

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order, I have reviewed the following petition pursuant to rule 11(7), and it is hereby read and received:

Of citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to allow the 1991 GRIP program to stand, and to begin working with the federal government and farmers to design a new program.

And according to order, I am also reporting on, according to rule 11(7), on the following petitions for private Bills that are hereby read and received:

By Mr. Kowalsky of the Ukrainian Catholic Council for the Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of Saskatoon in the Province of Saskatchewan, praying for an Act respecting the incorporation of the Ukrainian Catholic parishes within the Province of Saskatchewan; and

By Ms. Hamilton of the Regina Exhibition Association Limited of the city of Regina in the Province of Saskatchewan, praying for an Act to amend an Act respecting The Regina Exhibition Association Limited.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Crown Corporations

Clerk Assistant: — Mr. Solomon, chairperson of the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations, presents the first report of the said committee, which is hereby tabled.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As chairman of the Crown Corporations Committee, I will say a few words about our report, and at the end of my remarks I'll be moving a motion of concurrence.

Before my remarks, I wish to acknowledge the efforts and co-operation of all members of the Crown Corporations Committee over the past five months. Their contributions were very important in the efficient operation of our committee, and I wish to thank them for their co-operation and their participation over the last number of months.

Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations is one of two public accountability committees of the legislature. The Standing Committee on Crown Corporations reviews the annual reports of all of the Crowns in the province, 29 in all. Almost one-half of all government expenditures in 1989 and '90 were made by the Crown sector.

On behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and this legislature, our job is to review the expenditures of these corporations and to ensure their actions have been responsible and accountable. Our duty, simply put, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that the public interest is paramount in the decisions and activities undertaken by the Crowns.

In order for your committee to fulfil our duty, during the review of the annual reports, we depend upon the ministers to be forthcoming, responsive, and honest. I regret to inform the Assembly that I must report that this has not been the practice under the previous administration's ministers. In fact your committee was obstructed from performing its duty by the former administration for a period of 13 months.

How were we obstructed from performing our duty, Mr. Speaker? Your committee simply was not called to meet to deliberate on the Crown annual reports for the entire last year of the former government's term. This was the first time since 1947, the first time in 43 years, members, that the Crown Corporation Committee has not been called to undertake to fulfil its duty.

The former government was negligent in its duty to allow the Corporations Committee to meet to hold the Crown sector accountable. The former government was secretive in its operations of the Crown sector, and even when the committee last met in 1990, the former government was substantially less than forthcoming and certainly unco-operative in providing information requested. In fact, requests for information made two years previously were never answered.

We now see the results of this deliberate move of secrecy and avoidance of accountability: huge deficits, gross mismanagement, and a waste of taxpayers' dollars, high taxes, a reduction in public services, and a significant loss of control in our ability to run our own economy.

As a result of the former government's action, Mr. Speaker, your Standing Committee on Crown Corporations addressed the need for changes in accountability procedures for the Crown sector under the guise of democratic form but with the main objective of protecting the public interests.

We instructed our staff, under the direction of Mr. Greg Putz, to contact other jurisdictions in Canada to gather information on how they held their Crown sectors accountable. It was a comprehensive project ably and competently completed by Mr. Putz and I wish to acknowledge on behalf of the committee his fine efforts today.

We then considered his report in hearings in our committee. The committee then considered a number of recommendations concerning our terms of reference, our procedures and practices, and other issues.

In addition we invited the Provincial Auditor, the Legislative Library, and Crown Management Board officials to participate in our deliberations.

We considered a number of issues including the

committee's effectiveness; a change to our terms of reference; more involvement by the Provincial Auditor and his officials; whether the committee should initiate studies on its own; and a number of other matters which were pertinent to our operation.

Our deliberations over the past four months were important to the people of this province, to our committee members, and to this legislature, because we concluded that some reforms and changes were needed to improve our effectiveness.

The most important and most refreshing change in the operation of your committee is that the ministers of the present government indeed answered the questions put to them by members during our deliberations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — This was refreshing not only in the fact that they were answered, but that the members and the ministers were genuinely interested in responding to our committee on matters that they could respond to. This of course did not happen too often during the past nine years under the former administration.

We recommended, Mr. Speaker, that the government table their annual reports in a timely fashion. Previously this legislative requirement was often ignored, and indeed the call for timely tabling of annual reports and consideration of same was recommended by others.

I might add that the tabling of documents are now on schedule in this Assembly with respect to Crown corporation annual reports.

We have also changed, Mr. Speaker, some practices of our committee. Our committee will work more closely with the Provincial Auditor and his officials and with the Crown Management Board and their officials. As well some additional co-ordination will be undertaken with the Public Accounts Committee to avoid duplication.

Your committee has also agreed to work more closely with the opposition in bringing forward business to the committee. During the proceedings of the Crown Corporations Committee, Mr. Speaker, the minister present and responsible may provide the opportunity for officials of the corporation to address the committee directly. This significant change in procedure will save time in committee and provide administrative and public financial information in a more timely, cost-effective basis. This is quite similar to the procedures of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the aforementioned recommendations have been incorporated or addressed by your committee. However, your committee makes one recommendation for consideration by the Assembly: the committee recommends to the Assembly that provisions be amended to allow members of the Legislative Assembly to be appointed to the boards of Crown corporations.

The rationale for this recommendation is as follows: the presence of an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) on a board would add a new dimension to the

discussions and decisions taken by a Crown. MLAs are usually quite informed and knowledgeable about issues which affect their communities by the nature of their having access to meeting many people in organizations on a continual basis. As well as having varied life experiences, MLAs keep in touch with community opinion and can offer this expertise to Crowns in this regard.

MLAs are also on the front line of accountability. Whether MLAs remain MLAs depends upon the support of the public. Our jobs are up for review every four years. People hold all MLAs in government accountable for the actions of government even though we are not ministers.

This recommendation would expand the role of a private member who has to meet the voters daily and gives the MLA another opportunity to participate in government decisions. It would also, in our view, Mr. Speaker, provide another accountability stream into decisions.

It was noted as well that private members could assist the minister in charge in his or her duties as they relate to the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for bearing with me and I therefore move:

That the first report of the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations be now concurred in.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the member from Regina North West who has presented the report today. However, I'd just like to make a couple of comments regarding the report as it's presented. I would like to comment on the fact that, yes, it did seem the ministers were more than willing, and very open to . . . and very quick to present answers and respond to questions from the committee this time around. And we're trusting and we hope that indeed in the future we will see the same kind of co-operation and forthrightness coming from the ministers.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to note in committee — and it almost appeared almost a little comical — it appeared at times that possibly maybe the minister was already aware of the question as the response seemed to be coming ahead of the question. And so, like I say, there seemed to be a fair bit of co-operation and willingness on the part of the ministers to respond to the committees and to the questions that were being presented by the committee. And as I indicated we look forward to the same type of co-operation on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the committee has made a number of recommendations regarding just a couple of points. One of the points I would like to just mention, certainly the recommendations that were made were not totally unanimous and all committee members certainly took part in the information, expressing their views and opinions.

I would just like to mention to the Assembly today the fact

of making a recommendation that MLAs be involved on Crown corporation boards, the suggestion was made and certainly on the part of the opposition members, that opposition members be allowed to be part of the boards as well, to provide for a greater accountability on the Crowns, Mr. Speaker. The suggestion was also raised about the fact that maybe Crown corporations committees should be a committee chaired by an opposition member.

Now these are a number of views that were expressed and brought forward and, Mr. Speaker, as we enter into more open debate on Crown corporation committees, we certainly do look forward to a commitment on the part of the government for more openness, more accountability, and certainly members of the committee will be keeping the government . . . bringing them to task regarding the operations of the Crowns in each of the Crown sectors. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Wednesday I will ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to reduce heritage grant coverage and to eliminate the grant outright for low income seniors living in subsidized housing: (1) Did the minister consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken; and (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; and (c) what was the content of representations made to the minister?

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to give notice that on Wednesday I will ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to eliminate the FeedGAP program: (1) did the Minister of Agriculture consult with any groups or persons prior to eliminating the program? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and what locations did the consultations occur; (c) and what was the content of representations made to the minister?

(1345)

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to eliminate the Saskatchewan Pension Plan: (1) Did the minister responsible consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the

consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of representations made to the minister?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Wednesday ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to impose increases on the handling and deposit fees on soda pop and other beverages: (1) Did the Minister of the Environment consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of the representations made to the minister?

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to cancel the agreement with the federal government and AECL: (1) Did the minister responsible consult with any group or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultation; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of representation made to the minister?

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding the changes to the prescription drug plan as they affect diabetics: (1) Did the Minister of Health consult with the Saskatchewan Diabetic Association prior to the imposition of these changes? (a) If so, on what dates and where did the consultations take place; (b) what was the content of representations made to the minister; (c) what are the names of the individuals consulted? (2) Did the Minister of Health consult with any other organization or persons regarding the changes? (a) If so, on what dates and where did the consultations take place; (b) what was the content on representations made to the minister; (c) what are the names of the individuals consulted?

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Wednesday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to pull the province out of the national standardized tests: (1) Did the Minister of Education consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of the representations made to the minister?

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Wednesday ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to eliminate the livestock cash advance: (1) Did the Minister of Agriculture consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) and what was the content of representations made to the minister?

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to retroactively apply regulations pursuant to The Saskatchewan Crown Minerals Act from January 1, 1974 as if those regulations had been in place ever since that date: (1) Did the Minister of Energy and Mines consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of representations made to the minister?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Wednesday ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to give the Minister of Social Services the power to unilaterally decide whether or not to release personal family information in any form the minister chooses under The Adoption Act and The Child and Family Services Act: (1) Did the Minister of Social Services consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of the representations made to the minister?

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to give government employees power to forcibly enter premises without a warrant or other approval of the courts under The Environmental Management and Protection Act: (1) Did the Minister of Environment consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of the representations made to the minister?

The Speaker: — Order. I want to remind members of a

ruling made in this legislature on May 16, 1991, in regards to notice of motions. At that time the Speaker made it very clear that it's only a courtesy to members that oral notice can be given, or shall be given. If it is used as a tactic of obstruction, then it is not permitted. Beauchesne is absolutely very clear on that. It's only a courtesy to members to give oral notice. You can table notices, but I just want to warn the members that if this continues very much longer I shall call it out of order.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Wednesday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to impose user fees on chiropractic patients: (1) Did the Minister of Health consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultation; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of the representations made to the minister?

Deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with the next one immediately afterwards.

I give notice that I shall on Wednesday next, Mr. Speaker, ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to de-insure optometric services: (1) Did the Minister of Health consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and at what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of the representations made to the minister?

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I do have two notices here. I'll just present the one and present the other one right in. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Wednesday ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to close hospital beds and lay off nurses in Saskatoon: (1) Did the Minister of Health consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and what locations did the consultations occur; (c) what was the content of representations made to the minister?

I present.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Wednesday I will ask the government the following question:

Regarding the decision to impose a full fuel taxation scheme on farm vehicles: (1) Did the Minister of Agriculture consult with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken? (2) If so, (a) what are the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) on what dates and what

locations did the consultations occur; and (c) what was the content of representations made to the minister?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the privilege to stand in for the member from Estevan today and introduce from the Midale School 11 grade 10's. They are sitting up in the Speaker's gallery. Their teachers are Garth Holman, and the bus driver is Sandra Holman.

I would like to ask all members to welcome them to the Assembly today. I'll be meeting with them later for pictures and drinks. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me on behalf of my colleague from Rosthern to introduce 38 students, grade 10 students from Waldheim, Saskatchewan. They're accompanied today by Mr. Sam Neufeld, Mr. Henry Penner. Chaperons are Darlene Penz, Vi Vogt, and Herman Fehr.

I'm going to be meeting with them later on to talk about the activities in this Assembly. I just want to note to the students that the member from Rosthern is attending a funeral of his mother's brother, and therefore is not able to attend today. And so we will visit with them and talk about what the Assembly is doing. And I'd like all members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming them here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, 16 adult students from the SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) program here in Regina. They're enrolled in a program, English as a second language.

I want all members to join with me in welcoming them here today, and I'm sure that they'll enjoy the proceedings here in the legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rolfes: — I too would like to introduce some guests that I have here today from Queen Elizabeth School from my constituency.

I will have to apologize to the students that I will not be able to meet with you at 2:15 as we had planned. The activities have been taking a little bit longer today.

I do want to welcome the students to the Assembly. I hope you enjoy the activities that are taking place and I especially want to welcome Mr. Toles and Miss Terri Tyler. I hope all students will enjoy the activities here and I hope you have a safe trip back to Saskatoon.

I ask all members to join with me in welcoming the students from Queen Elizabeth School.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a statement on initiatives that were announced in the May 7 budget to address the problems in northern Saskatchewan. Housing is a very important component.

To help address northern housing needs, Saskatchewan is assuming responsibility for the rural and native housing program delivery. This will allow for greater community involvement in the delivery and management of housing units. It will facilitate greater levels of household repairs and will allow the co-ordination of housing improvements with the government's wellness-based health objectives.

Community need and demand studies will be completed by June. Basements and foundations will be completed by late fall.

These new initiatives, Mr. Speaker, will provide much needed housing in northern Saskatchewan and will also create a large number of new jobs. Provincial delivery of the rural and native housing program will allow the province to address the northern housing needs directly, both in terms of new and existing units. Community Services housing division plans to deliver 76 units in northern Saskatchewan in 1992.

Other initiatives include self-build home ownership options. The rural and native housing program has been modified to include a self-build home ownership option. Community Services housing division will incorporate the self-build option into the northern housing delivery strategy beginning in 1992.

The Speaker: — Order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have with me a letter today from the Carnduff branch of the Royal Canadian Legion concerning an issue of importance to all legionnaires and all legions and I'm hoping it will be of importance to the members here today.

This issue concerns a Bill before the House of Commons. It's a private members' Bill presented by Ron MacDonald, the MP (Member of Parliament) for Dartmouth in Nova Scotia. It concerns Remembrance Day being made a statutory holiday.

I'd like to quote from a letter from the research branch of the Library of Parliament, a non-partisan and independent agency, about Bill C-289, designed to ensure that Remembrance Day continues to be observed at least within the federal public service.

