

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 13, 1983**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Hon. Mr. Swan:** — I'd like today to introduce to you a group of students from Division 3 school in Rosetown. There are 24 students accompanied by their teacher, by two teachers I guess, Rod Ford and Adele Brisbois. I'd like the Assembly to welcome these students to the Chamber. They've travelled a long ways, and I'm sure are looking forward to an interesting period here in the Chamber. I'll be meeting with them about 3 o'clock for pictures and later on for refreshments. I hope that you'll enjoy your time here in the Chamber, and I look forward to meeting with you later. Will the Assembly welcome them?

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Currie:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and through you to the members of this House, a group of visitors from the Wascana constituency who are sitting in the west gallery. These young people . . . There are 44 grade 8 students from the Wilfred Hunt school in Regina, and they are here with their teachers, Mr. Dewhurst and Linda Trew. As a matter of interest, one of the students is the son of the Hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Andrew. I hope that you people find the proceedings enlightening and I also hope that you find that the proceedings have some relevance to what you have learned when you help your own model parliament at school. I shall meet with you for pictures and refreshments following question period, and I would ask the members to join me in extending a cordial welcome to them at this time.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Social Assistance Benefits**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Social Services. I have a cabinet document here which is recommended by the minister and approved by the Premier of the province, which in part says that those who are on social assistance will have, effectively April 1st, cancelled the clothing allowance as well as the housing allowance. What I would like to know from the minister is whether or not this will mean that those people for the first three months of social assistance benefits will not be eligible for a clothing allowance or a household allowance from your department from now on.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the cabinet document that he has, with me.

**An Hon. Member:** — You signed it.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Well, may I finish? You first stated the house allowance and secondly stated the household and I just want to clarify that. I believe you're talking about the household allowance.

The decision was made for those new people coming on that are in the employable, the unemployed employable category, that for the first three months it was reasonable that the clothing and household allowance would not be needed.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. I would like to find out from the minister if she believes it is reasonable that a family who have been out of work for one year, for example, on unemployment insurance, that they have run out of unemployment insurance benefits, now come to your department for welfare . . . Are you telling me that when a person's children needs clothing in the first three months that you find it reasonable that you will not have money for that?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — No, Mr. Speaker, that isn't quite what I said. I think the issues that we looked at when we looked at the overall picture of some budgeting and the increasing numbers coming onto welfare was the point: people that have been employed and then unemployed and on UIC have had an income. They also could have a very, and I'll agree, small amount of assets, for instance in savings and that type of thing, but for the first three months coming onto social assistance it would not be a necessity.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. Let's use the example of someone who had been on minimum wage and lost their job a year ago. As you will know, the unemployment insurance would have paid very, very little to that individual. They will now be coming to your department to apply for Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. Are you telling me that when an individual's children needs a pair of shoes one month after they go on welfare that you will now tell them that they don't need shoes?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the member from Shaunavon started out with a hypothetical question, but I will address the last part. If you're talking about some special needs that children have, that allowance is in there.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about a special need. I don't think that clothing, shoes and clothing for children who are going to school, is a special need. I think if the department recognizes that they need social assistance, part of that has been a clothing allowance. What I would like to do and to ask the minister if she will reconsider this ill-conceived plan to cut those people on welfare off of a clothing allowance and a household allowance for three months, if she will consider going back to cabinet and attempting to get the money for these people that she is responsible for.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, the social assistance plan, under this government, will continue to be reviewed on a constant basis, and that means monitoring. And if there appears to be a problem with any particular policy that is in place, or lack of policy, then we will seriously sit down and consider it.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier of the province. I would like to ask the Premier who signed this document which, in effect, cancelled the clothing allowance and household allowance for all those individuals in the province who are on welfare — the unemployed employables, at least — cancelling the clothing and housing allowance, if you will have another look at this to see whether or not you

can find the money and the goodness, I suppose, in your heart, to see that they get a living amount of money so they can buy food and clothing and shelter for their families. That's all they're asking.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it would be relevant if I talked a little bit, in response to this question, if I talked to the members opposite a little bit about the jobs that are being created in the province of Saskatchewan to address this problem . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you would just care to listen. I'll let you in on what's going on in the province of Saskatchewan, and those in the gallery and those in the media, about jobs, Mr. Speaker. I think it's relevant, because we're talking about unemployment and we're talking about people who want to be employed.

In the month of March of 1983, we created 4,000 new jobs over the month of February — 4,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, we're talking about creating jobs for people who want jobs. That's relevant.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're talking about welfare. Welfare.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — No, we're talking about welfare; we're talking about putting people to work, and I'm going to mention work. In the month of March, Mr. Speaker, we created 4,000 jobs over the month of February, number one, Mr. Speaker, in the two months of February and March — February and March — we created 10,000 more jobs than existed in Saskatchewan in January — 10,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the 6,000 new jobs in February was an all-time record for the history of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order please. I want to ask the Premier: you indicated at the beginning that you're going to relate this to the question that was asked; are you about to relate the answer to the question?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. It's very difficult to get an answer to a question when we don't have silence long enough to get it, and I would ask the group to be quiet while the Premier answers.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, my point is: when we create 10,000 new jobs, we are taking people who were on or were possible going into welfare in giving them jobs. That's 10,000 new jobs, Mr. Speaker; not old jobs, but new. So we were talking about how we're looking after people in Saskatchewan. All I'm saying is that we lead . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . When we lead the nation in creating new jobs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Any statistical standard you want to look at, this leads the nation and leads all statistical records in the history of the province, which means that's 10,000 people that aren't on welfare but are employable and employed. Now that's

relevant, and that's what this government is doing better than any other administration in the country, and that's significant.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, what we were talking about in the original question was people on welfare, the unemployed employables who have been effectively been cut off of a household allowance, as well as a clothing allowance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier one more time. As he will know, the unemployed employables in the province of Saskatchewan has increased from 9,146 last year at this time, to 14,291 today under your administration. What I'm asking you is whether or not you will reconsider the cutting off of the household allowance and the clothing allowance for these people who now find themselves on welfare as a result of your government policy. Will you reconsider reinstating the clothing and household allowance? That was the question.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not our policy. The policy that we have is to create jobs faster than anybody else, because they're coming into the province. The new policy is to create jobs faster than any other province; that's what we're doing. Now there's nobody in this province, if they're in need, can't get help. And the minister has said that. So the combination I would like to find — you find me families in Saskatchewan that can't get assistance for clothes. Find them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right.

The minister has said that they can get that assistance; they always have and they always will. Plus, Mr. Speaker, no place else in the country are people looking for jobs any faster than they are in the province of Saskatchewan. The unemployment rate is up here because population is going down in other provinces. Our province to the east is exporting people into here, looking for jobs. Under the NDP administration they're finding it difficult; they're coming to find jobs here under our administration. We're creating more jobs than anybody else in the country.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier one more time to answer the question if he would: whether or not he will reconsider cutting those many thousands of families off of the clothing allowance and household allowance, which you have done by this cabinet document which you signed on March 31st, which in effect cut them off of the household allowance and clothing allowance for three months. Will you reconsider that ill-conceived idea? That's the question.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, as the minister said . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Member.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Our minister said . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh.

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — . . . of Social Services that if all the considerations with respect to employees and employables and unemployed are under constant consideration by

this government. So it's an undertaking that's going on constantly. The most important undertaking, and I'm sure the members across will agree, is to provide job opportunities for all these people coming to the province of Saskatchewan, to look for them, and that's what we're doing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As has been pointed out to you, Madam Minister, the regulations which have been changed, indeed apply to the unemployed employables, and what it does is that it delays the qualifications for a clothing allowance for three months. And it delays the qualifications for rental of premises for a three-month period. Looking further into the regulations, we note that while you have cut the services to these individuals, what you have done in a perverse way increased the burial amount that will be paid. Why have you instituted a policy whereby you deny assistance to those who are alive and are prepared to pay more for the burial of the poor souls?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about this. We are not talking about a denial, a straight-out denial of what is available to people. We are talking about three months to when they first come on social assistance — three months for those people that have had some income before coming onto the welfare rolls, and could conceivably have a small amount of savings or assets.

Now when I said to the member from Shaunavon earlier that it was reasonable, I should have perhaps clarified that. In terms of the overall picture of Saskatchewan, and the downturn in the economy, it makes good sense to ensure that there is a safety net there for a lot of people that require help, and that often means people other than those on social assistance. It also includes the mentally handicapped, the physically handicapped, a lot of people, and that's what I meant by reasonable.

I personally do not believe that it is going to be an undue hardship — those three months. If it is, I assured the member from Shaunavon that we would monitor it, and I would be open, if it is creating a serious problem.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Social Services. Would she tell me what the average stay on social assistance is for unemployed employables?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not have those figures as to the average stay. I don't believe I've ever seen any figures to indicate on any kind of statistics I get that gives an average stay. But I will . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . If the member from Regina Centre would like to answer the question, I will gladly sit down and he answer the question. I just don't have those statistics, and I will take notice. If I can find them, I will bring them to you.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, it's well known by anyone who has anything to do with social work or the Department of Social Services that unemployed employable remain on welfare, half of them, on an average, less than three months. So what in fact you're doing for the unemployed employables is cutting them off totally, and Madam Minister, Madam Minister, this isn't a policy that looks like the first three months will be taken away and then the next year or two years will be able to pay a clothing and household allowance.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Does the member have a question? The member is on his feet in question period to ask questions, not to make statements, and I would ask you to get directly to the question.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — My question to you, Madam Minister, is once again, do you believe that it's reasonable to cut that many people who are finding themselves on the roll of welfare in this province, 12,000 more than there were at this time last year? Do you think it is reasonable that they no longer need a housing allowance, a place to live — to put it in simple terms — and clothing for their children? Do you really believe that that is reasonable?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, the member says 'thousands.' Obviously I'm not getting through to him. These are for the new people, the unemployed employables, that are coming on. That is not 12,000 every month.

**An Hon. Member:** — Sure it is. That's what it is.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — No, it isn't. Why don't you look at your statistics for the month of February, for the numbers in the unemployed employables, and you will see 500-plus, not thousands.

**An Hon. Member:** — There's 14,000 unemployed employables.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Every month eh? Every month.

**An Hon. Member:** — How many are there right now?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — It is for those new unemployed employables coming on. For the month of February we had a small number over the number of 500, not thousands, not thousands. If it's true, as you say, if the employables are often there for much less than three months, I don't quite understand your first question.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that there's a great amount of humour about the fact that people on welfare won't be able to buy clothing, but my question to the minister is this: are you telling me that the unemployed employable who applied for social assistance and was approved on March 30th will be able to get a clothing allowance and a household allowance, but the person who applies on April 1st of this year will not get it? Is that what you're telling me and the 14,000 people who are unemployed employables — that there will be two standards, one for those before April, and one for those after? Is that what you're saying?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the regulations were to change on April 1, and that says it all.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Madam Minister, I want you to clarify that point, that the children who need shoes . . . Mr. Speaker, the question to the minister is: the children who needed shoes before March 31st will get shoes and those after won't — is that what you're saying?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, the rules for the clothing allowance changed on April 1. Those coming on April 1 and thereafter that fall in the unemployed employable

category will not have for the first three months the clothing allowance.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. You have obviously changed the policy in respect to the qualifying criteria for the unemployed employables. And what I want to ask you is: have you done a calculation of the total amount that would be saved by the department invoking this new criteria?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, we have not changed the rules for those that qualify. You know, how you qualify for social assistance has not changed, so let's be clear about that. Yes, there has been a cost analysis done on the savings, and I will take notice of the figure and bring it to you.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Premier today indicated that, in not answering the question, that there'll be nothing but jobs, and what I want to ask you is why you found it necessary, if indeed there is nothing but jobs to be found in this province, to suddenly change the criteria to strike out against unemployed employables, if indeed there are jobs? Why the need for change?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Is the member for a moment suggesting that everything in this society stays status quo just because something doesn't change? Like, that's just not the way the world works. This government was elected to bring in some changes and to bring in their own policies.

In looking at the issue and the need for changes, we had, as a department, to be realistic in looking at the numbers that were there. Now if you want to counterbalance that off with the employment factor, we can do that, too. Let's look at the new numbers alone that have come into the work-force in Saskatchewan. Considering the downturn in the economy and the recession that Canada has been in, Saskatchewan has done A-1 in terms of trying to keep that employment factor up.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker; a question to the Minister of Social Services. Let me remind you, Madam Minister, it is one thing to chop a road between Sheho and Hoey, for instance; it's quite another thing to rob the poor of the basics of life.

My question to the minister is: how do you justify giving doctors a 6 per cent increase, giving this Assembly a 7 per cent increase, and denying the poor, who by definition are on welfare through no fault of their own, the very basics of life in shelter and clothing?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, I can only simply say I'm not the Minister of Health. You know, he can deal with the doctors in this House.

On the point of robbing the poor, that is totally misleading — absolutely, totally misleading. If you think that it is only the poor that during a recession have had to use the safety net of social programs, you live in isolation as an MLA.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — My question is: in estimates during the last session you

indicated that a large amount of money was being committed to a study on social assistance in the province of Saskatchewan — can you tell me whether or not the regulation changes which come into effect on April 1 are a result of the report coming from that committee?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I did not indicate in the '82-'83 estimates that there was a large amount of money being spent on the review. The staff were seconded from the department. The expense was already there. There was no new dollars put into it, and in fact it is cost-shared through the federal government, because it falls under SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan).

