

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present once more to the legislature a petition signed by approximately 400 residents of Saskatchewan, residents who are extremely concerned about the government's intention to privatize SaskPower — the SaskEnergy part of it — and they have asked us to make their views known to the House in the form of these petitions, and asking the government to withdraw that legislation and not to pursue with it.

These names, Mr. Speaker, come from such places as Willowbrook, Theodore, Springside, Wynyard, Quill Lake, Battleford, Sceptre, and my own city of Saskatoon. I so place these petitions before the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table a few hundred petitions by various people from various parts of the province who ask that the government listen to a clear expression of public opinion that the sale of SaskPower is not in the public interest, that it constitutes a sell-off of a major public utility, and will lead to higher utility rates.

These people, Mr. Speaker, come from North Battleford, Battleford, Lanigan, Viscount, Plunkett, Watrous, Nokomis. These people represent most areas of the province.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present several hundred, I think 400 names on a petition. These people are petitioning the government to stop the sell-off of SaskPower that they know and believe will lead to higher power and gas rates in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, these people are from the towns of Lumsden, Melville, Yorkton, Regina, Saskatoon, Rosthern, and Shaunavon.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise pursuant to rule 11 to provide some 600 names of petitioners in respect to their opposition to the privatization of SaskPower.

These petitioners reside in a wide range of communities throughout Saskatchewan such as Milestone, Regina, Wawota, Kipling, Endeavour, St. Victor, Hudson Bay, Tisdale, Melfort, Canwood, Nipawin, Neudorf, Esterhazy, Estevan, Corning, Usherville. I so file, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise pursuant to rule 11 to present petitions to the Assembly containing 400 names of Saskatchewan residents who are opposed to the privatization of SaskPower. These petitioners are from such places as Estevan, Bienfait, Prairie River, Hudson Bay, Dysart, Sturgis, Fox Valley, Prud'homme, Hodgeville and Coronach. Thank you.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I rise along with my

colleagues in this Assembly to lay on the Table, petitions of about 400 Saskatchewan people who are concerned about the privatization of SaskEnergy.

The petition says in part that the privatization of SaskEnergy constitutes a sell-off of a major public utility which serves all Saskatchewan people.

These people come from such varied communities in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, as Elfros, Wynyard, Porcupine Plain, Kerrobert, Carragana, Moose Jaw, Maidstone, Zehner, Kronau, Yorkton, and my own city of Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker.

Since I've begun to table names of people who've signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, I've personally tabled 4,100 names.

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly. This petition is signed by residents from Langenburg, Kindersley, Goodsoil, North Portal, Prince Albert, Lloydminster, Semans, Qu'Appelle, Watrous, and Carrot River.

And these petitioners are urging the Legislative Assembly to stop the privatization of SaskPower. They state that the privatization of SaskPower constitutes a sell-off of a major public utility which serves all Saskatchewan people.

In all now, Mr. Speaker, I have presented 3,900 such names to the Assembly, and I'm pleased to present these this afternoon.

Mr. Hagel: — I thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my honour as well to rise pursuant to rule 11 to present the same petition, with signatures in the neighbourhood of 400, from people who are opposed to the Saskatchewan government's stated intention to privatize SaskPower.

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners come from several communities including Dalmeny, Holdfast, Windthorst, Bethune, Spring Valley, Frontier, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Cabri, Shaunavon, Eastend, Maple Creek, Success, Swift Current, and others.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to a rule of having to present petitions from quite a few different communities from across the province of Saskatchewan, which includes about 400 residents. These include Saskatoon, Kelvington, Hudson Bay, Unity, Weyburn, Dubuc, Stockholm, Pilot Butte, Earl Grey, Delisle, Duperow, Biggar, Landis, Estevan, North Battleford, Midale, Albertville, Lipton, and Fort Qu'Appelle.

These petitioners are opposed to the privatization of SaskPower, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too rise pursuant to rule 11 to present to the legislature several hundred signatures of Saskatchewan citizens who are opposed to the privatization of the Saskatchewan Power utility.

The people who have signed the petition come from

several different rural constituencies throughout Saskatchewan. They come from Maple Creek, Lafleche, Shaunavon, Arcola, Perdue, Lang, Pangman, Macrorie, Shellbrook, and Prince Albert.

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 as well, to present to this legislature a petition signed by 400 residents of Saskatchewan. The petitioners oppose, Mr. Speaker, the privatization of SaskPower. They believe a sell-off of SaskEnergy is not in the public interest, and they are opposed to the PC government's policy in this regard.

They represent a number of communities including Balgonie, Drake, Wishart, Wynyard, Rayner, Swift Current, Weyburn, Saskatoon, my home town of Regina, and the constituency of Regina North West.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to file approximately 200 petitions against the privatization of SaskPower. These petitions come from a number of different communities including Rocanville, Swift Current, Simmie, Melfort, Torquay, Ridgedale, Maple Creek, Eastend, and Saskatoon. Thank you.

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition under rule 11 which has been signed by approximately 400 residents of the province of Saskatchewan, and which urges the provincial government to stop the privatization of SaskPower. The people signing this petition hail from communities such as Lumsden, Southey, Kennedy, Martensville, Kelliher, Leross, Melfort, Gronlid, Codette, Yorkton, Pilot Butte, Wynyard, Cupar, Estevan, Yorkton, Regina, and Saskatoon.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to section 11 as well to again present some 400 names of residents of Saskatchewan who are concerned about privatization of SaskPower by this government. Of great concern to them is that SaskPower privatization is not in the public interest.

Some of the communities include, Mr. Speaker, Muenster, Maple Creek, Melville, Stoughton, Blaine Lake, Fillmore, and Elrose. I trust the Government of Saskatchewan will listen to these petitioners, residents of rural Saskatchewan. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too join my colleagues in rising pursuant to rule 11 to present to the legislature a petition regarding the proposed sale of public asset, that is, SaskPower natural gas utility, signed by residents from a number of different communities around the province, including Regina, Conquest, Manor, Dinsmore, Elrose, Carlyle, Craven, and White City.

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, pursuant to rule 11 I rise to present a petition with another 400 signatures of Saskatchewan residents, residents opposed to the privatization of SaskPower. And these petitioners make their homes in communities such as Allan, Rosetown, Spiritwood, Canora, Saskatoon and Regina, Odessa, Markinch, and Paradise Hill.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to

rule 11 yet again to present the signatures of 400 more people opposed to the privatization of SaskPower. These signatures are a time-honoured method of the people in our democracy to make their views known to the government. These signatures, Mr. Speaker, represent many, many hours of volunteer efforts of collecting these signatures, and I thank those people for it.

These petitions are from Lake Alma, Oungre, Goodwater, Grenfell, Whitewood, Humboldt, Melfort, Bright Sand, Pennant, and the town that I grew up in, Beechy.

Ms. Smart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too am honoured to rise pursuant to rule 11 to present the petition of residents from many different communities asking that the privatization of SaskPower not go ahead, because the privatization of SaskPower is not in the public interest. The privatization of SaskPower constitutes a sell-off of a major public utility, and the privatization of SaskPower will lead to higher utility rates for Saskatchewan people and will benefit only wealthy investors.

The people in this petition, Mr. Speaker, come from communities of Turtleford, Odessa, Webb, Warman, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Sedley, Vanscoy, Sturgis, Preeceville, Indian Head, Regina, and some from Saskatoon Centre.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to rule 11 to present a petition to the Assembly for several hundred residents of Saskatchewan. These petitioners are urging the government not to privatize SaskPower but to keep this major public utility in the service of all Saskatchewan people.

These petitioners are from a number of communities including Balgonie, Edgeley, Broadview, Meadow Lake, Tuxford, Rocanville, Paddockwood, St. Benedict, Englefeld, Duval, and Regina.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I join with all of my colleagues in also rising pursuant to rule 11 to present some 1,000 petitions of people from many parts of the province who are saying that they oppose the privatization of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. They don't think it's in the public interest. They are fearful that it will result in greatly increased utility rates. There's evidence why they have a right to believe that.

These thousand names, Mr. Speaker, which I present here today, now bring the accumulated total of approximately 10,000 names today, for a total of approximately 90,000 since these petitions began to be signed by the people of Saskatchewan.

And the names that I present here, Mr. Speaker, come from Zenon Park, St. Walburg, Crystal Springs, Sturgis, Meadow Lake, Prince Albert, Yorkton, Birch Hills, Hague, Weyburn, Foam Lake, Fort Qu'Appelle, Wilkie, Regina, and many, many other communities throughout Saskatchewan.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to the Assembly a group of 19 students seated

in your gallery today from the town of Hodgeville. They are grade 6 students. They're accompanied today by their teacher, Alison Peake, and their bus driver, Mark Gross.

I'm going to be meeting with them outside later on, and I hope you enjoy the Assembly proceedings here while you're here. Question period will be delayed a little bit for a few minutes, and if you're interested, you could probably stay and watch that. You'll probably be seeing interesting things happening here.

I'd like all members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to other members of the Assembly this afternoon, a group of 47 students from Henry Kelsey School in Saskatoon. They're grades 4, 5, 6, and 7. They're in the west gallery, and they're accompanied by their teachers, Guy Jean and Kathleen Ryror Hildebrandt, and four parents who are chaperoning them today.

They're going to be visiting in the Assembly for question period, and I will be meeting with them about 3 o'clock this afternoon. I certainly hope that they enjoy the proceedings, and I would wish them well with the remainder of their school year and also a very happy summer vacation. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to welcome this group of students, their teachers and chaperons here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Allegations re Provincial Auditor

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Premier, and it's in regards to the rather serious, not rather, but the very serious allegations made by the Minister of Justice in the question period on Friday last, where the Minister of Justice alleged, among other things, that the Provincial Auditor had acted improperly because, as the Minister of Justice said it, the auditor had demanded, in part, material advantage to himself in exchange for a better report on the spending habits of your government, Mr. Premier.

My question to you, Mr. Premier, is this: do you support those grave charges made by your Minister of Justice, since you've had the weekend now to consider the transcript and the evidence; and if so, will you today table in this House any and all proof whatsoever to back up those grave allegations?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, earlier today we provided to the Leader of the Opposition, pursuant to his request, two letters dated April 14 and April 18, and I intend to table those letters after question period today.

The letter of April 14 — if the hon. member would listen

— the letter from April 14 from the lawyer for the Provincial Auditor to the lawyer for CIC (Crown investments corporation of Saskatchewan) refers to a package proposal being made by the Provincial Auditor, the substance of which I have been made privy to. The package proposal contains material information central to the . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order. The hon. member is answering a question and deserves the right to have that opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I said, Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted, the package proposal, I am aware of what is in it. I say to this House that that package proposal contains material information central to this entire question.

The package proposal was sent to our lawyers by the Provincial Auditor's lawyers on trust conditions of confidentiality. The package proposal was returned by our lawyer to the auditor's lawyer by letter April 18, and the copies that we had made were destroyed pursuant to the demand of the Provincial Auditor's letter and trust condition. The Provincial Auditor is the only person that has this proposed package; the only one in existence is in his hands, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have asked today of the Provincial Auditor, through our lawyers to, one, provide me and the House with that information.