Veterans and groups such as The Royal Canadian Legion are dismayed that the observance and non-observance of this special day is a question of negotiation between labour and management. It is

all too commonly seen as another day off . . . rather than a solemn day for remembering the dead and those who fought in the two world wars and Korea. As the participants in the wars get older, and the wars recede in memory, it is likely that these trends will increase.

Even if this remains the case in other sectors of the economy, it is arguable that the federal government has a special responsibility and obligation to observe the holiday. Bill C-289 is intended to ensure, therefore, that federal public servants cannot be forced to take a substituted holiday in lieu of Remembrance Day except in extraordinary circumstances.

I would encourage all members to contact their MPs about this Bill to encourage passage of this Bill before the House of Commons. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(1400)

Mr. Roy: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to comment on the proposed integrated health care facility that was promised for the community of Cudworth. Mr. Speaker, I can well appreciate the disappointment of the people in Cudworth area as a result of the news that the redevelopment of the Cudworth Nursing Home and the St. Michael's Hospital will not proceed as planned.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the people of Cudworth and area, and in particular the individuals who worked so hard on this proposal, that they have not been singled out or treated unfairly in the province. For the past number of years, Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of change in the trends in health care program delivery, and as well as utilization of services. We're placing much more emphasis on the health promotion, illness prevention, and also community-based health care. Mr. Speaker, that's not only in Saskatchewan but right across the country in every other province.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I want to reassure the people of the Cudworth and district that the Government of Saskatchewan, the Health department, and myself will be working very closely with them to develop some new and innovative solutions for delivering health care services that will ensure we meet the needs of the community in an effective and efficient manner. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak on behalf of the young people who have been in contact with my constituency office in Saskatoon Greystone, which is in the heart of my home city. I am the member for the largest urban constituency in Saskatchewan. Last week some 2,300 students convoked from the University of Saskatchewan, which is on the edge of my constituency. The president of the university referred to the recent cuts to education as being so serious as to, and I quote him: for ever impact on the future of Saskatchewan.

Every day my constituency secretary takes resumes from bright, enthusiastic young people with physical

education degrees, engineering degrees, degrees in physiotherapy, psychology, veterinary science, and so forth. The young people of Saskatoon Greystone, the city of Saskatoon entirely, and indeed the young people of Saskatchewan, are feeling betrayed and hopeless and lost in their quest for a promising future at home with their families and friends.

Their parents are very disappointed for them and they're worried that their children will leave, never to return. This is a serious . . . and as serious as it gets, Mr. Speaker. In fact this is the worst crisis facing Saskatchewan.

On behalf of all of those who have called or written to me, I implore the government to get their strategies for job creation on the table before one more talented young person gets rejected by an employer, before one more parent puts his son or daughter's suitcase in the car and waves goodbye to a lifetime of dreams.

The Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I have some good news regarding Saskatchewan Transportation Company. And I want to refer to the financial statements and the monthly customer accounts.

Mr. Speaker, in October 1991, it took 110 days for STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company) to release its customer accounts and financial statements to its own management. In May of 1992 it took 20 working days to release those same things.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — It's remarkable, Mr. Speaker, when we realize that in October of 1991, STC was in the process of buying a brand-new computer at a cost of \$1.6 million. Instead the computer has been internally cleaned up at an estimated cost of some 6,000; savings, very nearly \$1.6 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, the staff in finance and administration at STC deserve special recognition for their very long-standing patience with a system that was ignored or very poorly managed. Changes since October 1991 have resulted in the remarkable turnaround, Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted to support and congratulate the Minister of Environment, STC president Peter Glendinning, and the tremendously dedicated staff at Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to pay an acknowledgement today to a group of men and women who have organized a new association in the province of Saskatchewan, and it's called the Saskatchewan High School Rodeo Association.

Last fall, with discussions going on with parents who were interested in promoting this, they encouraged each other. And we have representation on a board of directors from Whitewood, Beechy, Regina, Swift Current, Saskatoon,

Kennedy, Coronach, Maple Creek, a whole lot of places. They have held five rodeo days already this year. And they include young people, men and women who are grade 9 to grade 12.

I want to point out that this is the third province in Canada that has been initiating this program. B.C. (British Columbia) has 90 students involved, Alberta has 150, and I'm proud to say that Saskatchewan has 117. And they're very well qualified. They have to maintain their scholastic standard. They have to have a report from the principal of the school regarding that. They are having their final rodeo in Beechy next week on June 5 and 6.

And I want to just indicate, Mr. Speaker, in case people don't realize how well these young men and women do, at Maple Creek last weekend one young fellow roped a calf in 10.2 seconds. And if you take and look at that, that would easily qualify in Edmonton's . . .

The Speaker: — Order.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Recommendations on Construction Industry Collective Bargaining

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Minister of Human Resources, Labour and Employment.

Mr. Minister, on Tuesday we saw another example of how your government is using heavy-handed tactics to impose your political agenda on the people of Saskatchewan. Your announcement that you intend to put in place recommendations from your hand-picked advisory committee is tantamount to a dictatorship, Mr. Minister. You intend to give yourself sweeping powers to dictate your labour agenda on the construction industry. Employers and even employees will have no choice, no options, when it comes to collective bargaining, according to your proposals, Mr. Minister.

Why on earth would you want this all-encompassing power, Mr. Minister? How does this my way or highway policy square with your open and consultative style of government that you have been claiming to have? Mr. Minister, would you respond?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the report that the member refers to is actually the Construction Industry Advisory Committee that was established a few months ago in an attempt to consult with both labour and industry.

And I guess I find it more than passing interest in the fact that for about 15 minutes the members introduced questions and motions to have . . . find out where the government has consulted and urging us to consult. Now we have a report here where we went out and consulted with the building trades and contractors. They have brought back some recommendations. And now you're saying that we shouldn't have consulted. What's difficult to understand from the members opposite is whether they

want this government to consult or whether we shouldn't consult.

But one thing I can guarantee you, that this previous government's attempt to divide and conquer using business against non-labour and business against workers has come to an end. We are going to be consulting and that's what we've done here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Supplementary to the same minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Minister, these proposals, which you say you will implement, will give you absolute command over the bargaining structure of the construction industry. There is no disputing that. You will be able to force contractors to form organizations and force them to bargain collectively through those organizations whether they or their employees want it or not.

Mr. Minister, other than giving you the . . . sorry, omnipotence that you desire, what possible good for Saskatchewan taxpayers will come out of this proposal? Is this your way of delivering the reward for union support during the last election, Mr. Minister? And if your colleagues wish to participate in the question period, maybe they would write a few questions for me and pass them over and I'll ask them as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the member opposite that he, first of all, gives some misleading information about how this is our policy, and then he jumps ahead of himself and now says that we're about to implement this policy. I'd urge the member to wait and be patient, and when we bring the legislation before the House he will see it then.

But what we're referring to is not a piece of legislation or the policy of the government, but some recommendations from, I say again, contractors including Ken Holloway of Dominion Construction, Don Bell of the Insulation Applicators Ltd. Other names: Ron Thorpe of Thorpe Brothers Ltd. and Sid Matthews of Matthews and associates. These are the people who bring forward these recommendations, along with some of the building trades.

And so I say to you, be patient. We'll bring forward legislation when the minister is here and gets the Bill completed, and you will see what we're proposing. But to assume that as a result of some consultation the recommendations that come forward here are the policy of the government is premature.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting that a news release is released in this province with such a critical problem as this and the minister is in Ottawa at the time. It's a complete sham. The whole thing is just a snow job.

Mr. Minister . . . I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for the same minister. Mr. Minister, your hand-picked

advisory committee is at least forthcoming in why they insist that these measures be implemented. In fact they say, and I quote:

the unionized sector is in jeopardy and a co-operative effort by the unionized contractors and the building trades unions is required to ensure its survival.

Now not that we need job creation or that a strong business environment is needed to help the provincial economy, instead this committee wanted to ensure the unionized sector's continued growth and survival. Those are the words.

Mr. Minister, these actions will clearly bolster the political and financial powers of the union at our expense. Surely you will join your own committee in recognizing this as the reason for implementing these proposals, and for no other reason.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the member should realize that he is speaking against the contractors I list here. This is a unanimous report and recommendations of a group of contractors and building trades. And big contractors and build trades are interested in the survival of the construction industry in the province, that's true.

And why wouldn't they be? After 10 years of mismanagement and waste, they're interested in their survival. That is the contractors and building trades, because it's a unanimous report of the industry and of the workers. And for them to get together and come forward with some proposals and recommendations, then to be attacked by the opposition members, seems to not be in the best interest of the province, and certainly not in the interest of consultation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — I find it strange that you would say that everybody is represented when unionized contractors and the building trade unions are the two groups from which all of these people come. I see nothing from outside of the union structure in this committee providing any direction.

My new question, Mr. Speaker, is to the same minister. Mr. Minister, you also announced on Tuesday that you will likely be implementing a proposal from your hand-picked committee regarding union preference for subcontracting. Now, Mr. Minister, in response to questions in this legislature on May 5 of this year you said, and I quote:

I asked the committee if they were prepared to give (you) . . . advice on the question of union contracting, and they said no. They said they didn't want to do that. So their mandate has been limited . . . and I expect to receive their report in that connection . . . any day now.

Now these two statements are totally contradictory, Mr.

Speaker. This committee indeed passed on a recommendation on union contracting. At the time, I was asking how a union preference policy would affect the cost to taxpayers of using union-only labour. Perhaps you could now come clean and answer the question put to you on May 5, Mr. Minister. How much more is a union-only policy going to cost the taxpayers in increased labour costs on government construction projects? Would you please answer this time, directly?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, obviously what the Minister of Labour was doing when he set up the committee, was attempting to get a new spirit of co-operation between the construction companies in the province and the working people. And I think that's laudable and I'm surprised that members opposite don't support that.

This new spirit of co-operation, we believe, will lead to a Bill that will have the approval of the building industry as well as working people. Further to that, we've been doing a great deal of consulting with other groups — business and workers — from many areas of the province, and will continue to do that.

I know the members opposite tried to survive for 10 years by pitting business people against workers, and farmers against non-farmers, and natives against non-natives, and people on welfare against non-welfare people. But I can tell you, that is not the mandate of this government and we reject totally any attempt by the opposition to take us back to those good old bad days of Tory government when that was the mandate of that government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It's unfortunate that you would say in one breath that we have co-operation in a province that seems to be destined towards a total dictatorship.

I have a supplementary question. And I suspect that your union preference policy goes far beyond the subcontractors, Mr. Minister. Indeed I suspect you have unwritten policy which gives preference to unionized contractors and puts pressure on other contractors to hire unionized employees.

In fact, Mr. Minister, last November you stated, and I quote, during the . . . this would be the Minister of Labour that made this statement during . . . and I want to quote from what he said because it's important, that this is his portfolio and I have to quote what he has said about his . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. The member has gone on at some length on all of his questions today and I've been very patient with him. He has now gone on about 40 or 45 seconds, and he wishes to make another quote before he asks his question.

An Hon. Member: — No way.

The Speaker: — I have the records here for members to . . .

I'll show you the records. He's gone on very lengthy today, and I ask him to put his question.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for rambling on. I guess I got caught up in the rhetoric. Mr. Minister, is it true . . . My question to the minister is, Mr. Minister, that you have already implemented an informal union-only policy, and have you awarded contracts based on that policy for numerous closed tenders? You would have liked to have heard the comments.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say again and reiterate that what my colleague, the Minister of Labour, is attempting to do here — and I hope that he is successful and I hope our government's successful in it — is to create a new atmosphere of co-operation between the building industry and the people who work in the industry. And I think there are signs of that working already in the province of Saskatchewan.

In talking to contractors as recently as this morning, the building trades are having a troubled time finding enough people to do the cement work and the bricklaying that's needed in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time. Now why is that? That's because there is a great increase in construction in our two major cities. And we want to ensure that as this building takes place that there's co-operation between the trades and the people who work in the trades. I think that is a laudable attempt by the minister and I'm surprised that members opposite are opposed to it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the same minister. I obviously disagree with what he said, but I will carry on because I want to get to a point.

Mr. Minister, we have received numerous reports that contracts from the Shand power station and others have been awarded with the caveat that the contractors hire union members on the site, on the job site.

In fact the vice-president of Stuart Olson contracting, the firm which has been contracting to build the Melfort water treatment facility, has already been pressured by your agents to hire union employees. Is this not an example of your informal policy, Mr. Minister? A direct question.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speculate on the newspaper story the member is talking about.

I want to tell you very clearly that at every opportunity we are going to be consulting with the industry and with the workers — and the unionized workers, non-unionized workers — to come up with a Bill that will be satisfactory in meeting the needs of the economic development of the province. And that's the interest of this government.

Now when the Bill comes forward there will be ample time for you and others to bring forward

recommendations and amendments to the Bill. But for you to jump to the conclusion that newspaper stories are in fact policy of the government or that these recommendations are the basis of the Bill, is premature.

Be patient, wait for the Bill, and we'll have as long as you like to debate the pros and cons. But I'll tell you, it will be an attempt of co-operation and new-found spirit of development in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a new question for the same minister. Mr. Minister, also on May 5, a few short weeks ago you told this House, and I quote:

I have assured the industry and everyone involved that before any such policy would be considered by the government, extensive consultations would . . . take place.

Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that you are now considering such a policy, can you tell us of one individual, can you give us the name of any construction association outside of your hand-picked committee, that you consulted with? Tell us who you consulted with outside of your advisory group which consisted exclusively of unionized labour and unionized contractors. Is there any other one?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member that I cannot speak on behalf of the Minister of Labour as to who he has consulted with, but I can tell you that he has consulted with a large number of people. And part of the process was the report that he had done for him. I know other members will have consulted with a large number of people as to what kind of labour laws there should be in the province of Saskatchewan.

As minister in charge of Economic Development, I've talked to many, many business people as to what would be a proper mix in terms of legislation that we would bring forward. So there has been consultation.

I'm surprised the member is now urging us to consult when his first questions he was critical of the consultation we had done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Supplementary to that question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, had you bothered to talk to the Saskatchewan Construction Association, who are the only provincial industry-wide association, you would have discovered that moving toward union monopolies has a devastating effect on the economy and the treasury.

