

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next, move:

first reading of a Bill to declare a day of appreciation for the Scottish clans in Canada.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Knezacek:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly, a class of 26 students from Langenburg High School who are seated in your gallery. The students are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Okrainetz and also Mr. Haczekewicz.

I would just like to mention that these two teachers were my colleagues up until election time in the Potashville school division. And if I can put a little plug in here, I think the Potashville school division is one of the best school divisions in the province. So I'm pleased to have the class and the teachers here with us this morning.

I will be meeting with the class and the teachers at 11:10 for pictures and then followed by refreshments. I'd also like to acknowledge their bus driver, Mrs. Nerbas, who came up from Langenburg with them this morning. I'd like to wish them well on their tour today and a safe trip home. And I'd ask you to welcome that particular class to the Assembly this morning.

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

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my colleague, the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for The Battlefords, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House 55 grade 5 and 6 students from the Lawrence School in North Battleford seated in the west gallery. The students are here with four of their teachers: John Diehl, Andra Kelly, Janet Anderson and Doug Schell, along with their bus driver Ken Maertens.

My colleague regrets being unable to be here today, but I would ask all members to welcome the guests here from North Battleford.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the House, I'd like to welcome 13 grade 6 and 7 students from Paddockwood which is located in the centre of my constituency.

Their teacher's name is Janice Dearing and chaperons Janet Slater, Greg Harris and Bonnie Griffin, and the bus driver is Mark. I will be meeting with them at 10:30 after

question period for pictures and drinks. Would you please help me welcome them.

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

**Mr. Johnson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the House, 36 students from the Hartley Clark School in Spiritwood. They are here to tour the Legislative Building and four or five other sites in the Queen City.

They are accompanied by their teachers, Gil Goodfellow and Jean McLachlan; chaperons, Melvin Nelson and Adele Booth. I was told that as I met with them a little before they came in here that they haven't had a good count on the students since they left Spiritwood, but they hope they still have the same number.

I will be meeting with them for pictures afterwards, and I hope that they have a good day today because they're going to spend the evening as well here and stay over and go back tomorrow so that they're in good shape to really give their chaperons the run-through.

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

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 34 students that come from 9 countries who are enrolled at the University of Regina in the English program as an academic program.

I met with them on the stairs for pictures earlier and took them on a very quick tour. I'm going to be meeting with them following question period in Room 218 for refreshments and to answer any questions they may have about the proceedings that they've been able to view.

I would ask members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming the students and their Professor Penthes, Laura Roszell and Therese, the teachers of the program.

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

### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**Mr. Kluz:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I was in Wadena and six farmers came and talked to me at different times. Some of them weren't even finished eating. They had some very serious concerns.

They said that the federal government was acting even worse than when they cancelled the two-price wheat system. We all remember at that time they promised to be reimbursing the farmers for the equivalent of one year's losses. There was never a payment issued.

Now that Western Grain Stabilization Act, their administration is gone, there's a bill in the mail from Ag Canada. They're taking \$41 million directly out of the Saskatchewan economy. And I have a letter here that was accompanying that bill, and it say:

Dear Producer,

. . . I know this is difficult news coming at a time when many of you in the grains and oilseeds sector are under financial strain . . .

We apologize for the inconvenience this situation has caused, and appreciate your co-operation in resolving it.

We want to be as fair with producers . . . we will make every effort to work with farmers . . .

Signed with the director of WGSA (Western Grain Stabilization Administration).

They sent some remittance options with that. It says you can pay it by cheque or money order, deduct from a NISA (net income stabilization account) payment, deduct from a GRIP (gross revenue insurance program), deduct from a crop insurance payment, or other. And I tell you, every farmer should go with the other one because . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to bring to the attention of the Assembly a destructive act of one of the members of the media just this morning. I got off the phone with a constituent just a half an hour before the House opened and the story was confirmed by a member of my caucus staff.

The CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) morning hostess, in questioning the federal minister of corrections, wanted to know why the healing lodge was located in Maple Creek because she said Maple Creek is one of the most racist communities in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this is an outrageous charge to be broadcast across the province at taxpayers' expense and I demand an apology for the people of Maple Creek.

Maple Creek has one of the soundest and most progressive relationships among aboriginal people and the non-aboriginal community. The fact that the CBC could not find Maple Creek until it found an offensive avenue of attacks speaks loudly to the taxpayers in my constituency about the money the federal government takes from them and gives to this state-owned radio. The fact that the healing lodge location was approved by the aboriginal women and the chiefs escapes the CBC commentator.

I am proud of Maple Creek, and I am proud of the friendship and co-operation among all of the people of Maple Creek and district. Mr. Speaker, every member of this Assembly should join me in condemning this wrong and unfair attack on my constituency.

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

**Mr. Cline:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to relate to the Assembly that after years of lobbying by Saskatoon's business community including the chamber of commerce and the North Saskatoon Business Association, the city of Saskatoon decided this week to establish the Saskatoon Economic Development Authority. This body will in a very proactive way seek to

attract and facilitate the expansion of Saskatoon's business community.

As a member from Saskatoon who meets regularly with my colleagues in the chamber of commerce and the Saskatoon economic development board, I want to congratulate the city of Saskatoon and the chamber of commerce and the north Saskatoon business community on this initiative. They've worked hard to bring the idea to fruition. And we as Saskatoon MLAs, Mr. Speaker, are committed to co-operating with the authority in its endeavours. We believe that as the authority increases the involvement of the business community, business will be attracted to Saskatoon. And we also feel that this spirit of co-operation between the civic government, the business community, and the province will keep Saskatoon in the forefront of economic development. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wish to bring to the attention of the Assembly this morning that the 79th annual meeting of the Saskatchewan stock growers will be held in my home community of Moose Jaw on May 30 to June 2. And I think it's imperative, Mr. Speaker, that as many rural members particularly of this Assembly as possible attend because of the severe drought that is going across southern Saskatchewan at this time. I'm aware of many tens of farmers in that area having to move cattle. They're looking for hay supplies.

I'm sure this meeting will touch on a number of areas of importance to the province, Mr. Speaker: the changes in the critical wildlife habitat legislation, certainly the FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) program, cash advances to livestock, breeding fee increases in community pastures. There are a whole realm of things that I'm sure will be discussed at the stock growers' meeting.

Moose Jaw, I'm sure, is very happy to have them there. And I would encourage all members of the Assembly to avail themselves of this meeting in Moose Jaw.

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

**Ms. Murray:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tomorrow marks a very special day in the history of one of the towns in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. It is the 100th anniversary of the founding of the school in Pilot Butte, which is quite an achievement when you consider that Saskatchewan as a province is only 87 years old.

I'd like to take a moment to remind my colleagues in the House of the achievements of rural education. Out of the small country schools in Saskatchewan have come some of Canada's most impressive men and women, leaders in the fields of public service, the arts, industry, finance, and sports — people like Frances Hyland, Sinclair Ross, Al Johnson, Gerald Bouey and Gordie Howe.

I have no doubt that the education provided by these schools is as good as ever and that children attending these schools now will continue that tradition of leadership.

Pilot Butte School has for 100 years ensured a quality, comprehensive education for the children of the area. And tomorrow many of the students educated there, will return for a day of celebrating and reminiscing.

I'd like to welcome those who are returning for the celebration, and I would like to extend my congratulations to the staff and students at Pilot Butte School, Mr. Speaker, and also to the people of the community who have supported the school. I wish them much success as they begin their second hundred years.

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

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was pleased to be a part of a tour and media conference with the Hon. Carol Teichrob on the filming crew from Minds Eye productions who are in town to produce the film or the show, *Eli's Lesson*.

Kevin DeWalt, the producer, took us on a tour of the locations for the filming to be occurring, and Mr. Marshall spoke to us as a director who left Saskatchewan at the age of 19 to pursue his career. He is now back in Regina as the director of the film.

It is a time in Saskatchewan when we can see a film being produced that employs 80 to 90 per cent of the people from Saskatchewan. It's a co-operative effort between the industry and the province of Saskatchewan and other local people who are involved in the making of the film, as well as an opportunity to have a co-operative effort between the Hutterite colony at Arm River and the makers of the film who have had good co-operation. And I would mention it's the first time anywhere that people have been involved in filming in a Hutterite colony and they've received a warm welcome from the people there.