That review began somewhat months before the official review took place, as to putting the seconding of staff into that particular role. In the preliminary review that we did we found it absolutely necessary that some steps be taken with the present system that was in place, particularly given the statistics and the figures that were coming in as to where we were going to be in 1983, and perhaps even in 1984. Now in being realistic in looking at those figures, as opposed to fudging the figures like you did in 1981-82, in your particular spring budget, we said 'No, that's not the way to go. Let's be realistic about it.' On the review many interim reports recommendations have been coming forward. This particular one had been done in-house, with administration in Social Services before that.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Are you saying then that the changes that have occurred were a result of interim reports coming from that committee?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — No, I didn't say that. I said that this particular one that we are discussing today had come from the department, in-house, before that time.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, it seems absolutely insane that an individual would be paid \$60,000 a year to do a study at the time that they're making major changes to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. What I would ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not at this time she will consider cancelling that study and review what is being done, because obviously it is a complete farce. And will you consider taking that money that is being paid to those individuals, and including it in a housing allowance as well as a clothing allowance for the children who are finding themselves on welfare as no fault of their own?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — I just want, Mr. Speaker, on the point of increasing something in there. I want to remind the member that there has been a 6.5 per cent overall for food and clothing allowance in the social assistance program this year. To his un-question: no, I will not consider cancelling that review.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Pathologist at Valley View Centre

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise today. There was an article in the newspaper about Valley View Centre and the position of a pathologist. If I could pronounce his name, I would, but I can't. Anyway it was in relationship to the position of the pathologist at Valley View. And I would like to state at this time to all members of this Assembly that I have directed the deputy minister in Social Services to put that whole exercise on hold. And I will be personally reviewing it with him.



The action taken was counter to direction given and that too, will be dealt with, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the announcement in a response to an article that appeared in the *Leader-Post* which is headed, 'Famed Speech Pathologist Axed As Position Is Ruled Redundant.' I know Dr. Subhas Maharaj who has done a great deal of work in developing a program called PIC (Pictogram-Ideogram Communications System), which helps people who are handicapped communicate. It was an operation which was undertaken a number of years ago by this individual and one which has proved successful in a great number of countries, not only in the province of Saskatchewan, but in the United States and many European countries.

It was also assisted and promoted by the Reed foundation of Saskatchewan. And I can well imagine that when the minister found out exactly how much pressure was growing as a result of axing this individual, that you reconsidered it.

I would, in closing, ask the minister as well to look at those individuals who she has axed from a clothing allowance and whether or not . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Under ministerial statements, the member is not allowed the liberty of exploring all avenues of any department but rather must stick to the substance of the ministerial statement.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### **Bill No. 8 — An Act to repeal The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to repeal The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

### **Bill No. 9 — An Act respecting the Department of Supply and Services**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the Department of Supply and Services.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

### **Bill No. 10 — An Act respecting the Department of Tourism and Small Business**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the Department of Tourism and Small Business.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

### **Bill No. 11 — An Act to repeal The Educational Communications Corporation Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to repeal The Educational Communications Corporation Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 13 — An Act to repeal The Universities Commission Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to repeal The Universities Commissions Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 14 — An Act respecting the Department of Justice**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the Department of Justice.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 15 — An Act respecting the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Education Act**

**Clause 1**

**Mr. Koskie:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments at the outset. I raised, Mr. Minister, some concerns during second reading, and I want to say that while these bills were said to be housekeeping in nature when you introduced them, I want to say that they are in fact fairly significant — significant for what they demonstrate I think about the direction of this government, and that is the decrease in the amount of full disclosure of the financial stewardship of the province.

I want to say in respect to these five acts, the recommendation at least was made to the Minister of Finance by a member, or both members, on our side who are in public accounts, and they indicated that it would be desirable to have these bills at least reviewed by the public accounts committee. And they could in fact ask their witnesses as you indicated, the auditor and other experts if they need require, because they can bring in other experts as to whether the particular changes that are being made here

are in fact desirable.

And I want to say that it seems like a very reasonable direction to go to the public accounts committee. The public accounts committee after all, Mr. Minister, is in fact, has direct control over the stewardship of the financial affairs of the province and the method in which . . . and changes that should be introduced, in fact, to increase the financial examination of the government's activity.

I think that it's inconsistent, Mr. Minister, that you now, as Minister of Finance, would not take the opportunity of in fact presenting these bills to the public accounts committee, a committee which you supported strongly and which in fact you have indicated the increased necessity of the auditor's powers to be broadened and set up in a separate act.

I have indicated to you that there are indeed a number of concerns. It now appears, Mr. Minister, that these new revolving funds will be entirely separate and apart from the Consolidated Fund. It now appears that if at the end of the year there is a surplus or a deficit in a particular revolving fund, the government may be able to simply carry this forward to the next year.

No longer will any of these accounts, these revolving funds, have any maximum limits set by statute. Previously, there was, in respect to the advance accounts, there was in legislation a setting-out of the maximum amount in statute. This is not the case now. All such limits are to be set by order in council.

No longer, in our view, will there be any statutory requirement that details of financial transactions in fact will be published, and in fact that the same detailed scrutiny of these accounts, revolving funds, to the same extent as what we had in respect to the advance accounts. And similarly there appears to be no longer any clear requirement that these funds and their transactions be audited by the Provincial Auditor. Not only have this government cut the staff of the auditor in their budget, it appears to us that they want to reduce the scope of the examination of the auditor.

But I want to point out another major concern, a very major concern, Mr. Minister, and one which we in fact intend to move an amendment, and will be. And that is, it is especially interesting to note that each of these bills is to come into force on April the 1st, 1982. That is the beginning of the last fiscal year. Bad enough that we are departing from the advance account to the revolving account and, in our view, less scrutiny of these accounts, but here is the minister coming in and saying that they're going to go back retroactively for one entire year. And I want to say that the only justification for retroactivity is: one, that you have something to hide, or secondly, that you've been operating without the legislation in place. There's no other earthly reason why you have to go back to the date of April 1, 1982, and I want to say that this is a precedent dealing here with the financial scrutiny and review. And if you get up and say, 'Oh but you're wrong, there is going to be scrutiny and review' do you know what you have done by retroactivity? We have dealt with the estimates of every department and the finance of 1982-83. We've done that. And what you are going to be doing now is to deny us the right to do the examination for the past year by your retroactivity. And I don't think you can deny that, because you have no right to go back into the previous year for an examination, and that is a concern I think which I'd like you to address: why it's necessary, and if in fact you are not denying us the right to proceed on this basis.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to set the record straight with

regards to the background and the history of this, and I would refer all members (if they like) to the *Report of the Provincial Auditor 1980-81*, and I will read it for the member opposite so he has a full understanding.

The internal accounts reported as assets are the working capital advances which total \$149,634,935 at March 31, 1981 — primarily deferred expenditures chargeable to appropriations in subsequent years in accordance with authorization authorizing legislation. The study of the accounts of Canada, accounts of Canada, recommended that assets of government be defined as financial claims acquired by the government on outside organizations and individuals as a results of advance and transitions prior to the accounting date, and accordingly (this is the auditor's report) working capital advances which are not primarily used to record such financial claims should be deleted from the statement of assets and liabilities.

Now, the next paragraph is very important.

In order to determine the applicability to Saskatchewan of the findings of the report, the select standing committee on public accounts and printing recommended in 1978 that a study be undertaken to determine whether or not changes should be incorporated in Saskatchewan in the manner which we dealt with, in which we deal with working capital advance.

That report was commissioned in 1978 by the then public accounts committee.

I have been advised by the Minister of Finance . . .

That's in 1980-81, and that was not me. That was your minister of finance.

. . . that a decision had been taken to introduce in 1982-83 fiscal year the budgetary and other measures necessary to discontinue the practice of charging working capital advance account expenditures to budgetary appropriations in subsequent years. I concur with the discontinuance of that practice.

This bill, and several like it that were passed through this Assembly in last legislature were a direct result of requests by the Provincial Auditor of recommendations by the then public accounts committee. It was accepted as stated by the Provincial Auditor, by the then minister of finance, Mr. Tchorzewski, that the then government, which was your administration, would introduce this legislation. The election intervened. Following the election we introduced that legislation in accordance with this and that's what we see today, and that's the reason for it.

Now, the hon. member makes the observation that the auditor has been frozen out of this. I suggest to you, and I challenge you to ask the auditor. The interpretation of the auditor, the interpretation of the legislation is this: as it is drawn it becomes a budgetary item. All budgetary items are audited by the Provincial Auditor. He still has that power. It doesn't have to state it in the act to give him that power, because he has it by the very nature of doing it all. So the auditor, in fact, does have the right to audit.

Now the member makes some idea of, 'What are you trying to hide?' If he would try to read this and understand what that bill is, it now entitles the members opposite during estimates to raise specific questions with regard to the revolving account as to how

much can go into it. Each year it has to be a budgetary item as to how much can go into it. Rather than making it something that you are hiding, in fact we were making it now so that the questions can in fact be asked where before they could not. So that's hardly a very credible argument with regards to that. And it will be discussed annually in the House in estimates which, for the first time, members opposite and all members of the House will be able to ask about these particular accounts.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — In my review, initial remarks, Mr. Minister, and in your reply you indicated that there was a recommendation that came out of public accounts in 1978 that there was to be a study, a recommendation for a study, in 1978. What I'm asking you: why will you not resubmit the direction which you are taking to the public accounts in order that that committee can in fact review it, get the expertise of the auditor, and to simply satisfy many of the doubts which we have?

It was initiated by . . . A study was requested by the public accounts. Why not . . . You have developed a so-called solution. Why will you not, in fact, resubmit it at this time in the form of the bill that you have here to the public accounts committee?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — This was brought down as . . . This legislation is as a result of properly accepted accounting procedures instituted by the Canadian organization that deals with the way you want to do accounting. And it's been a long-standing thing and complaint by the auditor. The auditor finally had, in 1978, the public accounts committee — before I was chairman of it, before I was even elected as a member — had that committee endorse the review of this whole process. It has gone through . . . This is a recommendation of the auditor people as to why we want to do this.

I find it strange indeed when we have five of these to be done. There was something like 10 done in last session, 10 done in last session. There was no great interest at that point in time to have it done at the public accounts committee, no indication at that point in time that this is what they proposed to do. I can't believe the member is asking the question, when what we are doing is the same thing that they as government undertook to do, as is clearly stated out in the Provincial Auditor's report. They as a government, their minister of finance, undertook to introduce in '82-83, and we all know what happened in '82-83. There wasn't a large legislative program that year, when they were in government. They undertook to do it. We are doing the same thing. We are making it so that it is easier for the people to ask questions with regard to the revolving account. We are opening the process up so they can ask more questions. We are making it clearly so that the auditor still has all the process, and we're making so it becomes more responsible as to the way things are handled by government and by the legislature.

Now if that isn't progressive legislation that they want to oppose, I don't know what is. If they want to simply send it over to the public accounts committee, all they're looking for is to play fast and loose politics with a move that was encouraged both by this government and by that government. I can't believe it and we would not accept that.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Chairman, did I hear the Minister of Finance correctly when he said that we want this to go to public accounts to play fast and loose politics? Will you repeat that? Is that what you said?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — You heard me correctly.

**Mr. Engel:** — Maybe that was your role, maybe that was the Minister of Finance's role when you were chairman of public accounts, to get a forum where you wanted fast and loose politics. Maybe that's the only reason you wanted public accounts open to the press, so you could play fast and loose politics. That's not why I'm on the public accounts committee. That's not why I'm on the public accounts committee — and what is the matter? Tell me one reason and what you're trying to hide, why we couldn't take this bill and do a clause-by-clause study with the auditor in the public accounts committee, and with that kind of support staff, so we could get a detailed explanation of the bill. Give me one reason for not doing that. What are you trying to hide?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Let me put it in another way to the hon. member from Assiniboia. You're on the public accounts committee. You ask me what particular — and ask me a question on each particular clause that you like to. That's what the function of committee of the whole is. Ask me where your concerns are with regard to — one at a time, what your concerns are. Lay them to me and I'll try to answer them, okay?

**Mr. Engel:** — The operation in this House compared to in public accounts is quite different, is very different, and the minister full well knows that. When I go to public accounts, we have in there support staff. They're sitting behind you. The very people sitting behind you are there to interject, tell us the areas that'll cover up. I'm not a trained accountant or a financial expert in the field of even knowing what questions to specifically raise.

So in public accounts, we have the staff there that works as a committee and to interject and say. 'No, this is the area and you're on the wrong direction there,' and 'This is the question you should be asking. This is what we wanted to do in changing into revolving accounts.

And what would be so wrong with taking one morning in a public accounts committee and going through one sample bill and telling us what it's going to do and what the differences are going to be in a relationship to where the numbers will be in the book? Just tell me what difference that would make that we could have that kind of detailed explanation in there where we can sit down, lay our politics aside and we act as a committee in there where we can sit down, lay our politics aside and we act as a committee in a non-partisan way to discuss what this bill's doing, what the implications are. That's what public accounts are about. It's not what you were trying to infringe earlier, that public accounts was a political forum. That's not what it is. Public accounts is a review of how your departments exercise financial control and financial management from the assignments they get from this legislation. Public accounts reviews that kind of operation.