Take Ontario. Legislation of this very same style has destroyed the province's economy. Everyone recognizes that. Did you consult with any of your friends in Ontario as to the results of what happened there before you came up with this policy?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate

to the member opposite that we didn't consult with Ontario where the economy is in trouble as a result of free trade and many of the Tory government federally . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — And is in trouble as a result of the free trade deal and many years of Liberal administration at the provincial election. Nor did we consult with the NDP (New Democratic Party) government in B.C. where the economy is booming. This is a Saskatchewan consultation process and it's broad-based and we'll continue to consult, and then we'll bring forward a Bill that you'll have ample opportunity to deal with.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. New question to the same minister. A report from the Saskatchewan Construction Association, issued by the association, indicates that with comparable wage rates, labour components costs are 20 to 30 per cent higher for some types of construction under a union-only requirement.

Mr. Minister, do you not agree that these moves will increase costs for construction, increase costs for new business, increase costs for government, increase costs for taxpayers? You are taking money out of business, out of taxpayers, and giving it to your union allies. How can you justify this action, given the economic difficulties this province is in? How can you justify this patronage on this massive scale, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — I don't know why the member insists on union bashing and contractor bashing here in the House today. The only real threat to the economy of Saskatchewan is the gloom and doom being perpetuated by the members opposite, and they won't quit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yesterday it was an attempt to shut down the Crown Life deal. Today it's the attempt to shut down the construction industry. Tomorrow, who knows what it will be?

I can tell you, be patient, wait for the Bill, and you'll have plenty of opportunity to debate it over the next few weeks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Economic Growth in Saskatchewan

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member likes to go on about the economic projections for this province. Today though we see the Conference Board of Canada has today singled Saskatchewan out for the largest decline in economic growth in the country — fully a 3 per cent drop in the growth from the projection of last year.

Will the minister clearly today admit that it's time to stop destroying the projects started by the previous

administration and get on with the job of real economic planning that this province desperately needs.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the member should recognize that the forecast that the Conference Board made was lowering expectations for all across Canada except in the province of British Columbia.

There are many projections that are made. The Royal Bank recently released their projection showing a growth of 1.2 or 1.4 per cent. The Investment Dealers Association of Saskatchewan, after the budget, indicated a growth of in excess of 1 per cent.

The Conference Board indicates and makes its projections on the basis of an assumption that Saskatchewan farm production is expected to drop 10 per cent from 1992 because of the bumper crop year that we had. There is no way that one can fully predict all of those things, Mr. Speaker.

But what we have done as a government is put in place a policy of good financial management which will bring this province to the point where we can have economic development which will be meaningful, which will create jobs, and which will create wealth in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Conference Board indeed did say was that the economic performance of Saskatchewan is going to decline. I think that's very clear, and the reason for that decline, Mr. Minister, I think is clear. The differences of things like dropping of the AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) agreement, things of that nature; cancelling of farm programs; the cancelling of the upgrader in Lloydminster. Those are the types of things that are destroying the economic performance in this province, Mr. Minister.

I think, Mr. Minister, the important thing we have to recognize is here that you people are responsible for the economy of Saskatchewan today, and it's clear that you don't have a plan for Saskatchewan. And if you do have a plan, Mr. Minister, for the economic direction of this province, would you now articulate it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the member opposite that this government is doing exactly what the member opposite is talking about — putting the finances of this province on the right track so that we can make sure that there is confidence by investors in Saskatchewan. We are restoring that confidence, contrary to what the members opposite did for the last 10 years where they drove this province from a total debt of \$3.5 billion self-liquidating to a total debt of \$15 billion; got this province from the second highest possible credit rating in all of Canada to a point where we are now A minus on a credit watch, all the responsibility of the members opposite.

Just the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite are now over there and not over here is a confidence builder

for the investment community in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister talks about fiscal responsibility, but indeed what's happened in the province is he's increased spending. That's what he's done — he's increased the spending in the province by \$100 million.

The minister talks . . . the budget presents \$100 million increase in spending and \$500 million of increased taxes. The people of this province can't sustain the increased tax load that you're forcing upon them, Mr. Minister.

The minister continues to blame of all it, the woes of his government on everybody else — the federal government, anyone else, and pretty soon he's going to have to start blaming it on the taxpayers because the taxpayers of this province can't bear the load that you continue to put onto them.

Will this minister now admit that their government has no plans for the economy of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, were it not for the interest on the public debt created by the members opposite when they were on this side of the House, the budget that is being considered by the legislature at this time would have had a surplus of \$242 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I know the member from Kindersley is new, but I invited him to read all of the documentations now that has been tabled because of the new openness that is being provided by this . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — And he will find that the interest on the public debt from 1982 has increased from \$43 million to \$760 million which has strait-jacketed the province of Saskatchewan from doing some of the things that we would like to do. But in spite of that, in spite of that, Mr. Speaker, we're going to do everything that's necessary to create investor confidence, to create development, and create jobs for our young people in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the same minister.

Mr. Minister, this is utter nonsense. You put an economic forecast for the province of Saskatchewan together last December; you predicted growth based on the projects of the former government. You did that, sir, in that forecast.

Why don't you join with the Dean of Commerce from the University of Saskatchewan, why don't you join with him, who says that your budget, sir, is a further dampener on the Saskatchewan economy and that you've taxed, that you've done things to the Saskatchewan economy with this budget that won't let it recover? Mr. Minister,

why don't you join with him? Why don't you use your own words from your December forecast and get on with an economic plan that makes sense to these people?

People all across Canada, Mr. Minister, are seeing the nonsense of your budget. Will you not agree with them now and change your ways, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, let me make it very, very clear. We will not change our ways to return to the 1980s and the mismanagement of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — We will do, as has been recognized by **The Globe and Mail** in which it is reported, the headline said: "Province still trend-setter, this time in fighting debt."

We will do what has been reported by the investment dealers of Saskatchewan which have acclaimed the province of Saskatchewan for doing what we're doing. That's the direction we're taking. We have restored this province to open, honest, accountable government with good fiscal management so that the future for our children can be guaranteed rather than threatened as it has been in the previous 10 years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Revenue and Financial Services Act

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill to amend The Revenue and Financial Services Act be now moved the first time.

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

Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move item no. 3, first reading of a Bill to amend The Education and Health Tax Act.

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

Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Corporation Capital Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move item no. 4, first reading of a Bill to amend The Corporation Capital Tax Act.

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

Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move item no. 5, first reading of a Bill to amend The Tobacco Tax Act.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply

The Chair: — Before the minister moves his motion, would he please introduce his officials to the Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to introduce the officials who are here to help us today. John Wright, the deputy minister of Finance, on my immediate right; Mr. Craig Dotson, Associate Minister of Finance, to my right; and behind me, Mr. Gerry Kraus, the Provincial Comptroller, who's down here now; and John Law, executive director of the treasury board branch, immediately behind me; and Al Dennett, the director of operations of the treasury board branch, to my extreme right.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to just make a couple of brief comments for the benefit of the House. As you know, this is consideration of Committee of Finance of the interim supply Bill. An interim supply Bill, as members will know — I say this for the benefit of new members — is a Bill that is provided by the government during a session when after a budget is introduced but has not yet been fully passed, in order to provide one-twelfth of the funding for the following month of government operations, such things as school grants, hospital grants, municipal grants, and paying of wages and other things.

This Bill essentially does that — the Bill I'm going to be introducing after the House deals with a couple of motions. It provides one-twelfth and actually more than one-twelfth, more twelfth by a hundred and . . . I think \$116 million.

The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is because there are some funding that the government does on a quarterly basis. For example, a school funding will have six-twelfths of their 1992-93 funding provided as a result of this and previous expenditures. The same thing happens with municipalities and other things which require more than one-twelfth because of the kind of funding arrangements are there.

So theoretically this interim supply Bill provides one-twelfth plus the additional funding necessary to meet other requirements so that third parties in particular could meet their obligations. And so this is \$116 million in excess of the normal one-twelfth provision.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I need not explain any further in that except, for the record, indicate that this first interim supply Bill is for \$469.935 million. And I will leave it at that and proceed to move the two motions which are by the rules required.

The first motion, Mr. Speaker, I move is that:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$469,935,000 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1993.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be making a few comments in regards to the motion that is brought forward by the hon. Finance minister, and at the end of those comments ask a few questions of the minister.

Mr. Chairman, it's very odd that this minister should be before the House asking for this interim supply Bill today. This coming from a minister and a party which ran around the province of Saskatchewan on numerous occasions talking about the use of special warrants.

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that the House is in session so we can't call this a special warrant; we call this an interim supply Bill. In effect, that's what it is, Mr. Speaker. Three days, Mr. Chairman, three days before this legislature was called back, after every member in this Assembly had got notice from the Speaker of the Assembly as to when it would open, this minister and his government went to the Lieutenant Governor to ask for money three days before.

This was from a government, Mr. Chairman, that said it was going to bring the legislature in on time, that the legislative timetables of the province of Saskatchewan would go back to the point where they should have been, according to the members of the government.

Well that agenda just didn't work out, did it, Mr. Chairman? So we now have the minister asking this Assembly for monies to defray the costs of the Government of Saskatchewan, not for one-twelfth but for one-twelfth plus — \$469.935 million.

Mr. Chairman, that's a lot of money when that minister knows full well that he could have presented a budget to the province of Saskatchewan on time. That budget could have been debated, the estimates could have been debated, and all of the sums that are due the various departments of government, after debate in this legislature could have then been properly expended by the minister.

Instead, Mr. Chairman, we have this minister now running out of money — no budget passed, no estimates passed in this legislature — and he expects the opposition to simply lay down and say yes, we agree to the expenditure of over nearly 500 millions of dollars when we haven't had the details of the budget presented to us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that this government has passed on any of the arguments or the accounts that would allow it to justifiably bring this motion forward. This government could have brought forward a budget last fall. Last fall, when we met in December, this Minister of Finance could have brought a budget forward.

(1445)

And instead, he suspended the constitution so that he

could escape the laws of the land, of this province, in bringing that forward. And instead, Mr. Chairman, we went through that happy little charade last December where the minister sat in his place and said, I'll answer questions for the entirety of government.

Well I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that that exercise a few days before everyone wanted to go home for Christmas, in the dark of night, was a futile one, I suggest, for all members of this Assembly. That minister could no more answer questions about other departments than members of this Assembly could fly to the moon. And the member full well knew it.

So we went through the charade last December, Mr. Chairman, but we went through it at least with the minister saying that spring will be different; that this new government would be bringing in budgets on time; this new government wouldn't be using special warrants; that all the ills that they assigned to the previous government wouldn't be compounded by this one.

Well January came, Mr. Chairman; February came, Mr. Chairman; we were into March, the traditional time of budget consultation in this province, everyone expecting the minister to bring down a budget at the end of March. And no budget. No notice of recall to the legislature. Instead we see, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance trotting off to the Lieutenant Governor to operate the province of Saskatchewan on special warrants.

And we go through two months of special warrants and then finally, Mr. Chairman, the legislature is called in and we have a budget presented. But they made sure, Mr. Chairman, that knowing how tough this budget was going to be on Saskatchewan taxpayers, how much pain they were going to inflict on Saskatchewan people, knowing they were going to break every last campaign promise that this political party had ever made to the people of Saskatchewan, they made sure that they snuck in three days before the deadline to get some more money from the Lieutenant Governor.

And my guess is, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister of Finance has probably salted away enough to get himself about 10 days beyond May 31 if he runs into significant problems. And I would guess that this little more than one-twelfth might give him a little more room beyond the 10 days; that we can put off some of the grants to schools and others.

Mr. Chairman, this is an exercise that shouldn't be happening in the legislature of Saskatchewan, given all of the pronouncements that we have heard from that member particularly, and members of that government over the years in this Assembly and around the province of Saskatchewan.

And I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that this sum of money that is being requested of the Assembly today is going to be used for a number of purposes that Saskatchewan people disagree with. We recently saw a Bill brought into this legislature that will have the use of force to enter private property without a warrant. Is some of this sum of money going to be used for that purpose?

We are seeing Bills brought before this legislature that will centralize power in the hands of ministers. Regulations in the mining industry yesterday. Regulations dealing with personal family details of Saskatchewan people. I believe some of this money will be used to do those things, Mr. Chairman, Bills that deny individuals the rights to make a full defence of possible charges in a court of law. Is some of this nearly \$500 million going to be used for those purposes?

Can we justify, Mr. Chairman, can this opposition really justify giving this minister that kind of money when it can be used for purposes such as that? He's asking this Assembly to provide money to support this government that is rank with contradictions and inconsistencies. He's asking this Assembly to provide money, Mr. Chairman, so that the Minister of Agriculture can use that money to fight in the courts of this province against farmers who have a legitimate case to carry with the Minister of Agriculture.

The Minister of Finance — let's make it clear, Mr. Chairman — is asking for money to spend on lawyers to fight the farmers of Saskatchewan because the Minister of Agriculture did not send a notification to them as was deemed in law. And the Minister of Agriculture has threatened in the courts of Saskatchewan to bring a piece of legislation before this Assembly that will deem that he sent a letter which he didn't.

And I am terribly afraid, Mr. Chairman, if we grant supply to this minister that he will take some of that money. He will give it to law firms such as Olive, Waller & Waller to fight the farmers of Saskatchewan and others who are contesting legitimately, contesting actions taken by this government. And I think that would be inappropriate, Mr. Chairman, to grant monies for that purpose when this minister can take and deny the basic rights of Saskatchewan people.

I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that this minister may take some of this money and engage in dangerous meddling as the Premier outlined in this Assembly yesterday with the Crown Life deal. It has been revealed by the chairman of the Crown Management Board that there may possibly be \$50 million override costs attached to Crown Life because this government has dithered around for months and months and months, that there is a potential cost of \$500,000 with Sachs and Goldman in New York because of this dithering that the government is doing. And we have a potential huge cost to the taxpayer of this province because of it, Mr. Chairman. And I am scared that this sum of money being requested by this minister, some of it may go to that particular entity.

And I also am fearful, Mr. Chairman, I'm very fearful that this government who says on one hand they will spend \$500,000 on due diligence on Crown Life, is launching off into other provinces in an insurance scheme, apparently without any due diligence. It may cost the taxpayers of this province untold millions of dollars also.

And I am fearful, Mr. Chairman, that some of this money being requested here today will be taken by the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance), taken by that minister and taken off to do insurance businesses in other provinces. And, Mr.