The stars of the show are a local woman named Gaye Burgess, and we are also able to attract Kenneth Welsh as a Canadian actor and Jack Palance, who said he is coming to Saskatchewan because of the lesson in the film. And he's here and taking part in the film to tell people that you should never desert your dreams or give up on your dream because someone claims it can't be done. It's a lesson . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order.

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

**Mr. Hagel:** — I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we've heard congratulations extended to graduates of universities as well as high schools in Saskatchewan. And on behalf of the members of the Assembly I'd like to add today, Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the grads of our technical education system from SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology).

I'll be attending the Palliser campus graduation tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and it will be indicative of the changing face of post-secondary education, Mr. Speaker, as many of those grads will have their own children there as members of their family for the graduating class. Many

of the grads, Mr. Speaker, are returning to technical education as part of a second . . . the beginning of a second career, and there will be some 800 grads who will receive their diplomas tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

So on behalf of all of the members of the Assembly, I wish to wish all of those grads every success in their new careers, and to hope as well that their futures will be found here in Saskatchewan.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Impact of Health Care Changes

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, yesterday my office received a very disturbing phone call from someone who has been trying to get help from your office for a couple of weeks already.

This woman is a low income earner who refuses to go on social assistance because she's determined to make it on her own. And this low income earner was told in the budget that she would be protected against your massive increases in health care. She phoned my office, Madam Minister, because she sees no evidence of your government helping low income earners. In fact, Doris Looker phoned because she received no help from your office. Doris is a low income earner and she has . . . is a single mother with a couple of children, and one of them has many ailments including such things as asthma.

Madam Minister, you said that the people who couldn't afford it wouldn't have to worry. And yet this woman cannot get a hold of anyone in your office who will help her. Are you prepared, Madam Minister, to help this woman? Are you prepared to talk to her?

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

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I thank the member opposite for bringing that to my attention. Absolutely — if Mrs. Looker will phone me I will personally speak to her and put her in touch with the proper officials to give her assistance in . . . We will have to discuss the situation with her of course. And, Mr. Speaker, as you know there is special assistance for people who cannot afford medication or other services depending on what they are. If they are low income earning and can't afford it, the government will provide assistance. So Mrs. Looker should get in touch with me and we will have someone look after the situation for her.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A new question to the minister. Madam Minister, Doris informs me that she has called your office more than five times, and that the only time that she got a return call from your office was after she threatened to phone the PC (Progressive Conservative) caucus office. That was the only time she got a response. She knows about the special assistance, she asked for it, and she was told that a form would be in the mail. That was two weeks ago, Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, you are the government that claims that it is the one that cares for people. You are the only one that cares for people. That is what you have been saying. Well some caring government, Mr. Speaker.

Madam Minister, are you telling me that this is the kind of treatment that a caring government extends to the people? Is this the kind of treatment that the people can expect from your government?

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

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know, in terms of what happened with respect to the five phone calls. What I can promise the member opposite is, I will look into it. I will find out who didn't return the calls. Her calls should have been returned promptly, and we will see to it that it is done in the future.

So Mrs. Looker should phone our office again. I don't know whether she's phoned the ministerial office or the Department of Health. It's not clear from the member opposite as to where the phone call was placed. I ask him to provide me with more information after this question period, and we will look into the situation.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will say to you, Madam Minister, that I will give you that phone number personally so that you can return the call to her personally.

Now, Madam Minister, Doris needs new glasses, but because of your so-called excuse for a budget, she is now no longer able to do that because you have placed user fees on optometric care. Doris cannot even go for her eye examination. Even worse she cannot afford to have a chiropractor work on her injured back, again because of your government's so-called improvements to health care.

Madam Minister, Doris Looker told me this morning when I called her that she is frightened. That's the exact word that she used. She is frightened for people like herself and for many other people in the province like her, and she stressed that. She's concerned not only about herself but many hundreds of people in the province like her.

And, Madam Minister, Doris Looker is paying a price for being independent. She's paying a price that's affecting the health of her family.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order, order. Does the member have a question? I'd ask the member to put his question.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, I ask you: is this the way your government takes care of those who choose to work rather than go on social assistance? You said that you would be taking care of people like Doris. If you're helping people . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'll let the minister answer.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I would ask the members opposite that when they hear of a situation like this — which it is our intention to help, you know, assuming that they cannot afford the services, as they indicate to you — I ask you to phone our office, give us the person's name, and we will get in touch with them and help them out as best we can.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, that is exactly the point that I have been trying to make this morning — the fact that people are contacting you; they want a response from you. But you in your callousness and your overriding agenda that the Finance minister is imposing on you, they can't get any response from you, Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, Doris is a real person who is desperate, Madam Minister. And your office, your staff, you are not responding to her needs. And there are hundreds like her, hundreds who cannot afford to pay, Madam Minister . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Does the member have a question? You're still commenting on the previous answer the minister has given. I want you to get to your next question.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I was laying the format for my next question, and this is it, Madam Minister. People cannot pay the exorbitant costs that you're asking for these low income earners.

Madam Minister, again, I want this to go on record once more. Will you give me your assurance that you will phone Doris — I will pass the phone number over to you — find out why this . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Let the minister answer. You've asked your question.

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

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I have said before and I'll say again that if the member opposite gives me the phone number, we will phone this individual. I also want to say this, with respect to anyone who may be listening, that with high drug cost threshold, the government has a program that will provide assistance to SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan) clients or anyone who is low income and cannot afford their drugs. They will simply have to go to their pharmacist — and I understand there are application forms there in order to fill them out — and then the department will take a look at the situation. And if they qualify for assistance because they can't afford their medication, it will be provided by the department. And there are a number of arrangements that can be made such as removing a deductible for up to a year or reducing the co-payment and so on.

There are other provisions with respect to some of the other services we talked about such as optometric for low income, SAP, FIP (Family Income Plan), and SIP (Saskatchewan Income Plan) to be covered, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to make this point as well, that the . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Next question.

### Effects of Budget on Livestock Industry

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Stock Growers' Association annual convention is scheduled in Moose Jaw to start this Sunday, and there are a number of serious concerns. And my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. And I wonder if he would explain to us a couple of things this morning. Will the minister tell us how much the net cost to producers will be for the budget brought down by the Finance minister? Will you tell us the net cost it will be to the livestock producers in the province of Saskatchewan? And are you prepared to tell them on Monday morning what that net cost will be?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member opposite that I will be attending the stock growers' convention and speaking with them. But I also want to let him know that I've had already a couple of discussions with the livestock industry and they understand the financial crisis in Saskatchewan, and they are willing to work with the government in recognizing that there are limited means at the government's disposal. I wish the opposition could be as cognizant of the mess they've created.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Will the minister inform the House today of the net cost that it is to livestock producers, hogs and cattle.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to again say to the member that I've . . . to the member opposite that I've been in discussion with the livestock industry both before the budget was brought down and after the fact, and they understand the difficulties that are in the financial situation here in Saskatchewan. They recognize the government's limited ability to participate in the kind of programs that were there and they want to work with the government in building a strong agricultural sector in the province.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is again to the minister. Tell us the net cost.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I will repeat again that the livestock industry is aware of the difficulties in the province and have expressed their willingness to work with the government in designing programs that are . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I believe that the member from Rosthern has asked his questions and I wish that he would let the minister answer. If you have additional questions, we'll recognize you later.

**Mr. Martens:** — Will the minister tell this Assembly the net cost on jobs that his budget that he brought down through the Minister of Finance will cost this province.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the members opposite ought to sit back and reflect for a moment on the net cost, of not only on individuals' jobs here and there, but on the cost to every Saskatchewan citizen of the \$760 million interest charges that are now part of the annual budget of the province as a result of the waste and mismanagement and the mess that you've created.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, and to the minister.