We want to know if this legislation is designed according to the pattern that was laid out by that original public accounts committee that long ago. I can agree with you that that was discussed because I was in public account in those days, '71 to '75. I was in public accounts in those days. From '71 to '75 I was in the public accounts committee, and we saw some need for change and some recommendations were made. Now why couldn't we have staff suggesting and discussing this thing, and taking some time to do it? Because it's going to take a lot longer here than it would in that committee there, if you're looking at time.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — If I'm to follow what the hon. member is saying — that he was

there from '71 to '75, that he understood that in that time they discussed this question and that he agreed with it that they should look at advance accounts — I take it then from '75 to '78 nothing was done, and in 1978 something was in fact done. Now clearly he is a knowledgeable member; he's been dealing with this subject for back as far as 1971. I simply asked him, I explained to him, what the purpose of it was. The thing was agreed to by the auditor. I simply asked him for a question. And your response back to me, as I take your interpretation of your response back to me. 'Well, I don't really have any questions because I don't know what it does.'

I asked you to ask me specific questions, and I'll try to answer those specific things in the most non-political possible way I can. So just ask me the questions: clause 1, what does it do? Clause 2, what does it do? And I'll try the best to explain to you. But if you just sit there and say. 'No, I'm not going to ask you any questions on it, I'm not going to ask you any question on it. I want the auditor to do this,' you're asking the auditor to sit in your place as a member of the opposition to challenge any legislation going through. That's delegating your power to somebody else. You haven't got then the wherewithal, is what you're telling me, to ask any specific questions. You don't understand what I'm saying. You ask me and I'll try to explain it to you.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Minister, you bared your soul in that statement, and that is the point I'm trying to make. The auditor has the staff of expert people that are reviewing and have done it over many years, as long as this province was a province, have been reviewing the financial handling of this province. It has grown from a very small budget to a place now where the deficit this year, the deficit is about 70 per cent higher than the total budget was when I was elected.

Do you know what the budget was in 1971? Are you aware of how much the total budget was? Do you know what the total budget was? It was less than your deficit is today. And there is some complicated financing going on. There needs to be some surveillance and some expertise involved, and the statement you made that's in *Hansard* that we want the auditor to ask some questions and you don't want to answer those — that is the reason why you don't want us to go to public accounts, because the auditor likely wanted something in this revolving fund that you're trying to hide. And why don't you want it to go to public accounts to let the auditor ask those questions, and to see if it satisfies his needs and requests, or if you're trying to strap him and trying to fit him into a little mould just this bid, and putting that premise on him. And that's the question I want to ask you.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I can assure you I sat in public accounts for a long time, and the auditor always says this: 'You ask me a question, and I'll get you the answer for it. But I'm not there to do your work for you.' And that's exactly what you're looking for, somebody to do your work, because you haven't sat down and done it yourself. You haven't even got a question. You haven't even so much as got one question to ask with regard to this legislation. Not one question.

You haven't got one question . . . (inaudible) . . . say, 'Well, don't do it here. Send it to the auditor so the auditor could ask it.' The auditor was the guy that initiated this. He is the guy that recommended it, and we are acting on his advice and after his study, and now you want to go back to him. I can't believe it.

**Mr. Engel:** — The minister can't believe an awful lot. You say I don't have one question with the particular bill that relates to Agriculture, for example. What did you give me for explanatory notes what that bill was going to do? You said, 'Once by us and twice by

them.' The other way around. We did it once, and you did it twice, and that was your explanation of the entire bill. Those are the explanation notes, and those are the things that you said that bill was going to do in Agriculture.

And when you take it in general terms now, if we take Bill 5, for example, you have completely eliminated family farm improvement branch's purchases. Their whole financial operation has been completely discontinued. They're not going to have a financial budget as far as expenditure is concerned for purchases, and yet you want to do a bill to give them a revolving fund. You want to do a bill to give them a revolving fund and you won't let me to take this to a committee, where we act as a committee and can decide to do it on a committee basis, and you say I don't have a question. I have lots of questions on this one.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I certainly, Mr. Minister, raised more than just the public accounts in my opening remarks, and you haven't addressed them. And that I'd like you to do, in a general way, is to address those, and once you have done that, we'll come back.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Okay, with regard to the specific question. The member from the Quill Lakes asked specifically with regard to whether or not the auditor would audit the revolving account. The answer to that is the auditor will audit the revolving account because it becomes part of the budgetary expenditures now where it wasn't before and therefore, it's part of the Consolidated Fund. Therefore, the auditor audits that like he audits the entire Consolidated Fund, okay? Okay, fine. Let's take it one at a time.

**Mr. Koskie:** — In respect to your comment then . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes I will for the Minister of Finance, and you can understand. I'll keep it simple.

In respect to your comments, Mr. Minister, you indicated that the auditor would, in fact, have the opportunity to audit those funds as a part of the Consolidated Fund. What I ask you: will there be a specific breakdown in respect to the itemized use of the revolving fund to the same extent that we had with the advance account, or will it simply be auditing a figure without the details being submitted along with the expenditures relating to the revolving fund?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Okay. From the *Public Accounts* point of view, all the dollars that are going in will be itemized in the *Public Accounts* — all dollars going in and all dollars going out of the revolving account. As well, because it's a budgetary item — all right — it entitles you now, as a member of the Assembly, to ask in committee of finance the question about how much money would be allocated in any given department to the revolving account, which is what I'm saying.

It gives you then the opportunity under each department where there is a revolving account to ask the appropriate minister the question as to what money would be going into it, where before, you know, all you did was increase the statutory limit that could be into an advance account, and that was the end of it. So what I'm saying is it becomes now more open for you to ask those particular questions on any given department.

You can ask the Minister of Agriculture when his estimates come up, 'Do you have a revolving account under the new system? How much money are you proposing to put into that revolving account? And what it is it going to be used for?' And that's the first time that that would be able to be done in estimates. And that's why I'm saying we're not trying to hide anything.



**Mr. Koskie:** — I come back to the same question. Will the itemization of the revolving account be detailed in a similar manner for *Public Accounts* as was in the past?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — If I can carry on. If you looked at the new *Estimates* for this year, and I'll just give you an example. Turn to page 30. Okay? Item no. 17 — to provide for the net expenditures (recovery) of (from) the Saskatchewan book bureau revolving fund (statutory): — and it sets out \$133,820. Now that's the first time that's ever been displayed in the blue book as to expenditures going into the revolving account.

So not only does it give you the opportunity, it identifies the revolving account which then allows you as a member of the opposition or any other member to ask the appropriate minister what that money is going to be used for. And there it is, already allocated out. It's the first time that has been done, so how can you say that we're trying to hide something? In fact we're trying to clarify something, and that is in accordance with the recommendations of the auditor. And that's all I'm trying to say.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Going one step further, it is our understanding that no longer will any of these accounts, these revolving funds, have a maximum limit set as to the amount, and it can be controlled totally by OC. And so, in other words, what I'm saying is that you may set it out here, but obviously any amounts . . . The limits can be set by order in council. It is our understanding that previously the maximums were in fact detailed in statute.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Except that the process before to control it was simply to limit the size of it in statute. That's like saying that you should limit the size of the Department of Health budget. Everything that is set out is going to be set down there.

In Education, in the book bureau, for example, it shows \$133,000. That's how much is going to be spent. So each year, what you're doing . . . Well, you don't have a limit, but you don't have a limit on anything else either. You say, 'This is what I am going to spend. This is what we're proposing to spend. This is what we are asking for an appropriation from the legislature for this particular revolving account.' And that's the function of it.

The limits on it before was basically a check and control by government that it didn't go over that particular limit. And that was the basis of the check and balance before. This is a better check and balance. You know, I don't take credit for the wisdom of this type of thing. It's something that was brought in by, first of all, the recognized accounting process across the country, and by the Provincial Auditor.

So all I'm saying is there's nothing tried to be hidden from you. It's clearly there as to what we're proposing to spend, and it's no different than any other appropriation.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Minister, can you tell me then what other jurisdictions, to your knowledge, have in fact in place the proposal of the revolving fund?

**A Member:** — Bulgaria.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Bulgaria?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The ones that we are familiar with for sure is the federal government, the Government of Alberta, plus all other governments, as we understand, are moving in this direction, if they haven't already done it. I'm also advised that the

province of Manitoba quite recently also amended theirs in conjunction with . . . very similar to what we're doing.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Also, to speed this up, Mr. Minister, you have a retroactive provision in the bill and I would like your comments in respect to the necessity of the retroactivity.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The problem I would have with the question of retroactivity is that the whole legislation was understood that it would be passed last legislative session, and it wasn't, and that's where we're into the question of needing retroactivity. The previous minister of finance had given the undertaking that the legislation would be brought in in the year 1982-83. As a result, we prepared the blue book based on that particular systems for the advance accounts and the revolving accounts. And so, from that point of view, while I don't agree with retroactivity in that sense, it does have to do it in this particular time for the way it's shown in the books.

**Mr. Koskie:** — You're going back to April 1st of 1982 — over a year — and you did submit the estimates in the previous year. And what I'm saying is: under what legislative authority were you able to operate on a revolving fund and not in respect to the advanced accounts? What I'm saying is that what you're doing with the retroactivity is to go back to April 1st of 1982. You're saying as an explanation that they're in the blue books. And I'm saying: under what jurisdiction were they in the 1982-83 *Estimates* set out, as you demonstrated here in respect to the '83-84 on page 30? Were they designated in that way in '82-83?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, they were designated that way in '82-83 in the blue book. Okay. Just like the reorgs are in the blue book this year. The reorganization is in based on the fact that when we pass the bills through the House in reorganization, they will be able to read and interpret them through the *Estimates*. That's the same argument. What you're saying is: don't do that and we would have heard the great hue and cry if we had put the estimates down three months or six months under the old system, and nine months or six months under the new system. Then we would have had a book twice that size. There was enough complaints now that you can't understand the *Estimates*, and that would have made it twice as hard. What we want to do by the retroactivity is to put all advance accounts on the same footing to be reported and interpreted the same way, and that's why the request to go back to 1982.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I don't follow you on that. I really don't, because if what you're saying . . . then what you were doing is operating under a system which you had absolutely no legislative authority. And you are justifying that, apparently — that you did do that. And that's what I raised as our objection — that you have contempt, apparently, for the House; that you don't in fact have the legislative authority which you are trying to put into place now, and we didn't have an opportunity to debate it at that time, and we can't go back to those estimates if in fact you had it in the '82-83 to discuss and examine each minister on the example like you gave on page 30. You have denied us that opportunity.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — To say that we've denied you that opportunity, you passed 10 of them. The House passed 10 of the same type of legislation, exactly the same type of thing. You are trying to make a case of something that doesn't exist. You're concerned about the accounting process. The same accounting process was in the proposals, in the bills that went through this legislature — 10 of them. You had all the questions and you asked questions about it as I understand. I wasn't here. You asked questions about

it through the process. You went through the process . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you didn't get any answers so why did you pass it through and allow it to go through? Why did you let it go through? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you say you didn't want to go it through. Now you say: why do you do it, why do you do the process? You could ask the same reason: why do you put the *Estimates* out this year shown under the new forms of the departments that were proposed to bring in? Now if you can collectively say, 'No you can't have those reorganizations,' then I suppose the blue book is going to be wrong too. We try to do it in that way to accommodate everyone so it had the most meaning as to what we're proposing to do . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sure we're going to do that at the same time. All right. I simply . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. If the member has comments to make on this would he make them from his feet so that his comments go into *Hansard*.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I indicated, Mr. Chairman, that these were of course before the House. They died. We simply want to bring them back in. They didn't get passed. I wish they had've got passed last session. They didn't. And now we have to bring them in and we want to bring them in so that we have a standard accounting process across government. And that's the reason for it. I know the opposition will make a point out of the retroactivity. It wasn't passed. They're being introduced back in again under exactly the same form that they found themselves in before. The thing that strikes me as strange is that it's exactly the same proposal put forth by the previous government. We're simply proceeding on with that.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Minister, actually your explanation leaves something to be desired, because you haven't answered, first, the question; and, secondly, you have demonstrated here the incompetence of your government. You indeed did pass a number of bills to change the system from advance accounts to revolving accounts. He said, 'Oh, gosh! We had these on, but we didn't get them passed.' I want to tell you that we were prepared to come back in early January to do the business of the House — we were . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Ready, willing and able to be here.

And I can see no problem with you proceeding with those in which you had passed, and there are some bills passed in this nature, and we oppose them and oppose them strenuously. And I want to say that now what you're saying, 'Oh, but we didn't get around to doing some others, so we want to make it retroactive.' And I want to say that that is not acceptable. And I want to know why you have to go back to 1982. I don't understand why you have to go back to '82 — '83-84 I can understand. If you have the bill coming forward and if you put them into the budget under those subvotes, I can understand that. But I cannot understand what you are saying when you have to go back to 1982.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Let's go back and put aside the retroactivity for a minute, for the hon. member from Quill Lakes. Let's put aside the retroactivity question for a minute.

