, but I will take notice of the question.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)**

#### **SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **RESOURCES DIVISION**



## GOVERNMENT SERVICES

## Vote 14 — Provincial Development Expenditure

## Item 1

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my right is my acting deputy minister, Mr. Otto Cutts, and to his right is Ken Rankin, acting director of the purchasing agency. Behind him is Keith Laxdal, assistant deputy minister and branch head of the revenue division. Behind me is Ian Laidlaw, executive director, operations division. And seated next to him is Ken Brehm, executive director of administration.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that introduction by the minister. I hope that the person sitting to her right realizes the precarious position that he sits in, because people who have been in that position over the last 10 months have had a very short term. Only a few short weeks ago we were in this House discussing one Dennis Foley and the problems that the minister had with that deputy minister. I wonder if she could now explain the problems and the reasons for the demise of her next acting deputy, and give the reasons why he is no longer an employee of the department.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Chairman, we are in government services, supplementary estimates, vote 14, expansion of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, the minister wants to stonewall. You may do that. We saw a precedent earlier this afternoon when your Premier refused to acknowledge the existence of people. The member from, I don't know the name of your riding in Saskatoon, may one day understand there is more to these proceedings than what the media report. There's also traditions and custom and respect, which has heretofore been observed. The minister wants to stonewall. She's got an excellent precedent. Your Premier did it all afternoon. He did not know the names of people who he rubs elbows with every day — did not know of their existence.

But the minister is not going to get away with suggesting that we are limited in dealing with estimates to whatever it is the money was spent on. That is not the system; has never been the system; and isn't the system now. And none of your colleagues so treated it. It has not been done in the past. This is not the first time this has happened.

If the minister wants to stonewall on the issue because there isn't an answer that won't disgrace you, I'll accept that, and frankly, that is what I suspect the answer to be. But don't for one moment suggest that you have no obligation to answer any question but the specific item on which that money was spent; that is simply not the system. If you can't given an answer which won't disgrace you, then we'll accept that. And I rather suspect that's the case. But nobody who has a smattering of understanding of these proceedings will accept for one moment that you responsibility is limited to the specific thing that the money was spent for.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I just reiterate that we are off vote 1 on government services. We are on vote 14 of the supplementary estimates, and it pertains to the expansion of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I'll ask a question of the minister in regard to

one, the acting deputy minister of government services, Mr. Wallis Cousineau. Can the minister tell me whether or not you recommended the order in council, February 25, which allowed for a payment, severance payment, of \$17,500 to be paid to that individual?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I see no relevance, Mr. Chairman, to vote 14 on supplementary estimates.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to try this another way. Will the minister please try to explain to me why the \$17,500 was paid to that individual in light of the fact that he was also paid \$7,000 to move here?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the member stay on the topic, with respect to the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, if he has questions pertaining to that area? The member for Shaunavon.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I can well imagine why the minister doesn't want to talk very much about her performance in dealing with deputy ministers and acting deputy ministers in light of the fact that they stay so very shortly. But I wonder if she could ask her acting deputy now and find out for me what this money is exactly being spent on.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — The supplementary estimate of \$1,160,000 is being spent on the expansion of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw. Because of the construction strike in 1982, we had expected a slowdown, but materials continued to be delivered to the site and were therefore available to proceed with the construction as soon as the strike was over. Because of that, and due to the accelerated construction just mentioned, this additional money was needed to do the project.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I wonder if the minister could advise us how many square feet are involved with this project.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Chairman, we don't have that information, but we will supply it forthwith.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, it's Madam Minister, that's right; I'm not to make that mistake. Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, could you tell me when this expansion for which this additional funds is required commenced? When did the expansion commence?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — The project started about May and it involved a two-story addition, a 236-stall parking lot, and renovations to the shop, gymnasium, cafeteria and the T-block areas.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — The minister advised that the project started in May. How does this project relate to the project which had started some months earlier for which the structural steel was up at some earlier time in the year?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — My officials indicate to me that they believe it started in May but we do not have the data base here. We will send it all over to you.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I was just a little curious to know how it related to the project that I had the honor to attend the official opening of, back in, I think, February as I recall

it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — March 25.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — March 25, could be, but I think not. Some earlier time, I would have remembered March 25 — I'm sure I would have. There was a large hole in the ground at that point, and there was some evidence of activity. We were unveiling models, and at least you were talking about . . . There has just been one project for the expansion of the technical institute in the last 18 months. Is that accurate or inaccurate?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Yes, that's accurate. It's a continuation phase.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 14 agreed to.