I'll tell you about costs. Land bank costs in 1970 to 1990 have been a significant amount, up to 15 and \$16 million annually. I want to know what the . . . and you did that and your party did that. I want to know from you the cost in real jobs for the province of Saskatchewan in the livestock sector by the changes in the budget that you brought forward.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to put on the public record that the members opposite reduced support to the livestock industry from about 55 or \$60 million in the mid-'80s to under 20 million by the end of the '80s. And in the process of doing that, additionally created a debt which is now publicly known to be about \$15 billion, which burdens every Saskatchewan citizen and which every Saskatchewan citizen recognizes that needs to be dealt with, except of course the members opposite. And they will work with the province, trying to create an economy not only in agriculture, but in all other areas of further development because they are hard-working and they are creative and they are innovative. And they're going to make Saskatchewan work — not like the members opposite.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, again about jobs. How much money did you put into Intercontinental Packers so that they could buy the Moose Jaw packing plant from Canada Packers to keep jobs?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the investments in business creation here are in the jurisdiction of the member of the . . . Mr. Lingenfelter. The fact is that we will continue to participate in job creation and economic development strategies with Saskatchewan people who are willing to look to the future as a positive place, in spite of the difficulties that are here as the result of the mismanagement of the members opposite.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, we have packing and killing plants in Saskatoon and in Moose Jaw in this province, and we have packing plants in North Battleford. How many jobs are you going to lose by the very fact that you've cut the budget in the livestock sector so that producers have no more opportunity to be

competitive?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan producers are amongst the most competitive in Canada. Our hog costs-of-production are the best in the country; our grain producers are excellent producers; and our cattle . . . our livestock people in the cattle business are also very competitive producers. And I can assure the members opposite that they will continue to work in Saskatchewan to support their communities and to generate economic activity here.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister who he consulted with in the Pork Board to deal with the changes that you made to the feed grain assistance and to the livestock cash advance.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the questions are getting a little repetitive. You're aware, you dealt with these questions a couple of days ago. And the facts are that the members opposite know that we would not discuss the final detail of budgetary measures.

I want them also to know that I've met with the Pork Board on more than one occasion. I've met with the other members of the livestock . . . repeatedly and clearly the livestock industry is willing to deal with the crisis in Saskatchewan that the members opposite are not.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. If the opposition does not wish to have any answers, I will cease the question period and we'll go on to other business. I do not want to remind the members again. If you want the ministers to answer, I don't want continuous interruption.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point and say this: you had the freedom to talk about cigarettes in the province of Saskatchewan going up in price, but you didn't have the freedom to consult with the people of the province of Saskatchewan, the livestock producers, about the impact of your budget. And how do you square that with those livestock producers?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the feigned anger of the member opposite belies the truth of the last 10 years in agriculture. Who did you consult with when you cancelled the beef stabilization program in favour of the tripartite program? And who wanted that changed? And what was the result of that change on the livestock sector in Saskatchewan?

Our feeder cattle numbers have gone from \$400,000 to approaching \$200,000 under the changes you made under those circumstances. Your investment's reduced from about 60 million to under \$20 million. Talk about changes in the livestock industry without consultation.

That was under a circumstance where you had the beginnings of a provincial economic structure that was healthy. You have then dismantled the economic health of Saskatchewan and wonder why we have to do tough things.

I'm saying one more time that Saskatchewan people are prepared to deal with this crisis, and I wish the members opposite would get on side and try and build Saskatchewan instead of throwing stones.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is again talking out of the both sides of his mouth on both faces. And I want to say to you, \$150 million or more is in that beef stabilization debt which you moved over in the Department of Finance in March 31, '92. Are you going to put that back? And are you going to initiate that program again so that you can impact negatively on the provincial debt your government started? Are you going to do that again?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite was asking about the health of the livestock industry in Saskatchewan. I simply repeat one more time that the livestock industry in my discussions with them after the budget, as well as the day before the budget, recognized that there is pain here. Of course it's pain. We all understand that. And they are willing to deal with that pain because they know that they are good producers and they will produce under the circumstances that they find the province in. They know there is not a lot of money here. Everyone in Saskatchewan knows there's not a lot of money here. And they will do business the way they've always done business and they will do it well.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — The pain is in the minister in Agriculture. And I know where it is; it's a pain in the neck. And I want to point out to them . . . ask the minister again: will he give the people of this Assembly and the producers in this province an assurance that he is going to protect the jobs by offering an opportunity to back the livestock industry like we did in the last 10 years.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I will assure the member opposite and all the people in Saskatchewan that we will get the financial situation in this province under control so that the programs that are so essential to every sector and industry . . . so that we can continue to spend 80 per cent of our agriculture budget on income support and stabilization; so we can continue to spend money on economic development and industry development in agriculture; so we can continue to spend money on the kinds of things that are important to Saskatchewan, will be able to be spent because we have a solvent province, one that is willing to deal with its economic difficulties created by you.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, this province is carrying debt from two programs initiated by that member and the government opposite by the Minister of Finance — land bank and beef stabilization.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the question: are you going to bring them back so that the people can increase the debt in the province of Saskatchewan? Is that what you're going to do?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a curious argument the member opposite makes. The Saskatchewan government is now paying back \$14 million a year from the 1988 drought program that you pretended to put in place with money that was hopefully paid for.

The members opposite sit there and watch the federal government demand \$41 million back from farmers. They sit there and they sat there for four years and watched the federal government off-load \$260 million on to the province of Saskatchewan.

How can we see any sincerity in the members opposite when they have contributed to the demise of funding of agricultural programs in Saskatchewan; when they've watched the federal government and supported the federal government in taking money from Saskatchewan people so that their buddies in Ottawa can get off the hook, and pretend they've done something for the province.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Why did you take the cash advance off? Grain farmers were getting it. We gave it an opportunity to the cattle producers to equalize the opportunity.

Are you going to reinstate that as a part of what you're going to do for the people in the livestock industry? Are you going to make that announcement on Monday when you speak to the stock growers?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want the member opposite to know that those program discussions were part of the discussion I had with the livestock industry. And they accept and recognize that these reductions are necessities in the face of the climate, the economic climate that's in Saskatchewan, recognizing that it is difficult in order to live in that circumstance.

We had this year to reduce the provincial proposed . . . projected deficit from 1.3 billion to 517 million, a number we still believe we wish we could make lower. As result of the measures the other members made, we are left virtually bankrupt. We have balanced the books for the province this year, except for the \$760 million interest charges as a result of the mess you've made.

We would have a \$240 million surplus if we could only dispose of the debt that you imposed on this province over the last 10 years. And farmers and livestock people and workers and business people across the province know what has to be done to get the province back on its feet.

The members opposite should be so observant as to notice and get on side with the work that has to be done to build Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — The grain producers were on the front lawn here and they didn't appreciate what you had to say about off-loading.

Now I'll tell you what. When you get there on Monday, they're not going to appreciate the off-loading that you're doing in the livestock industry — in the cattle side nor on the pork side. I want to ask you this question: why did you off-load on them on their lease fees for the pastures?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are also aware of what went on with pasture lease fees, that there were formulas set in place that were after that ignored. They were formulas based on the economic health of the industry and the returns from livestock.

That formula has now been allowed to function again. The lease fees have been increased in response to that formula, and the member opposite is quite aware of that. He didn't have to ask the question to find out the answer.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you why . . . or can you give me the volume of jobs that are going to be lost by the change in the budget that you got from the Minister of Finance, the changes in jobs in the packing industry itself?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the difficulties in Saskatchewan that have been perpetrated by the members opposite are ones that will certainly be felt by all of us, and the people across Saskatchewan are willing to deal with that.

The fact is we've crafted a budget which balances the continued economic development of Saskatchewan with the need to bring the budget under control so that, in fact, not only other Saskatchewanians but other Canadians and investors internationally begin again to respect the financial management of this province as opposed to the sincere disrespect they had for the *ad hoc*-ery of the previous administration.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, the court heard information on GRIP that was going to cost the farmers roughly 30 bucks an acre. Mr. Perkins, who is the head of the livestock feeders association, pointed out in his letter to you, sir, that it's going to cost on an average of \$30 a head in the feeding industry — your decision on the budget. Can you tell me how many jobs are going to be lost in the packing industry because of those two things?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Perkins and we have had more than one meeting. He is a responsible livestock producer and a responsible representative of the livestock industry and understands the difficulties the

province is in.