Now you asked me two questions. One being whether or not the auditor . . . You were very concerned because the auditor didn't have the right to audit. I explained that to you, and I take it to your satisfaction, that the auditor now does have the right to audit. You're not satisfied? Now, are you satisfied now that you have the right to ask questions? Did you see it set out in the estimates as to how much is proposed to go into the revolving accounts? Are you satisfied that now it is being displayed where it never was before and now gives the opposition the opportunity to question with regards to that?

I mean . . . Okay, those are two questions I asked you. I assume from your response to them that you agreed then that we're not trying to do something wily behind your back on this particular thing, and that . . . What other questions did you have with regard to the specifics of the bill that was a big concern for you?

**Mr. Koskie:** — All right. I want to point out to the minister, you referred me to items 17 under Education — okay? And item 17 says this: 'To provide for a net expenditure (recovery) of (from) the Saskatchewan Book Bureau Revolving Fund (Statutory).' And there's an amount. I go over to what was provided to us in your 1983 budget, and I read item 16, and it says: 'To provide for a net advance (recovery) to (from) the Saskatchewan Book Bureau Advance Account (Statutory)' — not 'Revolving Fund.' In the new budget you have it as a revolving fund; in this budget here you have it indeed as an advance account (statutory). Now, what I'm asking you is: for what reason . . . Your reason doesn't stand up for why you have to make it retroactive. Can you explain that to us?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — What I take it is that you're seizing on the terminology in the blue book of November, and the blue book of this year.

**Mr. Koskie:** — In place before, Mr. Minister, was indeed an advance account which we were aware of, and can only be changed by amendment that you're proposing to introduce. Specifically in here, it says advance account statutory. That is operating under the previous system, and that's what is in there. Now what you're saying is to make it retroactive, and really we weren't carrying on with an advance account statutory. We must have been carrying on disguised as a revolving fund, because if you look at the two items, Mr. Minister, you can't deny the fact that one was a statutory advance account, the other is a revolving fund.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I am simply advised that it's a terminology situation where the blue book started to reflect . . . It was in a November, 1982, blue book was the first time you would show a revolving account, or an advance account numbers. The first time it was shown and demonstrated in the *Estimates*, first time in history, okay? It is simply a terminology difference, whether the terminology used there or the terminology used now is any different. It's the same thing that we're demonstrating. You had the right to ask, and probably did ask questions with regard to that revolving account, I'm sure, when you went through the *Estimates* last time. Well, what do you mean you didn't . . . It was there. I'm sure you ask each question as you go through the *Estimates*.

Let's go to page 47, for example, of the new *Estimates*. Let's go to page 47 to the member from Pelly. Page 47, vote no. 20. It's a revolving account in the Department of Highways. Okay, and there was also, I would assume, reflected in the November budget . . . You might have had a different . . . advance account name on it rather than revolving fund, but it was there, and I would assume that the members went through the *Estimates* and asked questions on each of the votes and items. And you voted on each of the votes and items, and they were set out there. For the first time ever they were set out.

**Mr. Koskie:** — But I still want to ask the minister, will you explain then just one more time as clearly as you can and then maybe we can get on, is why you need retroactivity, because, in fact, you indicate that you're using an advance account in, for instance, with respect to education? Why do you need to go retroactive now?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The two reasons as to why we have the retroactivity in it is, number one, the previous minister made a commitment to the Provincial Auditor that this legislation would come in. That's number one. Number two, over half of them have already been through and, in the accounting world, you have to have that consistency, you should have the consistency with regards to the way you have an accounting process. When you bring in an accounting process you want a consistent accounting process across government. That's the reasons we're asking for the retroactivity.

**Mr. Koskie:** — But, Mr. Minister, what you're telling us is that you have bypassed this legislature and have been operating a system which you didn't introduce to this legislature, apparently to satisfy a commitment to the Auditor. And I want to say that we take strenuous objections to you in fact giving us that form of a reason. You are answerable here to this legislature and you have no entitlement to put into place a new system until this legislature, in fact, passes this here legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Let's not get carried away with the new system. It's an accounting process, remember. Okay, it's an accounting process. You certainly have the right to ask me any questions with regards to those particular accounts. I'll find them for you, if you want. From that point of view, I was certain it was simply a process that happened that we didn't get the bills through. We didn't get the bills through; now we're asking for the retroactivity.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Minister, I find it interesting that a commitment made by a previous minister and a previous government would have that much of a binding effect on you. There were commitments made in terms of shelter allowance for senior citizens; there were any number of commitments made by a previous government that you chose not to go ahead with.

The point that we're making is that retroactivity in this case, when the budget has been passed, is done. We can no longer ask questions on any of these five areas, including education, but we're simply not accepting that you need retroactivity, nor are we going to be allowing it through easily. Because in having retroactivity which goes back more than a year, very simply, what you're doing is trying to avoid a certain amount of scrutiny of money being spent, by this Assembly, by the opposition, and you're trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the taxpayers by using some jiggery-pokery in your accounting system that we're not willing to accept. And on these five bills we're not willing to accept retroactivity back to April 1st of 1982.

You simply cannot stand in this House and say that it's the same as what we're doing with changing the names of departments now in dealing with estimates. We're dealing with both of them at the same time, knowing full well what is happening, and both are being discussed. The bills are on the order paper now, as of today — finally — where you are saying that you're bringing in change of departments, and we know that in the estimates.

Last year it's quite different. We weren't aware that these bills were going to be passed, because very simply they weren't passed. You didn't take the time to come back into session prior to the complete passage of the budget last year, to make sure that they were done. And for you to come here now and say that it's any responsibility of the opposition or that these bills should have been passed that weren't, and now I want permission to do it, simply isn't acceptable to the opposition, nor should it be to the people of the province. Because what you are attempting to do is ruin the role of the

Legislative Assembly in scrutinizing the moneys that are spent by your government, and that isn't acceptable.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Just a minute. Let's follow the logic now, of the hon. member. Let's follow the logic of the hon. member. He is saying, 'Because we didn't know these bills were before the House . . . ' These bills were, in fact, before the House when you were going through your estimates last fall.

**An Hon. Member:** — You got to pass them before . . . (inaudible) . . .

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — They were before . . . No, but that's your argument. Now your argument is that he's saying, 'Hey, I didn't know these bills were before the House so how could I ask questions with regard to the estimates?' . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well now you're saying. 'Well, I didn't assume they were passed.' And you say that that is different from what we're doing now. That's different from what we're doing now if we don't pass the reorganization legislation. Clearly the legislation is going to be before the House. If estimates come up, it's going to be in conjunction with that reorganization. Now, it would be fine if you had've said, 'Hey, just a minute, we never saw these bills last fall, and we didn't know that that was happening or taking place.'

Those bills were before the House, so don't come with your argument saying, 'Hey, somehow you tricked me because I didn't know these bills were before the House. 'The bills were before the House, Mr. Chairman, the bills were before the House — number one. It was demonstrated and set out in the estimates — number two — for the first time ever. To say that that somehow misleads you so that we couldn't ask and have grievance before supply, it seems to me it was clearer then than it ever was before in the past. And I dare say that questions were asked with regard to that; I have to go back through each of the estimates to find that out. But your argument with regard to the fact that you didn't know this was being advanced — they were clearly there and you were quite aware of them.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Following your logic, Mr. Minister of Finance, what you're saying is that this House is given notice, and you as a government don't proceed to pass them and let them die, then that is sufficient, sufficient authority for you to proceed because you have given us notice, as if they had passed. Because that is exactly what you are doing. How else do you interpret your actions and your response?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Follow the logic the other way as to what you're saying. We put it forward in advance before you in the estimates of last year, based on these revolving things — on the revolving fund. Now, we put it based on that, Mr. Chairman. Their questions were therefore premised on the fact that that's how it was demonstrated in last fall's blue book. The legislation was before the House. Now it would seem to me that if we were going to mislead them by simply then not proceeding with the legislation, where we would have been misleading them is in fact putting it in the blue book, saying we're going to do it one way, and then in fact end up doing it the other way. We've been consistent, and that's why the retroactivity is needed, to make it consistent with the way it was addressed in the estimates last fall.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, you brought up the Department of Highways just a few minutes ago, regarding the revolving fund. We dealt with our 1982-83 book, the fall book that you put out dealing with the 1982 estimates. And in item 22, it is to provide for a net advance recovery from the Highways advance account statutory. The 1983-

'84 deals with your revolving fund. So when we're asking questions on your last year's budget, it was not with the revolving fund; it was on the statutory requirements or money put forward from the advance account. Now, we are dealing with a revolving fund. That's in that '82-83; we have dealt with '82 or '83-84; we dealt with '82; that should no longer require a revolving fund. There should be no reason for retroactive legislation put in to the beginning of 1982. '83 — we understand it, but why '82?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . All I'm saying is it's the terminology. Okay, it was there. You clearly went through, I am sure, the hon. member from Pelly, and did investigative questioning to the Minister of Highways with regard to those advance accounts and what they in fact were. They were passed after you did your estimates. Now, if the Minister of Highways had not been able to put that through, or did not get that legislation through, and he advanced it to you, he was doing it in such a way he would have been misleading you not to have gotten it through. He would have been in fact misleading you, so when you got up and asked him what process are you using, and what's this revolving fund (and I'm sure you did because you leave no stones unturned in your question of him) . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Penetrating questions.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The answers were given to you on the premise, and the answers were given on all other departments on that premise as well, based on that premise. That was the way the answers were given to you. Okay? So that's the reason for and the consistency of doing it this way.

**Mr. Koskie:** — In your 1982 you indicated it as advance accounts. Will you agree that that was the system that had been used, and which members opposite and members of government should have been familiar with the accountability in the advance accounts? Because it had been in place for a number of years, and as a consequence, by indicating that it's an advance account, as you did in '82, and not revolving account, obviously we could take it as assumed that the accountability will be done exactly the same way as before, and obviously we could in fact be satisfied and forego any questions because it was marked as an advance account. But now we find out after the fact, that that wasn't an advance account. That was terminology. Obviously there are changes in your system, and I want to say that that is nothing but deception, to indicate that it is an advance account when in fact you were operating under revolving account. And that is our concern.

How can you deny the fact that if it's advance accounts, that the members here would not be familiar with indeed the method of checks and balances because it was in operation for years? Here now you're saying it's something else. Why would we have to ask a question on an advance account when we know the checks and balances on it? But you say, 'Oh, but we got one by you. We didn't have advance accounts. We really had revolving, and see, you didn't ask your question so you're out of luck now.'

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I'll tell you what I'll undertake to do for you, if you like, on the retroactivity part. If we can make it retroactive from March 31st, '83, back to April 1st, '82, we'll call it the advance accounts and not the revolving account. Would that satisfy you?

**An Hon. Member:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — That was your concern. You were seizing on the terminology of advance account versus the terminology of revolving accounts.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, you are introducing a bill to change the advance account to revolving funds. That is what you're asking. You're asking us to approve that. All we are saying is: why do you want to make it retroactive? We have dealt with the '82 estimates under the advance account . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — On the old system apparently.

**Mr. Lusney:** — . . . Under the advance account designation, that's true. It's in the books. That is the way we took it to be, under the advance account. For '83-84 you are suggesting that you are going to a revolving fund system, accounting system, which is fine. That would mean that your legislation that you are proposing now should read, 'Effective April 1 of 1983,' not '82.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — What the member from Pelly is saying . . . We'll make a couple of assumptions. Assumption number one: you went through all of your estimates and asked on each vote on Department of Highways. On Department of Highways, right? You saw the advance account ; the advance account legislation at that time was before the House. The advance account with regard to Highways was passed in the House last year, right?

**An Hon. Member:** — No.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — No. But okay, let me ask you the question: is that correct? Did you understand, Department of Highways, that it would be a now revolving account in a new accounting process with regard to accounts? Given the fact it was demonstrated in the book, and given the fact that there was legislation before the House, and given the fact that legislation was passed in the last session, were you misled with regard to what that meant? I asked that question. Last year.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, that legislation was passed, a few of the bills were passed last fall regarding the revolving fund. However, when we go into the estimates we deal with what's before us. What is before us is the advance account, a statutory provision through the advance account and we deal accordingly. We ask questions accordingly.

In this new one we understand that we are going to have to change our line of questioning, because it is going to be a revolving fund. We are going to have to look at where the money is moving back and forth. When it's a statutory allotment then we know that that money was put in there from the advance account, and that's what was in the Department of Highways, and we question on where it was spent. If it's not there, it's gone.

Here, in your new one, you're going to have money that you could be moving back and forth. We're going to have to find out where that money went. This one is revolving in '83-84; the other one was not revolving in '82.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — But the hon. Member, the bill that was passed last fall in the Department of Highways advance account made it retroactive to April 1st, 1982. That was before the House when you were asking you questions on Highways estimates. For the first time in the history of estimates it was demonstrated in the blue book as to



what that was going to be. Now that was what it was going to be.