## **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

### **REVENUE, SUPPLY AND SERVICES**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 18**

##### **Item 1**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Madam Minister and Mr. Chairman, I want to start first of all with a question. I would like to ask the minister if she would outline the purchasing policy of her department. Does, for example, the policy continue to guarantee access to government markets by all qualified suppliers?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — We haven't made any changes under The Purchasing Act as was followed by the former administration, so I would assume, yes, access is available to all qualified people.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I wonder if the minister, for the edification of all, would outline briefly what she considers to be the policy which she is following. I know she says she's following the other one. I would like her to outline some of the ingredients of that policy.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Basically, we follow The Purchasing Act of 1973-74, called An Act respecting Government Purchases, and the guidelines that are set out in it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Then I have one further question which was alluded to previously, but it comes under the purview of revenue, supply and services. Can the minister indicate whether the policy was, in fact, followed in respect to the purchase of purifiers?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Yes, it was.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Were the individual purifiers which we alluded to previously tendered?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, they weren't.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Will the minister indicate why they were not tendered, and what provision of the act or the regulations was followed in respect to not tendering for a purchase of purifiers?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — The purifiers were bought through government services, and The Purchasing Act, section 11, was the section that was used.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, I'm rather surprised. Is it normal for articles such as purifiers to have been purchased under government services rather than under the policy of revenue, supply and services?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I would say that government services acted unwisely perhaps, but now unlawfully.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Would you explain what you mean?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Well, section 11, Mr. Chairman, of The Purchasing Act, or purchasing agency under which the purchasing agency works, states that the Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations prescribing (a) the manner in which supplies will be acquired and disposed of, whether by public tender or otherwise, and the procedures to be followed. Item (b) goes on to state the type of supplies that shall be acquired or disposed of by public tender or otherwise.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Madam Minister, I think if you recognize that really the purchase should have been made under revenue, supply and services, and indeed that you would then be governed by The Purchasing Act and the regulations thereto . . . I am saying to you: do you agree that in fact the purchases should indeed have been made under The Purchasing Act under revenue, supply and services?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Well, I would tend to agree with you, but as I indicated before, though government services might have made the purchases unwisely, they were not unlawful.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to point out to the minister that The Purchasing Act requires all purchases to go through the purchasing agency unless the authority is specifically delegated in certain cases, either by order in council or by order of the director of the agency. I ask you: have any such delegations of purchasing authority been made under section 5(2) or section 5(3) of the act since May 8, 1982? If so, give the details.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Yes, we do delegate. One department that gets a lot of delegation to do purchasing is government services. I can only state once more that although it might have been unwise and the purifiers slipped through the crack, it wasn't unlawful.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, I'm moving off from the specific though, and what I'm asking you is: under The Purchasing Act it requires all purchases to go through the purchasing agency unless the authority is specifically delegated, as I indicated. What I'm asking you is: during the course of the year since May 8, 1982, have there been any delegations made in respect to any other contracts, and if so, would you give the details?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Chairman, I can just inform the member that we haven't made any changes to the delegation that was in place before, such as highways being able to go out and contract for their gravel, and government services in the renovations of buildings and whatever. In the past they were given delegations and powers to go out and procure the type of supplies they need. That hasn't changed since May 8.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Has there been any change in the purchasing policy in respect to preferential treatment for Saskatchewan companies?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, there hasn't.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I address to the minister, there is sometimes a concern in respect to restrictive brand specifications. In other words, certain departments may be ordering specific purchases and it goes through the agency, but the specifications are, in fact, set out so that only a specific brand can qualify under the specifications. I wonder if the minister is aware of this particular problem and whether she addressed it during the course of the year.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I might respond to the member by saying that since taking over we try to use the generic brands in as many instances as possible. Our objective is to get the department in line with the Canada standard specifications, something that wasn't done by the former administration.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like to ask the minister: have any purchase orders been issued by the purchasing agency that did not result from a competitive public tendering during the course of the year?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, it's all on a competitive bid system.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — You're saying then, if I'm clear, that during the course of the year, there were no purchase orders issued that did not result from competitive tendering?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Yes, I can give the member that assurance, that anything purchased since May 8 through revenue, supply and services was done on a competitive base. I might add even the gasoline is now being purchased on a competitive bid process, something that your administration didn't do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I'd like to turn to the CVA aircraft. I was wondering if the minister could provide information on all occasions in which the Saskatchewan government aircraft has been used since May 8, 1982, include CVA aircraft and also provincial air ambulance aircraft. I specifically want to know where each flight started, its destination and the names of all the passengers on each flight. In the case of passengers who were government employees, what their position was, and what department. In the case of passengers who were not government employees, the reason they were on the aircraft and which department or agency paid or will pay for their flight. I wonder if the minister could undertake to provide that information.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Yes, I can provide the type of information that is available to the public and to the opposition. As I've said, we haven't changed any policy, so as far as the individual names of individual passengers are concerned, that information, as in the past, is never made available.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to finish off a few other questions, and my colleagues have a few questions, just in respect to a couple of the subvotes, and I can pass through them fairly fast. In respect to the administration, subvote, I notice that the total number of person-years is the same, 29.5, and I note that there has been a very substantial and

sizable increase in other expenses. I was wondering if the minister could indeed provide the reasons for the substantial increase.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — With respect to administration, personal services, it just reflects the more accurate cost. Apparently the retroactivity that came with the last contracts signed was not in place in the '81-82 budget. As far as the other expenses are concerned, that reflects approximately a \$400,000 loss in the systems centre.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I wonder if the minister could provide a breakdown in respect to other expenses, the details of other expenses in the subvote 1.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — We will provide that.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Just to speed it up, I have another subvote, if you don't mind proceeding that way, Mr. Chairman, and that's in respect to time 5, mail and telecommunications. And here again, I note that the person-years is exactly the same, 39.1. There's a fair increase in respect to personal services, but there is a very substantial increase in respect to other expenses, and I'd like an explanation in respect to that.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — The reason for the salary, again, is the same as under subvote 1, a more accurate calculation of it, and retroactivity being included in the forecast for '82-83. As to other expenses, it just reflects an increase in postal rates.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — There is an increase of about \$1.8 million. Are you indicating that that is all reflected in respect to the increase in mailing costs?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — It is calculated at \$1.549 million with the last rate increase from Canada Post.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Again, I would like to ask the minister to provide me with the itemized breakdown of the expenses in respect to that subvote. Can she do that?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Yes, we can.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — One other item, and that is in respect to the mortgage interest reduction plan. I was wondering if the minister had allocated some \$35 million. I was wondering whether or not she could indicate whether that amount will represent the take-up on the program, or is it likely to exceed the amount?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I can indicate to the hon. member that when the calculations were first being done on projected costs for MIRP, we estimated the cost of the program in the '82-83 fiscal year would be in the neighborhood of \$56 million, and at that time interest rates were exorbitantly high. As the member will I'm sure remember, most of them were around the 19 per cent and above range. The current revision, with the downward trend in interest rates, is \$35 million.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, thank you. Madam Minister, could you tell me how many aircraft you have in your fleet at this time?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Chairman, we have three aircraft based in Regina, two Cheyennes and a Navajo; a Navajo in Saskatoon that is our air ambulance. This was the

figure that really surprised us, because as opposition members we could never get the number of aircraft owned by DNS, and to our surprise, it's 17.

**MR. ENGEL:** — How many pilots are stationed at both Saskatoon and Regina?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — We have five pilots based in Regina and two pilots based in Saskatoon.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Do you have any airplanes on contract in Regina that you lease, over and above the number the number you have listed here?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Not on a regular contract.

**MR. ENGEL:** — I meant other than a charter flight, do you have some aircraft that you would lease that these pilots would use should one of theirs be laid up or inoperative or if you require additional ones, or do you go straight for charter flights?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, we don't.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, I have one short question. I would like to know, in particular, in the case of a blue 1980 Oldsmobile, licence number KDW 292, who this car was signed out to during the period January 1 to February 1 of this year. If you could send me that, give me your assurances, I'd accept that.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, I can't give the hon. member that assurance because that type of information also is not divulged. It's a regular CVA pool car and it's used on a demand basis. I think that as members just coming out of government, you would realize that that type of information is not available.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Madam Minister, you're saying that it's assigned out in a pool nature. Is that what you said, or what was your response?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — My response was that it's not government policy to divulge that type of information.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, I wonder if you can explain the reasoning behind not divulging that kind of information. What harm could be done by giving out information of a car that is bought and paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and where it was during a certain period of time? What's the big secret?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — We're just being consistent with what CVA divulged under the previous administration, and that was one of the things they didn't divulge as they didn't divulge the list of passengers on aircraft, and we're just carrying on with the tradition set by the members opposite when they were on this side of the House.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — It's hard to understand how this government picks and chooses the things that it wants to follow of the previous administration. In terms of the minimum wage, you certainly aren't following the fine tradition set by the former government, but now, when it's convenient for you to attempt to cover something up, you don't want to answer the question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The fact of who had this car, licence number KDW 292. That's what. Because she won't give it to me, that's why. She won't tell me who had the car signed out. That's what I'm asking, and