Chairman, I think that would be simply inexcusable for the members of the opposite to grant supply to a minister and his colleagues who may do that.

Mr. Chairman, should this Assembly grant supply to a Premier and a government and a Finance minister who have, in this last budget, taken away the rights of diabetics to life-saving drugs. And I am scared, Mr. Minister, that some of the changes that this government has implemented in the budget, some of this money that they are asking us to grant in interim supply today will be used to make changes to the health care system that may in fact deny diabetics in this province the kind of access that they need in insulin in order to look after themselves in a proper and decent way.

And I am scared, Mr. Chairman, that if we grant this nearly \$500 million to the minister today in this Assembly, that the people on next Monday who are going to go see chiropractors and be charged fees may be forced to make further changes because of monies granted to this minister in this Assembly in this Bill he has presented to us.

We may have the situation, Mr. Chairman, of seeing the minister take some of this money and actually have the government start ripping up paved roads in this province and converting them back to gravel. What a shame, Mr. Chairman, that we would grant the Minister of Finance interim supply in this House before it is properly debated either in the estimates of the Highways department or in other ways that this minister could supply money to that department and go out and start tearing up the surfaces of the paved roads of this province without any type of consultation of the people involved.

Is the Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, going to use some of these monies in helping to get rid of the farm fuel exemption in this province? Is he going to use some of these monies in taking the FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) program away from livestock producers in this province, Mr. Chairman?

Are some of these monies, Mr. Chairman, going to be used in the setting up of the government's phoney energy institute that they implemented in cancelling the AECL deal? And I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that if one looks carefully through the list of areas that this money is going to, that that will be one of the areas where the government is trying to cover its tracks and monies from this particular motion would be granted to that phoney agency.

Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues has asked if he could introduce guests. I'll now let him address the Chair.

The Chair: — Is leave granted to the member from Moosomin to introduce guests?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition I would like to introduce to the members of the Assembly, a group of 25 students, grade 4 students from Hillcrest Elementary School in Estevan who are

presently visiting the Assembly. They are accompanied by their teachers Michael Donovan and Cathy Gerein, and bus driver John Chest.

I know the member from Souris-Cannington will be meeting with them shortly. He is meeting with another group at the present time so it's my pleasure to be able to introduce this group of students to the Assembly, welcome them to Regina, and trust they have a safe trip home and a good day in the city.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply (continued)

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, I also fear that some of the monies that the Minister of Finance is requesting from this House today will be used to make interest payments on write-downs of corporations in this province that didn't need to happen. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that even though the Minister of Finance knew full well that there was no permanent impairment on the shares of Cameco Corporation, that this minister has chosen to write off entirely the book value differences on what the shares were originally valued at and what they presently are in the stock exchange today.

The minister has chosen to do this, I say, Mr. Chairman, because he fully expects in the future to have a large capital gain attached to those shares at some point when he needs money for some of his political schemes.

But, Mr. Chairman, agency after agency within this country and outside of this country, in the studying of those share offerings said there was no permanent impairment suffered by offering those shares for sale. And I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that some of the money used, being asked to be used in this supply Bill will be used to pay interest on the debt the minister has incurred, and do just exactly that.

(1500)

This minister, Mr. Chairman, has taken the opportunity to unload as much debt as possible into the previous fiscal year to make his further initiatives down the road look better. Mr. Chairman, we saw the example in this legislature of monies taken from the last special warrant, monies expended by the Minister of Community Services on community recreational complexes, asked for in the special warrant three days before this Assembly was called in. Those monies were asked for in this fiscal year and expended back into the previous fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, that is a classic example of what we are seeing today in this legislature. That this minister cannot be trusted with this amount of money before this legislature has had the opportunity to go through the estimates line by line in the budget presented in this House. If this minister and his government can take money from special warrants in the '92-93 fiscal year and turn around and put them back into the previous fiscal year, then I say, how many more of these fancy little deals are going to be done, Mr. Chairman, before we get the

estimates of this budget passed in such a manner that the people of Saskatchewan can be assured that those monies are being expended properly?

It's funny, Mr. Chairman, that as we listen to the Minister of Finance in debate, as we listen to the Minister of Finance explain away some of the numbers he uses, he always falls back for an excuse on the recommendations of the Gass Commission.

And, Mr. Chairman, we are very suspicious of that minister because he likes to mix and match his numbers. The minister and his officials don't operate on accrual accounting in the province of Saskatchewan at present. They don't operate anywhere close to that system that Mr. Gass often refers to in his remarks.

And yet we have the minister coming in the House asking for nearly \$500 million today, and often leaving the impression with Saskatchewan people that the deficit numbers that he uses all the time in this House are actually the way that the government is accounting for its money. That he comes in here and asks for \$500 million in interim supply, knowing full well when he stands in this House and uses a \$15 billion deficit figure, that he is using a fully accrued system to arrive at that figure.

And just as the prospectus filed in Washington, D.C. (District of Columbia) by the minister explained, because they have the addendum attached to it from the Gass Commission, said that the deficit of Saskatchewan is the same whether you use the Gass numbers, the accrual numbers, or whether you use the present cash-in system of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister has been unfair with the public in mixing and matching these numbers all the time, because you can't have it both ways. You can't tell the people of the province that the deficit is one number, come into this House and ask for \$500 million in interim financing because you didn't bring your budget in on time, but be operating on a different system that produces a different number.

The same system that the previous government used. The same system that the Allan Blakeney government used. The same system that the Ross Thatcher government used, and I would suggest the same system that the Woodrow Lloyd government used. And probably Tommy Douglas before that, because they tell me the present system was brought in in 1958.

So all the way along government has been using the same system of accounting. And yet this minister, bald-faced, stands up in this legislature time after time again and uses the other numbers — a system that we aren't even on at present; a system which only the federal government has even advanced down the road to.

And yet he comes into this legislature, says to the people of the province, we've got a \$15 billion debt; I need \$500 million in interim financing because I brought in a late budget.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be more reasonable for the minister to maybe stop using those numbers until he

has changed his accounting methods to comply with them, that he would use the numbers that the people of Saskatchewan are used to and for the accounting methods of this province.

And then if he wants to use those other numbers, if he wants to talk about the pension liabilities that exist in this province, then he attached a true value to them in 1992 dollars, and he'd tell the people of Saskatchewan where most of that accrued liability came from before he comes into this legislature and asks for \$500 million.

What we have, Mr. Chairman, what we have today with this Minister of Finance coming into this Assembly and asking for this sum of money are a whole host of issues: some legal, some not; some involving consultation, some not; some involving the power of ministers to intrude on the lives of Saskatchewan people and companies. We have a whole host of areas, Mr. Chairman, where the Minister of Finance will be using these monies, using these monies to change the lives of Saskatchewan people before they have had the opportunity and their elected representatives have had the opportunity to go through the estimates of this province, through the estimates of the budget presented by the Minister of Finance and question their expenditures on a line-by-line basis.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, that is simply inexcusable. If this minister had been caught with perhaps one special warrant because of some special circumstance in the new government, if we had not gone through the charade last December in this House, Mr. Chairman, that all members were forced to go through — and I say it really was a charade, Mr. Chairman — if we had not had to do those things, then perhaps the opposition wouldn't have to be quite so stringent with this minister.

But I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have to ask this minister many questions relating to the topics that I have outlined before this particular Bill can be allowed to go through. It's that, Mr. Chairman.

I will ask the minister a question in regarding to the FeedGAP program. What analysis have you done, sir, on the livestock industry that will show that Saskatchewan livestock producers will not lose tens of millions of dollars because of changes to this program?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, let me just make a . . . I'm not going to respond to all of what the member opposite said, but I want to clarify some things for the benefit of the House and for the record and for the public. This is an interim supply Bill. It is nothing different or unusual or otherwise an exception from what has been normally done as long as there have been legislatures in the British parliamentary system.

It provides for one-twelfth of the funding of the full fiscal year except in cases which are explained and can be explained where there is a requirement for funding because of other provisions such as quarterly funding for municipalities under the revenue-sharing program, the funding for school divisions so that they don't have to borrow the money to fund themselves because that's what they would have to do if there was not an interim supply Bill.

And so that there is nothing unusual in the presentation of this interim supply Bill. Every year this happens after a budget introduction. It doesn't matter if the budget was introduced in February or March or April or May or June. We've had a budget in this House introduced in June in 1987, 1988, or it was in May. Actually it was in June. And in each of those years there were interim supply Bills, usually for the first two months, of one-twelfth and then in future months for two-twelfths.

This is exactly what the purpose of this interim supply Bill is. In the Department of Agriculture, for example, the provision is for an exact one-twelfth of the budget in the Department of Agriculture.

I would say to the member opposite that the estimates are presented to this legislature, to the committee. Members opposite have an opportunity to deal and complete with one of the estimates, the estimates of the department of the Property Management Corporation. I understand that this House is considering the estimates for the Public Service Commission. And in each of the departments and agencies of the government, members will have, both on the opposite side in the opposition and on the government side, to ask specific questions of ministers and the departments related to those estimates. All this Bill does is provide the one-twelfth of the funding except where they're an exception.

In the remarks that the member from Thunder Creek made, he did ask some questions in his comments, and I'll try to respond to some of them for the information of the House.

For example, the question he asked: is money being requested for any funding for the Crown Investments Corporation; or is any money in this Bill, interim supply Bill, being provided for the purposes of funding related to the Crown Life proposal project; or is there any money being provided in here for interest payments on the write-offs. The answer to those questions is no, because this is an interim supply Bill.

For example, in the case of the interest payments on write-offs, it's statutory. It does not come here in the form of a Bill and has to be dealt with when the Department of Finance estimates are considered finally at some point during the session. So there will be an opportunity, now that we have a full session in place and a budget which identifies clearly the expenditures and the revenues of the government, for all of the detailed considerations that members opposite want to give each of the departments. So there's nothing unusual here.

As to what the Department of Agriculture has done with its various projects, with its various programs, and the funding that it provides, the member will have to . . . have the opportunity to ask of the Minister of Agriculture when that department comes forward in the estimates, to get those specific answers.

I, as the Minister of Finance, can talk in general terms about the one-twelfth provision that is provided in this Bill which we're going to present, but I'm not in a position — because I don't have the Agriculture officials here and

I'm not the Minister of Agriculture — to give specific details of the particular estimates in each of the departments, which will be coming to the House in due course when they are presented.

(1515)

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess that's why the opposition has so much trouble with this minister. This minister now stands up and likes to hide behind the narrowness of discussion in this committee.

Last December he was quite prepared after a fancy little piece of legislative work to say, I'm prepared to stand in this House and answer questions for each and every department of government. I and my officials are either so knowledgeable or else we can get to you almost immediately any question that you wish to ask.

As I said in my earlier comments, this minister was quite prepared to go through the charade then, but the minute that members here might — and I don't know if they will or not, Mr. Chairman — get a little bit specific . . . And I did take the opportunity to go back and study the verbatim of some of the interim supply Bills which the member mentioned took place in this legislature, and I can assure him that they got detailed enough down to the point of members of the then-opposition asking the Minister of Finance, the member from Weyburn, about the consultation process involved around consultation Saskatchewan, or what was the . . .

An Hon. Member: — Consensus.

Mr. Swenson: — Consensus Saskatchewan. And the minister from Weyburn attempted to do his best to answer the questions about the consultation process, and that's from the interim supply Bill when those people were the opposition of this province.

So I think you can expect, Mr. Chairman, that we in the opposition will try and be general in our responses to the minister, but that at times we will seek to have the minister answer questions because he expected the former government to answer them. And he told us himself here in December that he was quite knowledgeable, that he was a minister that was quite prepared to take on every last department in this province and answer the questions that might arise from them. So we plan on holding the minister to that.

I also noticed in the minister's comments — and this would pose a question to him — he said that the potential impact of differences in the Crown Life deal would not affect in any way the monies that he has requested from this Assembly today. And I might remind the minister, I might remind the minister that if the Minister of Economic Development, the minister in charge of community bonds in this province, goes forward with some type of convertible bond or public share offering agreement with the principals around the Crown Life deal, he will need monies from this Assembly in order to issue those guarantees and to do his due diligence process as necessary.

I see in here that the Department of Economic Development is asking, and has apportioned, two million, six, four, eight, one thousand. Mr. Minister, are you saying today, in the Assembly, that the Minister of Economic Development has been removed from that process, that no one in his department would be expending monies in relationship to either a community bond or a convertible bond or some type of public offering in relationship to the Crown Life deal? Is that what you're saying, Mr. Minister, today?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me make it clear to the House that the community bond program is not an expenditure of money other than the related staff work that may be required in order to perform due diligence and do an analysis of the proposal.

All the community bonds, Mr. Chairman, are, are a guarantee of bonds which are proposed by community development committees or community development authorities.

If the member opposite would look at the information, he will find that the amount of money provided in the department of industry, trade and commerce is exactly one-twelfth of this fiscal year's proposed appropriation for that department. There's nothing unusual about that. If there are proposals that in this period of time come forward to the department with community bond proposals, there are officials who are being paid their salaries and other related expenses out of the one-twelfth provision that's being requested here who will carry out that in the normal course of events.

If the member's question is, is there a specific amount of money here put for the purposes of Crown Life or any other such project, the answer to the member opposite is no, there is not. There is not in this one-twelfth interim supply Bill a request for that kind of money.

I want to also point out that last December when we considered the supply Bill at that time, there were many questions that I as the Minister of Finance was not able to answer. I don't apologize for that. I shouldn't be expected to answer those questions. But I did take notice of all of the questions that we could not answer because of the unusual situation that we were considering, and in writing either I or each of the ministers about whose departments questions were asked, answers were provided to the members opposite so that there were no questions that were asked which were not answered at some point in time in the very near future following the consideration of that Bill.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister is absolutely right that the few questions that were asked were answered in writing at that time. But I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, three days before Christmas in the dead of the night with a minister who couldn't verbally answer any questions, seemed like a futile operation for members of the opposition. So what was the point of asking the hundreds of questions necessary of the minister, given the situation the opposition was placed in?

So I don't think the minister should hide with comfort behind that particular reply to the legislature. What he

should do, Mr. Chairman, in coming in and asking interim supply this time is apologize for that charade, put this House back on a level footing, and say that I won't do this to the Assembly again, because it was a charade.