Now the legislation that you passed, that we passed as an Assembly, made it retroactive back to April 1st, 1982, so clearly your questions, because you are on top of your department, like nobody else is, your questions dealt with that. And I'm sure you understood that. And if it was the first time it was shown in the blue book, I'm sure it would twig to you — and I can't remember what happened in Highway estimates, but I'm sure it would twig to you, here's a new subvote, and what is this? And here's some legislation before the House. So you're saying that you were confused, and it was different. It was in fact there.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, it was not a new subvote. In the Highways *Estimates*. '83, which dealt with the year of '82, said that on item 22:

To provide for a net advance (recovery) to (or from) the Highways advance account (statutory)

It was not a revolving fund. It may be terminology, as you refer to, but it does state that it was the advance account that was being used in the preparation of the estimates for 1982, in this blue book, '83-84 states quite clearly that it is now going to be a revolving fund — item 20.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — But if you go back, to the hon. member, if you go back to previous blue books before the November blue book . . . Okay, if you go back before that, it was not — the revolving fund, or the advance account, call it what you like — it was never a budgetary item. All right? Never a budgetary item before November. Okay. Now isn't that the function of grievance before supply: that you want to have those as budgetary items. That is the concern of the Provincial Auditor, that they were being done without the approval of the legislature, that they weren't budgetary in nature. That was the purpose of it, so that's why I have trouble with the hon. member. You're seizing on names but you're not seizing on the principle of it.

**Mr. Koskie:** — What you're saying, Mr. Minister, is that it was incorporated as a budgetary item, but clearly what you did in the *Estimates* was to put it in as a budgetary item under the advance accounts, and I want to say that if you put it in under that way you are entitled only to operate under that way, if you do not in fact have the legislation. And you did not have legislation in respect to The Education Act. And so you're circumventing this here legislature.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, I'm sure I haven't invented retroactive legislation, and to simply name a few I go back to: The Oil Well Income Tax Act of '80-81 session, The Mineral Taxation Amendment Act of 1979, The Succession Duty Act 1972, The Vehicles Act Amendment Act 1981 — all of them made retroactive not by this government but when you folks were in government. Okay. Now you are hung up surely on the principle of retroactivity, as the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg is concerned about the whole thing but he doesn't even understand what we're proposing to do here.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister is attempting to make the House believe that the members on this side don't understand what he is trying to do. The problem simply is that we do understand what you are attempting to do, and we don't like it. The fact that you're attempting to bring in legislation which would affect last year's budget, the estimates that have been passed by this Assembly . . . You are

attempting to bring in legislation which would legitimize the way that you did your books last year. That's the point.

Earlier you said that because the five bills were on the books that we should assume that that's the way you were going to be operating. Well, you also had other bills on the books that dealt with expanding the liquor outlets in the province. I hope that the minister, on the same assumption, hasn't gone out and opened up 50 or 100 more liquor outlets, saying, 'It was on the books, so certainly you knew we were going to do it and we've done it. What do you guys want to know about?' I'll tell you that we are interested in what you're doing without legislation, and that's the point that we're making today. And we intend to spend a fair bit of time making the point that making legislation retroactive to cover your tracks is not acceptable. Why is it that you're attempting to bring these five bills in now when you weren't interested in getting them passed prior to prorogation, which we did only a few months ago? Why weren't we dealing with them at that time?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I've explained why we want retroactivity. I made reference to The Vehicles Act Amendment Act of 1981, became retroactive to the 1950's, which was brought in by your government — not our government — retroactive to over 30 years. Don't tell me about being retroactive legislation. I don't care for retroactive legislation. You asked me why I was doing it. I explained (a) and (b) as to why I'm doing it. Now you can ask me a thousand times, you're going to get the same answer.

**Mr. Engel:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, earlier I was asking about moving this into public accounts, and you suggested that maybe I need the auditor to help me ask some questions, and to ask them for me. That's the words you used.

Okay, now maybe my neighbour from Milestone thinks that's a big joke. And I suppose he does because I don't suppose you ever sat in the public accounts committee, or did you? Because the thing is this: in public accounts we don't have the expertise to check out anything in any department. We look at managerial letters that were sent out to them. We look at the answers they send back and what changes they made into accounting procedures, or into billing procedures, or into opening of mail procedures or whatever.

Now, somewhere along the line you want us to agree to retroactivity that goes back a whole year, and the only reason you'd want that is so that you could then hold it under Mr. Lutz's nose and say to him, 'Look here, we've got the legislation that we could do the accounting like this, and you can't write these departments managerial letters saying that you should have done it like this, or you should have kept records like that, and we've taken action.' Give me one other reason why you'd want it retroactive.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Because it was requested by Mr. Lutz, the Provincial Auditor.

**Mr. Engel:** — Well, if it was requested by Mr. Lutz, the Provincial Auditor, he must have had a reason to request it, and what was his reason then? Because you told me you'd answer the questions we'd have. In public accounts he would tell me why he asked that question and why he requested it.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I will tell you why he requested it: so it would be a budgetary item, so that when it came in, instead of having an account that was not before the legislature, it would be in so it would be before the legislature, so there could be grievance before supply. And that's the purpose of the committee of finance; that is the

reason for it.

That is the reason as to why the auditor wanted this legislation, why we accommodated him, and why the previous government was going to accommodate him as well — to make the legislature stronger, to make it so they could ask questions about expenditures of government, rather than having advance accounts that could be off spending money without putting it to the legislature as to what they were doing and, in effect, without the appropriation of the legislature as most people understand it.

**Mr. Engel:** — You said you want this legislation . . . Let's take it very simple. You said you want this legislation retroactive so that you could list it in *Public Accounts* as a budgetary item and then the legislature could ask questions on it. That's what you told me — those three steps. Mr. Lutz requested it, number one; then you would have the retroactive legislation and it would appear in our public accounts book; and then we could ask questions on it. So, if this legislation is retroactive, in Bill 4, give me one example of an agricultural item that will be listed in a public accounts book that will not be listed if this legislation is not retroactive — one item.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — You didn't understand what I said with regard to the Provincial Auditor. He wanted it so it would be listed in the *Estimates*, so you could have questions on what the money was going to be used for, etc. Okay? It would also reflect into the *Public Accounts*, as an advance account did, as you were fully aware. This would be exactly the same way. And it will now also be reflected into the *Estimates*.

It was never that way before. By putting it into the *Estimates*, it now can be questioned on grievance before supply in the committee of finance. That was not the case before. That was the prime reason as to why the auditor felt that the legislation should be changed to accommodate it accordingly — nothing to do simply with public accounts. But it was clear to the members of the legislature that it was disclosed as to what was going to be done with these advance accounts or revolving accounts or whatever you like.

**Mr. Engel:** — The minister is arguing the need for retroactivity — and I imagine you can get some pretty good information, because when we dealt with the original bills in your absence, the minister of industry and commerce was having a certain amount of problems. It made this very confusing. So if the Minister of Finance thinks today we are confused, you'd better talk to your brilliant minister and he'll make a dozen back to seven.

You suggested that making it retroactive would put it back into estimates. What will change in our '82 estimates because you're making this retroactive? Are you going to print another set of estimates? We've covered those; they're past; they're done; they're gone. Why would you need it retroactive for the estimates' sake?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I tried to explain to the member when he set up to start his questioning, to explain what an advance account was, as opposed to a budgetary expenditure. Perhaps I should try that one on him. If, let's say that, if you buy an . . . If the government expends money, let's say, to build the T.C. Douglas Building, to build the T.C. Douglas Building . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order.

**Mr. Engel:** — I asked a question and he's trying to answer something different and confuse the issue, I asked him a specific question and I want an answer to that specific question. Are you going to change the '82 estimate?

**Mr. Chairman:** — Will the minister answer the question?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I was simply trying to explain to him what an advance account was. He clearly didn't know. So I just simply tried to explain that to him, number one. Number two, the estimates for 1982-83 reflect the advance accounts or the revolving account, as proposed in this legislation. The estimates of that year do that.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Just in respect to the 1983 *Estimates* . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it's called 1983. Yes. Right. Now, you see, in education on item 16, you have to provide for a net advance recovery to/from the Saskatchewan Book Bureau advance account statutory. Now, are you saying that it would be impossible to simply put as a budgetary item what you have indicated here, that is, indicated as a budgetary item an advance account. Are you saying it was impossible to in fact designate as a budgetary item (do you follow me?), advance accounts? In other words, using the old advance accounts, could you in fact put in as a budgetary expense, as you did in the *Estimates* here, advance accounts? Was it possible to do that?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Under the old system of advance accounts, you could not show it because it was not a budgetary expenditure, it was not a budgetary item, and therefore it could not be shown in the *Estimates*.

**Mr. Koskie:** — What I am asking you then as a follow-up: — how else can you treat this, other than an improper designation which in fact is a deception to the budgetary process? I mean, what you have done is clearly and unequivocally designated as an advance account. What are we to read into that? I could read it no other way, Mr. Minister, other than it's advance account that has been put into a budgetary item. How else could you read that? Education had passed no bill changing it to revolving funds. How else, conceivably, could the opposition know that you were in fact changing the terminology in your mind but not telling the legislature? How could we act on that responsibly?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Because when we were going through those estimates, the bill was also before the House. For the first time they were demonstrated and displayed in the estimates book. Talk about deceptions. It seems to me that you're trying to clarify and to set out clearly what you intend to do, and that was that change of accounting policy. That's clearly what we did. There was no deception in any way, shape or form.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Minister, you have designated here as an advance account . . . You said it's impossible to designate as a budgetary item an advance account. And what you have done then is to put into this here estimate of Education an item which in fact you had no entitlement to do, because you, in your own words, said you are unable to put advance accounts into a budgetary item.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Yes, but what you're saying is that what this . . . this reflects the new accounting system as to how you deal with advance accounts. It does. I'm simply telling you that it does. And you know, as a member of the treasury benches, that you would not have an advance account as a budgetary item. You sat on the treasury

benches for what? Four years? So you knew that the advance account . . . surely you guys knew that the advance account never would reflect into the estimates and so you would have to assume, I mean even the simplest would assume, that there's a new process in place, especially when there's a bill setting out what it was.

**Mr. Koskie:** — You have confirmed what I have been trying to get you to say: that your system of designation left to the members of the opposition the necessity of making assumptions. And I want to say that that is unsatisfactory, because you have no right to claim, nor should we be required to make assumptions when we receive estimates. And now, not only that, what you have done is to say that we have to make another assumption: that if you have legislation and you give notice of that legislation, that we in fact have to assume that you have acted on the legislation before it's passed. Those are two items that you have indicated. Can you clarify if that assessment is correct?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — What you're telling me is this. If we go to the '83-84 estimate book, we've got a series of new reorganizations. These estimates and these reorganizations in this blue book this year makes the assumption that that particular legislation will be passed by the House. Okay? Now, if those don't in fact get passed through the House, then I assume that yes, we have misled you, that we are going to set this up and we don't.

My answer to that is that, you know, how do you do it any other way? We could have made the book twice as thick, put in twice as many estimates to gear it, and make the assumption that it would come into place July 1st. And that's what we're trying to do to make it more open, to make it easier for you to understand what we're going to do and to make it easier for you to ask questions as to how we're spending money.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I don't want to have this drag on, Mr. Minister, but initially you said the desire for changing this was to meet a commitment to the Provincial Auditor. Now you're saying you did it out of the graciousness, so that you wouldn't have to double the thickness of the volume of paper that you would present to us.

You know, obviously what you have done here, Mr. Minister, is to operate under a system which we had no right to believe was in operation. That's the crux of the whole issue. That's exactly what you have done. You have incorporated a provision in the estimates which in fact you did not have the legislative authority and which, no way, should the opposition assume that you're operating under it. There can be no other explanation that that in fact is what you're doing Is that not correct?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — No, it's not correct, and when you went through your estimates you simply asked the questions, I am sure. Not that I was here for all of them, but each vote I am sure you went through and asked those questions, and when you asked a question: 'Hey, what is this particular subvote here with regard to this advance account?' you were given a full explanation by the appropriate minister as to what it was, and here's how it's being done. So there is no misleading of nothing. Now you're trying to make a whole lot out of an accounting change, and I suppose if you want to score the political points that you think you're scoring, then keep her up and we'll go as long as you want.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, I don't think we're here trying to score any political points. We're just trying to get something clarified. I checked some of the bills that we passed last fall regarding the revolving fund. There were four of them. But when you look in the book, Education wasn't one of them, yet you used the revolving fund using the

terminology of the advance account. This is what you used, using the advance account terminology in Education to get through the estimates last year, making the members think, I'm sure, that they were a standard type of advance account estimate that we were dealing with. However, it really wasn't, so you were using the advance account in your '82 estimates, when you really had no legislative power to do that. You had it for four departments. If you passed them for the rest of the departments this year, we accept that, but to say that you were able to use that accounting system within the departments that weren't passed last year for 1982, and now saying that somehow we should have assumed that when we took you on your word to say you passed four of them. We accept the four; we don't argue that. But there are a few of them here that weren't passed last fall, and yet you used a revolving fund on some of them, and used an ordinary system of accounting on others. Why did you use the revolving fund, sir, on Education, and didn't use it, say, on Urban Affairs? Why use it on some, and not on the others?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — We used the revolving fund accounting system on all of them.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman, it becomes more and more unclear whether we are dealing with a government that can't get their legislative program together, or one that is just simply attempting to deceive the opposition and the people of the province.

The reason that we're dealing with these five bills now, rather than during the last session, is because this government doesn't come forward with their legislative program so they can be dealt with. That's why we're dealing with it now. Here we are, day 18 of the session, and we haven't got one piece of legislation on the books that would indicate what this government attempts to do, or want to do, in terms of legislation.