I want her to give me the names of the individuals who that car was signed out to during the period of January 1 to February 1 of 1983.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, I'm not prepared to give the hon. member that information.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, I will ask the minister again. Can you explain the reasoning, other than the fact of the fine tradition. I don't think that's good enough because it just doesn't make any sense that the member would pick and choose which of the fine traditions they were going to follow. Why, in your mind, doesn't it make sense to allow the opposition and the people of Saskatchewan to know where one of their cars, paid for by the taxpayers, is and who it's assigned to? Why are you afraid to answer that very simple, straightforward question?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I might respond to the member by saying that I'm not afraid of you. I'm not supposedly hiding something, covering up something. It is just not policy to divulge that information. We have 5,000 cars to look after.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I can see very easily why the minister, if I was asking for all of the 5,000 cars, where they were, and who they were assigned to . . . I'm asking very specifically for one car, one licence number, for one month during the term of this government's administration. Now the answer you gave me that you have 5,000 cars and it's impossible to give that, I agree. But I'm asking for one car for one month, and that doesn't seem like a very big task, and I'm not even asking for it tonight. If you want to write it down and send it to me over the next week or month, that would be fine. So I'm giving you every opportunity. It's not a task that's too great, I don't think, for your new deputy to take a minute tomorrow, look it up and send it to me. Will you not do that?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I can only tell you one more time very directly and very succinctly: no, I am not prepared to provide that information. I can't be more direct or more emphatic.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, in the case of this individual car, this one car for one month, why is it so difficult for you to do that? Can you explain that to us?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I am just being consistent with the policy that was set by the previous administration, and I think that was one of your better policies.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, will the minister read me from the policy which she is referring to, where it says that she cannot divulge who cars are assigned to? Give us an example.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Well, I can read it directly from the former minister of revenue, supply and services who under CVA estimates said:

I am not trying to hide anything personally. I said it was government policy not to divulge the name.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I wonder if the minister would take the time to read the question. It's a little hard to understand the question when you read out an answer that doesn't refer to CVA vehicles or anything else.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I don't think it's necessary, Mr. Chairman. I don't think I need the question. You asked for the policy, and I gave you the policy. It was set by Mr.



Robbins when he was minister of revenue, supply and services.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, this is absolutely ridiculous. The minister is giving an answer that doesn't refer anything to do with the policy of CVA vehicles, and attempting to tell the Assembly that we should just accept it. What I want is the policy of this government on CVA vehicles, and I would like you to read that to me so that I know whether or not you are attempting to mislead us in not giving us the information. Quoting from a former minister out of context, without the question, is not good enough.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I can only reiterate it is not the policy of this government — it was not the policy of that government when sitting on this side of the House — to divulge that type of information when it pertains to CVA.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I can guarantee you that the members of on this side of the House do not accept that that was the policy of the former government, given the words that she has put on the record here tonight. I wonder if the minister will tell me if she's refusing to give me the policy, verbally, of her government, or written, as to their policy, and just get up and read it off a piece of paper. Where is this great policy? Is it like the ones that apply to civil servants and their political activity?

It seems like you have a policy for all these things, but when you go to look at it, there's nothing written down. In fact, there is no policy. You make up the policy to fit the situation. In the case of this vehicle, I would like very much to know who it was assigned to between January 1 and February 1 of 1983.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Well, I might say, Mr. Chairman, that there is written policy, but we are following the policy as was enunciated by the former minister of revenue, supply and services in direct questions from us, when we were on the opposition side of the House, stating very clearly that it is not government policy. Whether it's accepted, whether it's written, whether it's understood, that isn't what the former minister said. I will continue to tell you that it is not government policy to divulge that type of information.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the minister would kindly send me across the memo that she's reading from so I could have a chance to peruse it.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — It's *Hansard*. It's the only one I have with me.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Will the minister please send it across so I could have a look at it? I don't have my copy with me from back in whatever year she's quoting from because we don't have it here at our desks.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — It's the 1981 *Hansard* of April 8.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, will the minister send it across? Just ask for a page to bring it across to me so I can read it.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — This is my only copy.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I find this an absolutely appalling way to carry out estimates. We saw it earlier tonight and all day today in fact: the Premier attempting to stonewall in terms of getting information. And now tonight, we have the minister in

charge of revenue services and government services stonewalling on a very important issue — the issue being the control and whereabouts of CVA vehicles, taxpayers' vehicles. And I cannot understand why the minister is carrying on in this manner, but I think that the people of Saskatchewan will be very interested in knowing that the whereabouts of this particular vehicle is not being explained by the minister and this government, and we'll see how that turns out.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, can you tell me if licence plates have been changed on vehicles during the year 1983? Has the vehicle been registered with another licence plate?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Only those vehicles for which the licences have expired.

**MR. ENGEL:** — When CVA vehicles' licences expire during the year, do you usually apply and get a new number for them?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, it's done like other non-government cars; you get a new type.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Have any vehicles received a new number for one reason or another — the licence numbers destroyed or bent or damaged, so that you had to get a new number for one?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — That's possible. If one or two of them were destroyed or, as you indicated, bent or whatever, yes, it's quite possible.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Is it possible that a licence plate was changed for some reason or other like that for a certain 1980 Oldsmobile that seems to be of interest to some people?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — If the member could indicate to me the serial number of that particular vehicle — we have several 1980 blue Oldsmobiles.

**MR. ENGEL:** — The former licence number of a certain blue 1980 Oldsmobile was KDW 292, and my driving around the yard and lots just has failed to reveal that that car is around. I was just wondering if you happened to change the licence number on that vehicle.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — My officials are not aware of it, but we will check that particular question that you asked of me and provide you with the answer.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Will you then provide me with the new number that was issued to that car?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, we'll indicate to you whether or not that particular licence plate was changed on that particular car.