Mr. Minister, during the consideration of interim supply you're absolutely right, that figure assigned to Economic Development is one-twelfth, which is the normal procedure. But are you also saying, Mr. Minister, that the Goldman Sachs study that you're doing in conjunction with Crown Life was accounted for in those expenditures, or was that a special expenditure? And I suggest to you it was probably special.

And how are we to be assured, Mr. Minister, as we consider this interim supply Bill, that there won't be other items such as Goldman and Sachs where you run off and spend a half a million bucks that's got nothing to do with this and yet ultimately may have a very large impact on Saskatchewan taxpayers as you have in the case of Crown Life because of your dithering?

And I don't see any guarantees, Mr. Minister, that that won't happen. Because you have potentially spent that money and there is the potential impact, and I suggest you might take some of this money and you might use it to pay Goldman and Sachs.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Let me assure the member that the answer to the question is no, there is no money provided in this interim supply Bill for the purposes of Crown Life or for the purposes of the study that Goldman and Sachs is doing.

I know that the member legitimately should be interested in that, and I can tell him that when this legislature considers the estimates of the Crown Investments Corporation where this process is taking place, he will be able to ask the questions and those questions will be provided.

I am not able to respond to that because in this interim supply Bill no such funding is being provided — and I want to make sure that I assure the House of that — at this time as we consider this Bill.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I assure you that the opposition will wait for that opportunity when it comes to discuss Goldman and Sachs and the amount of money that the province's taxpayers are forking out to do a study that might not necessarily have been necessary.

Mr. Minister, I raised a number of questions during my opening remarks, dealing with the Government of Saskatchewan and its involvement in legal tangles with taxpayers of this province. Mr. Minister, because it covers more than one area, I think it's appropriate that the members of the opposition ask if any of the monies being asked for in this interim supply Bill will be going to pay legal costs of the Government of Saskatchewan in fighting legal actions with its own taxpayers.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I had a note here and I thought I had responded to that in my first initial remarks, but apparently I did not.

The funding for the Department of Justice, where that kind of expenditure would be made, is one-twelfth, one-twelfth of the normal allocated amount or appropriated amount of money that is being provided in this budget for the Department of Justice. There are no unusual requests for unusual expenditures other than the normal expenditures in the Department of Justice, which is one-twelfth of the provision, which is one month.

Mr. Swenson: — Well that is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, because the people in the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation in their application to the judge in Melville concerning the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) case, said the potential cost to the Crop Insurance Corporation, i.e., the Government of Saskatchewan, was upwards of \$40 million if the judge did not grant their wish. Now thankfully for Saskatchewan farmers, the judge in her wisdom said that Crown corporations simply cannot trod on the rights of individual farmers in this province.

What we have before us here is a \$9 million figure. Obviously if the public pronouncements of the Crop Insurance Corporation officials are correct, then Saskatchewan Crop Insurance is in a far different state than what the minister has indicated in his interim supply Bill. That case is before the courts at present. There is considerable money being expended by the province of Saskatchewan — expended to the point where they asked the judge in Melville to slap a \$750,000 bond on the farmers to try and scare them off so that they wouldn't take the government to court.

And the government by its own admission says that the cost is in excess of \$40 million. Now I would think that at some point the government may need some extra money, and certainly these ongoing court wrangles and costs are going to be considerable.

Mr. Minister, given the pronouncements of the Crop Insurance Corporation in the court in Melville and the sums of money that we're talking about, can you assure Saskatchewan taxpayers today that none of the money allocated in this sum will not end up in some special circumstances as outlined by the Crop Insurance officials.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I can once again assure the member that if you look at the appropriation in this interim supply Bill for the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance, it is one-twelfth. It's one of the areas in which there is no exception because there is no good reason for it to have an exception.

It is the normal one-twelfth, one month's supply for the month of June, and therefore there is nothing unusual other than paying for the normal functioning of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance which one-twelfth appropriation will pay for.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to move into a few of the more specific areas. I'm wondering if there is any money that's been allocated out of this supply Bill to fight the court case with respect to the GRIP contract holders?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Any costs that would be

associated with that would be provided in the appropriation that's here. I assume, I think I'm correct, that the Department of Justice would pay where there were lawyers that were hired. If they were the Department of Justice lawyers, if they were lawyers outside of the Department of Justice, either the Department of Justice would pay or any other agency that would hire the lawyers. But the money is the normal money that is provided in the interim supply, which is one-twelfth provision either in Justice or Crop Insurance or Agriculture. In each case, the provision here is only for one-twelfth.

Mr. Boyd: — In the court judgement that we saw as a result of the court case, the judge identified the fact that it was, I think, important to recognize for all of us in the province of Saskatchewan that even if the judge . . . even if in the end the judge does rule in the favour of the government, there could be damages awarded to the farmers. And I think they identified the damages could be potentially \$27.20 an acre, and that's, I would assume, on the entire acreage, seeded acreage in the province of Saskatchewan, which would be something in excess of 31 million acres.

Now that would be in excess, if there was that that judgement came into place, it would be, the province of Saskatchewan would be faced with a bill of something in the order of \$900 million. Now I'm wondering whether there's any of this money has been allocated in that direction, particularly in light of what the judges said.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The only amount of money provided in . . . or requested in the interim supply is the normal one-twelfth. There are no provisions for what may or may not be a judgement of some court. It's not possible to do that. The member as a lawyer will know that. The provision here is the one-twelfth provision which I indicated earlier.

(1530)

Mr. Boyd: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm not sure that we want to, in opposition, base our approval of supply to the government on assumptions like that. You were assuming that the budget for the money to fight the court case is in these different departments somewhere or another.

I feel that the role of the opposition is . . . I think we have to identify where it is. I'm just not sure whether you've . . . Have you allocated it or hasn't it been allocated? And that's the point we're trying to make is, has the money been put forward to fight those court cases and is there any of it that can be identified?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, if there are expenses related to the case that for example took place in Melville not so long ago, there will have been money provided in the various departments that would have had to pay the bill. We're providing, and I can only refer to the departments who I believe would be involved — the Department of Agriculture, the Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Department of Justice. All that's being provided here is the one-twelfth, the normal funding for those departments.

Within that, if there are associated legal expenses with whatever actions they may be involved in, it would come out of the one-twelfth provision. If the member opposite wants the specifics of what lawyer, what firms were paid what money, what firms are engaged, you'll have to ask that when the various departments come for estimates before this legislature. That's the appropriate place to ask the questions because that's the department who will have those answers.

The Department of Finance does not run the affairs of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Finance provides the appropriation for the year based on present representations made by the Department of Agriculture for a global amount of money geared to various programs that the department runs.

Specific answers to specific programs and expenditures of those departments have to be provided by those departments. The member will have an opportunity to do that at whatever length that the members opposite will choose to take. They can take a day, they can take an hour, or whatever, when those estimates come.

We are in the process of considering estimates of the departments now. That's one of the ways in which governments are held accountable to the Assembly. Details have to be explained to detailed questions. I can tell the member opposite, now that we have a normal session in place with a normal budget, those opportunities will be provided.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Chairman, I think what the minister is asking for is anything but normal, though. You're asking us as opposition members to allocate money on behalf of the government to various government departments and we don't know what we're allocating it for.

So when I go home to my constituents and they say to me, you took part in this debate with respect to the allocation of money for the government, and I'll say yes, I most certainly did take part in it. Well what was the money going to be used for? Was it, for example, used to fight the GRIP case? And I'll say, well the minister said he assumes that some of the money was used there, and he didn't know which department. It might have been in Justice, it might have been in Agriculture, it might have been in Crop Insurance.

I don't think that's going to be good enough for the folks out there. They're asking me those types of specific questions on a daily basis about what's happening with the finances of this province. So I think the minister has to do a little bit better than just say to the folks in Saskatchewan that we assume that the department has set aside some money for this. We don't know what the amount is, we don't know where, even which department it's within, but we want you to grant supply.

And I'm not sure, Mr. Minister, that we can go along with that. When people ask us as legislators to look after the public purse, I think that we have to look after it in a fashion that we know where the money is going to. And that's the problem I think, Mr. Minister, with this Appropriation Bill. We're not sure whether money is being set aside for these types of things.

So I wonder if the minister would care to elaborate a little bit more about what kind of response I should be giving to my constituents when they ask me where the money is going to.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well I think the member can have a perfectly legitimate response to his constituents.

The purpose of an interim supply Bill, one-twelfth, is to make sure that members of the legislature can do exactly what the member from Kindersley is talking about — only providing one-twelfth of the interim supply. And if the session happens to last another month, maybe there will be an interim supply Bill for another one-twelfth, so that the members opposite in the interim can ask of the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture in this particular case, all of the questions that need to be asked. Otherwise the Minister of Finance would be here asking for more than one-twelfth.

The purpose of an interim supply Bill is to provide only those essential monies that have to be expended to run the operations of the government, to provide funding to third parties that require either by statute or under certain program obligations — revenue sharing, for example — the money that they need in order to operate their businesses or their jurisdictions and not have to go to the extra expense of waiting till the end of the budget debate and end of the estimates, and in the interim borrowing huge amounts of money and having to pay interest costs on them because the legislature could not provide them with the interim supply.

That's why you have only one-twelfth, so that this legislature — not as it happened last year; a very exceptional thing happened last year — so that this legislature does not have the final Appropriation Bill voted until any member who wants to question any department has had an opportunity to do that in as much detail as they may want to ask those questions.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think what you're asking us though for is an opportunity to provide for you a blank cheque, a blank cheque based on the fact that we don't know what you want to use it for. When we ask you specific questions about it, you can't answer the specific questions about it.

For example, is there a cost associated with winding down of the Saskatchewan Pension Plan?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — In the Department of Finance . . . we're dealing so far with only those departments in which there are no exceptions. If members want to ask questions where there is greater amounts than one-twelfth, I'll be able to provide the information of where it's going and what it's for. But in the Department of Finance, nothing unusual, simply getting the one-twelfth appropriation for this fiscal year, not more than one-twelfth. There is no extra money for any special expenditures and nothing abnormal about it.

Mr. Boyd: — I wonder if the minister would provide us then with a list of the departments that are being allocated more than one-twelfth.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, we have it here. The departments in which there is an amount that is in excess of one-twelfth are the following. Community Services because of the revenue sharing; Education; Energy and Mines; Department of Health; Department of Highways because construction seasons are this time of year so you have to advance the money quicker; Natural Resources; New Careers Corporation; Rural Development, once again because of the revenue sharing; Saskatchewan Water Corporation; and Social Services.

Mr. Boyd: — I wonder if the minister would table that information for us, please.

I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, if there's been any cost associated with the winding down of the FeedGAP program.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I know of no specific costs, but as I said, the Department of Agriculture, we're providing one-twelfth of their appropriation. The Department of Agriculture, when you consider their estimates, will have to explain how they have broken that down and each particular program. You can get the answers in detail.

Mr. Boyd: — Is there any identifiable cost associated with the delays in the Piper deal?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The member will have the information I sent him. The Department of Economic Development and Trade has been provided a one-twelfth appropriation, and they will do their normal programming expenditures. There is no provision for any exceptional expenditures as there are in, for example, the Department of Community Services because of revenue sharing.

Mr. Boyd: — Is there any identifiable cost in the delays in the Crown Life deal?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — There is no money provided anywhere in the interim supply Bill related to the Crown Life proposal.

Mr. Boyd: — Is there not ongoing discussions with the Crown Life folks, and their moving and all of that sort of stuff out here? Supposedly there must be a cost associated with that.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm sure there are ongoing discussions by the Crown Investments Corporation, Crown Management Board, with the principals involved in the Crown Life proposal. But as you will note in the second row of Crown Investments Corporation, there is an asterisk. We make it clear there's no money being provided in this interim supply Bill for the Crown Investments Corporations.

Mr. Boyd: — Is there any identifiable cost within the Energy and Mines department with respect to the upgrader at Lloydminster? We understand that the government may be put in a position to have to fund the overexpenditures there, and I'm wondering whether there's any identifiable cost there.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm informed that would be a statutory provision. Therefore it's not something that would be provided in the normal budgetary appropriation such as this. So the answer to your question is no.

Mr. Boyd: — Is there any identifiable cost in the Department of Highways for the ripping up of highways and turning them back to gravel?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Department of Highways has in its appropriation in this interim supply Bill, a request. We are requesting to provide to them an amount over one-twelfth of \$6.643 million. The purpose of that is to make sure that money is available for performing work that is done during peak summer periods. This is now peak time for maintenance costs and for some construction costs. That's what the money . . . money in excess of the one-twelfth is there because of maintenance and construction which is at its peak at this time of year.

Mr. Boyd: — I'd like to correct you when we're talking about ripping up highways. I think we wouldn't call it construction; we'd call it destruction of the highways. When you tear them up, it seems to me that would be the way you'd characterize it.

But I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, what is the reason for the costs associated with the New Careers Corporation? I thought you were . . . Is that the cost of winding it down?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The additional cost there in excess of the one-twelfth is \$708,000. And that's to meet commitments that are associated with the implementation of the new community employment program.

As you know, it's basically . . . To a large extent, I believe, it's a summer employment program. Not totally, but in order to meet the requirements of funding the creation of jobs under this program, there needs to be in this case an additional amount beyond the one-twelfth.

Mr. Boyd: — Within the Community Services department, what is the allocation above the one-twelfth to be used for there?

(1545)

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The allocation . . . Urban revenue sharing has to have a quarterly payment schedule, so there's \$3.6 million. Northern revenue sharing is the same; there has to be an additional \$700,000. Grants to libraries to accommodate the quarterly payment schedule needs an additional \$600,000 in excess of the one-twelfth. That's basically what the additional funding is for, mostly because of the quarterly payment arrangements under these programs that are there.

Mr. Boyd: — The next one we see is the Crown Investments Corporation. I think we might want to go through all of these in excess of the one-twelfth amount. So if you want, rather than me having to stand and ask you on each one, if you want to just deal with each one of those ones over the one-twelfth, we would maybe save a

little bit of time.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Let me just first of all, if the member would look at the information which I sent over to him, he will find that the footnote says no funding is being provided for Crown Investments Corporation in this interim supply Bill. So there's no additional funding that's being provided there.