I indicated, and I think it's interesting for the hon. member to listen, I know what is in that package proposal. It is central to the issue of what we are dealing with here, and it cannot be released because of the trust conditions imposed by the Provincial Auditor's lawyer — those letters I sent to you this afternoon.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question. I would like it to go to the Premier, but I suspect that he will not answer this question as he didn't the first question. So I'll simply direct it to the Premier, and whoever in the front benches takes it, if it's the Minister of Justice, I guess that's who we'll take the answer from.

Mr. Speaker, as I heard the Minister of Justice a few moments ago, he has told the House that he is aware of — I think he repeated that two or three times — of something called a package proposal or a proposal package. My question to you, Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, is: when were you made aware of that proposal package? And having given us the date, which presumably you will, as to when you became aware of that proposal package, if there was something improper in that package, why would your lawyers, presumably on instruction by the government, destroy it and not deal with that impropriety at the time? Or more importantly, why didn't you act at the impropriety at the time that you were seized of the knowledge of it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I became aware of the package proposal, or the proposal by the Provincial Auditor, last Thursday when the provincial audit report was filed in this House. And the reason for that is because this is not normally the file that I would handle. I am

handling this file in the absence of the Minister of Finance, and therefore I became involved with it at that point in time.

The documents were sent by the solicitor for the Provincial Auditor to the solicitors for CIC. Those documents were then requested, pursuant to the trust condition in that letter, that they be returned and the trust conditions that all documents be destroyed. We did not destroy those documents because of our wish to; we destroyed those documents because of the demand of the trust conditions of the lawyer for the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Justice. And I must admit, like in *Alice in Wonderland*, his answers are getting more curiouser and more curiouser.

The letter which you gave to me — not you, but the Premier, gave to me this morning — the letter of April 18, 1989 from Mr. Kyle to Mr. Neill, Mr. Kyle writes as of April 18 that the photostat copy of the proposal package has been destroyed. Yet you tell us that just as of a few days ago you were aware of that package.

My question to you is: how is it that you were made aware of this package, since presumably it was destroyed? And my most important question to you and to the government is this: if there was impropriety in that package, as you alleged on Friday, why wasn't action taken? Why weren't steps taken on April 18, or whenever that package came to your light — steps taken to clarify this matter by way of reference to the Department of Justice or to some other appropriate body?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can advise the hon. member that I was aware of this document, or this package proposal, the substance of it — as I said, the substance of it. I have not seen word for word what is in there, but I have been advised by the three people . . . just hear me out . . . I have been advised by the three people that read that document. They are Larry Kyle, Wolfgang Wolff, chairman of CIC, and Larry Kyle's secretary. Now those are the ones that have seen the documents.

But is the issue to my hon. friend not this? There is a document in existence, and I have been advised as to what is in that document. There is one document available to us, sir, and it now is in the hands of the Provincial Auditor. Now if, as you would suggest on Friday, that within that document there is nothing of any significance, then I simply pose the question: why the secrecy by the auditor? Why the trust conditions by the auditor? Why the demand that the documents be returned back to the auditor? Those are legitimate, fair questions that you as a lawyer should understand, trust conditions.

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. Before we move to the next question, I would once more remind the hon. members unparliamentary language, whether from your feet or from your desk, is unacceptable and disrupts proceedings of the House. I would ask hon. members to refrain.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, my question to you is this: would you advise the legislature whether or not your government initiated a course of action with the Provincial Auditor before the letter of April 20, 1989, which was tabled by the Minister of Justice on Friday last?

The course of conduct that you negotiated I'm asking about with the designed objective of getting the auditor to amend his — what has been proven to be — damning report, to determine what it would take by way of changes to get the changes made to that report? And if this is so, who in your government authorized the discussions, when did they begin, and who conducted them? Were they Mr. Kyle, on the instructions of the government?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can advise the hon. member that the negotiations entered into between Mr. Kyle on behalf of CIC, and Mr. Neill on behalf of the Provincial Auditor, related to the following circumstance. There was in existence for some period of time a great deal of animosity between the Provincial Auditor's office and the offices of various appointed auditors, and the negotiations were to try to find ways by which the two sides, the two groups of auditors, might better co-operate to do the job that they're both mandated to do pursuant to the legislation and pursuant to their assignments. That was the purposes of the negotiations.

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Justice. He says the mandate was . . . where the lawyers for CIC and the lawyers for the auditor engaged in discussions to determine how the mandate can be fulfilled is, I gather, the essence of what the Minister of Justice says.

That being the case, how in the world does the Minister of Justice get up and make the serious allegation on Friday, repeated today in effect by indirect innuendo — or direct innuendo, if there's such a term — that those activities and responses by the Provincial Auditor were somehow improper. Why is that improper?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the ultimate answer to the entire question that we face lies in the document that I referred to. Now it would seem to me, you along with me and all members of this House, would want to know what that document says verbatim. It seems to me that is the question. Now there's a document in existence in the hands of the Provincial Auditor, the servant of this legislature.

It would seem to me that the entire matter could have a great deal of light shed on it should the auditor see his way fit to lay that document on the Table of this Assembly, have that information provided to the Assembly. Then you, sir, and everyone else in the House, can see for their own eyes what is in that document.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Premier, Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier or the Minister of Justice. I want to just get the Minister of Justice back to what the situation is here.

The situation is, sir, that you on Friday made the allegation of impropriety. I think that was the exact word used. You make the allegations of impropriety which now today you would have us believe you've done so on the basis of documentation that you've not seen; and you would have us believe, on documentation that everybody should see.

You're the one who made the allegation of impropriety, and I'm asking you, sir, is the only evidence of impropriety that you have the two attachments that the Premier gave to me in his letter of this morning? Is that the only evidence that the government has upon which you justified this serious condemnation of this long-time civil servant and the attack on the Provincial Auditor's office?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, permit me to read the letter we refer to of April 14. It is to Larry Kyle, Q.C. It's in handwritten form from one Mr. Gordon Neill.

Dear Larry: I am enclosing a package proposal from the Provincial Auditor on the following trust conditions:

(1) That it be made without prejudice and be returned on demand.

(2) That if accepted the contents will remain confidential (need to know) and that if not accepted the same conditions apply.

I (will) expect a response to this proposal as soon as possible.

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in my opening statement, I have been advised by Mr. Kyle and Mr. Wolfgang Wolff as to what were in those documents. I am prevented by this trust condition, as the hon. member understands trust conditions. Now . . . Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member says, there's no trust condition. Let me read paragraph two:

That if accepted the contents will remain confidential (need to know excepted) . . .

Need to know is the principals of the lawyer, in other words, the lawyer's clients, which is us. The hon. member should, in reading this letter, ask the question: why would the Provincial Auditor want to keep information from the members of the opposition? That seems to be the question, Mr. Speaker, and that is a question that should be asked. And the only individual that can answer that, Mr. Speaker, is the Provincial Auditor.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. The Minister of Justice has been seeking to build a house of cards upon a document . . . based on a document we don't have. I suggest to the minister that we deal with the documents we do have. And I'll suggest to the Minister of Justice that rather than painting a picture of a shabby effort by the Provincial Auditor to get material benefit, the documents which you have provided show a dedicated public

servant who sought, with considerable courage, to maintain the integrity of his office.

This letter of April 18, Mr. Minister, which to it you've referred, suggests — and I'm going to read this. Your lawyer requests:

a listing of those other requirements which he imposes as a condition of a further review of his presumably critical report.

You asked him, in effect, what will it take to change the Provincial Auditor's report? His letter of April 20, Mr. Minister, says what it'll take is to restore the integrity of this office. That's the response.

Mr. Minister, will you not admit that rather than behaving in a shabby fashion, he showed considerable courage, and in attempting to maintain the integrity of his office. And that's what the letters prove and nothing else.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I say to the hon. member opposite: why would you not want to know what is in — no, just hear me — what is in this package proposal? I know what is in that package proposal, the substance of what is in that package proposal, because I have been advised by solicitors for CIC. I have been advised of what's in that, and I say to you and I say to this House, the contents of what is in that package proposal is material to the entire debate we are debating here today and have for the last two days.

I believe that is important, Mr. Speaker. I would say to the members opposite: before you rush off on a crusade or rush off on some challenge to my character or anything else, why would you not want to wait and see what those documents are and what those documents say?

Mr. Speaker, here we have a person that says I need to provide information to the entire Assembly. Is it not proper to ask: why are you not providing this information to this Assembly that you say you serve as its servant?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question. The minister states that he knows what's in the package which he has not seen. Mr. Minister, we found out on Friday that you didn't know what was in the letter you were reading, so we're not prepared to take your word for a document you haven't seen if you don't know what's in the document you have seen.

Mr. Minister, will you admit that what happened was that you, your officials, sought from the Provincial Auditor a list of those conditions. You asked him, what will it take to get your report changed? He said, restore the integrity of my office, that's what it'll take. Isn't that what this correspondence boils down to, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says

he's not prepared to take my word. I say to the hon. member: is he prepared to request from the auditor the package proposal referred to in the auditor's letter of April 14? And if that is presented to this House, is he prepared to accept the words on the paper that are contained in that package proposal?

That is what is central to this issue. That is the information that this House must have to determine, Mr. Speaker, to determine the question at issue.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Justice. That being the case, why was it that your government through its various representatives, legal and otherwise, was dealing with the Provincial Auditor for all these weeks? If there was something improper in this proposal package, which was identified back on April 18, why in the world is it that your lawyers and your government is still dealing with the Provincial Auditor. How in the world do you justify that? Because surely if it was improper for the Provincial Auditor, it was improper for you to be dealing and not referring this to the appropriate authorities. Why didn't you do that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, and I say to the hon. member the following: clearly, when we have an issue before us that is this serious then we must look at the entire negotiation — which is what you were talking about — the entire discussion and the entire dimension of what was being proposed here.

Now I say to the hon. member, in all fairness to you this, sir: why are you not interested in what is contained in that package proposal? I have advised you as a minister, and as member of this House, that in that proposal is material significant to this entire question. I would think that all members of this House would want to have that document here to judge for themselves what that document says.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Justice. I want to tell the Minister of Justice, and especially the Premier, the opposition is absolutely interested in all of the relevant facts, including the proposal package. Make no mistake about that.

And I note that the Minister of Justice this day, Tuesday, after the long weekend, has now raised the proposal package. He did not make any mention of that at all on Friday, which I say leads one to suspect that this is a fact after conclusion.

We want the facts and we want the facts out now, in the open. And I direct my question to you, Mr. Premier, in the light of these ongoing serious allegations of which now you apparently have also supported by virtue of the letter that you've written to me, will you agree that we introduce a rule 39 resolution right now, this afternoon, to summons Mr. Lutz and any other party who is relevant, who can give testimony to this issue before the bar of the House of this legislature and tell all the facts right now, including the proposal package?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, I have indicated to you throughout question period, I indicated to you at the beginning of question period that I sought that document from Mr. Lutz today, or sought waiver of the trust conditions. We have not . . . Now just listen. I have sought that information. I believe it is fundamental that we have that document and that information here before the entire House, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — As I understand the traditions of this Assembly, as I understand the traditions of this Assembly, that the *Public Accounts* and the Provincial Auditor's records are referred to the Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts Committee have all the powers and authorities of this Assembly. They have the right to call for persons, papers, and things, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that is exactly where the matter should be; that I believe the document, Mr. Speaker, I believe the document I referred to as a so-called package proposal, should be requested to be put on the table at the public accounts.