And we will work with the livestock industry in such a way as to maximize the production here in order that the economic development dollars that are spent in this province result in the maximum economic growth here as opposed to the careless expenditures and the absurd debt accumulation of the members opposite over that last 10 years.

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

**The Speaker:** — I think statements by members has been done this morning. I would like to just remind the member from Humboldt and the member from Maple Creek of that.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I move that the Public Trustee Act be now read a first time.

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

### Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I move that a Bill to amend The Land Titles Act be now read a first time.

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

(1045)

### Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I move that a Bill to amend The Mentally Disordered Persons Act be now read a first time.

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

### Bill No. 35 — An Act respecting the Production, Supply, Distribution and Sale of Milk

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill respecting the Production, Supply, Distribution and Sale of Milk be now introduced and read the first time.

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:** — Order. The business before the committee is interim supply and the motion of the Minister of

Finance:

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. Mr. Chairman, after the comments by the minister yesterday in the House, I took the liberty of going back over some interim supply motions from the last two years. The minister will remember that there was supply motions in both '90 and '91 and it was very interesting, Mr. Chairman, in spending a couple of hours going through the verbatim from those particular supply motions. And I must say that I reviewed the comments of probably half of the government caucus in how they approached this particular issue.

And I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the discussion was quite wide-ranging, to say the least, in both years, that members of the then opposition went on at great length about very specific items. And it was very interesting, Mr. Chairman, in reviewing that verbatim that the then minister of Finance was far more forthcoming to the opposition members of the past two years than what I saw the Minister of Finance with the present opposition yesterday.

The Minister of Finance yesterday maintained over and over again that he couldn't answer any questions dealing with the particular departments, even the ones that were more than one-twelfth, because there would be ample opportunity in debate in estimates later on in the session, that those types of questions would be answered. And he kept referring that these answers are statutory votes of this Assembly and that they'll be handled at the appropriate time.

Well my fear, Mr. Chairman, in this process is that the appropriate time may be about the 70th or 71st day of the legislature that these votes will be handled and that the ability of members to question the minister about a number of things, particularly the minister's moving of debt around in a very significant fashion . . . has the opposition wondering if we aren't going to sort of be held to the last day of the Assembly so that the minister doesn't have to answer those questions.

It was interesting, a statement made by the now member for Churchill Downs, the Associate Minister of Finance, who in the April 9 discussion on interim supply when the minister brought the motion forward said, and I quote: Mr. Minister, I accept your explanation, but I don't seem to recall having seen it done this way in the past.

What the then minister of Finance asked for was one-twelfth, one-twelfth of the amounts to be voted. And the minister, the now Associate Minister of Finance, said, I don't recall having it seen done that way in the past.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this Minister of Finance comes in, says, here it is, boys. I've stripped it of any debt associated with any of these departments, run it back into the previous fiscal year, and bloated my previous deficit to the hilt. But I don't want to answer any questions about that. I don't want to talk about the capital side of hospital



construction or nursing homes or educational facilities. I don't want to talk about any of the capital projects that Energy and Mines are involved in, even though Energy and Mines are getting more than one-twelfth. I don't want to talk about any of these things because you can do that at a later date.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I say, going back and reviewing the verbatim of the last two years in interim supply, we had the member from Rosemont talking about Rafferty in very specific detail. We had the present Premier, the member from Riversdale, talking about federal-provincial funding agreements in agriculture in great detail. We had the member from Churchill Downs, the now Associate Minister of Finance, asking questions about the debt side of potash in very great detail.

And I must say in reading that verbatim, Mr. Chairman, that the member from Weyburn, the Finance minister of the day, did talk about each of those issues at some length with the members who are placing questions. Some questions he said would be better answered in committee, in estimates, but in other areas he did give the members many questions and answers that were properly answered I think, Mr. Chairman.

So it's very interesting, Mr. Chairman, that now that the shoe is on the other foot that the members of the government of the day, who wanted to be very specific about a whole range of issues on a one-twelfth appropriation, a one-twelfth appropriation that the member from Churchill Downs says he'd never seen it done that way in the past . . . and now this minister says you can't ask me anything specific because what you have here is just one-twelfth of these departments except for some exceptions.

The exceptions have federal-provincial agreements tied to them. They have contractual arrangements tied to them. They have third-party granting tied to them. There may be some ongoing construction tied to that third-party granting, but I can't talk about it because that would be too narrow.

And I just want to say to the people of Saskatchewan who are watching the Assembly this morning that this is another case of saying one thing in opposition, demanding one thing in opposition . . . and if one checks the May verbatims on interim supply from 1991 you will find out, Mr. Chairman, that that particular interim supply motion went on for days and days and days and days, indeed weeks, because the members of the then opposition said we are demanding questions on specific areas. We want to know about the debt. We want to know where you've moved the debt. And now the fact is that they are the government, they're saying, no, we can't talk about it.

We can move it from one fiscal year to the other. We can take a special warrant supply from '92-93, move it back into '91-92, but we don't want to talk about it. That's better left to the minister to talk about. We can take write-downs involving major Crown corporations and agencies of government, take massive write-downs, shift them back a year arbitrarily, for political reasons, but we don't want to talk about it.

We can take items such as the member from Morse identified yesterday like the land bank and the Beef Stabilization Board that have seemed to have just disappeared into thin air — completely disappeared out of the budget documents, disappeared out of the *Estimates* — and yet I'm sure that when one adds up the deficit numbers that the member, the Finance minister, the member from Regina Dewdney talks about, that those debt numbers are indeed in there. Indeed form large chunks of it — large chunks of debt that he is saying to Saskatchewan taxpayers, interest charges will accrue to.

And, Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to go out and borrow money in order to have funds to pay those interest charges. I have made a arbitrary political decision to take all of this debt in one particular year, but I don't want to tell the members of the Assembly, when I come to this House after two special warrants, an interim supply motion, and my guess, that we'll have another interim supply motion, Mr. Chairman, before this House rises, and I don't want to talk about it.

I'm going to spend more than one-third of the entire allocation of the province of Saskatchewan's '92-93 budget. I'm going to spend over one-third of it — probably closer to half because of the special considerations that he says are necessary on quarterly deals — and I'm not going to tell you a darn thing about it. I'm not going to tell you the consequences of moving all of that debt into one particular year. I'm not going to tell you the consequences of moving all of that debt into one particular year. I'm not going to tell you the consequences of taking all those write-downs on share values in one particular year.

And I think the reason that he doesn't want to talk about those things, Mr. Chairman, is that those consequences would point out to Saskatchewan taxpayers, people watching the Assembly this morning, some very clear inconsistencies, particularly in what the members of the government said a short seven months ago in an election campaign, but particularly some inconsistencies as to what might happen in the future if certain circumstances were to change — certain circumstances that might allow the Minister of Finance to begin building his election platform for three and a half or four years down the road.

And I think that's clearly, Mr. Chairman, why when we ask questions that aren't single line items by any stretch of the imagination — which members of the now government felt quite at ease asking in the interim supply in '90 and '91 — but broader issues, broader issues such as the capital side of health care, the capital side of education, and the debt that was being amortized over 20 and 25 and 30 years with many of those projects, and how it is now all gone some place else that we can't talk about, how that debt has shifted in so many different areas.

(1100)

It was interesting, Mr. Chairman, going through that verbatim, all the various numbers used by the then opposition, talking about debt. And we had a great variety of them. The member from Regina Elphinstone, the

former member of Shaunavon, talking about the Consolidated Fund debt being at \$5.2 billion. Other members — I believe it was the member from Humboldt — talking about the consolidated debt or the total debt of the province going from 3 billion to 9 billion. Had one of the members opposite talking about the total debt including the pension liabilities from the 1970s and '60s added in, the debt of the province being 13.1.

It's really interesting, Mr. Chairman, because Mr. Gass uses some numbers that I think are very close to 14. The Minister of Finance in his replies yesterday was up to 15. It's the old question, Mr. Chairman, of the dancing deficit. It's whatever number they happen to want to pick at a given day, and we're supposed to believe it. I mean they're asking the former minister of Finance all sorts of questions and they tell him on good authority that the debt numbers are this, this, and this. And we have totally different pictures presented, Mr. Chairman, by this minister in this motion for interim supply.