I predict that by the time the session rolls around to the last week, we will have a whole raft of bills similar to this that you're attempting to ram through, and try to get through without having an honest debate in this Assembly, so that the people of the province and the press can have a critical look at them. Why else have you got to day 18 of this session without having one piece of legislation which would tell the people of the province what you intend to do, let's say with the check-off program in Agriculture, or with your Labour legislation, or with the amendments to The Highway Act, and on, and on? We know you're going to . . . (inaudible) . . . legislation here.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. The question before the Assembly is Bill No. 1. Will you ask questions on that please?

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman, what I'm attempting to do is the reason that we're dealing with these bills that have been on the order paper in the last session, and we're now dealing with them now is because the government's in action in bringing bills forward — a complete mismanagement of running the Assembly. And I'm telling you that that's the reason we're dealing with these bills now and didn't deal with them in the last session. That's why they died on the order paper; that's why we're in the predicament we're in now.

So I'd let you know that we're going to get into the same problem with bills. And, in dealing with Bill 1 here today, I'm trying to avoid the problem by indicating to the government to get your bills on the order paper so we can deal with them in legitimate time so we don't have to go through the process of having retroactivity back to over a

year.

And on Bill 1, we in the opposition are making a case that we cannot operate an Assembly by dealing with bills retroactively that should have been dealt with in the last session. And I want to ask the minister: does he expect that this is the way that we are going to continue to deal with bills, that the people of the province will be allowed to . . . Or the people of the province will have to bear the brunt of having bills brought up on the order paper, allowed to die, but working as if under the legislation as if the legislation had been passed by the Assembly. Is that what you're asking us to believe and asking us to accept here?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, obviously the legislation will come before the House. When it comes before the House, the members opposite will have all their opportunities to study it, to ask questions on it, and away they go. Now, you want to lecture me about how this government functions. I suppose I could head into a diatribe and lecture you folks about what type of an opposition you are, but I will refrain from doing that in the sense of co-operation. But don't lecture me about the way we are performing without looking inward at yourselves.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, if I heard you correctly a few minutes ago, you said that all the estimates in your '82-83 book were using the revolving fund. Did I hear that correctly?

**An Hon. Member:** — Well, haven't you been listening for the last hour?

**Mr. Lusney:** — Okay, Mr. Minister, if I heard you correctly a few minutes ago, you said that all of your departments use the revolving fund in your '82 estimate book. I'll go to rural affairs where the total amount voted — ordinary expenditure to be voted, total for rural affairs — had a figure, not using the advance account — the terminology that you're talking about — nor the revolving fund terminology. You sued the regular system of accounting and estimates in that one vote for rural affairs. You didn't do that for Education. You decided in Education to use the revolving fund, using the terminology of the advance account, to and from. Why don't we simplify this argument that we're in right now and just say that you have made some errors in what you put in your '83 estimate, or '82 estimate, which we have already gone through, and use the bill that you're introducing now regarding your revolving fund, date them as April 1, '83, would solve all the problems that are there. And then we would know what we're dealing with in your '83-84 estimates.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I would simply ask the member from Pelly to consult with his colleagues that were formerly in the treasury benches on the other side. They will be the first to advise him that there never has been and there never was an advance account in the Department of Rural Affairs. Therefore, how could we show an advance account in the Department of Rural Affairs or a revolving account or anything else?

**Mr. Shillington:** — I want to return, Mr. Minister, to the general subject of the legislation. I would appreciate it if the minister of — and it does relate to the bills, Mr. Chairman. I will relate it to the bills. I would appreciate it if the minister would save me the tired, paternalistic-sounding lecture about what kind of an opposition we are. We are doing the best we can in this opposition, under what is admittedly adverse conditions. All we are asking is that the government do the same, and we suggest you are not doing the best you can to make this Assembly function smoothly.

Mr. Minister, I have been involved in this Assembly and in the legislation process of this

Assembly since the '60s. I worked with the caucus in the '60s. I worked as an executive assistant to the deputy premier in the early '70s. I've been a member since 1975, and this is unprecedented, to be in — what is it? — the 18th day . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — The 18th day.

**Mr. Shillington:** — . . . the 18th day, and have five bills on the order paper, all of which we have known about for some considerable period of time. This is just unprecedented, to be this far into the session without having the bills. It is discourteous, and it either smacks of disorganization . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . This is not the question period. I know the member from Saskatoon is terribly inexperienced, but this is not the question period and I am not obliged at any point in time to get around to asking the minister a question. I can lecture him if I want, so long as it's relevant.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, that this is either discourteous, or you are just terribly disorganized. You are either discourteous because you are intentionally withholding the bills, or you are monstrously disorganized. There may be bills that you haven't got ready, and I refer to the co-operative act, that that bill may not be ready. But the liquor act is. It was here last year. You had it ready.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order! We're not discussing the liquor act. We are discussing Bill No. 1.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I will leave the subject. I will accept the Chairman's ruling; I'm going to leave the subject, but I'm going to say to you, Mr. Minister, that what you are doing with these bills is indicative of the way you run this. You're turning it into a three-ring circus. You are either disorganized or you are discourteous, and I would ask you to tell this opposition which one of those two it is.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Chairman, I've only been in this legislature four years. This is my fifth. I recall back in the days when I was in opposition, we would pass, the Assembly would pass something like 100, 120 bills. Of those, most of those bills came in very close to the end of the session, very close to the end of the session, Mr. Speaker, very close to the end of the session.

What I can also advise the Assembly is that we will undertake to ensure, if we have to stay here till August or September, that you have all the time that you will need in which September, that you have all the time that you will need in which to study the various legislation to get your particular views on the legislation. We will undertake not to jam it through on 'em, and they can have all the time in the world they want to do it.

And really, that's what the argument is, I'm sure, is that do we have enough advance notice to be knowledgeable on the bill?

Clause 1 agreed to.

## **Clause 2**

**Mr. Shillington:** — I recognize that when we discussed the matter in public accounts yesterday, you did not have a lot of warning on the subject. I wasn't, quite frankly, thinking of it when we started the debate. And I think it is now too late to consider that, having gone through the committee of the whole; I don't know what



purpose it would serve to go through the public accounts committee.

I do want the Minister of Finance to keep the thought in mind that legislation, which is primarily financial and accounting in nature, should be referred to that committee. And I know of one other piece of legislation which is coming — and that is the Provincial Auditor's act. I'd ask the Minister of Finance to seriously consider referring legislation of this sort to the public accounts committee. I say that, and I trust I'm going to be given some liberty to stray a bit, but I want to make the point to the Minister of Finance that I'm not doing it in a partisan fashion.

I'm making a sincere suggestion that legislation of this sort, which is highly technical in nature, not likely to cause any kind of any issue . . . Quite frankly, the esteemed members of the press gallery have a problem with this legislation, much less our constituents. Legislation which is this technical and which is of an accounting nature should, I suggest, be sent to public accounts. And I'd ask you to consider that in the future. I will admit you didn't get much time yesterday to consider it, and reacted in the fashion which perhaps anyone would have.

But I'd ask you to seriously consider that as a possibility in the future. I really believe the public accounts committee would be a better forum to deal with this kind of legislation than this Assembly.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, I will respond to that in two ways. I don't think you were in the House when I outlined that the recommendation for this legislation found itself . . . emanated from the public accounts committee, emanated from the *Report of the Provincial Auditor*, the year 1980-81. I went back to the public accounts committee of 1978 — the recommendation — and as a result it went from that. And reading from the report, and I don't think you were in, I have been advised this was a 1980-81 *Report of the Provincial Auditor*:

I have been advised by the Minister of Finance that the decision has been taken to introduce in the 1982-83 fiscal year the budgetary and other measures necessary to discontinue the practice of charging working capital advance account expenditures to budgetary appropriations in subsequent years.

And that's what we're talking about with this legislation. So I mean it's something that did come out of the public accounts; it was good work of the public accounts.

With regards to the proposal for the Provincial Auditor's report, certainly I would take under advisement your suggestion that the public accounts have an opportunity to read that legislation as it . . . And sit on that legislation (if you like) either prior to its introduction or referred to it. And I'm not necessarily against that type of proposal.

I recall, in opposition, making that request many, many, many times, and I don't think there was ever a piece of legislation referred to a committee, in my memory, in this particular legislature. But, you know, perhaps that's something that we could change. But certainly that request was made very often when I was in opposition, sitting in the same seat that you're sitting in now.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Well, I just say it, and then I'm going to leave the subject.

The need for the change in the system of advance accounts, that suggestion did

emanate from the public accounts committee. I would not be prepared to admit that the precise form that these bills took was approved by the public accounts committee. I don't think it was; I don't think it was. And that would I think, had we had more time to consider the matter, have been a good reason to refer them to public accounts where the atmosphere is, by and large, non-partisan, with some exceptions — by and large, non-partisan, where we have the expertise we need to deal with such difficult subjects. So I leave the subject, except to ask you to consider it with respect to this kind of legislation in the future.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I would only like to make the final point to the member from Regina Centre, who is also the chairman of the public accounts committee, to understand what this bill does. And this bill does allow the legislature now, under committee of finance, to in fact ask questions and grievance before supply, but they never had that opportunity before. And that's the reason for the legislation: to get back to the fundamentals of the reason for the legislation. It only found itself in the light of day in public accounts after the fact. Now it finds itself in the light of day prior to the passing of the estimates. And I think that is a positive step with regard to the way we deal with the spending of government money.

**Mr. Lusney:** — Mr. Minister, a few minutes ago you were trying to lecture me on what was where and when within the departments. Going back to the March '83 estimate book, prior to your term of government, or getting into government, in Education — the same department — there was no mention of a revolving fund or a statutory advance account fund. It was just voted on by the various expenditures, plain and simple, which all the members were used to dealing with, and you got the final figure that you voted on and that was to allow a total amount for Education under the ordinary expenditure, which we voted on, and that was it.

In your estimate book, you made a change without legislation to accommodate that change. So all I can say, Mr. Minister, is that you used some very deceptive measures and took some action to try and slip in a revolving fund accounting system without the legislation to allow that to be done. Now all you would have to do is agree that this is what you have done. You didn't have the legislation in place; you did it. You had the legislation in place for four departments in which it is quite clear that that is what happened, and you stated as such in those four departments. But in some of them that is not the case. And all we're saying is for those, although you have proceeded to prepare your estimates for '82 under the revolving fund without the legislation, admit that you have done that without the legislation being in place and now pass legislation to cover 1983-84, starting April 1 or '83. And that's it.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, we'll try it one more time for you. If we had not have moved in November budget . . . You're correct in the March '82-83 budget, there is nothing shown. The reason it wasn't shown is because it was not then seen as budgetary. In other words, you did it without the legislative approval. Okay? You didn't need the approval. When we set up this your own advance account, we didn't need the approval. But what we're saying is that, yeah, you should have the approval for that, so you should demonstrate it, so you should see it. Now obviously the reason we're asking for it retroactive is because the bill didn't get through last session, and we're trying to but it through now. I've said that right from the start. That's the reason for it.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I just have one further question, Mr. Minister. You have indicated earlier that in fact an advance account statutory, as designated in your '83, could not in

fact be a budgetary item. That's what you said.

Then, assuming that what you say is right, and the opposition assuming the same thing, then you come to the situation of, why deal with it, because you can't put it in as a statutory as you have designated it? So why deal with it, because in fact, as you said, you can't put it in as a statutory item. Therefore it is superfluous; it has no meaning.

We knew in fact in Education there was no legislation passed. We could not be expected to assume that you were going on a different system, with a name that has no relevance to the system which you are adopting.

So what I'm saying is: that there could be nothing less than being totally deceptive, and I think it prevented us from availing the opportunity of in fact examining those in the detail which they will be done, knowing that it's under the new system of revolving accounts. How else could it be interpreted, other than that?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, I'm sure that you go back to when . . . your leader is not here. He was fully aware of the fact (and perhaps some other ones of you were not) that the advance accounts were not set out in the estimate book. The Leader of the Opposition obviously was aware of that fact that it was not set out in the estimate book . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, I make the assumption that he knows that and he did know that. Okay? It was there for the first time in the estimates book. The bill was before the House. Clearly the question of trying to mislead, the question is completely the reverse. It was there in full light of day.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I want to leave this and go on, but obviously what you're saying is totally inaccurate.

First of all you say the opposition should assume, because these five bills were on the order paper and let die by the government, we should assume that you were going ahead and using revolving funds.

Secondly you said, 'I'll assume that the Leader of the Opposition knew full well what was meant by it.' Now I want to say that are we going to operate with this government opposite based on assumptions or on facts? Throughout your dissertation in explaining this irregular action, you have based all your answers on assumptions, and I think that that is highly irregular for the minister to come in here and say, 'I assume the minister of the opposition knows. I assume that when we didn't pass those bills that you knew we were operating on . . . (inaudible) . . .'

I want to say that this is not surely the way in which we can expect the Minister of Finance to continue to act in the future. Can we expect a more regular format?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, perhaps I should apologize. I've always understood the Leader of the Opposition to be an intelligent man, and I believe that. And I perhaps made the assumption that he knew this. I think that's a very safe assumption. I should perhaps apologize that I maybe made the assumption that some of the other members were equally intelligent, and perhaps that was not a fair assumption.