I believe that all people material to this question, whether it be the Provincial Auditor, the lawyers, Wolfgang Wolff, the secretary of the lawyer, should also be summonsed to that committee, and that committee has all the power to do that. I can say to the hon. member that the people on this side of the House that are sitting on that committee are prepared to co-operate in having those people brought immediately to the Public Accounts Committee along with the documents that I have referred to.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Justice, and if I may be permitted a very brief opening comment. I say to you, Mr. Minister of Justice, that that request smacks of nothing more, nothing less than a cover-up, pure and simple.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And it smacks of a cover-up, sir, because the Public Accounts Committee's main mandate is to deal with the report of the auditor with respect to the expenditures as he sees it in any one given year.

That is not the issue right now we're dealing with. We're going to get to that. The issue we're dealing with right now is the integrity of the auditor, your allegation of impropriety, and the Office of the Provincial Auditor, which has nothing to do with the Public Accounts Committee; it has everything to do with this legislature because he's an officer of this legislature.

The only way to get this thing aired, and aired properly and completely and fully, I say, is to call him before the bar right now with all the documents. I say to the Premier: will you overrule your Minister of Justice and get on to the bottom of . . . define the truth of this case right now? Call him to the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's ultimately for you to rule as to what power the Public Accounts Committee has.

I say to the hon. member, my understanding of the Public Accounts Committee is it has all the powers of the Legislative Assembly. It has the right . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well he says, nonsense. It has the right to call for persons, papers, and things. That is a fact. That is the rules of the Public Accounts Committee, subject, sir, to your ruling and interpretation as the Speaker of this House.

I submit that it does have that. And I submit, Mr. Speaker: how can you say it is a cover-up, as the hon. member tries to say — a cover-up — when we're saying, please give us the document, Mr. Auditor General? Please give us the document. Come before the Assembly. We will call the various people that I have listed out, or any other members the hon. member wishes to call that are relevant, before that committee so they can be heard.

(1445)

I say to the hon. member, if the hon. member simply wants the matter to be dealt with in this Assembly so that he can carry on for, what — two weeks, three weeks, four weeks more — if that is what his intention is, Mr. Speaker, if that is what his intention is, Mr. Speaker, I would ask him: are you interested in getting to the bottom of this issue, or are you more interested in disrupting further the House as you have already done this session?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Are the hon. members ready to proceed?

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rules of this Assembly to raise a question of privilege. In accordance with the rules, Mr. Speaker, I provided to you earlier today an advance notice of my intention to raise this matter. I would now like to state the matter to this Assembly.

At issue are the extensive remarks made by the Minister of Justice about the Provincial Auditor during question period on Friday, May 19. This present question of privilege is based solely on the minister's remarks made on Friday morning and is, therefore, completely separate from the question of privilege raised by the colleague on Thursday on which you have already ruled.

Mr. Speaker, section 3(2) of The Provincial Auditor's Act reads as follows:

The Provincial Auditor is an officer of the Legislative Assembly and holds office during good behaviour.

I also note, Mr. Speaker, that the Erskine May *Parliamentary Practice* 19th Edition defines privilege in the following way:

Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals.

That's on page 67.

May elaborates on the nature of privilege as follows:

Each House also claims the right to punish actions, which, while not breaches of any specific privilege, are offences against its authority or dignity, such as disobedience to its legitimate commands or libels upon itself, its officers or its Members. Such actions, though often called "breaches of privilege" are more properly distinguished as "contempts."

That's on page 68.

With respect to the officers of the House, May also states, Mr. Speaker:

It may be stated generally that any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House or Parliament in the performance of its function, or which impedes or obstructs any member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty or which has the tendency directly or indirectly to produce such results, may be treated as contempt.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, May states the following:

Both Houses will treat as breaches of their privileges not only acts directly tending to obstruct their officers in the execution of their duty, but also any conduct which may tend to deter them from doing their duty in the future.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we have before us, an unequivocally clear breach of privilege of this Assembly.

During the question period on Friday, the Minister of Justice spoke at length about the Provincial Auditor. And during the course of the minister's remarks he made reference to a letter from the Provincial Auditor's lawyer, purported to quote from that letter, and undertook to table it. He did table it after question period.

When the minister's remarks as recorded in *Hansard* are taken as a whole, and particularly when his remarks are compared to the actual text of the letter itself, it is unequivocally clear, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has engaged in an assault on the professional conduct of the Provincial Auditor. I note the following issues in particular.

The minister's assault appears to have been premeditated in so far as he came to question period with the letter and began to refer to it, quite apart from the substance or thrust of questions to which he was responding.

Throughout the minister's remarks he repeatedly implied and inferred improper conduct on the auditor's part, and at page 1247 of *Hansard* went so far as to state, in part, Mr. Speaker, "I suggest that this is improper", is the words of the minister. In purporting to quote directly from the letter, the minister quoted both incorrectly and inaccurately.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that this particular minister has made unacceptable and unjustifiable critical comments about an officer of the Legislative Assembly. In the spring of 1987 the minister made such comments about the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk. In ruling that those comments constituted a prima facie case of privilege, you said on June 24, 1987 at page 697 of *Hansard*, and this is your quote:

It is vital, if parliament is to get fair and impartial service from its officers, that these officers must be defended from intimidation while conducting their duties. Critical comments attacking the competence of and (the) credibility of an individual can be construed as a form of obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, the office of the Provincial Auditor is absolutely fundamental to our system of parliamentary government under which we are proud to live as free men and women. The auditor is not the agent of the government of the day. No, Mr. Speaker, the auditor is an officer of this Legislative Assembly, and thus is the watch-dog of the people of the province in the public interest.

The office of the auditor must be secure from unacceptable assaults from any member. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, such an assault has taken place. And I submit to you, sir, that the Assembly itself should now have the opportunity to decide on this matter. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, if you find that there is indeed a prima facie case of privilege, I would then propose to move a motion along the following lines:

That this Assembly condemns the Minister of Justice for having breached the privileges of the legislature by his unacceptable and unjustifiable criticism of the Provincial Auditor; that this Assembly calls on the Premier to require that the minister apologize publicly and resign from the Executive Council; and further, that this Assembly reaffirms the importance of the office of the Provincial Auditor as an officer of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider the prima facie case of a breach of privilege, and if so doing, I'll move on to the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's impossible for the Speaker or members of the Legislative Assembly to make a determination as to breach of privilege or not, without all the facts before the legislature, Mr. Speaker.

I mean, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . all

members, all members are aware of the package proposal that was given to the solicitor for CIC and the trust conditions attached thereto. All members are now aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice has asked, through the solicitors, to have those trust conditions dropped, or to provide this Assembly with that package, Mr. Speaker. It has been made aware to the legislature by the Minister of Justice that information in that package is material to this very question.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to determine whether there has been a breach of privilege or not until such time as those facts are made available to this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. And I think Mr. Speaker should take that into account when he's making his decision.

Mr. Shillington: — I just want to make a couple of very brief comments. The question was based upon . . . the motion of privilege was based upon what was said Friday. None of this was available to us Friday; indeed, none of this is available to us today. All we had today was the minister making some reference to some documents which nobody, including himself, has seen.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this has adds nothing to the scurrilous comments made by the Minister of Justice on Friday, which I suggest to the Speaker clearly impede a legislative officer in the discharge of his duties.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to speak to the matter of privilege being raised by the members of the opposition. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd be very supportive of all of the evidence being brought forward to this Legislative Assembly and to the public of Saskatchewan before you or anyone else prejudices whether or not there is a case of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition have made the case thus far that the Auditor General is lily-white, if you like, or without sin. The Minister of Justice has made . . . raised some very interesting questions. I would think by the mere fact of the introduction of the letter so far, that there has to be some questions that should be addressed, Mr. Speaker.

Furthermore, today in the legislature, Mr. Speaker, by reference to this other document, I would think that those are serious questions that should be addressed. Surely the members of the opposition, as we would, and you, Mr. Speaker, would want all of these facts brought forward to the people of Saskatchewan before you rule whether or not a case of privilege exists.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make one point clear and to reiterate what my colleague from Regina Centre was saying when he was making his comments; that is, the privilege that has been proposed today deals not with a package that has been mentioned by the minister and by other members of that caucus, subsequent to the issue on Friday; that is a letter that was referred to by the minister — misrepresented and misquoted — for I believe his own political purposes — this is the point — and at whose expense?

I say, Mr. Speaker, at the expense of the auditor, yes, and the office of the auditor, but at the expense of the taxpayers of this province. That's what this debate is all about — millions and billions of taxpayers' dollars at stake as to where they're being spent. And the auditor says there's a problem with that.

The minister rises in his place on Friday and quotes from a letter inaccurately, for his own political benefit, because he's in political trouble. He misrepresents the letter, he misrepresents the auditor, and he does a disservice to the people of this province. And that's why we're saying we have a case of privilege against this minister. That's what it's all about.

And the history of this minister is clear, and my colleague from Quill Lakes refers to it. This is not the first time that he has attacked an innocent individual who is employed by the legislature.

The Speaker: — I think we're getting into a debate. Let's confine our remarks to the question, directly to the question, the privilege question.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to say that this minister has been involved in this kind of an incident before, and that's why we are concerned and believe very truly that a case of privilege is in fact in order today — and going back to 1987 when he made comments similar to this, not as exaggerated, about the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk, and had to apologize.

Here we are again in the second case of privilege now before this House, dealing with the same minister. And I say it's based on a letter which he not only read parts of, but misquoted and misrepresented the facts. I think that that is a case of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak just briefly to the point of privilege.

As you well know, your decision is whether there's a prima facie case of privilege. And I notice that government members are suggesting that we have to see the whole package — the package that no one has access to, it appears, at this point in time — before a decision can be made on whether there's a case of privilege here.

Well the question of whether there's a case of privilege will be decided by the Assembly. But your decision, sir, the question of whether there's a prima facie case of privilege, surely will not have to depend on whether or not we have access to this package. And therefore I urge you to rule, Mr. Speaker, that there is a prima facie case of privilege based on the fact that the remarks made by the Minister of Justice clearly interfere and impede with the ability of the Provincial Auditor to perform his role as an officer of this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1500)

The Speaker: — At 10:30 a.m. today I received notice for

a point of privilege for which I thank the hon. member from Quill Lakes. I had an opportunity to examine the matter raised, and I am prepared to make a statement.

The case made by the member charges the Minister of Justice with a deliberate attack on the professional conduct and integrity of the Provincial Auditor. The member cites remarks made by the minister during oral question period on Friday, May 19.

I remind all members that the Provincial Auditor is an officer of this Legislative Assembly, and consequently he is protected by its privileges. I don't intend to outline those privileges here again, but simply refer members to my statement of May 19.

Before making my ruling, however, I must repeat the following: it is not the role of the Speaker to decide if a breach of privilege has been committed. This is a question only the House can decide. It is my role to decide whether a prima facie case of privilege has been established which would justify the matter taking precedence over the normal business of the House.

I now turn to the case presented by the member for Quill Lakes. This question rests on the statements by the Minister of Justice last Friday and the interpretations put on them. The Chair is not in a position of deciding whether any particular interpretation in this case is valid or not. Nor is the House in that position without proper reference to a substantive motion or motion of censure. Simply put, charges cannot be brought against an officer of the House incidentally in the midst of other proceedings.