And I guess it harkens back to statements made, Mr. Chairman — and the minister, I know, doesn't like me to talk about the financial review commission headed by Donald Gass, but there was a very important statement in there, very important statement. Mr. Gass at the end said, you know, anyone that cared to look, anyone that had the slightest bit of interest in the finances of the province of Saskatchewan, could go and have a look. The books were always open.

And I commend the minister's staff in the Department of Finance because I think they always were forthcoming. I mean, rating agencies, bond people, anybody that cared at all . . . and I can remember well going around the province of Saskatchewan on some budget consultation trips in the spring of 1991 and people asking questions about the debt of the province and it was always forthcoming. There was no hidden agenda, no hidden secrets that the member now likes to perpetrate on Saskatchewan people. That those debt numbers were there.

But one always has to remember, Mr. Chairman, that those debt numbers have been accounted for, as I pointed out yesterday, by the past six administrations of this province in one particular way. Since 1958, I am told, we have had a cash basis of doing our accounting. But the minister insists on using these other numbers which the province doesn't use at present in its accounting systems. He likes to use those bigger numbers because he thinks they'll have more political impact on the public out there; that he can get away with his tax measures.

And by the way, Mr. Chairman, that was another very important part of the verbatim of the interim supply motion in May of 1991. We had the members of the opposition at the time going on at great length about what harmonization would or would not do to the province of Saskatchewan — what growth potential would there be with harmonization; what was the job creation numbers being used; what were the detriments to Saskatchewan society; how would the retail sector be affected; how would the manufacturing sector be affected. And they took great issue with the Finance minister today because he said there'll be a 1.6 — I believe was the number used

— of growth in the province and that there would be 5,000 jobs created.

Now we've heard since, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister of Finance, a wholly different set of numbers about what de-harmonization would do for the province of Saskatchewan. The Conference Board of Canada comes along yesterday and just blows any numbers that he even dreamt of out of the water. But that doesn't seem to matter to this minister.

He can stand and his colleagues can stand in interim supply last year and go on at great length about the tax grab, the massive tax grab that the minister of Finance has just brought down in his budget because by having a 7 per cent tax on a cup of coffee or a hamburger or clothing under \$300, the people of Saskatchewan were going to suffer dire straits.

And they went on to talk about the roads being full of pot-holes. Not tearing the pavement off the roads and putting them back to gravel, but the roads would be full of pot-holes. And how was the government going to justify all these hospital closures, Mr. Chairman? These were the things that were discussed in interim supply just one year ago, very narrow questions to the minister of Finance.

I mean, Mr. Chairman, if you want to talk about hospital closures, here we have a report to the government on the Plains Health Centre, an institution that they built as an election promise 16 years ago at hundreds of millions of dollars it cost, and they're talking about tearing it down now. That is the inconsistency of these members of the legislature.

And, Mr. Chairman, they took those comments from interim supply last year and went around this province day after day after day and into the election campaign using the same numbers, the same rhetoric, and they said that the minister of Finance of the day wasn't forthcoming and he didn't answer my questions.

Well I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the questions asked by the members of the then opposition were indeed, were indeed tough questions to answer for the Minister of Finance because they were in great detail, very specific, down to individual buildings, individual projects.

The members opposite yesterday . . . the members of the opposition yesterday simply asked the Minister of Finance to account for some very broad issues. You've moved tens of millions, indeed hundreds of millions of dollars of debt around. You're saying you're accounting for it in a different way than has been the practice since 1958.

We simply wanted to get from the minister some answers as to how much interest is being paid on that debt, why was it all moved in one particular year, why wasn't some of it perhaps done in a different year?

If you've added the cost to the taxpayer of Saskatchewan, why are you taking all of these write-downs in one particular year? Who's advice was that on? Did you seek outside advice? Was that the smart thing to do? Did you

seek some advice from people in the investment industry around the world that the government deals with?

Did you, when you were in New York city, discuss with people what it would do to Saskatchewan's bond rating? And if not, just simply give us some general answers on it.

Because it simply isn't good enough, Mr. Chairman, to come into this Assembly, come into this Assembly with a very — in the definition of the Minister of Finance — narrow document, and say, well I simply can't answer any of those questions. You can do that at a later date. It has no bearing on the ongoing operation of government.

And I say to the minister this morning it has a great deal of bearing on the ongoing operations of government. Because we want to know how items like land bank at nearly \$200 million can simply disappear from the public's view. How the over hundred million dollars in the beef stabilization fund simply disappears from the public's view. How the debt attached to capital projects all over this province, many of them three, four, and five years already into amortization period, simply goes poof and disappears from the public's view. And that the figures that he presents to us in this Assembly, \$469.935 million have no bearing on all of these things that have just gone poof and disappeared from the public's view.

And I think that is why, Mr. Chairman, it's important for the Minister of Finance to start answering some of our questions. Because if precedents have been set, Mr. Chairman, if one wants to use them, I can go back through far more verbatim than I did last night, Mr. Minister, and find precedent after precedent after precedent for very narrow lines of questioning, believe me. And it can go on for days and days and days in this Assembly because those precedents are there.

And there are arm loads of this stuff, Mr. Minister, arm loads. And I didn't go back beyond 1990. I'm sure '89 and '88 and '87 and '86 are full of it too. And it is very narrow, it is very extensive. And I must say that the minister, particularly the member from Weyburn, in reviewing that verbatim, gave a lot more answers than what we in the opposition were treated to yesterday, Mr. Chairman.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to one of the questions from yesterday and introduce it. And I think the member from Morse has some more questions on that matter. But I would like the minister to explain to the Assembly this morning what exactly did happen to the land bank debt, an item that used to be visible to the public in a line by line item in the budget, and seems now to have disappeared off the face of the earth.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to comment on the member's sterling defence of the former government's record. I think that record speaks and stands for itself. I'm not going to take the time of the House to comment on that. It is not particularly a record that if I was a member of the opposition I'd be very proud of.

I want to respond to some of the comments that were made, Mr. Chairman, and draw to your attention as well as the attention of the members opposite, because I too

took the time yesterday to review the verbatims of interim supplies of previous years.

And I in particular reviewed the rulings of the Speaker of the House, who at that time was the Hon. Mr. Arnold Tusa, with regard to questions in interim supply. And I will bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, what those rulings were. I guess it would have been the chairman of the committee at that time, this would have been the former member from Shellbrook-Torch River.

And it's quite appropriate to debate in a wide-ranging way, the resolutions that are presented to the House in interim supply. And the members opposite have been doing that yesterday and they're doing it today. Nothing inappropriate about that. Nothing inappropriate about talking about all kinds of things. I accept that.

How long and at what time various estimates of various departments are presented before this House is really not a decision of the government. It's a decision of the members opposite. Everyone knows that how long a session lasts is determined by the members of opposition parties, not the members of the government.

So if members opposite want estimates to come to the House, it'll be up to them as to how long they take any one particular department to ask the questions that have to be asked.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that in April of 1990 the chairman of a committee on page 56 — you will find it in *Hansard* — ruled as follows:

... members must realize that this is not an appropriate place to get into detailed questions on the operation of specific department programs.

I refer members to debates of June 14, 1989, as follows:

Detailed questions should be asked of the minister of that department. Interim supply covers the whole government and all its expenditures, but not any detailed question should be asked of separate departments under an interim supply Bill.

I mean I can only abide by what is the rules of the House, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that's what we're doing.

On page 99, May 10, 1990, the chairman ruled:

... the purpose of interim supply is to grant money for the operation of the government departments and programs on an interim basis while reserving to the Legislative Assembly the right to complete the detailed review of estimates at a later date. For this reason members must reserve their detailed questions on estimates and government financial policy for the regular review of the main estimates.

That's the position, Mr. Chair, that I have been taking, quite appropriately, during the consideration of these estimates ... these are not the estimates, during the consideration of this interim supply Bill.

(1115)

Now, Mr. Chairman, but to the extent that I am capable of answering the questions as they apply to the interim supply, I've been doing that and I will do it today. Members opposite raise the question: on what recommendations did the government act to write off certain debt on the CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan)?