**Mr. Koskie:** — I just want to ask one question under item 2, Mr. Chairman. Section 11 (1) — I want to particularly draw the attention of the minister, 11 (3)(b). And all I want to

indicate there, it is our understanding here, that under that amendment the powers of the minister to use the revolving fund appear to be expanded under section 11 (3)(b). It will allow the minister to make purchases and to distribute material using a process which we clearly think is not completely under the legislative scrutiny as in the past. Will the minister explain whether or not the powers, as we interpret them, have been increased under section 11 (3)(b)?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — In response to that question, if you want to hear the answer in response to that question, the legal people advises that the minister already has that power under 10 (2)(b) of the act. That this simply — it was their advice that it should be put in so that there was no confusion that in fact power was there. It's simply why it's there.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Obviously what you're saying is that the power was not in fact clearly there. And what you are doing is expanding the power, as we feared. And our legal research indicates that that's clearly the situation, that there is an expansion of powers.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Murray, the legal people say that it's already there; that it should be put in here for the completeness of it. If you want to read section 10 (2)(b):

The minister may establish one or more branches of the department:

. . . for acquiring and making available for the use of the schools, in such manner and on such terms as the minister may authorize, films, slides, and other prints, non-print material related to the course of study;

and, for the purposes mentioned in clauses (a) and (b), the minister may, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, enter into contracts with:

(c) publishers with respect to the publication of any textbooks or terms and conditions under which the textbooks or other books or printed material may be purchased by the minister or by the board of education;

(d) suppliers of films, slides, and other audio-visual material with respect to the terms and conditions under which such equipment and material may be purchased by the minister or by the board of education;

and the textbooks, reference books, other print and non-print material, supplies and equipment shall be made available by the minister or the board of education at no cost to the pupils.

Now, it is our understanding that he has the right to do that.

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you for your comments, Mr. Minister. I want only to raise our concern. And our interpretation is that in respect to this section that there is an increase in the powers of the minister and subject to the legal interpretation. I want to ask the . . . I'll ask the minister questions further down as we progress with the bill.

Clause 2 agreed to.

### **Clause 3**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Proposed House amendment moved by the member from Quill Lakes:

Section 3 of the printed bill is amended by striking out ‘April 1, 1982’ and substituting ‘April 1, 1983.’

**Mr. Koskie:** — I have said quite a lot on this already, and we’ve raised the majority of the points. But I want to say that we are prepared to go back to go back to April the 1st of 1983 to accommodate your current budget, but I don’t think that we would be responsible for the opposition to agree for the retroactivity of the 1983, as you termed it, the November budget, and to incorporate and legalize that which we were not given the opportunity to in fact scrutinize. And accordingly this is the reason why we’re raising it. I would solicit the co-operation of the Minister of Finance in adopting this very reasonable amendment.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 6**

|        |              |        |
|--------|--------------|--------|
| Engel  | Lingenfelter | Koskie |
| Lusney | Shillington  | Yew    |

**NAYS — 39**

|            |                         |          |
|------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Birkbeck   | Andrew                  | Berntson |
| Pickering  | Sandberg                | Hardy    |
| McLaren    | Garner                  | Klein    |
| Katzman    | Currie                  | Duncan   |
| Schoenhals | Smith (Swift Current)   | Boutin   |
| Weiman     | Tusa                    | Sutor    |
| Sveinson   | Sauder                  | Petersen |
| Glauser    | Meagher                 | Schmidt  |
| Parker     | Smith (Moose Jaw South) | Hopfner  |
| Martens    | Rybchuk                 | Domotor  |
| Maxwell    | Embury                  | Dirks    |
| Myers      | Zazelenchuk             | Johnson  |
| Baker      | Dutchak                 | Folk     |

Clause 3 agreed to on division.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act**

**Clause 1**

**Mr. Koskie:** — Mr. Chairman, I want again to clearly indicate that the objections which we raised in respect to The Education Act are equally as valid in respect to The Department of Continuing Education Act. I want to say that the department of

continuing education is apparently no longer a department, or soon will not be, and so we have one piece of legislation coming forward which will abolish or repeat the department of continuing education, and the arrangement from the other side did not even initiate the legislation to put into effect a new department which they are contemplating and which they have budgeted in their *Estimates*.

They did not even come forward and pass that legislation first creating a new department, and then coming forward with a bill which would in fact reflect the change that they're making in the department in the realignment. And I want to say, this is the messiest procedure and unexplainable how the incompetence has permeated through that government to such an extent as it has — what we're seeing here today.

And obviously what we are doing, we will have to come back and then amend the act. If we had gone the other route of introducing the legislation which would create the new department, then bring in this legislation here, which in fact would reflect the new department, we could have proceeded. And what I want to say is that here again there is the retroactivity, and we're opposed to that and we're opposed to the legislation on the same grounds as I've indicated and I need not repeat, because I assume that the changes that were made in the estimates, from the advance accounts to the revolving fund, that we have to make the same assumptions that the minister said we should: one, that we should assume that we know what he's doing, even though he doesn't designate what he is doing; and secondly, we should assume and knew that he has a commitment to the Provincial Auditor; and three, we should assume that he is going to — because he puts a bill on the order paper — we should assume that he has gone ahead with it, even though it hasn't been passed.

Having said that, I want to say that in the strongest way, the members opposite want to raise their objections to this bill, as we did in the previous bill.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

### **Clause 3**

**Mr. Vice-Chairman:** — Clause 3, House amendment. Moved by the member for Quill Lakes:

That section 3 of the printed bill is amended by striking out 'April 1st, 1982,' and substituting 'April 1st, 1983.'

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

### **YEAS — 6**

Engel  
Lusney

Lingenfelter  
Shillington

Koskie  
Yew

### **NAYS — 33**

Andrew

Boutin

Rybchuk

|                         |             |            |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------|
| Berntson                | Sandberg    | Hardy      |
| McLaren                 | Klein       | Katzman    |
| Currie                  | Duncan      | Schoenhals |
| Smith (Swift Current)   | Weiman      | Tusa       |
| Sutor                   | Sauder      | Petersen   |
| Glauser                 | Meagher     | Schmidt    |
| Smith (Moose Jaw South) | Martens     | Domotor    |
| Maxwell                 | Embury      | Dirks      |
| Myers                   | Zazelenchuk | Johnson    |
| Baker                   | Dutchak     | Folk       |

Clause 3 agreed to on division.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Public Works Act**

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman, on Bill 1 we made a case about this type of legislation being brought in retroactively to cover off the tracks of an inept government. I would very much appreciate it if the minister would at least learn something from this, but it is not apparent that that has been done. I checked the records back for the last two sessions on legislation, and on day 17 or 18 how many bills are usually before the Assembly. On November 26th, 1981, there were 26 bills on the order paper on day 16. In your own last session, which you started in June of last year, by day 16 you had 15 bills, meaningful bills, on the order paper. Today is day 18 and we have six bills on the order paper, five which were left over from the last session and one which was a means of getting some money for your government, which is perfectly appropriate. But as far as the legislative agenda or program, we have no idea, the press and people have no idea, and we're beginning to wonder whether or not this government has an idea of what legislation they will be bringing in and what kind of a legislative program they will have.

And, Mr. Chairman, in moving ahead quickly with The Public Works Act, Bill No. 3, there are a number of problems we have with this bill, in particular the part making it retroactive to April 1, 1982, but we do not intend to hold the bill up. We will be moving an amendment similar to the two previous bills. But I would like, if the minister who is representing these bills or bringing them forward, would indicate to the House Leader — and I see the House Leader has now returned — that we should be dealing with bills on a more regular and quicker basis here in the Assembly or we'll get into the same problem by the time this session ends.

And I think that it's high time that we got a legislative program forward, and I would recommend that we move quickly and get the bills on the order paper.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, I don't like to have to explain to the members the way the House works, but we came in, we brought in a throne speech. The throne speech was well received across the province. We then debated that throne speech. Good debates . . . Then we brought in . . . The following day, we brought in the budget. The budget was debated and well received. Now we are proceeding with our program with regard to the legislative program.

I might advise the members opposite that one of the reasons that we were elected in this province was that you can govern and you can run a province without bringing in 5,000 pieces of legislation and 10,000 regulations. People don't need that.

For one year we brought in some legislation, but it hasn't been earth-shattering type legislation. What we have done to deliver to this province is the way we run government, the way we listen to people, and various other things, and that's what makes it happen. You don't necessarily run government and you don't judge government by the number of pieces of bills and legislation they've brought into place.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agree to.

**Clause 3**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Proposed House amendment. Moved by the member for Shaunavon.

Section 3 of the printed bill is amended by striking out 'April 1, 1982,' and substituting 'April 1, 1983.'

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 6**

Engel  
Lusney

Lingenfelter  
Shillington

Koskie  
Yew

**NAYS — 33**

Andrew  
Hardy  
Currie  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Tusa  
Petersen  
Schmidt  
Martens  
Maxwell  
Myers  
Baker

Berntson  
Klein  
Duncan  
Boutin  
Sutor  
Glauser  
Parker  
Rybchuk  
Embury  
Zazelenchuk  
Dutchak

Sandberg  
Katzman  
Schoenhals  
Weiman  
Sauder  
Meagher  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)  
Domotor  
Dirks  
Johnson  
Folk

Clause 3 agreed to on division.

The committee agreed to report the bill.



## Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act

### Clause 1

**Mr. Engel:** — There's two or three things that I really wanted to clarify. One, I can't quite understand that as strong a minister as Agriculture has, that he would have agreed to a bill like this, because when you get rid of all the froth and foam that the minister's been trying to spread over this bill, and soap it down, the bottom line is that basically what's happening is the Department of Finance is getting their tentacles into the departments. And, I can see that happening in some of the lesser departments. I can see it going into Education, where you want to control the expenditures. But in Agriculture, the baseline industry of the province, why you'd want to exercise that additional control is beyond me.

But, several things . . . You'd mentioned earlier in your response to the other questions that there will be full accounting. Is that going to be a line-by-line printing in *Public Accounts*, and if so, where is the authorization in the bill? Under what section do we see that same authorizations as was before under the old system?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I will go through it one more time for the member, that what we have is: the accounting is in the estimates, in grievance before supply, where you can ask questions. Then all the expenditures will come in the *Public Accounts*. All dollars going in, all dollars going out, because that's the system that you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, that's the system that you have to follow under the mechanism.

You don't set out what you have to do in each bill. As the Minister of Agriculture has advised me (and he has heard from many people), over the years there has been some less than brilliant people in this Assembly. And I am not passing judgement on anyone. But other people are.

**Mr. Engel:** — The minister promised earlier that he's going to answer some questions. And some of the questions that I asked in public accounts is: what line? What page? Where does it say that there's going to be a line-by-line entry of individual expenses in *Public Accounts*? Where do you see that? Show me the line.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — It falls under the general accounting principles of government, and that's how the accounting principles of government work. You don't put that into this type of legislation. It's in the overall accounting of governments. Okay? The overall accounting of governments.

**Mr. Engel:** — Overall accounting of government. If the Department of Finance, or even Executive Council, decides that they want a group, can they lump some numbers into one group and register them or will that be individual expenditures as the cheques come out? That's what I'm trying to find out. Is there going to be an individual record in public accounts, or is this revolving fund going to say the amount of money goes in as \$3 million or less or more, and the amount of money that was spent was \$2.5 million; that's a half a million less. Is that what it's going to do, or does it give a line-by-line expenditure?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Let me give you an example of how it works. Let's say it's CVA (central vehicle agency) vehicles that are being purchased. Well let's take that as an example just so you can see. There won't just be X number of dollars in — X number of

dollars out. It will say X number of dollars for the purchase of automobiles — X number of dollars for the purchase of something else. Okay? Dollars going in, appropriated in, and how the dollars are spent — that's what will be reflected.

So if you want, you could put down in the public accounts — it would be that thick — bought, one 1983 Chev car; bought, one 1983 Chev car; bought, one 1983 brown Chev car; bought, one 1983 Chev car. If you want it that way, that's how it would go, but if you say: 'Purchased X number of cars from a given supplier' then you simply ask the question in public accounts: 'Where did you buy the cars, what price did you pay for them, was it the best deal, could you have got it someplace else, did it fall into the regulations, are you buying Cadillacs or Chevs or Volkswagens or what?

**Mr. Engel:** — That's exactly what I was suspicious of. That's just what I thought you were trying to do. What happened under the old system? How was it recorded under the old system?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Before, in the public accounts, it was reported exactly the same way.

**Mr. Engel:** — Not right; I think every individual cheque that was written was recorded.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Any payment to a supplier in excess of \$10,000 is shown in the public accounts. Any expenditure in excess of \$10,000 to a supplier is demonstrated and shown in the public accounts just as it was before. It will still be done now. The difference with this legislation . . . It will now be demonstrated also in the *Estimates* so you had grievance before supply, and not simply after the fact in public accounts.

**Mr. Engel:** — I appreciate the fact that the *Estimates* are going to indicate that, and that was all right. Now, the only other question I have in . . . And what is the requirement regarding the Provincial Auditor? In the old bill, under the old act, there was specified that it would be the Provincial Auditor. Is there a requirement here, or don't I just read real well?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Under before was specified because it was not fitting into the normal system of government. Now it falls into the normal rules of the Provincial Auditor with regard to auditing the Consolidated Fund, which he does, and therefore under his mandate he also audits the revolving account as proposed.