I refer members to the principle outlined in Sir Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, 20th edition, page 378:

... no charge of a personal character can be raised, save upon a direct and substantive motion to that effect.

If the minister has a grievance against the Provincial Auditor, it should have been put to the Assembly by the proper means. In the absence of a substantive motion, I must look at this case strictly from the perspective of whether the remarks of the minister might constitute a reflection on the Provincial Auditor that could interfere with his ability to carry out the statutory duties. In isolation, the remarks of the minister contain allegations which could undermine the personal credibility and the professionalism of the Provincial Auditor. I reiterate that it is the duty of the House to protect its officers.

I refer members to a ruling of the House dated June 24, 1987, that it is vital if parliament is to get fair and impartial service from its officers, that these officers must be defended from intimidation while conducting their duties. Critical comments attacking the competence and credibility of any individual can be construed as a form of obstruction, because on the face of it, the officer's capacity to carry out his duties might be inhibited.

I find that this matter is serious enough to warrant the House setting aside its other business to deal with this issue.

Since it is not the Speaker's role to determine if a breach of privilege has indeed taken place, and since the House has the right to seek further information and that is the decision of the House, I now leave it up to the Assembly to determine if a breach of privilege has in fact been made.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the closing of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I intend to move a motion, essentially the following:

That this Assembly condemns the Minister of Justice for having breached the privileges of this legislature by his unacceptable and unjustifiable criticism of the Provincial Auditor; that this Assembly calls on the Premier to require the minister to apologize publicly and resign from the Executive Council; and further, that this Assembly reaffirms the importance of the office of the Provincial Auditor as an officer of this legislature.

I will be moving that at the closing of my remarks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, what we have before us here today in the Legislative Assembly is indeed a very, very grave matter. We have an officer of the legislature, an officer of the public, an officer whose formal mandate by law is to watch over the public purse and to protect the public interest.

That officer, of course, is the Provincial Auditor, a very essential part of the integrity of our democratic system. And that watching over money has, throughout the history, evolved so that the legislative members would watch over the expenditures of government, and we have put in place the Provincial Auditor to do just that.

What we have here . . . or last Friday, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, we have a senior cabinet minister who I say came into this House with a copy of a letter, came into this House and misquoted, incorrectly and incompletely, and left clearly before the public no doubt the inference of improper action by the Provincial Auditor.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — As you have rightly ruled, Mr. Speaker, that is a breach of privilege. But the ultimate determination of what course of action should be taken in such a case, Mr. Speaker, rests with this Assembly.

How can the operation of the essential Office of the Provincial Auditor stay intact if the very members which he serves in this Assembly that he serves will undermine him? And what is even more galling is that on Friday the minister came in with one letter, as I said, and misinterpreted, quoted it incorrectly and incompletely, alleged an improper action, and then he tries to distort it further today by coming in with information which he is unable to table and hasn't seen.

But what is more important is that the minister, during this very question period, indicated to this House that on Thursday last he had knowledge of further information. But he came into this House, I believe, to misrepresent the facts and to misrepresent the position of the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Speaker, the law is absolutely clear on the point that the Provincial Auditor is an officer of the Legislative Assembly. The law is equally clear that the Provincial Auditor is required by statute to audit the accounts of the government of the day, to note any matters that in his professional view warrant significant attention, and to report those matters to this Legislative Assembly and thus to the public. In essence, that is the auditor's job, Mr. Speaker.

The Saskatchewan Provincial Auditor is required by law to audit the accounts of the province. The auditor is required by law to report fully and accurately on the audit to this legislature. The auditor is required by law to be a watch-dog over the public purse, a servant, Mr. Speaker, not of the government of the day, but a servant of the public interest.

To the extent that the Provincial Auditor is permitted by the government of the day — that is by the cabinet and its civil servants — to do his job, the legislature and the public can have confidence that the government truly has nothing to hide and that the public moneys are being used appropriately and legally.

However, Mr. Speaker, if the Provincial Auditor is prevented from doing his job by the government of the day, or if, as is the case now before us, the government or any one of its cabinet ministers tries to attack or undermine the office of the Provincial Auditor, that is unacceptable. That undermines this Legislative Assembly and it undermines the protection to the people of Saskatchewan.

Such an attack by the minister is unwarranted, unjustified, and totally unacceptable. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the unprecedented attack by the minister that we witnessed in the House last Friday morning simply cannot be tolerated or condoned by this legislature. That attack was groundless, without foundation, and totally unjustifiable. Moreover, the minister did not even have the courage to repeat outside the Chamber his very serious allegations which he made in this House.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in respect to any of the problems that the auditor has in respect to doing his work, providing his audited statement, giving a report on the expenditures, any information that he is unable to attain, any illegal acts of the government, the auditor has no way of getting to the government. His only court, his only protection, is this Legislative Assembly. And here we have a case of a member of the front benches, the Minister of Justice, an experienced legislator in this House, coming forward and making unfounded allegations against the auditor.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it's shocking to me and to many of my colleagues who have served in this House for

a number of years. I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, to see the Minister of Justice, one whose duty has imposed him with the responsibility of upholding the laws, of running an office of fairness to all people in Saskatchewan. And this very Minister of Justice walks into this House, and he is the one who makes the false allegations in respect to the improper conduct of the auditor.

Mr. Speaker, this legislature must take appropriate actions when there is a breach of privilege. In view of the gravity of the offence, and in view of the fact that it is not the first offence by this minister, the Premier of Saskatchewan must, I submit, require that minister to apologize publicly. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that he should no longer have the confidence of any premier to remain as the Minister of Justice and should resign his cabinet position forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go into some of the aspects of what precipitated our motion in respect to privilege. The minister came into this House last Friday. We were asking him questions in respect to the auditor's inability to carry out his work. And certainly the auditor indicated to this in his report that he did not have sufficient money . . . or sufficient information to be able to do an accurate accounting and perform his job.

(1515)

The auditor indicated that he was unable to get information. He indicated that the government, in several areas, would not provide information. Secondly, that they were acting contrary to the law. He indicated that it was incumbent upon him under the jurisdiction of The (Provincial) Auditor Act, to perform in total an accounting for the expenditure of the whole government. He recognized that some of the Crowns and some agencies of government are audited by private auditing firms. But within the auditor's report, he indicates that it's still incumbent upon the auditor to seek the information even though it has been audited by a private auditing firm.

Let me give you an example. If the potash corporation goes out and gets private auditors, that private auditor is hired and is the client of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and that's who pays him. The Provincial Auditor represents all of the people of Saskatchewan, and accordingly he has to account for all the expenditures by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Here we have a minister coming into the House to debase the auditor, alleging that he was negotiating a certain package, when within that very letter that was not in fact the case.

I want to take a look at the aspect of that letter and some of the comments on which the minister based his comments the other day, Friday morning. There were two aspects that the solicitor, on behalf of the auditor, was in fact negotiating. He was negotiating for the independent operation of the office of auditor, and it's clearly indicated in the second part of the page of that letter if the Minister of Justice had been fair in reading it completely and putting this letter forward in its full content. I want to indicate what the Provincial Auditor was doing . . . or his solicitor was doing on behalf of the Provincial Auditor.

The Provincial Auditor is prepared to continue in office so the appointment of a successor is not emergent. All that is required to overcome the difficulties is a directive from the executive to all concerned that they are required by law to furnish the information that the Provincial Auditor deems necessary to fulfil his duties (to fulfil his duties — that's what he wanted) . . . are required by law to furnish the information that the Provincial Auditor deems necessary to fulfil his duties and that his estimates be reviewed by the Board of Internal Economy.

And what the Provincial Auditor did . . . or his solicitor did, was to enclose a draft letter with respect to working out the details so he could be provided with all the information, and secondly, a statutory provision with respect to having the auditor's budget reviewed by the Board of Internal Economy, as is the Legislative Assembly's budget reviewed by the Board of Internal Economy. To clearly . . . indicative of what the Provincial Auditor was attempting to do, was in fact to bring greater independence — independence — to his performance of his duties.

And what was alleged by the Minister of Finance is that the Provincial Auditor was actually trying to negotiate what was going to be in the report depended upon what kind of a private package he might obtain. And I want to say that although the Minister of Finance comes into this House now with further letters, it's not relevant to the actions of the Minister of Finance in respect to his actions on Friday . . . Minister of Justice.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, this legislature, as you have indicated, and as set out in the various books in respect to parliamentary procedure, this legislature, it's incumbent upon all of us to protect the integrity and the ability of servants of the Legislative Assembly to perform their duties. And I say to you that in dealing with that we have to deal with it in a way in which is very, very grave affront to the legislature when the Minister of Justice comes forward and did what he did in the House on Friday.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the parliamentary system, in my view, cannot continue to grow and to exist unless each of us here share a responsibility in promoting it. It's not a very far step that democracy can be suddenly eroded. And I have been in this legislature for a number of years, and I want to say that I have been concerned over the recent years — I guess since 1982 — in the respect and the use of the Legislative Assembly as it had been in the post-period, or the pre-period to '82.

And I think what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a minister who would come in and have a breach of privilege which in effect was what he said, there was improper actions by the Provincial Auditor. He did that at a time when the Provincial Auditor has absolutely no way of defending himself. And more cowardly than that, the Minister of Finance made the allegations in this House. When he was challenged to make them outside of the Chamber, he was not prepared to do so.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, while we have immunity in

this House, because often the debates get hot and heavy, we still have to essentially be prepared to back our statements of what we allege in this House, or the statements we make in respect to the characters of other people. And here what we have, in my view, is one of the most graveous, most grave situation that I have encountered in the number of years that I have been in this legislature, an officer of this legislature who the Minister of Justice took it upon himself to indicate the improper action.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is much more that I can say in respect to this, but surely . . . I want to conclude my remarks by saying that a few of the basic aspects in respect to the background of the auditor and the position so the public can understand.

I think in respect to The Provincial Auditor Act, it requires first of all, it is necessary to appreciate that many of the terms used are defined in this Act and the "appointed auditor" means an auditor appointed pursuant to the Act or other authority to audit accounts related to the public money.

The "auditor" under Section 11 states:

That the Provincial Auditor is the auditor of the accounts of the Government of Saskatchewan.

And therefore, that really means that all information has to be made available to him.

And just because the auditor, after doing his best, with insufficient information, with some aspects where he indicates that not only information isn't provided, but that laws are essentially broken by the government, he indicates in his report that he is unable to carry out his major function as auditor.

And instead of coming into this House and addressing those concerns of the Provincial Auditor — and obviously, Mr. Speaker, we could go through the auditor's report, and it is a condemnation of the actions or the inactions of this government. It has been said, that is the role of the government. And any government certainly wants to have the least issues raised by the Provincial Auditor.

But any government acting properly, with a report of the nature that was presented by the auditor this year, would have come into this legislature, and the Premier or the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Finance, perhaps more appropriately, would have said, we have concerns with it, and outlined some of the areas in which they're going to address the concerns and work out the concerns in respect to what the auditor raised.

But not this government. This government, when backed into a corner, now lashes out against an auditor who has operated in this province of Saskatchewan for . . . prior to 1971 as an auditor. Mr. Speaker, the actions of this government indicate that they have no longer confidence in their administration of this province.

What has precipitated this debate here today is that the government has an auditor's report which is damning,

which indicates possible waste, possible disappearance of money, a lack of information. It's a damning report. It is probably the worst report that any government in the history of the Commonwealth has received from an auditor.