**MR. ENGEL:** — If it just so happens that it was changed, will you provide me with the new number that was issued to that car?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — No, we won't give you the new licence number.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned a moment ago the page

in *Hansard* which she was quoting. I wonder if she would give me that again.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — It was under revenue, supply and services, April 8, 1981, pages 1982-1983; it goes on and on and on . . . 1987. It's just . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, the minister is becoming more and more confused on this issue. She's listed out five pages now, saying that this is where she quoted from. She quoted one line. Can the minister tell me what page and what date it's from? Or are you attempting to mislead the House?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I am not trying to mislead the House. I might say that that particular exchange in 1981 raised quite a few questions. I am reiterating what Mr. Robbins, former minister of revenue, supply and services, states when it came to questions under CVA. That information is not the policy of the government to divulge is what he said repeatedly.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, will the minister give me the page of *Hansard* that she quoted from earlier? In fact, was she not quoting and attempting to mislead the House?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I gave it you: 1981, 1982 and 1983. For the member's information, the page number is right there: 1982, 1983, and 1981.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Which one were you quoting?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — All of them.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister is saying that she quoted five pages from *Hansard* when she was giving her explanation. I am sure she didn't. What I would like to know is where she was quoting from?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Well, on page 1982 the minister indicated, "It's not government policy." On page 1983, he stated again, "I said it was not government policy to divulge the names." And we don't intend to either.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I want to know whether the minister is telling this committee that any of those answers referred to CVA automobiles? Did they not all refer to passengers on CVA aircraft/

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — It refers to CVA, all of it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — But, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I invite anybody to look at this, and it will be revealed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, we've got lots of time. All right.

**MR. THATCHER:** — As you provide us with the updated list to February 1981, I certainly don't want to trouble you and send you back in the intervening years. Perhaps you could provide us with the names of the updated list of not only the individual who booked the flight but the names of the people who accompanied him on that flight.

**HON. MR. ROBBINS:** — No, that's not government policy. It's just the number recorded on the flight.

MR. THATCHER: — Let me understand you. Are you saying that you won't, or you can't?

HON. MR. ROBBINS: — It's not government policy.

Those are the only places on that page that those words appear, "It's not government policy." It is all passengers on CVA flights; not anything to do with automobiles; not anything to do with anyone who booked an aircraft.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We've expanded the policy . . .

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I am directing this to the minister. Is she saying that on pages 1982 and 1983 Mr. Robbins said one word about CVA automobiles?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I am saying that CVA encompasses both automobile and aircraft. To me it is very clear what Mr. Robbins, the former minister stated: that it is not government policy to divulge certain information as it pertains to CVA.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I am sure it's not government policy to divulge certain information as it pertains to CVA. But what he said was that it was not the policy to divulge the names of passengers of the aircraft, because there was no way of getting them recorded . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Agriculture wants to enter the debate, I am sure he will. I am saying that there is not one shred of support for the proposition that the minister put forward that anybody has ever refused to give the name of a person to whom a vehicle was assigned — not one shred of support. The suggestion that, because the names of passengers of aircraft have not been divulged, therefore, the names of persons to whom automobiles are assigned should not be divulged, is a truly remarkable judgment, and one which I suggest does the minister no credit, particularly because she did not explain this before it was made rather clear that she was, at least, being less than candid with the committee.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — We were talking about CVA. CVA encompasses both vehicles and aircraft. I think that the former minister made it very clear what the government policy was, though it is unwritten, I might add, for the member's edification. I might add that the answers here were less than precise.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, I think there is quite a difference here. If we would have asked a question, who was riding in a car on a certain day, that would be very difficult for you to reveal, because that kind of record isn't kept. That record isn't kept. If you're asking who was riding along a certain aircraft, those kind of records aren't kept. But when you assign a CVA vehicle, you have some explicit records who has that car, and there is no reason to hide who had that particular licence plate for the month of January. There is no reason why you would want to hide that.

The only reason you can't make available who was riding in an aircraft is, they didn't know if I happened to be riding along as a passenger, or if my wife was, or who was, because those kind of records weren't kept. They didn't have a passenger list. So that wasn't policy to declare that, and if a minister happens to pick up a person and given him a ride in his car he doesn't happen to keep a log on that, but if he's assigned a car, that's an altogether different story.

If you're telling us that you have 5,000 vehicles that you're spreading around

Saskatchewan, and are afraid to disclose it in case you're assigning it to your campaign manager or to your other staff that you're saying haven't got CVA vehicles, is that what you're trying to hide? Was that car assigned to somebody that was a political employee of yours, or was that car assigned to somebody that was officially on the list that could have a car? And that's what we want to know.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I might respond to the hon. member by telling him he doesn't know exactly what he's talking about. He may have been led to believe by the former minister of revenue, supply and services, like he led us to believe, that those passenger lists were not kept. In fact, he misled the House with that statement.

And I might also say to the hon. member an assigned car is a heck of a lot different than a pool car. An assigned car we can give you some information on. A pool car, we don't keep that type of information.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I find it absolutely astounding that the minister would rise to her feet and accuse a former minister of misleading the House, based on a bunch of rhetoric which she is trying to put out here today. But I'd like to tell this Assembly that if anyone is misleading this House it's the minister in charge of revenue and supply, and she's doing it very deliberately by attempting to mislead this group of people into believing that she was quoting regulations which apply to CVA vehicles, when in fact that wasn't true. And, Mr. Chairman, the record will show that the minister was attempting to mislead this Assembly. That's why she wouldn't send it across to me, and that's why she wouldn't read the question.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know now, in light of the fact that the policy she was quoting from was not CVA vehicle policy, but CVA aircraft policy, whether she will give me the names of the individual or individuals who were assigned a blue 1980 Oldsmobile, licence plate KDW 292.

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think the member opposite has been around long enough that he knows full well that when a minister of the crown in this legislature puts whatever it is she puts on the record, she puts it on the record in the best of her believe, to the best of her knowledge, and that word must be accepted by the members of this House. That member accused the Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services of misleading this House, and unless he can substantiate that, Mr. Chairman, he's under some obligation to withdraw and apologize.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Attempts to deliberately mislead the House are out of order. I caution both members they have been kind of stretching that a little bit. Let's get back to the business of the revenue, supply and services.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I can only say one more, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member that it is not government policy to divulge that type of information.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, I may have missed something while I was out for a moment. Did you indicate that this car was not assigned on a regular basis but was a pool car? When you say that it's not government policy to divulge the name, are you saying it's not government policy to divulge the name of cars permanently assigned to ministers or public servants?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — We provide a list of assigned vehicles to cabinet ministers and