We've dealt with New Careers. We've dealt with rural . . . no, we haven't dealt with Rural Development. Let me just explain to the member opposite why there is in excess of the one-twelfth here. It is there because there's money for lands branch because of the seasonal nature of the pasture operations. There has to be some money that is expended on a seasonal basis rather than on a 12-month basis. And also the grants for Rural Development, there is a first quarterly payment of unconditional revenue-sharing grants which adds \$1.9 million in excess of the one-twelfth.

Social Services, once again there's an addition there: payments to New Careers Corporation for training and the employment of social assistance recipients as to fulfil the agreement that 25 per cent of the total appropriation will be paid to New Careers Corporation by the end of June. We're dealing now for an interim supply for the month of June, so that's required.

Saskatchewan Water Corporation, there's \$622,000 in excess of the one-twelfth payment to the Water Corporation for irrigation programs. No money for outstanding commitments was provided in the April or May special warrants. So where we didn't need to do anything by special warrants in April and May, we withheld it because we wanted to bring it to the legislature. Because of that, we need an additional amount of money in the interim supply Bill to pay for that now.

What else is there? Education, same thing. Education is funded on a . . . not month-by-month basis, and so there's an additional \$79 million being provided to cover off the needs for basically, to a large extent, K to 12 school boards who will in total now be receiving six-twelfths of their total appropriation for the year. That's half. So there's an additional \$79.882 million; 72 million of which is for that purpose.

There is some additional money for teachers' pensions and also some additional monies for Official Minority Language Office to make payments to the language institute which have to be paid by June 30. Once again this I believe is under part of a federal-provincial agreement. I don't think it costs us anything in the end. It is refunded by the federal government, but we have to advance the money first and so we have to provide it.

Energy and Mines, there is additional overexpenditures of \$239,000 to provide an operating subsidy to the oil and gas revolving fund.

In Health there is a whole wide range of things. There is in excess of one-twelfth of \$21 million to provide \$12 million for provincial grant to the Saskatchewan medical care insurance; the Saskatchewan prescription drug plan

to provide for a provincial grant there; grants in support of health services; grants to hospitals. They're based on actual cash-flow requirements. Grants for allowances for home care; grants for special care homes; and grants for special care facilities.

Nothing unusual. Simply that in some cases the money is advanced quicker than on a one-month by one-month basis.

Mr. Boyd: — In these estimates is there any indication anywhere about the . . . with respect to the winding down of the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, I understand you're planning on paying out that amount, the amount that the people have in their pension plan, paying it out entirely to them, I understand, sometime this summer. Is there anything in there to allocate that amount?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — No. In the Department of Finance, if you look at the list there, there's nothing, no additional funding, it's straight one-twelfth of the Department of Finance.

If it was necessary to spend some money on that in the month of June, it would have to be taken out of the one-twelfth appropriation. There's no special money set aside.

Mr. Boyd: — Is there special money set aside in any of the departments then for unforeseen things? You know, something of the nature perhaps where we're faced with huge fire-fighting costs in the North or something like that, a little unforeseen. Is there anywhere in here that we deal with areas that may be of an unforeseen nature?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — No. All of the interim supply requests are based on the budget presented on May 7. The budget which clearly said: here is what is budgeted for each of the departments.

And what we base interim supply on is that budget. We cannot base it on unforeseen expenditures. Especially if you're dealing with one month at a time, you shouldn't. It's simply one-twelfth on the budget which was allocated to the departments and presented to this legislature and which members will be able to question at whatever length they like when the departments come forward to this committee.

Mr. Boyd: — Is there any cost, identifiable cost, associated with respect to the Conference Board's reduction of the economic growth for Saskatchewan? They announced that today. Would there be any identifiable cost — the interest cost, for example?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — There would be no cost associated with the Conference Board. This is simply an expenditure appropriation. It's a request of this legislature to approve the expenditure of this amount of money during the month of June to meet the obligations which the government incurs because of the budget that is presented to the legislature.

Mr. Boyd: — If we see, though, a further erosion of the bond rating of Saskatchewan, would we not then also see an increased cost in interest cost? And I'm saying that

maybe as a result of the Conference Board's lack of enthusiasm about the economy of Saskatchewan, perhaps there will be a cost associated if the bond rating services start lowering our credit rating.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Over the last 10 years our credit rating has been lowered quite significantly. There is no downgrading of the province's credit rating. Whether there will be or will not be, I cannot speculate. If there was, and there was additional cost, you would not see that reflected here because that would be a statutory provision which would not have to come forward as an interim supply.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to say a few things. I want to first of all begin by asking a couple of questions that I . . . in a general sense that I have a concern with. And one of them is, as you've transferred the assets and liabilities from one Crown corporation to departments, was there any kind of a cost involved in relation to that?

I want to point out a number of things that I'm aware of. One of them is that capital projects like hospitals and health care facilities, level 4 care facilities, schools — all of that was moved over as a part of changes that you've made. I'm not sure whether there was additional costs in doing that.

What I'd like to know . . . I know that this is interim supply, but we need to know and understand a little bit about what you did in relation to establishing not only your revenue and your expenditure but where this expenditure is going to really happen. What I see in many places is — and it's just an observation — that I think you've over-inflated the expenditure to the extent that you deliberately allowed the \$517 million to float in there. And subsequently to that you're going to say, well nobody's going to notice the 517 million because I've increased the taxes, because nobody's going to talk about it, nobody's going to notice the increased expenditures that you've had or you've budgeted for. And then turn around and say at the conclusion of the year, we had a real good year. We came in at 150 million or \$200 million of debt over and above our expenditures, or revenues and expenditures. And that will say, oh well I did a real good job. But you inflated the expenditures to the point where it was reflected in a negative.

And I want to point out that we have some serious concerns about that. We have serious concerns about it from the fact that it in fact is costing us more money because of our change in our rating. I think that that's a part that we want to inquire about.

One of the things that you, sir, said over and over again as a part of your campaign in the last election is, we'll never use warrants. And lo and behold, you come right straight through and use them.

Now in one case they're right, and in another case they're wrong. When you do it, it's right, and when I do it, it's wrong. Just make that as an observation. And I don't know, you can rationalize it in whatever way you want. I will say to you that the rationalizations of those arguments are probably exactly the same ones as we

used, only we never said we wouldn't do it. And that's the difference, Mr. Chairman. I think that that has to be pointed out.

You indicated that there were third parties getting grants. And I wonder if there would be an opportunity to find out a few of them and where they would be going and how much they would be in specific ways.

The other thing that bothers us a whole lot is how you've shifted the debt and the liabilities to the place where you move it all in one year and then subsequent years you're going to say, well we made a whole lot of money in our Crown corporations. We made a whole lot of money in savings that we made because we were so frugal in what we did. And that's a real concern to us.

First, I'd like to ask a question about Agriculture and Food. Is that exactly a twelfth of the amount of money that you've allocated there?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The answer is yes, it is exactly a twelfth of the money that's been appropriated for the Department of Agriculture and Food.

The member wondered about third-party grants; he'd like to have details on them. The ministers and the departments, when they come forward, will be able to provide you those details for you, as any department will be able to do that.

The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, the Provincial Auditor, and the Gass Commission, and others have made it very clear over time that the way the accounting was done there, on the basis of amortizing the expenditures, was inappropriate. We agree that that was an inappropriate way to account for a debt which claimed to be an asset when it was not an asset.

So now the expenditures will be expensed by each of the departments wherever that capital is being allocated — whether it's Health capital or Education capital — and will be spent, appropriated for, and spent in that year and accounted for in that year, rather the amortized route which was an inappropriate way to do it according to the Provincial Auditor and according to the Gass Commission.

Mr. Martens: — That's what concerns us, Mr. Chairman, that you're taking the debt and putting it all in one year, and then making it look like it's a way of saying that the deficit is higher when it was accounted for in a different fashion.

And now what you're doing is you're just saying, well this is what is the debt to the Consolidated Fund. And really it's a matter of a principle in bookkeeping, is what it is. It's not an increase in debt, which you have said over and over again in this House, it's because we have such an increase in the debt; we didn't know that it was there.

And if you'd have been looking at all of the aspects of the various material that the Department of Finance was issuing on other occasions, you'd find out that in fact it was all allocated. It was all designated. And now you're saying, well we've got all this additional debt. I'm not sure

that you don't understand it. I'm not sure if somebody needs to explain it to you, or if you're just deliberately avoiding talking about it.

How much of the debt did you put into the areas of . . . the government's total volume of debt did you move into the Consolidated Fund? I'd like to have a list of all of those areas that you moved from SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) or any of them. I'd like to have a list of those places that you've moved that debt from one place to the other.

(1600)

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well once again, I'm here as a Minister of Finance to talk about interim supply and not do the estimates of Crown Investments Corporation or of any other department.

But in order to be helpful, let me remind the member opposite that that information is available. It has been publicly made public. It has been tabled in this House, and if you check with the records, you will be able to get that information quite readily. And all of the write-offs and how they were done has been provided to the legislature, and it's available. If the member wants me to — well I shouldn't have to dig it out for him — but if he wants us to help him put it together . . . we don't have it here. But when we get the Committee of Finance and the Department of Finance and the Crown Investment Corporation is considered, all of that will be readily available.

There's nothing secret about it. That's one of the reasons the new accounting processes have been put into place — so that everything is out in the open, so that nothing is a surprise. That does not change the debt. The debt is still the debt.

In all of the new accounting systems that have been put into place, all of the write-offs that have taken place, the amount of debt for the province of Saskatchewan hasn't changed. It's still the same amount of debt. It's just that it's more appropriately accounted for, as has been suggested by the auditor, as has been suggested by the Gass Commission, as has been suggested by the independent study of Ernst & Young. It's the appropriate way to do it.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to know then is . . . on your Property Management Corporation you got \$951,000. When is the twelfth of the allocation going to go from SPMC into the Consolidated Fund to register that change in its volume of dollars that it's moving around?

You moved it in one lump sum. Did you move it in one lump sum, or did you move it in one-twelfths?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I can't respond to that. That was a question that I hope members opposite thought of asking when the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation was here during its estimates. That's why the estimates for the various departments are brought forward to the legislature.

If the members did not have an opportunity or did not

think of asking that question, there is no problem. Just provide the request to the minister in charge of the Property Management Corporation, and I'm sure that he'd be more than willing to provide that information for you. And if I can be of assistance, I will do as well.

But we're not considering here the estimates of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporations at this time.

Mr. Martens: — I know that, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to know whether this was one-twelfth of the debt that Sask Property Management Corporation had accrued through the years or whether this is new projects or whether this is buying a fleet of new cars. What is it doing?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — This is one-twelfth of the appropriation. It is grant money for the central services. Most of their other funding revenues will be received. I believe they receive from the various departments to which they provide a service.

The amount of money here is one-twelfth. It's for central services and operations of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation.

Mr. Martens: — Then where, to balance the books, do you move the debt that Sask Property Management Corporation had? Where are you going to move that? When you pass the budget? Or are you going to do that prior to, or does this House not know . . . function in finding out the information about that?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — If the member wants to study all of the supplementary tables in the back of the budget book, all of that is identified. We're not here to talk about the estimates of the Department of Finance. We're here to talk about the interim supply Bill. But it's all there — you can look it up, and it's been very open and fully accounted for.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. Then I'll ask the question differently. Is there interest being paid, in lieu of the debt in Sask Property Management Corporation, coming out of this one-twelfth?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The answer is no there is not because that's statutory.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. Then when does the interest payment accrue on the debt in Sask Property Management Corporation? Did it accrue on March 31, '92 or what was the date of it?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Once again, none of that is in this Bill, so we're not discussing that here. But the transfer of the debt from SPMC was transferred to the Consolidated Fund on March 31. It is being paid . . . the interest is being paid as part of the total interest on the public debt. It was always being paid as interest, but in this case is being paid as interest on the public debt.

But this Bill does not deal with that. So other than trying to be helpful there's not much more that I can tell the member opposite.

Mr. Martens: — Is there interest in this vote anywhere in these numbers here on the public debt?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — No there isn't.

Mr. Martens: — Where does that . . . is that just the fact that it's not payable in June or is it the fact that you're not allocating one-twelfth?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — You will find when we do Committee of Finance in the Department of Finance that all of that is statutory. It's all provided for in the estimates for '92-93, which this Bill does not deal with and it does not have to be voted in the House because it is statutory.

Anything that is statutory is required to be funded because of the statutes' requirements and therefore the government is already being accountable because it can only do what the statute requires. That's how the interest on the public debt is looked after and therefore it does not become a part of the process of voting in the House.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, is there anything in relation to the capital projects in Education and Health that are additional? I believe that there were some Education that was additional amount of money, and I believe Health. Was there any of that dealing with capital projects? Or where is that money being spent on?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, there is in grants for hospitals in this Appropriation Bill; part of the appropriation there is for capital. There is capital based on actual cash flow requirements of \$1.2 million which is in excess of the normal one-twelfth — am I correct? The same thing with special care facilities. There is a capital base on actual cash-flow requirements of \$200,000. So that is in addition to the one-twelfth, the details of which the Department of Health will be able to provide you when they come before this legislature and this committee with their estimates.

Mr. Martens: — I wonder if the minister would respond to my observations about warrants; why it was necessary for you to change your mind about the warrants in relation to the government, the needs for them and not a need for them. I wonder if you'd elaborate on that point.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the position of the government is that special warrants should only be used in certain circumstances which are required — that's why the provision is there, when there are circumstances of emergent nature or unusual situations. The government was faced this spring with unusual situation. The unusual situation was that because we had to open the books, we had to find out what the finances of the province were. We did not have the full information until the Gass Commission provided its report on about the 15th of February. We were not able to start the full budget process until after that period of time.

The member who's been in the treasury benches before will understand that the budget process takes six to seven months. We were faced with the situation where we had to put together the final decisions of the budget in the period of about three months, which made it necessary in order to be able to make some of those decisions with the

kind of sensitivity that was necessary to make them . . . it was not possible to have the budget in place by the end of the fiscal year.

That will never happen again unless there's some unexpected situation that's created. Our commitment is to bring the budget on time. I can tell the member from Morse, it will be brought on time. Mark my words.

Mr. Swenson: — Well I think the minister is absolutely right, Mr. Chairman. There were special considerations, but they were mostly political in asking for those special warrants.

The Gass Commission made certain recommendations as to changing accounting methods and taking write-downs. And nowhere, especially in the case of some of those write-downs, was it absolutely necessary to take them in the '91-92 year, except for political reasons.