**Mr. Engel:** — One more short question before we go into a clause by clause. This amount that you say, the \$10,000 — is that set by statute some place else in The Department of Finance Act, or is that something that you decide to do, and can you change that without the legislation having a look at it?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Any of those accounting practices with regards to the limit, is approved by the public accounts committee. The \$10,000 limit that is existing now — okay? — is proposed and accepted and accepted and approved by public accounts committee. If you want to up the limit . . . Let's say it used to be at \$1,000, and it became so cumbersome, etc. that you upped it to five and then later upped it to 10 . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Three, in between.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — That's right. That was done by the public accounts committee

as the way that they wanted the thing reported, okay? And the public accounts committee then passed on that, and it was approved that way, and then that's the way the system was.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I just have one short question. Section 17: 'The Minister of Finance shall publish annually with public accounts a statement showing.' This is in the old act. Can you tell me why that is being changed so that that isn't a requirement?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The reason before is the advance account was a special account, and therefore the thing had to be set out for clarification. Now, because it's a budgetary item, it falls into the gamut of the auditor's rules and the accounting rules, as do all expenditures under the Consolidated Fund. That's why the change is there.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — So that it will show up whether in section 14 or . . .

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Presently, the auditor has the power to audit all expenditures in the Consolidated Fund under The Department of Finance Act. We are proposing to bring in legislation this year which would set up a Provincial Auditor's act, and the authority would then come into the Provincial Auditor's act which now finds itself in The Department of Finance Act. But The Department of Finance Act, the particular sections, are where he has the power to audit.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — That's a little hard, to give away that reporting action that was included in section 17, and you're saying we're going to pick it up when we bring something in later on. That's a little tough for us to just sit here and say, 'Well, that's very nice, and we will trust the Minister of Finance to bring in a bill later on and give us some type of a report,' but we're giving something away here where we had, on an annual basis, a report published, a statement that we could see. You're saying, 'Well, don't worry about it. Later on, I'll bring something in and fix it up.'

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — What I said is . . . Here is The Department of Finance Act, section 22, which I'll read to you:

The Provincial Auditor shall examine in such manner as he may deem necessary, the accounts relating to the consolidated fund and to public property and shall ascertain whether in his opinion:

- (a) the accounts have been faithfully and properly kept;
- (b) all public monies have been fully accounted for and properly disposed of, and the rules and procedures applied are sufficient to secure an effective check on the assessment, collection and proper allocation of the revenue;
- (c) money expended has been applied to the purposes for which it was appropriated by the Legislature (never appropriated before) and the expenditures have adequate statutory authority;
- (d) essential records are maintained and the rules and procedures applied are sufficient to safeguard and control public property.

So, it comes under the Consolidated Fund now. It never came under that before. It is a special fund. Okay? It's similar to, not quite, but I draw the analogy with the liquor board that you were raising here two days ago, where it doesn't show in as a budgetary item,

and therefore there was no vote on it. Do you follow what I'm saying there? And so it has a . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — I follow what you're saying, but that's not what you said in your last answer.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — No, what I said in my last answer is that it's in The Department of Finance Act, but that, you know, just as an aside, what we are doing is proposing to bring in legislation for the Provincial Auditor that will have this in it. So that there's no way that that would cover it.

**Mr. Engel:** — I think you're stretching a very, very long bow here, telling us that we should accept the provision that there will be a requirement by the Provincial Auditor under the auditor's act, and we haven't seen the act yet. There's no reason why that act couldn't have been tabled, so we could look and see if that actually covers off or we're leaving an opening. And maybe this is the one key why you didn't want that to go to public accounts. I can't for the life of me figure why somebody like the Minister of Finance was afraid to allow public accounts to scrutinize this bill in front of the auditor, but I see now that he's removing some strength and some power that the auditor has. And he's just closing the door slowly on him. And you can't deny it, because in the former act it was in there in line and state that exactly we knew where he was and what he could audit.

The other question I have, right in the front of the page in section 14, the revolving fund will be known as agricultural supplies revolving fund. And:

the minister may use the revolving fund to purchase agricultural supplies for distribution or re-sale to farmers, rural municipalities and other organizations for use in agricultural operations.

Will there be a line in there that shows, for example, how much money he paid for the bulls that he took over to Bulgaria to sell, and how much he got for them, and if he made a profit or if he had a loss or if he was doing a public service or what he was doing? Is that kind of thing, is that going to be used out of the revolving fund or did he use it for a big barbecue party or what was involved?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — As I understand, and I think most of the world understands, when the Minister of Agriculture went to Bulgaria he went in his capacity dealing with agricultural development corporation, which happens to be a crown corporation which does not show itself in the Consolidated Fund. It is not budgetary items.

**Mr. Engel:** — You never answered my question, though. If that example . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You never answered my question. If this fund is used for that kind of a function, will it show how much he paid for the bulls and how much he sold? It'll be lumped; I know he won't list them separately. But will it show an entry like that, or do you just group them together? Will a specific item be demonstrated that we can see what he's doing?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — If you had the account and you bought supplies, it would be set out by supplier, just like it is now. And then, in public accounts, you would simply be able to ask the question of the appropriate official there, 'What did you buy? How many did you buy? Where did you buy them? Was it a good deal? What colour were they?' You will have all those questions, but you can't — and I'm sure you would appreciate that

you would not just set out line by line that he bought a black cow and a brown cow and a white cow.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

#### **Clause 4**

**Mr. Chairman:** — The amendment to the bill:

Section 4 of the printed bill is amended by striking out ‘April 1, 1982’ and substituting ‘April 1, 1983.’

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

#### **YEAS — 6**

Engel  
Lusney

Lingenfelter  
Shillington

Koskie  
Yew

#### **NAYS — 27**

Andrew  
Hardy  
Currie  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Sutor  
Meagher  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)  
Embury  
Zazelenchuk

Berntson  
Klein  
Duncan  
Weiman  
Sauder  
Schmidt  
Rybchuk  
Dirks  
Dutchak

Sandberg  
Katzman  
Schoenhals  
Tusa  
Glauser  
Parker  
Maxwell  
Myers  
Folk

Clause 4 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act**

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Chairman, every argument we’ve made on the other bills applies to Bill 5, plus one more.

In the family farm improvement branch, we have it spelled out clearly by this government, the intentions of their budget estimates, everything else, that family farm improvement branch is no more. It’s wiped out. The supplies are gone. I would like to know why we need this bill. Simple. Just give us a straight, honest answer why you need

this bill.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — We need this back to 1982 for consistency.

**Mr. Engel:** — Tell us what there is in 1982 that is inconsistent. What did you do in '82 that you need this bill for that's inconsistent?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I can go through the argument that we had before. If you can't hear me . . . (inaudible) . . . I can go through the argument that we had before, Mr. Speaker.

I don't want to get into here into the estimates that the Minister of Agriculture as to what he's done with his department here and department there. I simply indicate that we want the legislation in place so that we have the authority to set up a revolving fund. Clearly you can set up a revolving fund whether you budget for it or don't budget for it. This particular point in time, you want the authority, and that's why we're asking for the legislation now and in the future.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Minister, you don't need a revolving fund for a department or an agency that doesn't exist. They haven't got any more supplies. They're not going to do any more business. They're not selling any more pipes. They're not selling any more supplies. They're finished. They're gone. The pumps are gone. The farmers have to go to your friends to buy their pumps.

A well-driller from the member for Bengough was in to see me, and he told me, with the doing away with the family farm improvement branch, it's going to cost him about \$150 a well more to buy it from a private source. And he's been looking for tenders because of the amount of wells he digs. And that is just the difference between a young farmer affording it and not affording it.

So you phased out the whole department. It's gone. So why do you need a revolving fund for something that's not there any more? Consistency with what? Just as a matter of principle so we had revolving funds before and now we need them? You don't need this bill. No supplies.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Same answers I gave before.

**Mr. Engel:** — Mr. Chairman, the minister never answered the question.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I indicated that we proposed to have this legislation. How we budget in this particular government we will advance to. How we do it will maybe be one year let's have one way and maybe we change in the next year. We wish to have this particular legislation in place, both now and back to April 1st, 1982.

**Mr. Engel:** — Will the minister tell me what items or how much money he expects to be recorded in the advance account this year? How much money do they expect to rotate and use in that account for this coming year?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, that is obviously a budgetary item, and we're not going to be . . . (inaudible) . . .

**Mr. Engel:** — How much do they expect to use it for . . . (inaudible) . . .

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I refer the hon. member to page 18, and hope that he can read. It shows nothing in the revolving fund for 1983-84. It shows \$50,080 for the year 1982-83.

**Mr. Engel:** — I knew that, and that's why: if there's zero in there, why do you need to pass legislation for something you know you're not going to do?

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I simply indicated that we would not be budgeting. Maybe next year we will budget for it, and you won't have to bring the legislation in after the budget.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

### Clause 5

**Mr. Chairman:** — Proposed House amendment. Moved by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that:

Section 5 of the printed bill is amended by striking out 'April 1, 1982' and substituting 'April 1, 1983.'

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

### YEAS — 6

Engel  
Lusney

Lingenfelter  
Shillington

Koskie  
Yew

### NAYS — 26

Andrew  
Hardy  
Currie  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Sauder  
Schmidt  
Rybachuk  
Dirks  
Dutchak

Berntson  
Klein  
Duncan  
Weiman  
Glauser  
Parker  
Maxwell  
Myers  
Folk

Sandberg  
Katzman  
Schoenhals  
Sutor  
Meagher  
Smith (Moose Jaw South)  
Embury  
Zazelenchuk

Clause 5 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee reported progress.

### THIRD READINGS

**Bill No. 1 — An Act to amend The Education Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 2 — And Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Public Works Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Family Farm Improvement Act**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**THE SASKATCHEWAN RESEARCH COUNCIL**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 35**

**Item 1**

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure for me to introduce today Mr. Tom Pepper, the executive director of the Saskatchewan Research Council. To my right, Mr. Ron McGrath, the director of financial services.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in the last



session I asked you for a list of those who had been laid off in the research council. I was quite surprised to get a list of 29 people laid off. I won't read them: P. Archibald, . . . (inaudible) . . . B. Bell, M. Bowers, G. Brown, J. Chen, etc., etc., etc. How many staff, Mr. Minister, are left there after . . . It appears that you've released a very large number. How many are there, Mr. Minister? How many are left?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Two hundred and twenty.

**Mr. Shillington:** — There were 249 staff on the research council before these layoffs?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Yes.

**Mr. Shillington:** — What activities have been deleted as a result of these lay-offs?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Mr. Chairman, all the lay-offs resulted from reduced fee-for-service employees in their work. In other words, they were hired on a fee-for-service basis, so they knew that they were hired on the basis that when the service was no longer required, the employees will no longer be required. Sixty-five per cent of the Saskatchewan Research Council's operations is fee-for-service.

**Mr. Shillington:** — The activities which will be no longer carried on because the staff is not there, are fee-for-service activities. Is that what I understood the minister to say? I wasn't quite sure whether the people you laid off were fee-for-service or whether the activities which will no longer be conducted are fee-for-service.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — The activities are fee-for-service activities because the moneys come from fee-for-service activities such as contract work to Amok or any other firm in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Is that because you are . . . Does the decreased level of fee-for-service activity result from decreased demand from non-governmental sectors? Or does it result from some other cause such as an inability or unwillingness on the part of the research council to accept requests that are made to them?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the lay-offs resulted from the downturn in activity in the province's resource sector — resource industries, if you will. One-third of the lay-offs resulted from reduced need for the pilot plant in processing work in oil megaprojects, and in the uranium industry.

**Mr. Shillington:** — What portion of the council's activities now result from fee-for-service activity? What portion is now internal and what portion is fee-for-service?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Sixty-five per cent.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I would appreciate, Mr. Minister, a list of the research projects which are being internally conducted, that is not on a fee-for-service basis. I don't expect that you are going to be able to rhyme off the projects because I suspect they're numerous, but I would appreciate a list of those projects that you're doing.

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Just for the member's edification, the potash corporation recently spent \$4.5 million in a demonstration plant to produce potassium sulphate and the process was developed by the Saskatchewan Research Council — just one of

them. But I would be happy, and the executive director would be happy to provide you with a list.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Are the fee-for-service activities carried on at a loss, at a break-even point, or are they at a profit to the research council?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — We strive to break open . . . to break even rather, Mr. Chairman, because we do use market-place rates.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Do you in fact break even? You must be able to, in an accounting sense, determine what the fee-for-service activities cost you. Do you in fact break even?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Yes, we more than break even for fee-for-service projects.

**Mr. Shillington:** — ‘Excellent operation,’ says the member from Cannington. All right now, with respect to the level of funding for this year, perhaps Mr. Chairman can assist me in finding this in the estimates. Okay, so I take it that the 3.7 million by which the budget is increased this year by and large covers the internally funded, the internally generated research projects. The fee-for-service is carried on at a something of a nature of a profit and would be in addition to that. Is that right? This is what it’s costing us for the internally funded projects?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — Yes, that is correct.

**Mr. Shillington:** — You gave me the names of people dismissed in salaries and there was one name there in your letter of March 31st, 1983. Have there been any additional people in the 13 days that have elapsed since that letter?

**Hon. Mr. Sandberg:** — No additions. We’ve actually taken one back on since March 31st.

**Mr. Shillington:** — I have no further questions of this expenditure, Mr. Chairman.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 35 agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:45 p.m.