Well I'm . . . It's nothing secret about that, Mr. Chairman. They were public reports. They were based on the recommendations of the auditor's firm of Ernst & Young. That's been made public in this House and been made public through the media and to the public. Recommendations based on the Gass Commission report which recommended that these things be done. Recommendations of the Provincial Auditor who has made it clear year after year after year that these things have to be done.

The member finally asked the question about what happened to the land bank debt. Well, Mr. Chairman, nothing's happened to the land bank debt. It used to be in what was the Heritage Fund. The Heritage Fund no longer exists because it was recommended by the Gass Commission that the government should review all funds separate and apart from the Consolidated Fund to see whether they are useful, necessary, or appropriate. And Mr. Gass clearly recommended that the Heritage Fund should be eliminated. We agreed. As we're doing with almost all of the recommendations of the Gass Commission, we are implementing the recommendations of that commission.

Now what has that done with the money that was borrowed for the purposes of the Saskatchewan land bank, Mr. Chairman? Well the money was borrowed back in the 1970s from the Consolidated Fund; that's where it was borrowed from. And simply what's happened is that the interest cost on this money has now been transferred to the Consolidated Fund and that's where it is.

I said to the members . . . I gave that answer to the members yesterday, and that the interest payments on the bonds that . . . till they mature — some of them, I am told, mature in 1992, this year — until those bonds are paid up, the interest payments that have to be paid on them are paid as part of the interest on the public debt.

The member for Thunder Creek wanted to know the answer to the question. He now knows the answer to the question.

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister itemize or send us an itemized list of the various debt transfers that were made from the CIC to the Consolidated Fund? There's 875 million total. Can you give me a list of those items that were transferred and the volumes of debt in each one?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The member opposite can pick up the budget speech, which he received on May 7, and on page 4 there is a full itemization of CIC

non-recoverable debt which has been transferred to the Consolidated Fund.

**Mr. Martens:** — Can he also point out the \$184 million worth of Sask Water debt that was assumed by the Consolidated Fund and the irrigation projects that were involved in the debt transfer.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Did the member ask for the Saskatchewan Water Corporation and the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation? The 184 million of the Saskatchewan Water Corp debt which was associated with the Rafferty-Alameda project . . . and the member will know opposite that the Rafferty-Alameda project does not have the capacity to repay that debt. It does not have that kind of income-earning capacity; never did have. Didn't have when the former government decided to go ahead with the project. That has been transferred to the Consolidated Fund because there is no other way to pay for that debt except out of the Consolidated Fund.

The \$750 million in Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation has also been transferred to the Consolidated Fund because there is no other way to pay for that debt except from the Consolidated Fund.

So government should not play games. Government should not pretend that somehow it's not a debt. It is a debt. It wasn't incurred by the present administration, but it's a debt that's there and the taxpayer has to pay for it. So it's in its appropriate place, the Consolidated Fund, because the revenues that are expended by the Consolidated Fund come from tax purposes.

**Mr. Martens:** — On the 184 to Sask Water and to the Rafferty-Alameda project and certain irrigation projects, can you itemize them for me?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — My staff is searching for that. As soon as we get it, we'll get it to you.

**Mr. Martens:** — While they're looking for that, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would you provide for me the volume of dollars that have been paid for by the Americans to the compensation in the payment for the Rafferty-Alameda project. Would you give me the volume of dollars paid and the volume of dollars that are still to come?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, that's an example of a very specific question related to a particular department. When the Saskatchewan Water Corporation do their estimates with the minister here before the Legislative Assembly, they'll have that information. We don't have that specific information.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I want to point out that you wanted all the figures in one place under Sask Water, so you moved them into the Consolidated Fund. I'm asking whether you took the assets as well. Did you take the assets and dollars from the Sask Water Corporation that were being paid for by the Americans — the 40 million or \$50 million — did you take and put that into the Consolidated Fund?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The answer is no, Mr.

Chairman.

**Mr. Martens:** — Can I ask the minister where it is then?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Those assets would either be with the Saskatchewan Water Corporation or the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and that's why I keep saying, Mr. Chairman, that that's where the questions have to be asked because they are the ones who have to explain it.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I know that Sask Water Corporation had some of that fund. I want to know whether you transferred the assets and the value of those assets into the Consolidated Fund revenue.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The \$184 million that was transferred to the Consolidated Fund is on debt that is not recoverable from the Rafferty-Alameda project. That's why it's transferred to the Consolidated Fund.

If any other debt that is recoverable by Sask Water or SaskPower, that exists there because it is recoverable and it will be their responsibility from their revenue sources to pay for it. The only debt that's been transferred is debt that's not recoverable because there are no assets available to earn the income to pay for that debt and therefore it's a liability to the taxpayer.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well I don't want to disagree with you too strongly, but there were some assets that were recoverable, and I want to know where those went to. There was an asset from the U.S. (United States) commitment to the construction of that project, and I'd like to know where they are, how much they have paid, and whether there's any left.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a question that I can't respond to in interim supply. It has no bearing on the interim supply. There is nothing in this interim supply Bill that deals with that particular issue. The member will have to wait until the estimates are considered by the Saskatchewan water supply . . . for the Saskatchewan water supply board, which is going to come to the legislature in this session because only then will the appropriate information be available.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I want to know . . . You said yesterday that you had an allocation in your one line of \$1.425 million for Sask Water Corporation, and you said yesterday there was extenuating circumstances that you had to pay extra.

Now I want to know, are there any of the interest benefits accruing to the Sask Water Corporation, are there any of those accruing to the Department of Finance because of the money left in there with the payments made by the United States to the Sask Water Corporation?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The answer is no, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Martens:** — No to what? — to the interest being paid or to the debt being there?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — No interest being paid to the

Consolidated Fund nor any other revenues that are coming to the Consolidated Fund.

**Mr. Martens:** — Okay then I want to know where that principal is. I want to know how much it is. And your Department of Finance will know because they keep a track on all of the records of the Crown corporations.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, we are here not considering the estimates of the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, we're here considering interim supply. Interim supply does not deal with any of those questions. None of the funding that's being requested here deals with any of those things.

The member knows opposite that he's going to have to ask those questions with the Saskatchewan water supply board . . . or Water Corporation is before the legislature. The Department of Finance does not have the capacity to answer those questions, only the Saskatchewan Water Corporation has the capacity to do that. It is their responsibility and they will be in the legislature at which time those questions can be answered.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, yesterday the member from . . . that is chairman from the Crown Corporations Committee said to this Assembly that he was pleased at the co-operation and the general compliance that ministers had to questions being asked by members of the Crown Corporations Committee. And he said, I know that it will be the same in the future because these ministers are accessible, they are available for comment to give you the most credible information there is.

Now what we have here is a duck and run. You're ducking behind the fact that your line by line item here is saying one thing, but I want to know about the debt. When are we going to have a chance to answer the question on the debt? And that's what I want to know.

Are you clear that the 184 is the net figure or is it the gross figure that was transferred from the Sask Water Corporation? That's what I want to know. If it's the gross as it's stated here, I think it's important for the people of Saskatchewan to understand there's still 40 or 50 million sitting in the Sask Water Corporation that is available to the Consolidated Fund, and that's the point I want to make.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I will repeat again, Mr. Chairman, the 184 million transfer of debt from the Saskatchewan Water Corporation was the non-recoverable debt. There is no one who can recover that debt because there is nothing that will earn the income to pay to do that. It was part of the Rafferty-Alameda project. The part that is not recoverable was transferred to the Consolidated Fund as part of the Consolidated Fund debt because it is a liability of the taxpayer.

**Mr. Martens:** — So are you telling me it's a net debt?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — This is not the estimates for the Water Corporation. But in order to help the member, we'll see if we can find that information and we'll provide it to you. If not orally, we'll provide it to you from the

Water Corporation because they have to provide it to us in the form of written, if that's the way you want it. But I'll undertake to check with Saskatchewan Water Corporation so that they can get that information for you.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to have the itemized statement of the debt in related to the irrigation projects that are ongoing there. And if memory serves me right, there is some net debt there too. And I want you to provide that for me on net debt basis in those irrigation projects, because the 184 million is not accruing wholly and solely to the Rafferty-Alameda project which you are leading this Assembly and the people here to believe.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I'll undertake to do that as well, as I undertook on the other question. We'll have to check that with the Water Corporation. When we get it, the member will get it presented to him.