senior government officials, but the information as it pertains to pool cars which may be taken out for one day or two days or one week is not tabled and not divulged. So, I can only reiterate that it is not government policy to issue information on pool cars.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, just so that I may get the policy clear, is the minister advising the committee that it is policy to divulge the names of employees, elected officials or otherwise, to whom cars are assigned on a permanent basis?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — A cabinet minister, of course, is assigned a permanent car. There are many senior officials who qualify for an assigned permanent car. That information is available on request. We got it. I believe, when we were in opposition. What I am saying is that the information on the pool cars, which are used on an as-needed basis for a number of reasons, is not made available. The assigned permanent vehicle — yes, that information is available.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, do you have available the information of how many Oldsmobile 88s are in the pool?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — We have five 1980 Oldsmobiles in our assigned fleet. As far as the others, it fluctuates because do come back and are traded in, and we use them for longer than what other officials will use them for. Then they're assigned to pool car status and that type of thing.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'm not sure I made the question clear. During the month of January 1983, can the minister advise us how many Oldsmobile 88s were in the pool?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — My officials indicate that we don't have that information, nor do we keep it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled by the minister advising that there would not be information indicating what cars were in the pool at any given time. This is reminiscent of yet another period in this legislature's history when a car was lost. Our colleague, the former minister of labor, had great difficulty with that particular vehicle. Are we to understand, therefore, that cars could be lost from the pool with relative ease, on the grounds that nobody knows how many are there?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I'm not saying that. We keep good track of our cars, but the pool fluctuates daily, weekly and monthly — cars are rotated in, rotated out.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Well, I'm delighted, and I'm sure everyone will be delighted to know that the department keeps good track of its vehicles and knows where they are at any given time. And it was that sort of question which we were really directing. As I recall it, my colleague merely asked whether that was an assertion on the part of the department or whether, in fact, they did know where the vehicles were — not where they are on a daily or hourly basis, but who at least is responsible for knowing where they are. I think that was the question. I gather you are asserting that that particular vehicle was in the pool at the time in question.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Yes, that particular vehicle was in the pool at the time in question.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, just a while ago, you answered

in response to my colleague for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that DNS had in its possession 17 aircraft. I wonder if you could specify, for the record, what those aircraft are for.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — They are used for transportation and fire-fighting.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Breakdown, please.

**MR. YEW:** — Yes, please, for the record. I just don't want to have those 17 aircraft, as mentioned here, to imply that that is a waste of taxpayers' money.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I don't think that the member should feel that way. I think most people realize the vastness of the North and the inaccessibility to man, of the communities in the North, and that that is the particular need for that number of aircraft up there. We have people flying virtually all over the North, servicing the people of the North.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, you would agree then . . . Just a short supplementary here. You would agree then that the majority of that aircraft is for fire protection, would you not?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Sorry, I didn't hear that.

**MR. YEW:** — You would agree then that the majority of that aircraft is for fire protection, would you not?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Well, we have three Cessna 185s, six trackers that are used in fire-fighting, three Cansos, three Barons, a Cheyenne, and another leased aircraft.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. I just wanted to make it clear that those aircraft are for the specific use of forest fire protection, etc.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Could the minister indicate about how many aircraft Quebec would use in northern Quebec? Do you have a comparison? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It maybe sounds funny to you, but when the minister answered earlier, the tone she used in talking about "17 in northern Saskatchewan," as though that was a tremendous thing. Now, I was surprised that you didn't buy additional aircraft for fire-fighting, but could you tell me about how many aircraft Quebec would use in fire-fighting in northern Quebec?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I can indicate to the member that I can't answer for the Government of Quebec. Also, the surprise that I felt was why did you guys keep it secret whenever we asked you — you were the ones that tried to hide it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I don't mean to get into the debate too much, but I wouldn't mind reading a little bit from the annual report of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and I'm reading from the 1980-81 report. It says:

Two teams comprised of provincially owned tracker aircraft, three aircraft per team, and Beach Baron 55s, one per team, were operated by the department of northern air services branch, and two of three PBY 5A Cansos purchased by the province in the winter of 1980 were also operated . . .

This is not very carefully hidden if it's on page 20 of the annual report, which is available to all members. I thought I'd point that out in case it was thought that the information was buried particularly deeply.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Why didn't you give us the answers when you were asked?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Nobody has refused answers. This is a flight of fantasy by the minister (we always enjoy her particular flights of fantasy), but here is simply no basis whatever for the suggestion that these questions weren't answered. But at any rate, anyone can read it in the annual report. It's available for all.

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — I can only indicate to the hon. member that perhaps he is the only one on a flight of fantasy; he is still trying to govern in absentia, but it's not accepted in a democratic country.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

### Item 3

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — With respect to the purchasing agency, would the minister advise who is director of purchase at this time?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Ken Rankin is the acting purchasing agent. I'm getting real tongue-tied; it's past my bedtime.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Has Mr. Rankin been in the service of the Government of Saskatchewan for long?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — Mr. Rankin has been with the Government of Saskatchewan since 1973.

Item 3 agreed to.

Items 4 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

### Item 14

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Madam Minister, on these statutory votes to provide for a net advance or a recovery from the advance accounts (and I think we're on number 14 at the moment), the earlier legislation prior to the coming into effect of this new system, as I recall it, provided for a ceiling on the advance accounts. The new revolving accounts do not have a ceiling, or it is not provided in statute. Would the minister advise whether or not, and I now refer to the supply agency advance account, it is subject to any ceiling — the revolving fund — in the same way that the statutory advance account was subject to a ceiling?

**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — My officials indicate that, yes, they are subject to a ceiling.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, could the officials advise you so that you could advise me, in what sort of document is the ceiling? Is it in the statute or is it in regulations or is it in treasury board regulations? How is this achieved?



**HON. MRS. DUNCAN:** — It will be a treasury board regulation.

Item 14 agreed to.

Items 15 to 19 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 18 agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES**  
**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**  
**REVENUE, SUPPLY AND SERVICES**  
**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 18**

Items 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 18 agreed to.

**Resolutions**

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I have a number of resolutions I would like to move at this time. I move resolution no. 1:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, the sum of \$138,616,630 be granted out of the consolidated fund.

Resolution agreed to.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — No. 2, I move that:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, the sum of \$2,757,978,110 be granted out of the consolidated fund.

Resolution agreed to.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — No 3, I move that:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, the sum of \$35,942,620 be granted out of the consolidated fund.

Resolution agreed to.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — No. 4, I move that:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, the sum of \$136,702,000 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — No. 5, I move that:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, the sum of \$823,233,750 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — No. 6, I move that:

Resolved, that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983, the sum of \$17,160,000 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

The said resolutions were reported, and by leave of the Assembly read twice and agreed to.

### **APPROPRIATION BILL**

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That Bill No. 68, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal years Ending Respectively March 31, 1982, and March 31, 1983, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to put forth a few comments on this bill, but I understand that there are other members of the Assembly that would like to speak to it, so I will hold my comments until closing debate. So, by leave of the Assembly, and under rule 48(2), I move that the bill be now read a second and third time.

**MR. MEAGHER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured this morning to make a few brief comments on this the prorogation of the first session of the 20th legislature. Given the hour, I'm sure all the members will appreciate my brevity.

Nevertheless, I do so with a great deal of pride. I am proud to be the member of this legislature for Prince Albert. I'm proud to be a Progressive Conservative member of this legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MEAGHER:** — And in that capacity, proud to be able to support the efforts of the new Government of Saskatchewan in cleaning up the mess that was inherited from the previous NDP administration.