And instead of coming in here and humbly putting before this legislature how they are going to rectify it, like a caged, cornered animal, having lost the confidence of the people of this province, they now strike out at whoever stands in their way.

And here we have one minister, the Minister of Justice, who should stand up for fairness before the law, bringing in a letter, misinterpreting it, misquoting it, leaving out parts of it, and ending up by saying that the actions of the auditor were improper.

Mr. Speaker, this of course is a very serious situation. And we find a number of the headlines that have precipitated it where it says: "Andrew's attack on auditor called scurrilous, gutless." We have a provincial . . . another article by Ron Petrie, we have: "Andrew attack on auditor draws criticism."

And what we have before us, Mr. Speaker, clearly is a government whose record of mismanagement, of cover-up, of non-disclosure, of not providing the public with information having caught up to them. The very concern that the people of this province have is the fiscal management by this government. And the auditor is required by law to give his report, and he gave his report. And I'll tell you, the people of Saskatchewan are right, that this government's financial management is totally out of control. And that's what the auditor's report says, in part.

Can you believe a Minister of Justice coming in here to criticize the officer who brought down that report, rather than going to his Premier and saying . . . and his Finance minister and his other cabinet colleagues and say, let's formulate a policy how we can address these major concerns of the public. Because not only here have we an individual integrity being assailed by the Minister of Justice, but what is more importantly, it's symptomatic of the nature of government that we have here in Saskatchewan.

(1530)

Do you realize that the Provincial Auditor said that I can only really account for 50 per cent of all of the funds that are spent in this province? Fifty per cent, ladies and gentlemen, people that are watching. Fifty per cent, he says; with the information provided I cannot carry out the function under which the Act provides.

And rather than having a government that would address those concerns, as I know the government under Allan Blakeney addressed . . . And I can remember sitting at the cabinet table when an auditor's report came down and the premier of the province at that day said, I want a report back from every department in respect to the complaints of the public auditor, and I want you to indicate to me how those problems can be resolved. And if they reoccurred a second time under the premier that we had,

like Allan Blakeney, I'll tell you, you didn't sit comfortably around the table again.

But here what is lacking is a lack of leadership by the Premier of this province. Instead of allowing his minister to come in here and defame a servant of the people of Saskatchewan, what he has . . . he has no solution. This government is totally out of control, and what we have is the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Justice rather, who should be protecting, providing fairness under the law, coming in and leading the attack.

Mr. Speaker, I've indicated in the initial part of my remarks the seriousness of what is before this House. What you have found is a prima facie case that the minister in fact breached a privilege of this House in his attack on the Provincial Auditor. And it's not a question only of the individual, but it's a question of addressing the situation, the serious situation, and that is on behalf of the people of this province.

What I want to do, Mr. Speaker, in light of the seriousness of this allegation, I want at this time then, Mr. Speaker, to move the following motion:

That this Assembly condemns the Minister of Justice for having breached the privileges of this legislature by his unacceptable and unjustifiable criticism of the Provincial Auditor; that this Assembly calls on the Premier to require that the minister apologize publicly and resign from the Executive Council; and further, that this Assembly reaffirms the importance of the office of the Provincial Auditor as an officer of this legislature.

I so move that motion, Mr. Speaker, seconded by my colleague, the member from Regina Centre.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I want to address a few remarks on this matter. My learned friend from the Quill Lakes stated that this was a situation in which the Premier showed a marked lack of leadership. That, in a sense, was accurate. I think it was also fairly compassionate. I think the Premier has displayed not just a lack of leadership . . . I think what we have here is an effort by the government, and apparently with the Premier's advice, what we have here is an effort to cover up. What we have here is an effort to avoid an examination of the auditor's report.

We have a clear, intentional effort by the member from Kindersley to discredit the Provincial Auditor; sought not to deal with it; did not refer the report to a special committee, which might have been done; did not take any steps to deal with the issues that the Provincial Auditor had named, but attacked the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is unique in many ways. I don't think I have ever heard of such a direct, blunt, and brutal attack on an officer of this Assembly. In fact, the only instances I know of which approach this were all committed by the member from Kindersley.

It's unique as well, Mr. Speaker, because I doubt that in this Assembly have we ever had two questions of

privilege on the floor at the same time. We now have this one; we have the one which was dealt with Friday.

I understand my friend from Athabasca, Mr. Speaker, wants to introduce some students. Providing I will have the floor again, I'll yield it to him.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you today 15 grade 10 students from the Dene High School in La Loche, who are seated up in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher Sheila Hamel, and chaperon Donna Lee Dumont.

I'd like to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that these students . . . a trip from La Loche to Regina and back is a little over 1,100 miles, and I would ask all members in here to join with me in welcoming the students from La Loche, and we sincerely hope that your trip will be enjoyable and educational. And I will meet with you shortly after. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINT OF PRIVILEGE (continued)

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you. I want to point out to members of the Assembly that this debate, the debate on the point of privilege raised on Friday, are about the integrity of the office. But in a much more substantive way, Mr. Speaker, they are about the integrity of this government's spending. It's about waste and mismanagement and this government's attempt to conceal what is a shocking record with respect to its management of tax dollars.

The auditor's function, Mr. Speaker, is to assist this Assembly in ensuring that tax dollars are spent as efficiently as possible, with as much effectiveness as possible, and with as much economy as possible. Those words — efficiency, effectiveness, and economy — sum up the goal of the Provincial Auditor's office.

He serves as an officer of this Assembly, as you do, sir; as the Clerks at the Table do; as the Sergeant-at-Arms does; as the pages do. All serve this Assembly — in a larger sense, the public of Saskatchewan — all serve this Assembly in an attempt to assist the Assembly in carrying out its functions.

As members tell students, and I'm sure all members have told students, that one of the primary functions of a Legislative Assembly, of a parliament of any sort, is to control government spending. That is indeed what the battle of Runnymede was all about a thousand years ago. Parliament sought the right to control the expenditure of kings. It's the oldest and the most hallowed right, and the Provincial Auditor speaks directly to that.

With the growth of governments in this century, it became very difficult for members to do the job directly. Members began to rely on offices of the Assembly to assist them. One of the primary officers which assists us in

controlling government expenditures, in ensuring that tax dollars aren't wasted, is the Provincial Auditor.

And when they seek to obscure the Provincial Auditor's report, Mr. Speaker, they seek to obscure government waste and mismanagement, because that is his function. His function is to ensure, as I said, that money is spent in accordance with the rules which this Assembly has laid down, and that it's spent as efficiently as possible, as effectively as possible, and with as much economy as possible.

Mr. Speaker, you don't have to go very far to discover why the Provincial Auditor was as concerned in his report as he was. The Provincial Auditor's report must be without parallel in the history of the dominion. I would be very, very surprised if anyone can find another instance in Canadian history, provincial or federal, where a report of this sort has been issued. This, Mr. Speaker, is not . . . instances of qualified reports are very, very rare when dealing with a level of government. They're very, very rare. I never saw one before this government was elected.

A qualified report is a report where the Provincial Auditor says the report is not as reliable as it might be for the following reasons. This isn't a qualified report; this is no report at all. The Provincial Auditor says, and I will quote . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think the hon. members have to be cognizant of the fact that there are two motions before the House. One is in effect dealing with the issues that the members are about to bring up in a more substantive way. The motion we're dealing with today is directed more to criticism of the Minister of Justice for remarks he made.

Mr. Shillington: — I thank you for that, Mr. Speaker. I will relate my remarks to the question of privilege which is before the Assembly today.

I would point out to members opposite that one cannot deal with this motion without talking about the importance of the Provincial Auditor, and that's really what I was doing. If the members are to understand why the kind of remarks which the member from Kindersley made should not be permitted, it's important that we understand the role of the Provincial Auditor. That's really all I was dealing with.

And I point out that he provides a report which provides assurance to this Assembly that its rules have been followed, that there's been no waste and mismanagement, and if there's any instances of it, he points them out. This time he doesn't give us a qualified report; he gives us no report at all. He's unable to do his job.

The member from Kindersley, instead of dealing with that problem — and it's a very real problem — I want to just spend a moment talking about the sort of waste and mismanagement with which this Provincial Auditor is required to deal. I won't deal with that at length, but it's a proper comment to make. But instead of dealing with that, the member from Kindersley didn't try and solve the problem; he tried to shoot the messenger. As someone

has pointed out, he took direct aim at the messenger and shot himself in the foot.

One has to wonder, Mr. Speaker, what can be left of this government's feet after this last session. They've seemingly been doing nothing since the middle of March but shooting at their feet and, I may say, with deadly accuracy when they're pointing down.

Mr. Speaker, the amount this government spends has increased by 58 per cent in the years it's been in office. Inflation during that period of time has been 38 per cent. When I relate those figures to people, they say to me, but how can that be? The roads have deteriorated; the health services have deteriorated. The response is: that's patronage; that's waste and mismanagement.

(1545)

This is the function of the Provincial Auditor, to assist the members of the Assembly in rooting out waste and mismanagement and patronage and dealing with it. And when this government attempts to shoot the messenger, as it did, what it's saying to the public is: we don't want to solve the problem; we want to hide it, and we'll take aim at anyone who attempts to criticize us.

You don't have to go very far to find the sort of things which I think the taxpayer would want the Provincial Auditor to point out: the lease of a hotel in Regina for which they had no use; office space for which they had no use. We found some new ones with the Provincial Auditor's report. We found that there's a couple of million dollars missing from the sale of dental equipment. It may show up somewhere. I'm not suggesting it's in a numbered Swiss account — or it may be — but the Provincial Auditor points out that there can be no proper control over the level of expenditures if you don't know where the money is being spent. And that's all the Provincial Auditor said. It may turn out to be a more heinous story than I suggest, but it's bad enough. If all assumptions are made in favour of the government, the story's bad enough.

The Provincial Auditor attempted to do that. He filed his report in the Assembly . . . you did on his behalf, Mr. Speaker; you filed the report. He said, "I cannot effectively carry out my role to watch over the public purse for my client, the Legislative Assembly." The sentence ends with a period. There are no qualifications.

What did the government opposite do? Did they suggest, as did the Liberal government in Ottawa when they faced a report which wasn't anywhere near as damning from the then auditor Maxwell Henderson, they said, it's a problem; we'll see if we can deal with it. This government has never admitted that there's any conceivable problem in dealing with public expenditures. They've never admitted that there is waste, which there patently is; that there's mismanagement, which there patently is; and that there's patronage.

That waste, mismanagement, and patronage has left the people of this province with a high level of taxes and a low level of services. The difference is waste and mismanagement. That's what we have a Provincial

Auditor to deal with.

The member opposite . . . the criticisms of the member opposite could not have been more unfair. The Provincial Auditor, I suggest, throughout this, acted with sterling integrity and a courage that we can only admire. It is not the Provincial Auditor who lacked courage and integrity, it is the member from Kindersley who is displayed with a lack of integrity and an appalling lack of courage. In fact the criticisms which he levelled at the Provincial Auditor are very apt criticisms of himself, and most unfair of the Provincial Auditor.

Let's look at what the Provincial Auditor actually said. I'm sorry, let us look at what the correspondence actually says, to which the member referred. These are sessional papers tabled today and yesterday, not numbered, but it doesn't matter. I refer to a letter tabled today, dated April 18, 1989. This letter preceded the letter which the minister used on Friday on which he attempted to base his case.