(1130)

**Mr. Martens:** — And I also want to have, Mr. Minister, if I could, the statement of revenue, the volume of dollars from the agreement between Canada and Saskatchewan as it relates to the volume of dollars yet to be paid through PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration) and all of those areas as it relates to the irrigation development along the South Saskatchewan River, as a volume of dollars.

Included in that, I'd like to know where the volume of dollars are that the United States are paying to the Sask Water Corporation. Some of that was paid to the Consolidated Fund; some of it was paid to Sask Water. I'd like to know how much is in each of those locations.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well we're not aware of any of it being paid to the Consolidated Fund, Mr. Chairman. But as I indicated earlier, we're doing interim supply, we're not doing the Water Corporation. But we will check with the Water Corporation and we'll provide that information when it is available.

**Mr. Martens:** — Now going to the next area of net debt, Mr. Speaker, or debt by the provinces, you have on page 4 or 6 indicated the places that the CIC money went. And I can agree with that or disagree with that. I don't have a tendency to agree with the way you've put it together; however, I'll just put it this way: on the \$715 million that's the Sask Property Management Corporation, I'd like an itemized list of that debt and how you moved it over from the departments into the Consolidated Fund to deal with how you come up to \$715 million.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — That was the full debt of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation as of March 31, 1982. It was not a liability of each individual department. It was a liability, a debt, in the Saskatchewan Property Corporation.

There's only one itemization there — the full amount as recommended by the Provincial Auditor. The member will know that. He was on this side of the House when the Provincial Auditor recommended that, as recommended by the Gass Commission, has been transferred to the Consolidated Fund because it is a liability of the

Consolidated Fund, because the only way you can pay that debt is from revenues from the Consolidated Fund.

**Mr. Martens:** — Does Sask Property Management Corporation provide you with a list of the items that were placed from Sask Property Management Corporation into the Consolidated Fund? They must have said, here's a list of the itemized statements as it relates to the departments, the hospitals, the schools, all of those liabilities. Did they provide that for you?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, all that would happen is that the total debt was transferred. We don't have the information the member opposite asked. The member opposite was in the House when the Saskatchewan Property Corporation spent more than two days in estimates answering questions, and that was the time when the member could have asked those questions. He can still ask those questions of the minister.

But since the Saskatchewan Property Corporation has now had its estimates completed and since the members opposite either

**An Hon. Member:** — It's not finished.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — It's not? Well fine, then we have no problem. I am glad that that's corrected, Mr. Chairman.

Then the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation will be here, and the member will be able to get all of the answers to his questions because we don't have access to that information.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, here we come into the paradox. When I've been asking the minister those questions he says, oh, just wait and we'll give that to you from the department. We'll give you that from the department. They're the ones that know how much that money was.

And where have I got to get the information from? It all ends up conclusively in your department. It ends up in the Department of Finance, and that's why I want to ask you — because you're supposed to be running the finances of this province — where is a list of these assets that have been transferred from the Property Management Corporation to the liabilities and where are they transferred, and what are the descriptions of those liabilities?

You had the freedom, Mr. Minister, to do that in your CIC statement, but why haven't you got the freedom to do it in your Property Management Corporation?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the member is off on the wrong tangent here. There were no assets transferred. Any assets that may exist are still with the Property Management Corporation. The only thing that was transferred is the debt of \$715 million which is debt, not asset.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well you took the opportunity in CIC to itemize line by line as you have outlined them here on page 4. You have itemized each one of them. What you

need to do is give me that in the \$715 million.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, the debt is not specifically allocated to any particular project — not any particular hospital, not any particular school, or whatever it may have been. It is total debt that has been transferred. It is not specific in any other way except the total debt which was incurred and existed in the Saskatchewan Property Management Corp.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, if you don't give us the liability . . . or you've given us the total liabilities here and they went into the Consolidated Fund.

Now I know and you know that hospital boards are asked on a specific basis and school boards on a specific basis to allocate and budget certain amount for certain schools, and you pay a certain grant per year for that to be completed. And when you're done, you have an itemized line that says the school in Waldeck or the school in Neville has been paid for, it's finished. You have transferred that liability into the Consolidated Fund, and surely you have to have a line there that says they're finished. That's what I wanted to know.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge, school capital was never part of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation and therefore does not have anything to do with the debt that was transferred.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, you have all of these debts that have been . . . or liabilities that have been transferred to the Consolidated Fund. How do we know that they're debt?

We're assuming that you're telling us that there is \$715 million worth of debt in the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. We want to know from you what those items were because we're not sure that you're telling us, as you did in your inflated page on page 4 on your CIC non-recoverable debt. We want to know from you what that really represents. I don't necessarily believe you on page 4, so why should I believe on \$715 million?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well it's the privilege of the member opposite not to believe anything, Mr. Chairman. I mean, I remind the members and I remind the Chair again that the rulings that have been made about specific requests for specific information on specific departments. We're not here to do that. We're here to talk about the interim supply.

But the member did ask the question which in some way can relate to this. He says, who said that this is debt? Well, Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Auditor said that it was debt. He has recorded it and he has reported it in the *Public Accounts* and he has reported it in the Provincial Auditor's report saying it is debt that has been inappropriately considered an asset and furthermore said it was not an asset, it was a liability and therefore should be part of the consolidated debt which it is now.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well we're not arguing with the auditor's observations, we're arguing with your observations about where the liability is. And if in fact that liability was

transferred, what's the asset the liability is against? That's what we want to know.

**The Chair:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Thompson:** — Mr. Chairman, I request leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of my colleague, the hon. member for the Quill Lakes, I would like to introduce to you and through you, Mr. Chairman, 20 grade 3 students from the Wynyard Elementary School who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are students accompanied by their teachers, Doreen Bergfeldt; chaperons, R. Hitchcock, D. Lamont and P. Morrison.

We sincerely hope your visit will be both enjoyable and educational and that you all have a safe trip home. And I ask all members to welcome the guests here from Wynyard today.

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

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

### Motions for Interim Supply (continued)

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, let me try to help the member opposite. First of all, let me say this, that this matter has no bearing on interim supply. Interest on the public debt is statutory. It is not dealt with with a Bill dealing with interim supply whatsoever.

So therefore, Mr. Chairman, in order to assist the member, we will request the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation to prepare the information that the member opposite wants. But it'll have to be the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation that does that. And when they have done it, the minister will . . . the appropriate minister in charge will make that information available.

The debt of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, Mr. Chairman, is incurred the way the member opposite knows. I think he was a former minister, or at least he was on the Executive Council on the Treasury Board benches.

The Department of Health pays the interest and the debt of the projects, but it is a debt of the province of Saskatchewan because the interest and the debt has to be paid. So it's transferred to the Consolidated Fund in which it belongs.

But if the member wants to know what projects some of this debt was incurred for, I will see to it that the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation prepares it for him. And if the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation has not yet finished its estimates in the House, they can do it then. But if it is not considered for a while, they might even be able to do it

earlier.

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, on page 4, as you pointed out, there's the CIC debt. The observation I'm going to make about that is the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan privatization loss: \$361 million. Was that a loss or was that a book loss?

Now I want to know whether you calculated the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation on the same basis that the loss carried forward was actual value that they still have to give projects, or whether it's an inflated figure that you did in page 4 — you inflated it to read a book value or some ambiguous number that you picked out of the blue, and now you want us to believe that \$875 million is reality. You want us to believe \$715 million is reality. Can you give me some observations about that?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I cannot. The interim supply Bill which we consider has no appropriation, no request for any money dealing with the matters that the member opposite is asking about. That's a question he's going to ask in the estimates of the Department of Finance when the Department of Finance is here — and it will be — so the answers can be answered.

All I can say to the member is this: for the purposes of what we're considering in interim supply today, there is no request for any monies dealing with the matters that he raises.