Some time ago, Judge Noble referred to the DNS as a bureaucracy run amuck. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is being demonstrated in this session by the report of the public accounts committee, by ministerial statements and other revelations, is the indisputable fact that what was inherited last April was a whole government run amuck. An NDP bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, out of control, out of the control of the legislature, and therefore the taxpayers and people of Saskatchewan.

In their socialistic desire to own and control as much of the economy of Saskatchewan as they could, they squandered away hundreds of millions of dollars. They spent windfall resource revenues like drunken sailors. The difference, Mr. Speaker, is that a drunken sailor is spending his own money. The NDP administration spent the people's money. They squandered the people's heritage.

Then, alas, the chickens came home to roost. Faced with a worldwide recession, falling revenues, a bureaucracy out of control, they called an election. The proposition has been put forward that the NDP strategy was if they lost they election they would be handing over a practically bankrupt administration to a new Conservative government and their old slogan, "Tory times are hard times," would become a reality and we would have a depression, don't you know? And they would be swept back in power at the next election and inherit a cleaned-up, trimmed-up ship of state, and the Tories would get the blame. That, Mr. Speaker, is why the NDP want a depression; they need a depression.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MEAGHER:** — They want to go back to their roots. Well, Mr. Speaker, this session of the legislature has demonstrated to the people of Saskatchewan just how far off the mark that strategy is. It's off the mark on two counts.

Number one, they greatly underestimated the depth of the voter dissatisfaction with big government. However, after the by-election in Prince Albert-Duck Lake, I think they may be getting that message.

Number two, they greatly underestimated the resourcefulness and ingenuity of the people of Saskatchewan. With the government off their backs and out of their pockets, they decided not to participate in this depression.

It's for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I am so proud to be a member of the 20th legislature of Saskatchewan. The fact is that this session will be remembered as the turning point in Saskatchewan history.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MEAGHER:** — I am glad to see that all the members are with me on that. This is the legislature that demonstrated to the rest of the country that indeed, God willing, there is so much more we can be.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — We have had, Mr. Speaker, a number of instances of the flights of fancy (not to say fantasy) which overtake members opposite from time to time, and we had reference to some of it earlier. But we have had yet another flight of fancy from the member for Prince Albert.

He said that we, on this side of the House, needed a depression. May I assure him that if we had needed a depression, we could have done something about it in the last 11 years of unparalleled prosperity in the history of Saskatchewan. But whether or not we need a depression, I regret very much that I think we will get one. We will get one because members opposite believe their rhetoric. Unfortunately, the results of their rhetoric are such as to leave all of us the poorer. There is so much more we can be, bub, and the b-u-b stands for broke, unemployed and bankrupt.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — That, in fact, is what we are likely to be. More and more people, with every passing day, are broke, and more and more, with every passing day, are unemployed, and more and more, with every passing day, are bankrupt.

Looking at the budget which we are dealing with, even with the supplementaries the total capital expenditure is down, and with it the employment opportunities are down. I invite any hon. member to look at what the proposals are for the spending for highway construction, tell us say, in northern Saskatchewan. There is talk, of course, of developing our resources, but when it comes to putting out money to build roads into those resources the money is not in this budget. Tens of millions of dollars have been cut out of this budget so that that effort to build on our strengths has come to naught, because out of this budget has been cut the capital financing which would be necessary.

In the same way, out of this budget has been cut the geology building at the university, because members opposite really don't have confidence that we will be needing to do something to educate geologists. Probably, probably it will come in a later budget. They can't put it off forever, but they certainly have put it off successfully for one year, and that is a year of lost opportunity in the history of Saskatchewan, and a good number of young people in Saskatchewan.

I could list many, many other programs which have been cut in this budget. We have members who were elected to this House campaigning for high schools in Regina and Saskatoon and in due course maybe, if we all live long enough, they'll be there. But not one of them has been started this year. After 10 months there is not anything done with respect to high schools in Saskatoon or Regina, and I could . . . Except, of course, in announcements. Of course in announcements. If I may discount announcements and ask people to cut sort of something a little firmer, we certainly don't see any activity generated by those steps which are in this budget.

Here is the budget for 1983, and if anyone can find a dollar in there for Regina high schools or Saskatoon high schools, it got by me. So they are cutting out a good number of the things which they should have done to generate the activity which they say this province needs, and which I agree with them.

What else did they cut out? Every government reveals its priorities in the course of deciding to manage its money. And I remind the Minister of Urban Affairs that that's the

way it is. I am sure that he is amusing himself, and I am equally amused because he is probably not going to speak in the debate. He is confining himself to doing some musical direction from his seat.

Here is the first budget of this government, and in this budget it reveals its priorities. I ask the Minister of the Environment to pay heed to what I say, and whether or not it can be claimed that people are the priority when the planning and research in environment is cut back, when mines pollution control is cut back, when mine waste management and research is cut back, when environmental assessments are cut back. This is the language of a right-wing government which does not believe that the environment should be protected, but rather, in the words of the member for Saskatoon University . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — . . . “it’s time we stopped placing so much emphasis on environmental protection. It’s time we opened the doors to the private sector.” And this is very, very clearly coming through in this budget.

I see the Minister of Labor there, and a look at the labor estimates will make clear that he has cut some aspects of his budget. And what has he cut? He has cut the pension benefits provisions. Of course, this is a government which has people as its priority. It has done nothing in labor except cut pension benefits (that’s old people), and cut the women’s division (that’s women). So these are clearly not priorities for this government, other wise we would have seen additional expenditure in those areas.

But where do we see massive increases in spending? We see massive increases in spending on interest on the public debt, because that follows from the fiscal policies they are following, fiscal policies which are leading to massive deficits. We are seeing huge increase in the amount of welfare payments. Indeed, the payments under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, under this budget, are up \$50 million in one year — \$50 million. And this is because of the enormous increase in unemployment. A simple look at the figures will show that the great bulk of the additional funds is going to people who are employable and who cannot find jobs under this government. No one, I think, is alleging that this government is responsible for all of the unemployment, but we are certainly alleging that they have not done what they should have done to lessen that unemployment.

The increase in this budget is up from \$7.7 million to \$30 million for assistance to the unemployed employable, and that is an indictment of the policies of this government. So we see a government which is spending its money on welfare and spending its money on interest payments, but doesn’t have money for environmental protection and doesn’t have money for pension planning and doesn’t have money for women’s divisions. It doesn’t have money for the senior citizens home repair grants; they’re also cut. So that we are finding . . . I’m getting a good deal of assistance, but may I point out to members opposite and to my left that when they say “houses,” that there’s been a significant decrease in the spending for the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation in this budget which we have . . .