This letter says, if the matter is to proceed . . . we're not quite sure what the matter is — it appears to be the resignation of the Provincial Auditor. First of all, it's most improper of the government to be requesting the resignation of the Provincial Auditor in a private fashion, as they've clearly done. The government has clearly gone to the Provincial Auditor and said, we want your resignation. They have clearly gone to the Provincial Auditor and said, we want your resignation. What will it take?

It is very, very improper for the government to go to any member of this Assembly and ask for their resignation. The letter which they tabled today, which was supposed to buttress the case on Friday, states:

If the matter . . . (and it's clear from the context the matter is the Provincial Auditor's resignation)

If the matter is to proceed, it should proceed along the lines of your providing a form of letter which is acceptable to your client, along with a listing of those other requirements which he imposes as a condition of a further review of his presumably critical report.

To reduce that to simple language, the government . . . Mr. Kyle said to Mr. Gordon Neill, both solicitors practising in Regina, if he's going to resign he's got to do it in a letter which is satisfactory to us, and he's got to tell us what he wants in return for his resignation. That's what the letter says in the clearest possible fashion. How did Mr. Neill respond?

Mr. Lutz responded, I suggest, with considerable courage and with the highest possible integrity. Standing up to the bullies, Mr. Speaker, he states:

My client has suggested that joint audits of the crown corporations and crown-controlled corporations would go a long way to overcoming some of the difficulties. This was rejected by your side (meaning the Minister of Finance). My client has suggested that the executive government

ensure that (the Provincial Auditor) has full access to whatever information he deems necessary (as his Act provides) together with a statutory amendment to allow for the review of his budget by the Board of Internal Economy rather than the present system.

Then he goes on to say:

If this were done he indicated (that) he could retire quietly upon the appointment of his successor, knowing that his successor would be able to fulfil the responsibilities of the office in a more harmonious atmosphere.

It is clear from that paragraph that the Provincial Auditor's conditions were a restoration of the integrity of the office so that he could deal with the waste, the mismanagement, and the patronage, and assist this Assembly in developing and imposing upon the government a less wasteful system of running its affairs.

I am not sure how the member from Kindersley could have so interpreted the Provincial Auditor's letters, but he did. What the member from Kindersley said, I'm going to repeat that as well for members opposite. He quotes inaccurately, and out of context, the paragraph which I just read.

I'm reading from May 19, page 1247:

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — What I am about to read, Mr. Speaker, is directly related to what the Leader of the Opposition has said, Mr. Speaker, and it says:

This is a direct quotation from the letter, supposedly. It's indented and single-spaced:

I am advised if speedy acceptance of this proposal is confirmed . . . the Provincial Auditor will amend his report to reflect that satisfactory steps have been taken (to negotiate the deal.)

That is not what the letter said. That's an inaccurate quotation. The words "to negotiate a deal," Mr. Speaker, give a false impression of the entire letter.

The Provincial Auditor has behaved throughout this . . . I say again to members opposite, the Provincial Auditor was asked by members opposite what it would take to get his resignation. He said, the restoration of the integrity of my office. That's clearly the import of these letters.

The member opposite, in a shoddy, dishonest, and certainly stupid attempt to discredit the Provincial Auditor, attempted to put a . . .

The Speaker: — I know sometimes the word stupid is used in the House, but as it's directed at a member, I don't think it's good parliamentary language, and I simply ask that the hon. member to keep that in mind.

Mr. Shillington: — I recognize, Mr. Speaker, the accuracy of your comments. There are times when what is accurate is not necessarily what's parliamentary. In that sense, I withdraw the remarks.

I want to quote from the ... (inaudible interjection) ... I withdraw the remarks unequivocally.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order, order. I actually didn't ask the hon. member to withdraw his remarks — simply to refrain from it, and without any comment.

Mr. Shillington: — It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note what others are saying about this province. I venture to say ... (inaudible interjection) ... Well this is not Barb Byers. The member from Lloydminster never tires of libelling and maligning members of the trade union who are duly elected to their position by the public servants that you're supposed to be working with.

I would like to quote, not from a trade unionist in Saskatchewan, but an editorial writer in *The Globe and Mail*. I was coming back, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say, from a funeral yesterday. Someone came from the back of the plane and said, Mr. Shillington, I think there's something you might be interested in. It was an editorial, which had been written in consequence of the member from Kindersley's remarks on Friday. And I want to read a selected line or two out of this editorial. It says, I think more succinctly than many of us have, what this government is doing.

The Saskatchewan government appears to regard the province's auditor as a kind of Peeping Tom, a prowler in the backyard of its fiscal business and a rude intruder on its (public) affairs.

Thus, when Willard Lutz came to call with briefcase, clipboard and calculator, the response of the government was to rush around the house closing curtains, bolting doors and exhibiting other signs of inhospitality. This has gravely displeased Mr. Lutz, as well it might. It should equally disturb (the editorial goes on to say) it should equally disturb his clients, the members of the (Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan) ...

It is commonplace that government auditors (should) turn up irritating, embarrassing things in the course of their work. It is routine that they should remonstrate, strongly if necessary, with (respect to the) ... handling of public money and failure to ensure that the taxpayer got value for it.

It is rather less common for an auditor to censure a government for actually preventing him from getting at the books, thereby evading its obligation (to the) law ...

I think it's fair to say that it's not rather less common; it's probably never happened before.

And then it goes on to say, and I'll close with this line:

The image that emerges is (that) of a shabby, almost furtive government.

The member opposite tries not to deal with the problem but to cover it up. And I say to the members opposite, you

must realize there are some limits to the extent to which you can attack this institution without getting yourself into difficulty.

This episode on which you show no signs of relenting, is far and away from being the first attack on this institution which you've made. As someone pointed out, you have made a practice for years of not answering orders for return ...

The Speaker: — I want to once more draw the member's attention ... and he has been wandering somewhat. But I now draw his attention to the fact that the motion is a specific criticism of the Minister of Justice, and not of the government in general. And while I have allowed the member to introduce one or two remarks to substantiate his case, I believe he's getting off into a general discussion, and he should come back to the motion.

(1600)

Mr. Shillington: — That may have been. I want to deal with this member and his particular propensity to attack members of this Assembly.

I think members on this side of the House would be less alarmed if it had happened the first time. This, Mr. Speaker, is just unforgivable for an 11-year veteran of this Assembly to commit such a fundamental breach of the rules of this parliament. If a member came in and did it, if he'd been elected to this House for one month, I'd hope he'd understand that such behaviour is not tolerable. It is just unforgivable, Mr. Speaker, for an 11-year veteran of this Assembly to behave in a fashion which this minister has.

An Hon. Member: — This is the worst speech I've heard since the last one.

Mr. Shillington: — The member from Lloydminster says it's the worst speech he's heard since my last one. I have nothing to compare with because the member from Lloydminster hasn't spoken in so long that no one can remember it.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that the member from Kindersley ... this is not the first time the member from Kindersley's done this. He has attacked other officers of this Assembly when they happened to displease him. I've provided a short list of such breaches that I recall from memory.

When Mr. Tickell, who was then the Ombudsman, suggested that there was some room for improvement in the way this government treated some people, and when he suggested that his budget had been reduced beyond the level at which it was possible for him to do an effective job, what did the member from Kindersley do, who was then Finance minister? Did he say to the provincial Ombudsman, we'll look at it? Did he say, there is no more money; I'm sorry, you'll have to make with what you do? None of those things, which would have been a sensible and a fair and honest reply. What the member from Kindersley said to Mr. Tickell is, he's being chintzy.

Apparently the member from Kindersley's view is that

anybody who offers anything by way of comment on his conduct, which is anything less than fully supportive, is a proper subject of criticism.

I note as well that the . . . I recall as well the Legislative Counsel, Merrilee Charowsky, in yet another instance of this government paying something less than due regard for the democratic institutions. In 1987 they decided they weren't going to call the session, so they didn't. March went by; April went by; finally in May the then leader of the opposition, Allan Blakeney, sought an opinion from Legislative Counsel about the propriety of spending and warrants. The Legislative Counsel, as was her function, stated, this is illegal.

What did the member from Kindersley do? Did he say, well then we'll have to recall the session and have a budget passed? Did he take issue with the judgement? He described her as being some sort of a handmaiden of the opposition. I think his comments were: she's the opposition's lawyer. On that one and only occasion, the member from Kindersley apologized.

Nor is this his first attack on Mr. Lutz. He was reported in the Kindersley weekly newspaper as having made a comment which goes along the following lines: provincial auditors are people with very thick glasses; their function is to see if the i's are crossed and the t's are dotted, suggesting that they had no legitimate function to serve. That may well, I say to members opposite, that may well have prompted the opening line in *The Globe and Mail* editorial:

The Saskatchewan government appears to regard the province's auditor as a kind of Peeping Tom, a prowler in the backyard of its fiscal business and a rude intruder on its private affairs.

I suggest that this indeed . . . that this line in *The Globe and Mail* is justified by the member from Kindersley in his comments in Kindersley.

The member from Kindersley didn't even have the courage to justify his remarks, having made them, having been asked some hard but very fair questions by the media. What did he do? Did he stay; did he try to deal with it as best he could? As nearly everyone has reported, he ducked into the government lounge where the reporters couldn't follow him. It is bad enough that he makes these sort of — they're libellous, that's as good a word as any — makes these unfair, untrue remarks about the Provincial Auditor, a person who has no means of defending himself, unlike an attack which a member might make on another. We have grounds for replying.

If the member from Kindersley had attacked Mr. Neill, the lawyer, Mr. Neill has a means of replying, but the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Speaker, has none, no means of responding. He cannot engage in a debate with any member of this Assembly. Not only did it attack a person who has no means of defending himself, but the member didn't even then have the courage to defend his remark, ran for the government caucus, spent all weekend, presumably, trying to put together some sort of a defence which was as thin as the very air itself.

He comes into this Assembly today . . . I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there's got to be a point in time at which points of privilege are going to become surplus to the functioning of this legislature. But there's more. I suggest there's some points of privilege which could arise out of today's session.

The members opposite today, far from recanting their sins, far from at least avoiding their sins, have repeated them today. They have repeated some of the sins which they committed on Friday and have added a couple of new ones. As I say, I'm not sure what purpose it serves to each day keep calling more points of privilege, but there are a number which arise today. One of the ones which arise today is that the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Arises today, I thank the member from Regina Wascana. My, what a sparkling contribution you have made. It's obvious that the member from Wascana is a learned and brilliant student of the English language. I say it's obvious in that comment. We haven't heard him speak. It's too bad he hasn't got enough wits to get in cabinet or at least get up in this House and speak on occasion, but we'll simply have to take it from that contribution that his contribution could be brilliant if only he'd make it.

The member from Kindersley today, I think, in a very real way went on to say, it's true, and what's more, there's more damning evidence that the Provincial Auditor tried to trade material benefits for a favourable report, and it's contained in this document, this package of documents which we sent back. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that's yet another point of privilege if there was any point in raising it. I don't know to what point it's going to serve to keep adding one point of privilege on top of another. It's fairly obvious though that members opposite haven't yet got the message. The message is that central to the democratic institution in this province is this Assembly, and this Assembly cannot function without its officers, not in this day and age.