Some of the capital projects that the member from Morse has referred to in asking the minister if there is consideration in this special warrant for interest costs accruing to those capital projects, had already been amortized for a period of four to five years. Some of those projects — special care homes, hospitals, educational facilities — had already been on the books for some period of time with allocations of whether they were over a 20-year, 25-year, 30-year period of time, that those projects were going to be amortized.

There was no reason other than politics, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, to take all of that in one lump sum. The very fact that there were letters on record with Cameco Corporation saying, because of no permanent impairment, that it was absolutely fundamental, if you were going to the new style of accounting, to do them all in that one particular year, except for the politics of the Minister of Finance and no other reason. He could have done one or two of those in '92-93. He could have done maybe a couple more in '93-94. He could have done a couple more in '94-95 — you know, over a period of time.

But the minister had a set of numbers that he chose to inflict upon the people of Saskatchewan in preparation for his budget. And the easiest way that the minister could inflict that pain on the people of Saskatchewan and try and get away with it was to make some political decisions, and I say totally political, in running all of those debt numbers into one fiscal year and driving up the total debt of the province of Saskatchewan.

And the minister knows full well that those choices were open to him, that he didn't have to take all of the capital projects — because a number of them had been on the books for a number of years — in their transfer back into line departments.

The member from Morse is absolutely right. Those numbers were accounted for. They simply weren't accounted for using accrual accounting as the Gass Commission talks about.

The minister just delights in mixing and matching his numbers all the time. And it'll be very interesting as time

goes on and whether the minister actually adopts that accounting process. Because as others around Canada have pointed out, to go to a full accrual system in a short period of time will be very, very difficult for any government to achieve. The changes to the systems that would be necessary to achieve that would mean a fundamental restructuring of government.

And I believe, Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that somewhere, particularly in the items that you have identified that are more than one-twelfth, where there are capital projects which you have moved from Property Management Corporation back into departments, where there are interest costs accruing because of those capital projects being moved, some of which, as I said, had been on the books for three, four, and five years and had already been partially amortized over that period of time, some of the monies, Mr. Minister, I say didn't need . . . some of those costs didn't need to accrue at the time that you chose to take them. Would you comment on that, Mr. Minister?

(1615)

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, I can comment on that, Mr. Chairman, that what has happened now is that the expenditures on capital projects will be expensed now as they occur. Therefore there will be no interest charges that will be involved in that process. That's why we have changed it as the Provincial Auditor clearly has recommended that they be expensed as they occur.

The accrual accounting has got nothing to do with the interim supply Bill. All the interim supply Bill does, which we are considering here today, is the provision of the amounts of monies that the various departments of government need to pay their expenses for the month of June. One-twelfth provision of the total budget request which is presented to this House, except in cases where there are exceptional circumstances, all of which I have outlined for the members opposite.

Mr. Swenson: — But you see, Mr. Minister, the problem that we have with these numbers — take an example, land bank, which before had to have an interest figure shown for it. You have now shifted all of that debt in one fell swoop. A program that had been around since the mid-70s, a program brought in by a former New Democratic Party government, incurred hundreds of millions of dollar in costs. You've written all that debt off. It doesn't show anywhere here. There had to be some costs accruing with that particular write-down. Those costs must be somewhere within the one-twelfth or the two-twelfths or the three-twelfths that the minister is asking for, and yet he denies that.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in this interim supply for interest on the public debt. Interest on the public debt is non-statutory. We will consider them separately when the Department of Finance comes forward for the Committee of Finance. We're not doing that here today, therefore no provisions are being requested of the legislature to provide that kind of money, because it's not necessary at this time because it is statutory.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister says that his mixing and matching of numbers and accounting methods have no place in this debate in this Assembly. So the minister can come forward with an interim supply Bill which is very narrow and says that everything else is in a separate vote. And he has done that, Mr. Chairman, very artfully, I might say to the minister.

For he has been able to use one set of accounting numbers as his excuse with his budget. He continues to say that those numbers can't be dealt with because he's changed the accounting methods of the province of Saskatchewan. He says that we have more than one-twelfth in a number of areas here, and yet that there can't possibly be any debt, any interest costs attached to things like capital projects in the Department of Health, in the Department of Education, when we know full well that there is the ongoing costs of various capital projects in the province of Saskatchewan. And he says because he's changed the accounting methods, there aren't.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that cost did simply not disappear into thin air. At some place in this province there'll be a special care home, there'll be a hospital, there'll be a nursing home, there's something, where those costs have swung over from the Property Management Corporation to the line department and that somewhere the minister must be accounting for those costs.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I will repeat again, and all I can ask is for the member to accept my word. In this Bill, none of those requirements are being provided. So therefore there is no need to address that because we're not considering that, and that information I do not have available.

We will be able to address that when we do the Department of Finance in Committee of Finance in this legislature whenever that Committee of Finance is called during this session. This session will continue until we have a budget, until this legislature has voted on the budget, after this legislature has considered each of the departments including the department's finance estimates.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, I know your deputy minister and he probably has this sheet in his head that he knows exactly what we're talking about and he can provide it to you. He could provide it probably verbatim. And I know him well enough to understand that. And I know him well enough to know that he knows.

I just want to ask another question about . . . land bank is one of them. Last year that Department of Finance initiated and it said there's \$180 million worth of debt or \$184 million, whatever it was, and there was \$11 million run on my budget in the Department of Agriculture. I know it was there. I just wanted to know what you did to change it all around. This is the first time we have had a chance and an opportunity to discuss it with you. And subsequent to this, you have had two warrants issued for appropriation of funds in relation to this and nowhere do we find out what is going on.

I'm going to ask you another one. What about Beef Stabilization Board? Did you write off that amount of

money? First of all, tell me what the debt is, and then tell me how much you wrote off of it.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Once again, the member wants specifics because we're not here with the specifics of the Department of Agriculture. I cannot give you the specifics. I do not intend to give you the specifics because I do not have the capacity or the Department of Agriculture staff who are able to provide that information. When the Department of Agriculture comes, you will be able to get that information in detail. But directly to your question, because the Department of Finance will have something to do with that, you ask, is there some write-off on beef stabilization? As far as I know there has been no write-off on beef stabilization.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I took a serious look at the details in your book here, the one you read from on the night of the budget address, and I didn't see any beef stabilization debt in it. In fact if I hadn't read through it the third time, I wouldn't have even found the land bank debt. Now I'd like to know where it is.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — As far as I know, and my officials tell me, there is nothing in this interim supply Bill provided for the purposes of which you speak. We simply are providing for the Department of Agriculture one-twelfth of their required or appropriate amount of money as presented in the budget.

Mr. Martens: — Okay, and then let me attack it in a little different way. Under administrative services in agriculture, do you take one-twelfth of that?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — One-twelfth of the total department expenditures.

Mr. Martens: — Okay, now let's go to livestock and personal services and expenses under that subvote and you've got one-twelfth of that. Right?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, and you'll have to ask the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture to give you the answers on that provision when the Department of Agriculture appears before this committee as a Committee of Finance.

Mr. Martens: — Right. Now when you get to the land bank land, it went from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Finance, I assume. The debt went from Agriculture to Finance. Am I assuming that accurately?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — When the decision was made to do away with the Heritage Fund because it no longer was fulfilling any purpose, any liabilities or any debt in the Heritage Fund was transferred to the Consolidated Fund. Therefore the interest on any debt that may be incurred during that process, which was being incurred in a different way before, we will be provided under non-statutory or statutory provisions.

So you will have to ask that question when the Department of Finance is here as a Committee of Finance, because in this Bill no provisions are made.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, you're just deferring

the decision and the decision to choose when to have the question answered; that's all you're doing.

Your department is here. Your department officials of Finance are here. I don't know why you can't answer the question. You just don't want to. Now say that that's the reason why you're hedging on it.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I'm here prepared to deal with an interim supply Bill. The interim supply Bill provides one-twelfth funding, by and large, to various departments. And we're not here in this supply Bill . . . this supply Bill does not provide an opportunity to provide the detailed subvotes of any particular department.

I'm not here responding for the estimates of the Department of Finance. I'm only here to deal with the interim supply Bill.

Mr. Martens: — Well then let's make some more assumptions. Let's say in the month of June we go through this same process again and we haven't had the Department of Finance here to check on that. And then in the month of July we go through the same process again and we haven't had the Department of Finance here to do that.

What we need to have is some answers from the Department of Finance who are sitting all the way around you. And we need to have some answers for those kinds of questions dealing with how you dealt with the debt and how you moved it from the Heritage Fund to the Consolidated Fund, and how you move it back and forth from SPMC or Sask Water Corporation or Souris Basin Development Authority or any of them. We need to know that. And we want to know what the dollar values of those items are.

Because when I go through your book on borrowing debt and guaranteed debt, I don't find some of them there. And that's why we need to know. We want to know where you did this, when you did it. And if you did it before March 31, '92, you'll come back here and say, well we don't have to talk about that because it isn't the year under review. And so you can hedge yourself all the way around that.

We want to know, as a part of this committee — and I believe we have a responsibility to know — when you did it, how you did it, where you did it, and what you did.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, this Bill that we are discussing does not deal with those questions. I can assure the member that we will be prepared, I will be prepared to provide all of those answers when the Committee of Finance considers the Department of Finance. I won't be able to deal with them all because some of them will be involved with the Crown Investments Corporation, and the minister in charge of Crown Investments Corporation will be able to provide all those answers.

But when we are prepared to deal with the Committee of Finance on all of those questions, I can tell the member without any hesitation at all, he will be able to get all the

answers.

Interim supply Bill does not provide any of those things. And right now in this committee, we're considering the interim supply.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we need to go around this once more. I know that your department is here; they understand what I'm talking about. I think it's your unwillingness to participate in the discussion about what we're doing here under these kinds of circumstances.

You voted in cabinet to have warrants given for money expended in April. You did it in May, and now we're doing it for June. This is the first time we have had any opportunity to realize and have the public of Saskatchewan realize what you've done with all of the different kinds of fundings. And I want to know how you move those around. I think it's necessary for us to find out.

I want to know, for example, like I said before, where is this land bank land? Where is the debt for the land bank land? You talk about the rural services was providing some of the funding for financing that debt initially; I think it was \$6 million. And now it's gone from Agriculture and Food. It doesn't even have a space there, as far as I know. Where there was one before of \$11 million, it doesn't even have a space there in '91 estimates.

And that, Mr. Chairman, I think is showing us that you need to identify where those concerns of ours are not being realized. We have identified a whole host of those. SPMC, Sask Water Corporation, Souris Basin, the land bank, the Beef Stabilization Board — all of those were debts by the province of Saskatchewan. Can you tell me which each of those items were identified in which? Was it the Heritage Fund? Was it in the Consolidated Fund? Or are we still paying interest to some New York bank for the land bank land that we bought in 1971 to 1982?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Of course we were before the changes were made; we are after the changes are made. If you borrow money — the member will know — you have to pay the interest on the money. The money for the land bank is part of the Consolidated Fund debt. But that doesn't change anything. The total debt doesn't change. The interest you have to pay because the money was borrowed for that purpose, that doesn't change at all. But since the Heritage Fund no longer exists, any debt that was in the Heritage Fund is now part of the Consolidated Fund.

But we're not here considering the estimates of the Department of Finance, and therefore I do not have that information for you. I will have . . . and it's useful for the member to raise all these questions because we'll be better prepared when the Committee of Finance considers the Department of Finance's estimates. And that information will be provided.

We're here under the rules that require us to discuss the interim supply Bill and I'm prepared to answer the questions on the interim supply Bill.

(1630)

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the question again about the beef stabilization fund that had a liability. And I want to ask the minister if he would give his undertaking that there are none of those costs for the board or for the role of the board in the administration costs from the part of Agriculture, whether they're in there or whether they're not in there.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — They're for administrative expenses of various functions of the department, various boards. For the one-twelfth required, there will likely be provisions made in the one-twelfth that's provided in the interim supply Bill that's before the House today. If there's an administration cost on any program in the Department of Agriculture, obviously one-twelfth of that cost will have to be paid in the month of June. That's why that request is made here as part of the interim supply.

But interim supply does not break down each of the various expenses that the Department of Agriculture will be making. That's something that you will have to ask the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture when they're here, because it is they who will expend the money and it is that department that has to be accountable for the money.

Mr. Martens: — Where are the interest costs being borne for the Beef Stabilization Board?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm not aware of any interest costs involved there, and I'm not saying that there might not be. I'm not aware and neither are my officials aware of it. When we get to the Committee of Finance on the Department of Finance and the Department of Agriculture, that information will all be available. But because we're considering interim supply, I'm not aware of any such costs.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Minister, we've been sitting here for some two hours, trying to divulge some information from the minister regarding the expenditures that the department and certainly the government is asking of this Assembly at this time.

I've been listening with some interest to the debate that has been before the House, and certainly, as my colleagues have indicated, we have seen a government today that is coming and asking for interim supply when indeed we were informed prior to the election last fall that interim supply or indeed special warrants were a thing of the past. And that once elected, the New Democratic Party, if elected government, would then bring forward the budget in proper time so that the House could indeed address the budget, address all the estimates, and have a budget not only brought forward in time but put forward to the public that would allow for proper expenditures of funds.

And I would also indicate that yes, I'm not necessarily an accountant or have a real sound idea of accounting principles. Having been on the government side of the House for one term, and having followed with interest some of the debate and certainly listening to members

from the department — certainly your Associate Minister of Finance as well — it's intriguing to try and follow the expenditures in government where funds are taken from, where revenues are collected, how revenues are spent, and where they're put.

Certainly I think many people across this province today are wondering what has happened to the government that they elected back in October. First of all, we had a government that was telling people prior to the election that they would be able to live within a budget of \$4.5 billion; that the government of the day through mismanagement of finances had wasted a lot of money, and that this government, if elected, would do away with all the waste and mismanagement.

They would bring into place simple accounting practices that would be able to show the people of Saskatchewan exactly where their money is being spent. And indeed by eliminating the waste and mismanagement, by eliminating the wasteful spending, by eliminating the process that the government of the day formerly indicates was there, they would be able to live within — well within — the means of a \$4.5 billion budget.

However, Mr. Chairman, what we see today is, not only was a budget presented in this House somewhat later than we had indicated it would be, somewhat later than what most people had expected it to be presented, but we also see that the budget presented to this House has expenditures of well over the \$5 billion mark.