But let me turn now to this budget which should be written in red ink — should be written in red ink. It is blue. It is Tory blue, and I’m very, very glad they’ve changed the color, because I wouldn’t want anybody to think that this first Tory budget had anything to do with the New Democratic Party government . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — . . . a budget which has a deficit larger than the accumulated deficits of all the deficits in the history of this province, one which . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . We have had suggestions that the treasury was bare when the government came to office. It's too bad that the provincial auditor keeps insisting that there was a surplus of \$140 million last year, and he's going to say that there's a deficit of 220 million or 230 million this year. And we, therefore, are going to see a turn around of \$360 million or \$370 million in one year, and that is absolutely unprecedented in the history of this province — absolutely unprecedented. For any province this size, I suspect, is absolutely unprecedented — a turnaround of 360 million in a year.

I hear my friends opposite from time to time complain about the performance of a much less well-endowed province, the province of Manitoba, under Tory governments and under NDP governments. Even under the Tories there, or under the NDP there, they have never gone back \$360 million in a single year — never.

This is making Saskatchewan number one — number one in going from a position of plus 140 to minus 220 and more, I fear. This is said to be getting the government off the backs of the people and out of the pockets of people, but I tell you that very soon this government will be going into the pockets of people to pay the interest involved. It cannot be otherwise. It cannot be otherwise because not even Tories who wish to blind their eyes to the realities, not even they can get the bankers to blind their eyes to realities. In fact, you will have to pay the interest and you will have to pay the sinking fund. It will start coming out of your second budget, and we will see more of that in a couple of weeks.

There's no reason for pessimism about the future of this province, if we had a government which was able to grasp that future. We, however, have a government which says that it wishes to open the province for business, wishes to open the province for business by way of having a conference but not having any business. We have a government which has been in office for 10 months, and has a dismal track record in stimulating the private sector - -and they're perfectly willing to admit it. They are very, very frank in saying that their activities have created a large number of jobs — and they imply new jobs — in this province. They are very, very frank, also, in saying that the total number of jobs in this province is the same as it was a year ago — or perhaps 1,000 more, perhaps even 2,000 more, if you're jiggling all the figures. Yet they say their efforts have created 10,000 jobs or so.

What can I conclude from that except that their private sector partners have lost 8,000 jobs? Their activities have lost jobs. There is no way that they can argue, Mr. Speaker, that the government has created many new jobs, the private sector has created many new jobs, but unfortunately, in total, there are no new jobs. Not even the Tories can make that one stick.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — The fruits of the first year are here, and we are about to see the continuation of those policies. We are about, I suggest, to see yet another massive deficit and yet another indication that, when you start down the Trudeau trail of deficits, you will very soon have to pinch in the spending on welfare programs, pinch in the

spending on health programs, pinch in the spending on education programs. I predict that this will happen within the next 12 months. I predict this will happen in the next 12 months.

So we are, Mr. Speaker, about to pass this budget. We are about to vote the appropriation act, but no one can deny that this is a sad day when we have to vote an appropriation act which has such a poor financial showing identified in a budget. I don't imagine anyone opposite is proud of their financial showing. I can't imagine anyone being proud of that record. None the less, all of us, I think must look at it with some regret to see that, for whatever reason, be it hard times or be it incompetent management (and we probably all will have our own explanations), the facts are that we have a budget which is starting us down a trail of massive deficits which have left other governments in Canada in disarray, and which will leave this government in disarray if those policies are continued over an extensive period of time.

I would be delighted to think that the government opposite had any plan, had any idea, other than the boosterism of how we are going to extricate ourselves from this position, but I do not detect in members opposite any plan other than the idea of having a good attitude and hoping that, in the best of Micawberish tradition, something will turn up. And I expect that this is how they will conduct their affairs.

We have seen many other governments try that, almost always with failure as the result. We have seen the federal Liberals do it with failure as the result. We have seen Conservative governments, pretty consistently across Canada, do it with failure as the result. And while I hope that I am wrong, unless something very surprising happens, I suggest that the government opposite will be unable to extricate itself from this financial morass, and they will hand over to the next government which succeeds it, whenever that may be, an accumulated deficit the likes of which this province has never seen, or has never contemplated until the election of the government last April.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to address this motion, or this bill, at this early hour of the morning. And I suppose the most enlightening thing that I heard, and the thing that gave me the most hope, was when I heard the Leader of the Opposition predict more doom and gloom for this year. Because I remember that same man last spring predicting victory, and I saw him call an election and 44 seats diminished to a meagre 8. And if those are your predictions, and that's how they went, that gives me confidence that the economy will be turning around, because, sir, I have no faith in your predictions, and I don't believe anyone else in Saskatchewan does either.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — I also . . . I'll tell you that is so, because you haven't learned one thing. We had a nice little economics lecture today, a little discussion in which our Premier said, "It's very simple." You can't go around the country as you have in the past talking out of both sides of your mouth saying, "You can't be cutting things here." And on the other side, "You can't have a deficit finance, a deficit budget." And that's what you've been saying, and that is probably the reason why you've lost the credibility, or any credibility you had in this province, and I'm afraid, sir, it won't be coming back.

You talk about cuts, and cuts, and cuts. And I want to tell you there was one cut that this

budget brought about and it's a cut that I'm proud of, and it was a cut of one NDP member in the by-election in P.A. that's what that budget brought: a cut to your party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we could go on, talk about these things, but I want to bring forth some true facts of what the mid-course correction, the budget brought in by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, this year, has done for this province, and the direction to which we're headed in the future.

You know, we can talk about budgets from a philosophical course all night long, and that's what the debate has been about in the last week or two in this election, or in this legislature, but I want to tell you one thing. You can't argue with the expressed desire of the people of Saskatchewan for a change in economic direction. That was what was expressed on April 26. That is why Premier Grant Devine is the most sought-after speaker in North America today, because the people across this nation realize that in Saskatchewan, in a prairie province, in western Canada, there is a new direction. There is a government, as I said the other day, a government with imagination, a government with innovation and a government that is leading Canada in new ideas such as family farm purchase plan, mortgage, an dyes, gasoline. And as my colleague from Meadow Lake said many days ago, it still hurts, doesn't it, boys?

I say that the voters of Saskatchewan spoke clearly on April 26, and they voted for change. They voted for a commitment to the return to the traditional principles of economic freedom, where the individual initiative and entrepreneurship would not only be allowed but, different from anything they'd know in the last 10 years, actively encouraged.

More recently, the people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake expressed their pleasure with the economic policies of this government. As politicians, our barometer is the ballot box, and one cannot argue with the indications our barometer has been making with the political climate this year.