So when you attack the officers of this Assembly, you attack this Assembly and ultimately democracy itself. It is apparent that you people don't understand that. It's apparent that you care little for the officers. It was a cowardly, mean, and grossly unfair attack. You apparently don't understand that when you attack the officers, you attack the institution. When you attack the institution, you attack democracy itself in this province.

You people . . . I won't, Mr. Speaker, get back into the other examples of this government attacking democracy itself, because you've already asked me not to dwell on that at any great length, but I say that this is not an isolated example. This is not an isolated example of this government attacking democracy itself, the democratic institutions. They have done it on any number of other occasions by their conduct of the business in this province, in this Assembly, by their conduct outside the Assembly, and they've done it again today, Mr. Speaker.

The members opposite seem to feel that they should be attacking and criticizing anyone who isn't fully supportive. Never mind the fact that these people are doing their duties which they're required by law to do; never mind the fact that they have no means of responding; members opposite feel free to attack them.

I say there cannot have been a government elected in this province which had less respect for this institution and the officers than you people. There cannot have been another example of a government which had less understanding of how this place operates and less understanding of why it operates and how it functions. You people are really in a class by itself when it comes to showing disdain for this Assembly and its officers.

I see members opposite smiling. It is thought that a showing of disdain for the officers of this Assembly, and this Assembly, is a humorous thing. I say to you, you grossly underestimate the public of Saskatchewan. I say that when the member from Shellbrook sits grinning like a Cheshire cat, and the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has just thought . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . but he was when I was making the comment, and the member from Saltcoats sit grinning when I talked about the importance of this institution. I say to members opposite that when you attack an officer you attack this institution, and it's not something that I think you should find particularly amusing.

It's apparent that members opposite . . . you don't begin to understand the gravity of what you've done. The others do. As I say, I point out that this province, Mr. Speaker, has got more ink in the *Globe and Mail* in the last two weeks, all of it reporting . . .

An Hon. Member: — Negative.

Mr. Shillington: — . . . negatively on the province — that's right. All of it reporting this government's shortcomings.

I went to . . . with respect to this very issue of the Provincial Auditor, got to Toronto — not on very pleasant business, I might add — but at least one is away from the pressures of ordinary business. What happens? Pick up a copy of *The Globe and Mail* on the street corner and there's Saskatchewan and the member from Victoria commenting on it; Monday coming back, once again.

If you people are looking for coverage, you're succeeding brilliantly. If you're looking for good publicity, then you've failed very, very, very badly.

Mr. Speaker, while I would . . .

An Hon. Member: — Is this going to lead somewhere?

Mr. Shillington: — The members opposite ask if this is going to lead somewhere. I would hope this would lead to an understanding by members opposite of the importance of what we are discussing. I know members opposite think this is wildly amusing because members opposite couldn't care less what happens to this institution.

The public in Saskatchewan do, and if you don't shed yourself of some of your arrogance, and if you don't start showing some respect for the institution, the taxpayer, who Mr. Lutz is trying to serve, then indeed you people are going to be . . . to use the phrase of the former member from Wilkie, you're going to be given the option of transferring to the private sector after the next election.

(1615)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I don't know what members opposite think the rules of this Assembly are. I find it annoying enough that the member from Kindersley once again displays abominable judgement and an abominable temper, which is what he displayed — both bad temper and bad judgement. The bad temper is never forgivable. The degree of bad judgement is astonishing, considering the fact that he's spent 11 years here.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you'll indulge me if I tell . . . it's a true story. It happened to me last year, and I will be as brief as I can. I attended a conference in Denver last July. Met an individual who talked with a distinctly Brooklyn accent. It was obvious he was from the north-east. I was surprised he knew where Saskatchewan was. But when I told him where Saskatchewan was, he said to me, and this is a direct quote, "What on earth is going on?" I said, what do you mean? He said, what on earth is going on in Saskatchewan?

It turned out that he worked as an analyst for Salmon Brothers in New York. He was an analyst who analysed credit ratings for provinces. It is that very thing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . this is directly on point. It was that very thing that Willard Lutz is trying to deal with. He is trying to assist . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . indeed it was.

I was astonished that someone from New York would have heard of this province. They heard of this province in a negative context. They heard of it in a negative context because the bond rating had been lowered. Why had it been lowered? Because this government can't competently manage its province's affairs.

The primary function of Mr. Lutz is to assist us in imposing on the government some efficiency, some effectiveness, and some economy. I didn't say to the chap in Denver, it's because the Provincial Auditor isn't allowed to do his job; I said it's because of patronage, waste, and mismanagement that this province has got into the shape it has — but I might have. Because if Mr. Lutz had been allowed to do his job over the years, if he had been given the staff he needed and the support he needed, which was obviously lacking in the comments of the member from Kindersley, we might not be in the serious situation we are with respect to taxes, which are way up, and services, which have deteriorated very badly. It is that very issue which is at stake.

I say to Mr. Speaker, and to members opposite, that we treat this issue very seriously; we treat this institution seriously. If you think it's amusing, then you're going to have to spend some time, because we want to take an opportunity to talk about the seriousness of what's happened.

I see and I welcome a former colleague from Rosthern in the Assembly. He and I served on public accounts together for four years. We invested a goodly number of hours in public accounts, going over the public accounts,

going over the Provincial Auditor's report. I wonder what he would say if he still had a seat in the Assembly. He might be quiet out of the interest of party discipline, but I suspect he might well know that the Provincial Auditor is deserving of more support than he's been getting.

He's deserving of the support of this Assembly. He is entitled to conduct his work without interference. He's entitled to conduct his work without being the subject of criticism. And he's entitled to do so without the sort of comments that have been made.

This kind of comment which has been made I think must make the Provincial Auditor's work almost impossible. How on earth can any officer of this Assembly carry out his duties; how can he go to the public accounts day after day; how can he assist the members in dealing with the accounts when he's subject to the kind of attack which he has been in this Assembly? I think it would make his work almost impossible, and I suggest that this House has got to deal with it.

It isn't sufficient for this government to sit there glumly as they have done on every other issue in this Assembly. It isn't enough for the government to sit there grim faced and say nothing, and hope that sooner or later the members of the opposition will run out of speakers and steam and the issue will blow over.

This issue, Mr. Speaker, deserves better treatment than that. I see members opposite, if there's any indication that they are aware of the problem that they're going to deal with it, it certainly isn't evident in the members opposite who alternatively look as if they think it's funny, and alternatively look rather grim faced — amusing because they don't understand the issue; grim faced because they do read polls.

And whatever one might say about the Provincial Auditor, the waste, the mismanagement, the patronage with which we have been attempting to deal over the seven years this government has been in office, is beginning to catch up to this government. I therefore . . .

The Speaker: — You're about to move the motion, or to second it, rather.

Mr. Shillington: — I therefore, Mr. Speaker, take great pleasure in seconding the motion. And I trust all members opposite will enter the debate, and I trust this Assembly will find a means of restoring some integrity to the officers who serve us so loyally.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes on this motion, and only a few, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to try and keep my comments relative to the motion before us.

Members opposite have said, Mr. Speaker, that this auditor's report is a damning report. And I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, have said that the Provincial Auditor has a statutory requirement to report fully and accurately, and I agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

And while, Mr. Speaker, I haven't personally researched every point that has been made by the Provincial Auditor in his report, I would like to make reference to at least one today that I have responsibility for, to perhaps question why it's reported in the way that it is, Mr. Speaker. And let me begin, Mr. Speaker — this is on page 94 of the auditor's report — in July, Mr. Speaker, of 1988 . . . Mr. Speaker, this is about the time that there were some gas reserves at SaskPower, sold to Saskoil for cash and shares in Saskoil. The Provincial Auditor was of the belief at that time that SaskPower now became a Crown-controlled company and therefore he was the auditor. And the auditor that had previously been there, by virtue of Saskoil being a private company, was no longer the auditor. So he sent that auditor a letter — and I won't read it, I'll table it, Mr. Speaker — but he sent that auditor a letter setting out his belief and the reasons why he was now the auditor for Saskoil and not the private sector auditor, Mr. Speaker.

That letter was responded to by the auditor for Saskoil, and it says:

Dear Mr. Lutz: In your letter dated to me July 28, 1988, you have asked Clarkson & Gordon to provide you with the same reports which we provided to you for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. We did not provide any such reports for Saskoil for the 1987 fiscal year because it was not a Crown-controlled corporation.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, he says:

Its status has not changed, and I would be interested in discussing with you further your proposed change in our reporting to you for 1988.

Mr. Speaker, there was a letter from the auditor that said this is not a Crown-controlled company and I'm the auditor. Then there was a letter that went from the auditor of Saskoil that says, no, you're wrong, but I'd be happy to discuss that with you at any time. Okay.

Then there was another letter, Mr. Speaker, from the Provincial Auditor to the auditor for Saskoil. It says:

In response to your letter to the Provincial Auditor, it is our understanding that Saskoil became a Crown-controlled corporation on April 22, 1988, when the Saskatchewan Power Corporation acquired shares of Saskoil resulting in more than 50 per cent of Saskoil's issued and outstanding shares being vested in the Crown through the combined investments of SaskPower and CIC.

However, we would be pleased to consider any evidence that refutes our understanding in this regard, and I will contact you in a couple of weeks when my staff returns from vacation.

Mr. Speaker, it was during these discussions, Mr. Speaker, it was during these discussions that the auditor for Saskoil talked to the in-house solicitor at Saskoil for the purposes of getting all of this information requested by the auditor to satisfy himself as to whether or not Saskoil was a

Crown-controlled corporation. The solicitor, I am told, agreed to provide any and all information the auditor had requested.

The interesting thing is, Mr. Speaker, the auditor never showed up, or his people never showed up at Saskoil to get, to avail himself of the opportunity presented to him for this information, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. I have reminded other members that while I've allowed other members to make one or two statements that could be construed that weren't directly related to the motion in order to substantiate their case, and I want to draw the same rule to the Deputy Premier at this time.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, following that discussion — and I'll tie it in — following that discussion, Mr. Speaker, there was another letter went from the Provincial Auditor to the auditor for Saskoil and said, kindly disregard my letter of July 28 regarding the audit of Saskoil; I am satisfied that Saskoil is not a Crown-controlled corporation. The only reason I bring this out now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I mean, the members opposite are squawking. They were talking about everything from people he met on a plane trip to New York, Mr. Speaker, or another one coming home from wherever it is he had been travelling to. I am talking specifically, Mr. Speaker, about a question of privilege that we are asked to judge on without the facts before us, Mr. Speaker, without the . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. I don't believe the hon. member should be interrupted, and he has the right to continue.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And so, Mr. Speaker, the point that I make, simply, is on page 94 of the auditor's report. On page 94 of the auditor's report there is . . . well it may be factually correct in as far as it goes, Mr. Speaker. It does not tell the complete story. It does not report fully and accurately as suggested by members opposite, Mr. Speaker. It does not report fully and accurately. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, at no time was SaskPower ever asked for any information relative to this deal.

Now that point being made, Mr. Speaker, that point being made, I don't know why members opposite . . . I don't know how they can in good conscience sit there and scream and squawk about cover-up when all we are asking for, Mr. Speaker, is that all the facts be made available to the legislature prior to a decision being taken on this question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

(1630)

And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, because members opposite were talking about this in question period — I want to point out just what the powers, Mr. Speaker, just what the powers of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts are as they exist today. And this is in a motion passed in this House in 1986 on Wednesday, December 3, when these committees were struck, Mr. Speaker, and it says:

That the said Standing Committees be severally

empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by this Assembly, and to report from time to time their observations thereon, with the power (Mr. Speaker) to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath (Mr. Speaker).