The minister indicated that he had difficulty bringing forward his budget on time because of . . . It was due to unforeseen circumstances that were confronting the government of the day when they were elected, when they became government, when they had access to the books that indeed the circumstances were, as they would indicate, worse than they had been led to believe.

And I would suggest that yes, these circumstances were unforeseen because I believe — I'm taking the minister's word for it and I'm taking the opposition's word for it — that they really were sincere in the fact that they felt there was so much extra money floating around out there. When indeed in fact the former government and the former government of the day had indicated for the last number of years that we had been in some very difficult economic times and that the expenditures and the cut-backs and the reins . . . the government of the day was trying to pull the reins in but the opposition would not believe that that process had to take place.

And so of course, Mr. Speaker, when indeed the government was elected in October of 1991, all of a sudden they were brought into reality. The reality hit home that indeed the expenditures . . . the books were open, as Mr. Gass had indicated, and that there wasn't this big tree of money sitting out there that they could just go to, so that they could pull a dollar here and they could pull a dollar from there and could meet the demands of the public, whether it's in regards to health, whether it's in regards to education.

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the fact that yes, that's the reason the minister is standing in this House today with an

interim supply Bill, because he must have found it very difficult. I'm sure his colleagues, his cabinet colleagues, and no doubt probably all of his members, found it very difficult to all of a sudden have to re-gear their thinking and their ideology. Instead of spending and instead of throwing out funds that they said were there, all of a sudden, oh boy, we've got to pull the reins in here.

And then next thing we know, the budget deficit all of a sudden starts to balloon from \$400 million deficit to a \$500 million deficit and it seemed that even the Premier and the Finance minister couldn't agree. One would be in Saskatoon throwing out one figure and another would be, say, in Regina throwing out the other figure.

Mr. Chairman, what I can see confronting us today, I can see the difficulty the minister is having in trying to answer the questions — the fact that the minister would say, well he's just asking for one-twelfth of the allocation for this fiscal year so that the government can operate and provide the funds to meet the needs of third parties across this province, to meet the needs of seniors across this province, to meet the needs of the government payroll.

And, Mr. Speaker, what we're . . . or Mr. Chairman, or Deputy Chairman, our responsibility is to try and find out where all these funds are being spent, what the government is calling for at this time, why they would be . . . with regards to the dollars and the interim supply Bill they have for us, where it is going to be spent, where the expenditures are going. Are they going to the proper departments?

Are the expenditures in the Department of Agriculture and Food, the one-twelfth that's been appropriated for or the request that has been made, is that going to be sufficient to cover the needs of the Department of Agriculture and Food for the next month, or we are going to be indeed facing an additional request for funds before we even get through the month?

And, Mr. Speaker, like as I indicated, there are many people who today are really wondering what has hit them regarding the budget that was brought out. I would ask the minister, even in his request for funds through the Appropriation Bill we have here today . . . or the interim supply Bill, what consultation process did the minister take or go through in developing their budget and in talking to the many people that have been affected, especially in the area of health? What consultation process was taken regarding people with specific problems such as diabetics and their insulin problems, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of an interim supply Bill, the consultations that take place is that the Department of Finance requests of each of the line departments what their requirements are for that one month. The departments have provided to the Department of Finance their requirements for the month of June. Usually it is one-twelfth. In some cases it's in excess of one-twelfth. That's been explained during this debate that we have had here this afternoon.

I appreciate the comments about the member's responsibility to ask the questions and to get the answers.

And that's why we do have Committee of Finance so that all of the departments who expend the money and have to be accountable for the expenditure of that money can come before the Committee of Finance. And members on government side and the opposition side can ask the questions that the member opposite said are important to be asked. I appreciate that, and I respect it. And as the House knows, that opportunity will be provided for that to happen.

I want to answer the question: is this sufficient? Is the one-twelfth sufficient for all of the expenditures for all of the departments for the month of June? The answer to that question is yes, it is sufficient. Will there need to be possibly an additional request for the month of June? The answer is no, there should not be an additional request for the month of June. This interim supply Bill should satisfy the requirements for the month of June.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, regarding the ... in the expenditures in the Department of Justice, how much of the funds that you are requesting through this interim supply Bill will be going to cover the cost of any expenditures that could arise from the court case regarding the GRIP?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — That same question was asked by the member's colleague a little while ago. I cannot tell you because I can't provide the breakdown of each subvote expenditure in the Department of Justice. But I can assure the member that the amount being provided is exactly one-twelfth of the appropriation that is being provided for the Department of Justice to run the Department of Justice and pay the bills of operating the Department of Justice during the month of June.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister whether or not the funding requested through this interim supply Bill takes into account the extra costs regarding legislation and the costs of the extra legislative committees that have been introduced and brought forward in this House. And if so, how much?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The interim supply Bill provides for one-twelfth of the normal operating of the House, but there is an additional amount provided here in excess of the one-twelfth of \$44,000, which is for the purposes of covering the extra cost associated with the House being in session. Am I correct there? Yes, \$44,000.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, does that also address the added costs that probably occur through the additional committees that have been introduced, and I believe today there was an additional request for a committee on the environment.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Any of the costs of committee work will be funded out of the normal one-twelfth that has been provided here. There is no exceptional amount of money being put into place.

(1645)

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a new member, this is my first time I've had a chance to stand up and speak on interim supply on a budget. And

I'm sure my constituents will be interested in some of the answers that hopefully the minister will give us.

As a new member, Mr. Minister, I'm having a bit of a trouble understanding the whole process here. We're dealing with the budget, and we're dealing with one-twelfth of the budget. And you're also talking about statutory funds debt. Now your budget this year comes down at \$5 billion-plus. If you take one-twelfth of that, Mr. Minister, you get somewhere in the neighbourhood of 417 million. You're asking for, in this Bill, 469 million, \$470 million, and that would work out to over \$5.6 billion for the year if your supply Bill, your interim supply was actually was one-twelfth. But you say you're not including in that interim supply Bill anything from the public debt as I understand it because it's statutory.

One-twelfth of the public debt that you have outlined in the budget is \$63 million. I'm just wondering where does this \$63 million for the month, any one month of the year, fit into your interim supply Bill?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm not sure that I've got all the question there. If the member ... if I don't answer fully, I'm sure the member will ask again. I've been a member of this House for 17 years, if I could be of help in explaining the process which I must be the first to admit is not always simple.

But there are rules, and there are traditions, and there are processes that have been established in the legislatures of this country which actually make our system very accountable. And that's one of the strengths of the British parliamentary system. There are checks and balances. There is executive accountability, and that's why the member from Souris-Cannington is able to get up in the House and ask the questions.

Some of the answers individual ministers may not have in hand because sometimes you have to ask those questions in a particular committee. So if you want to know the details of Department of Agriculture, you will do what members have done with the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation in the last week getting the answers to the questions. And I was not here, but I understand that the minister was prepared to pass over all kinds of information which he had prepared ahead of time so that members in the opposition could have access to the information. That's going to happen in all of the departments.

What is happening here is simply a consideration of interim supply, providing one-twelfth of the appropriation of the expenditures that have to be voted on for the Government of Saskatchewan for the various departments. There are other things there that are statutory which don't have to be voted on such as interest on the public debt, things like pensions, for example, which we do not consider under interim supply but which will be considered when we do the estimates for the Department of Finance sometime during the period of this session.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, when we're considering interim supply and the monies that you are asking us to allocate, do you include the pension

portions, the public debt into that number, that 469 million, or is that outside of it some place?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — For interim supply, no. They're not included for an interim supply. They're part of statutory provisions which are voted on when we consider the estimates for the Department of Finance in Committee of Finance.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay, so when we are asking about interim supply, when we're looking at the budget, we have to pull out all those numbers that would be classified as statutory such as pensions, such as the public debt. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — That's correct.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, how can you come in here then and ask for interim supply of \$469 million and call it one-twelfth of the budget when it's not anywhere near close to one-twelfth of the budget because you have pulled out very large sums of money and say, we don't consider that. That is not part of interim supply; that's statutory. Yet you're coming in and saying, we want one-twelfth of the budget and it's not anywhere near one-twelfth of the budget. How do you explain that? How do you justify that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The answer's very simple. I'm not asking for one-twelfth of the whole budget; we're asking here for one-twelfth of the amount that needs to be voted. That's what we're doing here. There's a certain amount that has to be voted and we're asking for one-twelfth of that because the legislature has to vote on it.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, would you tell us out of your budget then what portion is the supply that has to be voted on? Take out the statutory amount; how much money is left that we get to vote on?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — My staff has I think told me something about the questions which may help me provide you the answer.

I'm sorry, but other members asked the question about this and there was questions about, why is there some provision here beyond the one-twelfth? Okay. The reason — and one of your members has got a copy of this; I sent it over — the reason for that is — the member from Kindersley — is because there are some expenditures that we vote on which we have to make which are not based on a one-twelfth basis for the whole period of the year.

Revenue sharing, for example, is paid out on a quarterly basis, so we have to provide enough money in the interim supply Bill to fully pay for the quarter amount, quarterly expenditures that have to be made.

Same thing with education. By the end of June the amount paid for school divisions, the school divisions will be six-twelfths of the total appropriation.

Because of that, there are in some departments some exceptions beyond the one-twelfth to make sure that this legislature votes the required money to be able to make

those payments.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Minister, if that is the process that you say is quite normal, why wouldn't you identify that then in your budget document and say that X millions of dollars are going to have to be expended on a quarterly basis no matter what the legislative timetable is.

Be up front about it. Put an addendum on here that says that these are expenditures that we have no control over because they're attached to third parties or something like that, and that the one-twelfth or one-quarter or one-third or however you're divvying that particular process up because of federal-provincial agreements would then be outlined at the very beginning.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, it is outlined. All of that is in legislation which this legislature has passed. And all we're doing by the interim supply Bill is abiding within the terms of the legislation for revenue sharing, for school grants which designates the period of the school year, and we're meeting the requirements of the legislation. Nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, what we are doing here today, you're here asking for one-twelfth supply, we're here to ask you questions about it, and you're here to justify why you should have one-twelfth supply. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, we're here to request the House for a vote on one-twelfth appropriation of the total budget, except in circumstances which we have made clear, where we have to have more than one-twelfth.

Because in our opinion — not only in our opinion; it's the opinion of all legislators — that when the House is in session and there is yet not the full budget has been considered by the legislature because all of the estimates have not been brought forward to committee, that each month . . . And in some cases legislatures over the years — 1987-88, '89-90, '90-91, and even under the previous government — sometimes the vote was for two-twelfths so that the legislature wouldn't have to deal every month with this while the full budget was being considered.

So we're here to provide . . . to ask the legislature to provide for one-twelfth of the expenditure of the total budget so that the government's payments to third parties, payments of employees in the government, payments of grants to non-government organizations can be accommodated for the month of June.

We could have come for two-twelfths. But in my judgement it was important to come for one-twelfth, and if the House is still sitting at the end of June and maybe sitting into July, we'll come back again at the end of June to ask for another twelfth.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, because you say you have to come into the House to ask for this supply, does it not also stand to reason then that you have to justify to the House why you need the one-twelfth supply?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, and to the extent that we can, that's what we're doing. As to where the specific

amounts are going to be expended, in the detail, you'll have to ask each of the departments because they're the ones who will be spending it and they're the ones who have to account for it.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, if we can't ask you some detailed questions on that portion of the one-twelfth that you are attempting to receive here today, how can you justify that you really need it?

I have a question on one department that I would like to ask you, to justify whether or not you need this money. On the Water Appeal Board, are you taking, are you asking for one-twelfth of the budget for the Water Appeal Board?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — In the case of the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, the request here is for one-twelfth except — and I will find it in a moment — except for an additional \$622,000 beyond the one-twelfth, which you will see on the flow chart which we provided, that is being requested for the following purposes: \$200,000 payment to the Saskatchewan Water Corporation for irrigation programs.

No money for outstanding commitments was provided in April or May. So we need the additional money because we didn't include that in the special warrant in April and May. We're allowing for it in the appropriation, in this interim supply Bill, so that the legislature can vote on it. It was necessary to put it in the special warrant now. We thought it important to bring it here instead.

The other additional amount of \$400,000 as payment for the Saskatchewan Water Corporation for irrigation development capital, once again, because no money was provided in a special warrant in April and May, we are requesting that it be provided here now to cover for April, May, and June, and that's why there is \$622,000 above and beyond the one-twelfth.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. But the question I asked you was the Water Appeal Board, and the Water Appeal Board is under the Department of the Environment. So I'm asking you, are you asking for one-twelfth of the budget for the Water Appeal Board which is under the Department of the Environment?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Department of Environment is being allocated precisely one-twelfth of their fiscal year's appropriation. There are no special provisions of any additional money — straight one-twelfth. How much of that goes to the Water Appeal Board, we do not have that knowledge. You will have to ask the Department of Environment.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, how can you justify coming in here and asking for one-twelfth supply for the Department of the Environment, when we can't ask you whether the particular programs within that department are actually in place and if they are actually working?

I've had phone calls about the Water Appeal Board that they're not doing anything, that nobody can get any work done there because they're not working. And yet you're

saying that you're asking for a one-twelfth supply for that department, for that program. Is that program working? Are you asking for a one-twelfth supply for the Water Appeal Board?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I believe that is the case. We're asking for one-twelfth for the Department of Environment. I can only assume from that that it'd be one-twelfth of the norm because the normal operation of the Saskatchewan Water Appeal Board.

But as for the specifics, you're going to have to wait for the Department of Environment when it comes to Committee of Finance. We don't have that information. The Department of Environment does.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, how can you come and ask for one-twelfth, when you can't answer whether these programs are in place or whether these departments are actually doing any work. If you're going to ask for money and to say that it's justified to receive that money, don't you have to have something concrete to bring forward to say that they are actually doing something and they actually need the money?

What are the other programs in the Department of the Environment? Are they doing anything?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — When the Department of Environment asks for one-twelfth appropriation for interim supply, they surely are asking for it because they are operating all of their programs for the purposes of what the money for the fiscal year has been appropriated. So therefore one-twelfth is being provided so that they can fulfil all of their roles and functions during that one-month period of time which is the month of June.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, you've come in . . .

The Chair: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.