So you can't argue with the strong message that the people of Saskatchewan have sent to us, and you can't argue with the results of our new economic directions.

And let me just cite a few examples. We have the strongest economy in Canada. We have the lowest inflation and unemployment rates in the country. Saskatchewan is the only province in Canada this year to show a net increase in employment this year. In the midst of a worldwide downturn we are attracting investments and investor confidence. We created 1,000 new jobs in this province in the last year.

The former administration saw it's so-called (and I remember that phrase) family of crown corporations (and how it came to haunt you and your group), saw itself as the mainspring of developments. We've turned that around. We don't want to fight with the business people of Saskatchewan. We want to work together with them, and that is a welcome change. And I walk out through Saskatchewan to the various towns, and I tell you, they say there's a different climate here and we're glad to see it. I think everybody in this House knows that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Our mortgage plan has proved relief for home-owners, and it has also put people back to work in the construction industry. Our housing starts are up, while in most parts of the country they're down. While housing starts in Canada were



down 29 per cent, our starts were up 46 per cent in Regina, and 68 per cent in Saskatoon.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Our overall provincial starts are up 14 per cent. As a result of the government's 3,000 build-a-home grant, our single-detached housing starts are up 394 per cent this year, a commendable increase.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — My friends, you can imagine what a difference this is making to the small builder who depends on the single-detached market.

Are the people of Saskatchewan interested in the new programs initiated by this government? I can tell you they most certainly are. We received 5,000 requests for applications for the build-a-home program.

As a direct result of this government's economic direction, our oil industry is back at work. In eight short months, this industry has gone from being one of the downturn's saddest victims to one of the heartiest survivors. Drilling was up 48 per cent in the last half of 1982, compared to the same period in 1981. Land sales peaked for the first time in two years at \$15.4 million in December. The oil supply and service industries are back at work in this province. We're looking at 1,000 to 1,200 new wells for 1983, and I understand that 182 of them have been drilled so far this year. These changes are but a result of our package of royalty and tax concessions. They were designed, in consultation with the industry, to revitalize our oil industry and what is most important, the big difference, they have worked.

Now, we talk about social programs. I remember the NDP saying how they were the great benefactors of social programs. I am familiar with the field of health, and I just want to indicate to you some of the areas in which this government, in the short period of 10 months, has improved the health services to the people of Saskatchewan: \$26 million increase in this budget over the budget that you had come in with earlier; an improved construction grant, a grant that we were able to implement. Substantial grants totalling over \$2 million have been made available to City and St. Paul's hospitals in Saskatoon for pressing capital needs. Funding has been approved for major hospital construction projects in Lloydminster, Nipawin, Melfort, Yorkton and Cut Knife, for \$43 million; and an extra \$500,000 put into an ambulance system that was crumbling because of a lack of funding by the previous government.

Just the other day, I was proud at the Telemiracle to commit \$2.7 million to a children's rehab centre in the city of Saskatoon, and that is done in conjunction with a voluntary sector, that fine group, the Kinsmen of Saskatchewan. The winter works program this year — \$3 million at Pasqua Hospital; 30 projects scattered around this province of Saskatchewan in various towns, in your constituencies and my constituency, providing winter works and jobs for people and, more important, renovating and upgrading the hospitals to the best standards we can provide.

And then my colleague sitting beside me, the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, has brought in a revolutionary program: the family farm purchase program, a very different, philosophical base than the state ownership of the previous government. And I want to tell you that since this program was established, the farm

credit corporation has interviewed 4,605 persons interested in the program and, of that number, 1,985 have been identified as appearing to qualify for the program. Their mortgages would total \$252 million. Going into the program, we have estimated 1,500 applications in the first three months. So let me tell you that the programs that the Devine government, the new Conservative government, the innovative government in North America, have come up with are working, and working well, to satisfy the needs of the people.

There's a lot more I could say, but I see it's getting close to 1 o'clock. And I'm sure that with those few facts I think I have indicated that the rhetoric of the past premier, the now Leader of the Opposition in Saskatchewan, was only rhetoric. I can see he's getting a little sleepy. He's had a hard day; I can understand. So, to show that we are a compassionate and an understanding government, a government that cares for the elderly, I will cut my remarks somewhat short. I will tell you that the recession that may be here in North America will be hit head-on by the Devine government. We will be the leaders to come out of the depression, or recession, in Canada, just as we have been the leaders in the mortgage field, and in the farms program, and in the gasoline cuts.

I have great faith in my colleague, the Minister of Finance. I think his mid-course correction was a necessary correction to the disastrous fudge budget that you people came in with that caused you . . . Yes, the fudge budget. More fudge figures than there is in a candy bar factory. And I just want to say that I have confidence in this government. I am proud to be a member of this government, and I can say that if there is a government in Canada that will guide their people's interest to recovery in these tough and difficult economic times, it is the Devine government in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division and bill read a second and third time.

**YEAS — 35**

Devine	Boutin	Gerich
Birkbeck	Bacon	Domotor
Taylor	Sauder	Maxwell
Berntson	Petersen	Embury
Rousseau	Glauser	Dirks
Hardy	Meagher	Hepworth
McLeod	Schmidt	Myers
McLaren	Parker	Zazelenchuk
Klein	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Baker
Katzman	Martens	Dutchak
Duncan	Rybchuk	Folk
Schoenhals	Young	

**NAYS — 7**

Blakeney	Koskie	Shillington
Engel	Lusney	Yew
Lingenfelter		

## ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION

At 1:08 a.m. His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber; took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the following bill:

Bill No. 68 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending respectively on March 31, 1982 and March 31, 1983.

His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to deliver the following speech:

Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislative Assembly;

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at this Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you and congratulate you on the work you have done.

You have established by legislation a mortgage interest reduction plan; a public utilities review commission, and a farm purchase program.

To reduce the provincial cost of living you have passed legislation to repeal the provincial tax on gasoline.

Amendments were approved to The Senior Citizens School Tax Rebate Act, The Renters Property Tax Rebate Act, The Property Improvement Grant Act, to raise the amounts payable to the citizens of Saskatchewan under those acts.

You have passed measures to streamline the administration of justice and the administration of the finances of government departments.

Amendments were considered and approved to The Workers' Compensation Act to increase the level of benefits payable in certain circumstances. You've approved revisions to the system of holding municipal and school board elections by repealing The Urban Municipalities Elections Act.

I thank you for the provisions you have made to meet the requirements of the public service. I assure you, on behalf of my ministers, that this sum of money is being used prudently and in the public interest.

In taking leave of you, I thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the session, and wish you the full blessing of providence.

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly, it is the will and pleasure of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it please His Honor to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

His Honor then retired from the Chamber at 1:12 a.m.