Now I've given one example in the auditor's report where I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it has been reported fully or accurately, Mr. Speaker. I've given one example.

We have the question now, Mr. Speaker, of this trust condition on a proposed package, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice is aware of the content of that package. None of the rest of us are. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it's right and proper to have all of these facts before us, Mr. Speaker, before we pass judgement, before we make the determination, Mr. Speaker.

And it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to amend the motion of the member for Quill Lakes, Mr. Speaker. And I move, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley:

That the motion of the member for Quill Lakes be amended by deleting all of the words after "that" and substituting "certain correspondence tabled by the Minister of Justice on May 19 and 23 and any associated circumstances be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts for their immediate investigation and report."

I move that, seconded by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — You've heard the amendment put forward by the member for Souris-Cannington. I have reviewed the amendment and find that it does not deal with the central issue of the main motion, which is the finding of a breach of privilege.

I refer members to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* . . . Order, order. Order. I refer members to *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* which discuss the issue of the relevancy of amendments as follows. Citation 425:

The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the questions.

Citation 426:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

And citation 437:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and

cannot be moved.

The amendment deals with the reference of certain documents to the Public Accounts Committee for review but does not demonstrate the relevance of this action to the determination of the question of privilege, which is central to the main motion. The Public Accounts Committee has no role to play in investigating or determining whether a matter is a breach of privilege.

The amendment does not purport to give the Public Accounts Committee any authority to consider the matter of privilege. I therefore must rule that the amendment is out of order . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member has spoken on the amendment and moved it, and therefore he cannot speak.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a couple of minutes to address the motion. I also, like the Deputy Premier, am responsible for one of the areas within the auditor's report, the property management, particularly regarding the dental equipment in which the auditor attests that there's \$2.2 million worth of assets, and certainly cannot, in his words . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, prior to recognizing the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, I think it was clear that the member for Regina North was on his feet, and that you chose . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . if I could have the floor, Mr. Speaker . . . that there was an obvious arrangement between the Deputy Premier and the minister in charge of privatization to get yet another motion moved. And I find it very interesting that you would recognize the minister of privatization and allow him an opportunity again to move yet another motion which would try to in fact "deep-six" the privilege motion that you have ruled on here in the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The member did not have a point of order. The member was standing on his feet, and I recognized him, and I do so now.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying previously that there's some comment about the dental equipment, and I'd given the figure of \$2.2 million. I would like to tell the same story, as my colleague just has with Saskoil, that certainly there was no request, no request regarding dental equipment specific to my auditors of (Saskatchewan) Property Management Corporation. So I think as we see these things come forward, that certainly puts some question as to the report, as my colleague from Kindersley has aptly said.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, for everything to be brought out in the open and have a discussion of this, and bring forth the package that the member from Kindersley has been talking about, I would like to move the following amendment to the motion, Mr. Speaker. And it is moved by myself and seconded by the member from Melfort:

That the motion of the member from Quill Lakes

be amended by deleting all words after the word "that" and substituting: "certain correspondence tabled by the Minister of Justice on May 19 and 23, 1989, and any associated circumstances be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for their immediate investigation and report as to whether or not the privileges of the Legislative Assembly have been breached."

The Speaker: — Does the member have an issue to raise?

Mr. Trew: — . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm on my feet. When you rule that out of order . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Members don't serve notice to the Speaker that they're next to speak. The Speaker recognizes who he sees first.

Since the Committee on Privileges and Elections can deal with the matter of privilege, I rule that the amendment's in order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the citations with which you back up your ruling. I would like to have an opportunity to examine those. And I would like to comment on a further point of order. It has been traditional in the debates of this House, once the mover and seconder have spoken, that the debate, if it seems convenient, will alternate from one side of the House to the other. Now the mover and seconder have spoken . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. I have dealt with that issue. The member was standing in front of me; I recognized him.

Regarding the first part of the member for Saskatoon Westmount's question as to the citations, they're the same citations that I mentioned previously — 425, 426, and 437.

(1645)

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As much as my colleagues, the member for Quill Lakes and the member for Regina Centre, have laid out this case of prima facie breach of privilege factually, there is also a fundamental question of fairness to be dealt with here today. And the fairness I'm talking about of course is the fairness to any officer of the Legislative Assembly, in this case a question of fairness to the Provincial Auditor.

You see, the member for Kindersley can take his place in this Legislative Assembly and make whatever statements he wants, either backed up with fact or not, backed up with fact or not, and he is protected against any legal action. So he can say anything he wants about anybody, including an officer of the Legislative Assembly. In this case, the officer of the Legislative Assembly that we're dealing with is the office of the Provincial Auditor, and that Provincial Auditor does not have the same access, the same ability, to speak out publicly to defend himself in this case. That's part of why, Mr. Speaker, we're asking for the Provincial Auditor to come before the bar in the Legislative Assembly so that he can defend himself, so that he can defend the office of the Provincial Auditor, and so that we can get to the bottom of all of the facts

rather than continually dealing with innuendo and with misrepresentations of letters, misrepresentations of the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier was dealing with a part of the auditor's report, and he was talking about page 94 where Saskoil sold some gas reserves for cash and shares to Saskoil, the oil company. He was trying to make reference to the fact that the Provincial Auditor had been calling for some special reports dealing with Saskoil.

But I want to draw members' attention to Appendix III of the auditor's report, and the following audits are not fully completed at March 24, 1989. It lists 26 — 26 audits not fully completed. Not one of those audits relates to Saskoil. Not one. So I wonder what the Deputy Premier was referring to when he's talking about the Provincial Auditor going on about the Saskoil audit.

Appendix IV of that same report, Mr. Speaker, deals with "List of Financial Statements and/or Annual Reports Not Tabled In The Legislative Assembly in the Manner Required By Law." Not meeting legal requirements, these keepers of democracy opposite, not in keeping with their own laws. And there are not one, not 26, but there are 64 — 64 annual reports and financial statements not tabled here as they are required.

Now who is it that is trying to defend the democracy? The Provincial Auditor quite correctly points out that in 64 cases the law has not been met. Those annual reports and financial statements have not been tabled here where they should be.

Not much wonder that the Provincial Auditor filed a report that was not exactly full of wild applause for the government but rather was a damning condemnation of the Conservative government and of the members opposite.

Now of the 64 financial statements and annual reports not tabled, I want to list a few of them, but I want to point out that nowhere in here is Saskoil. Nowhere does the Provincial Auditor list Saskoil as not being filed. And I submit that the reason that it's not listed is that the Provincial Auditor had at one time either thought Saskoil should be reporting to the Provincial Auditor or, in any rate, was checking it out to make sure that it should not be.

But some of the lists . . . some of the financial statements and annual reports not tabled, as required by law, include the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan — not tabled; Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan — again, not tabled in time; Municipal Financing Corporation; Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; public employees superannuation fund; and the list goes on and on. The Saskatchewan Heritage Fund, Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission, Saskatchewan Pension Plan, Saskatchewan Telecommunications — in total 64 financial statements, 64 annual reports not tabled, as required by law. And yet the members opposite would have us believe that they're the keepers of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has made statements

that are at best wrong and misleading, and therefore coming from an incompetent minister. Or another interpretation of his statements are the minister is attempting to discredit the Provincial Auditor so as to remove or reduce the public reaction to the duly submitted Provincial Auditor's report; in other words, making the public believe that somehow the Provincial Auditor is a nasty, mean-spirited individual who is somehow wrong, wrong, wrong.

And remember, as I pointed out earlier, the minister can make whatever statements he wants in this legislature, he's protected against any court action, but can make any statements, however factual, right here, and is protected.

But the officer that we're dealing with, the officer of the Legislative Assembly that we're dealing today, the Provincial Auditor, cannot do that. That, Mr. Speaker, is why we have repeatedly asked for the Provincial Auditor, and whoever else is needed to get to the bottom of this, to come and appear in the Legislative Assembly before the bar. Then we'll get to the bottom of it and, I suspect, only then.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina Centre pointed out that we have not one but two questions of privilege on the floor before us now. And I readily and hastily admit that, this being my first term, I don't have a long history of being in the Legislative Assembly, but I never in my wildest nightmare would have dreamt that we would have two questions of privilege to be dealt with at the same time. I always thought that the job of MLAs was to look after the public interest, to deal with legislation, and to deal with it in a forthright honest manner. Granted, there would be differences of opinion. Granted, there are differences in philosophy. But honest women and honest men can have those differences and deal with them in the Legislative Assembly.

What we have today is not simply an honest difference in opinion. We have before us today a whole question of the integrity of the member for Kindersley. I believe that it is really the member for Kindersley who is, and should be, on the defensive.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to a *Star-Phoenix* article of May 23. I want to refer to it in part, not to distort the article, not to represent the article . . . or misrepresent the article in any way, as the member from Kindersley so scurrilously misrepresented the April 20, 1989 letter from Larry Kyle to . . . or pardon me, to Larry Kyle from G.J.K. Neill, the lawyer for the Provincial Auditor. The article states, Mr. Speaker:

It wasn't until Friday morning that Saskatchewan truly discovered how distant from reality a government can become midway through its term.

Under attack from all sides by what can only be described as a scathing provincial auditor's report, the government set up its own world of make-believe to escape from allegations of secrecy in its spending habits.

The letter explains that the Provincial Auditor has been on

the job since 1971, and is now serving, I believe, in under its third administration. And then it says:

If the Provincial Auditor's estimates are correct, the only auditor who must by law report to taxpayers . . . can't get detailed information about almost \$3.5 billion in spending by government and Crown corporations — or (put another way) approximately \$3,500 for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.

That's not terribly far from half of the total spending that the government and Crown corporations in this province are responsible for. And we have a Provincial Auditor not able to deal with it. I'm going to skip a paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and then it goes on:

Puzzled and startled observers of the legislative assembly listened as Andrew read selected passages from a letter Lutz's lawyer (provided) wrote to the government's legal counsel on April 20. Andrew's abbreviated account of the correspondence left the impression Lutz had offered to resign, submit a palatable rewrite of his report and make no more trouble for the government — but only if the price were right for a severance package.

The article goes on.

Either Andrew believed no one would ever see the full text of the letter or somebody convinced him an overnight epidemic of illiteracy had gripped Saskatchewan and only cabinet ministers from Kindersley were immune.

Mr. Speaker, the . . . want to deal with some of the events of Friday last when in the Legislative Assembly, in answer to a question, the member for Kindersley said:

Number three, Mr. Speaker, (and I'm quoting now) . . .
Number three, Mr. Speaker, is, and I will read: That he would of course expect to . . .

TABLING OF REPORT

The Speaker: — Order, order. I would like to draw to the member's attention that at 4:37 this afternoon I received in my office the following letter and documents from the Provincial Auditor. The letter is addressed to myself:

Dear Sir: In accordance with Section 14(a) of The Provincial Auditor Act, I present herewith a special report to the Legislative Assembly. In accordance with Section 14(b) of the same Act, I request that you table this report.

I do so now.

It being 5 o'clock the House stands recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.