**Mr. Martens:** — In servicing the payments to the Department of Health for the construction in the Department of Health, there will be, I am assuming, some payments made to the Department of Health on the basis of projects that are in process, projects that have to be paid for, and the interest costs in relation to that and the costs in relation to that. I'd like to know that. And that's why we're asking the question on how much is left to pay and how much did you put in prior to March 31 and how much is put in after March 31.

(1145)

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, yes there is one-twelfth request for the Department of Health for the month of June. But as I indicated to the members opposite yesterday when they asked the question, there is some \$21 million which is beyond the one-twelfth because it requires to have some payments made earlier than on the monthly basis.

That included grants to hospitals for capital of \$1.2 million and grants to special care facilities for capital of \$200,000. That is part of the interim supply Bill. That's why I'm able to answer that question.

**Mr. Martens:** — On the \$149 million that . . . or \$150 million that Health is going to get for this month, of that volume, how much is going to service any of the debt that is there in relation to that?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — None, because that's all in the interest on the public debt.

**Mr. Martens:** — Now, I can't find beef stabilization nor can I find land bank in any of your books. Can you identify where that is located?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, the land bank becomes part of the total consolidated debt, so it's part of the total consolidated debt of the province. That's now part of the total debt of the province. There is no special identification because land bank, as it was, no longer exists.

Now on the question of the stabilization program, the responsibility for funding any deficits in the program is with the federal government. Under the current tripartite stabilization program, the province pays one-third of the premium costs plus administration costs in the province. And all of that, Mr. Speaker, is part of the one-twelfth allocation that is being requested in the Department of Agriculture.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm not talking about tripartite stabilization; I'm talking about the old Beef Stabilization Board and the liabilities that are in the board and the board's responsibilities for the debt. And I would like to know whether Ag and Food are carrying any of that or Rural Development is carrying that. Who's carrying that?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, once again that's a question that's properly to be asked when the Department of Agriculture estimates are considered before the House because then the appropriate officials will be here and the appropriate minister will be able to answer the question. But the knowledge that we have, or that I have, is that some of the loans have been paid back over the last several years. But I understand there's about \$151 million that is still showing as receivables under the program. It's part of the consolidated debt.

**Mr. Martens:** — So that wasn't a part of what you took as a part of the consolidated debt as a part of March 31, '92? That was attached to it previously?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The answer is no, it was not.

**Mr. Martens:** — But the land bank is of the stuff prior to March 31, '92?

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Okay. In page 45 of your budget address book it says that it's \$1.8 billion of debt effective March 31 that was transferred. Is land bank in that debt?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Answer's yes.

**Mr. Martens:** — I'm going to make a point here, Mr. Minister. The point is this. I have heard for the last seven months that the debt that had accrued in all of the Saskatchewan Property Management was waste and mismanagement. I have been told that through the years of our waste, our waste and mismanagement, we went continually and said we'll throw all caution to the wind and we'll spend money hand over fist and it doesn't come to any realization of a benefit, a net benefit to the society



of Saskatchewan.

And I want to point out to this Assembly that the \$715 million was paid and it went to schools in my constituency; it went to a hospital in my constituency. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the investment in my constituency was five schools and there was not one of them that was built after 1920, not one of them.

And that, Mr. Minister, is a part of the \$715 million worth of debt that you're talking about right here. And I will challenge you to go to Waldeck, to Success, to Neville, to Vanguard, and any of those communities — Cabri Hospital is a good example.

You decided in your administration in 1975 that you weren't going to have any more funding for health care facilities. And in that respect they have now got a health care facility that is useful to the community. There is no level 4 care facility between Leader, Saskatchewan, and Swift Current, Saskatchewan, in a capacity to handle level 4 care people. Today there is.

Is that waste and mismanagement? I want to point out to you, sir, that that in my mind is not waste. That is not even mismanagement. The opportunity to deliver those kinds of things is a benefit to the people of Saskatchewan and it is a part of what those people have worked for for years. And they have delivered it and they are prepared to deliver it based on the kinds of things that we talked about.

Now I want to just conclude by saying this. Why don't you talk about the waste of buying \$180 million worth of land bank land in the '70s? You talk about waste. There is a waste. There were people who were prepared to invest in the province of Saskatchewan, and do you know what your land bank commission did? It was in direct competition with those individuals who were prepared to buy the land. And that, Mr. Minister, is exactly what I would call waste. Building schools, building hospitals is not waste.

And if the member from Lloydminster wants to get into the debate, you just ask her about the hospitals in her constituency that were built in the last 10 years. And even though she got elected, I still don't think that was waste. And if she says it's waste, then, Mr. Minister, then you have a real problem with your evaluation and the process that you evaluated them by.

I want to point out one other thing. In the debt that was transferred in CIC, the profits that were made in SaskPower, SaskTel, SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) and retained earnings is almost equivalent to half the debt.

Now, Mr. Minister, you're going to retain earnings. That's what I see as of 1991 . . . 1990. Was it '91 or '90? It doesn't matter. You know which one it was.

And the last report from SaskPower was \$118 million profit, '91. Okay '92, what's the profit going to be with an increase in rates? Is it going to be \$250 million profit? SaskTel, increase in rates. Is it going to be instead of \$50 million profit, is it going to be \$75 million profit?

So in one year, in 1992, you're going to pull out of the tax base and the taxpayers of this province equivalent in two years to pay off the debt in your CIC. And you want us to accept that kind of bookkeeping?

When you move it from one . . . and what you're going to have in your Crown corporations is this pile of money. And when you see it as expedient to balance your book, it'll all slide back into the Consolidated Fund at your own convenience. Here you change the debt focus from CIC to the Consolidated Fund and then, Mr. Minister, you're going to have, oh, this wonderful bookkeeping provided me with an opportunity to balance the books.

And, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Chairman, I believe that when you were minister of Finance in 1981-82 you did exactly the same thing and that is a part of the whole program of what you say to this Assembly that really doesn't sit well with us. That is what's the problem.

And the member from Thunder Creek said, the Heritage Fund, that didn't have anything. And I ask you this question: were you the minister that set up the Heritage Fund? It was the popular thing to do because Alberta was setting it up. And I believe it was you, Mr. Minister, that set it up in the first place.

Now you're dismantling it. Why did you do that? You did it to cover your tracks in buying the Potash Corporation and buying all of the assets in the pulp mill. You did it to cover your liabilities in buying Intercontinental Packers, all of those things. That's what you did it for.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we want to see when we ask you for these itemized statements and itemized places where expenditures were made, so that we know you're doing your books right.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm tempted to get into the debate here, but that's not the purpose here so I will just answer the questions that are relevant and apply to the interim supply Bill.

What I want to point out for the record and for the member opposite, that \$875 million that has been written off as debt in CIC is debt that is non-recoverable because there are no assets to support that debt. I think the member knows that.

Now what he is advocating here — and you would have thought that maybe that he and his colleagues would have learnt their lesson — is stripping the existing Crown corporations to pay for this non-recoverable debt that's got nothing to do with those Crown corporations for which there are no assets.

Now we have independent accountants, we have the Gass Commission, we have the Provincial Auditor saying that is wrong. We have an officer of this legislature saying that's not the appropriate way that you should treat the debt. You should treat it up front and account for it appropriately so that it is where it belongs.

We're not prepared, as a new government — I want to make this clear — to strip the Crown corporations the way

the former government did, plundering them of even all of their retained earnings to the point where they had to go and borrow money to pay a dividend to the treasury. That is not an appropriate way to hide debt.

We're going to be open and we're going to be straightforward and everybody will know where the debt of this province is.

The minister in charge of the Crown Investments Corporation will be here to answer all the specific questions and, in fact, will do so in the Crown Corporations Committee, to deal with all of this, at which time the public and the members opposite will know what the situation is.

But I want to respond to one question the member asked. He asked about net equity. Here is the answers to his net equity question. In the fiscal year at the end of March 31, 1981-1982 — I'm going to say this slowly — the assets of this province were \$9.2 billion. The liabilities were 6.6 or almost \$6.7 billion. The net equity of this province was \$2.6 billion in 1981-82, March 31.

While we had 10 years of Conservative government . . . Let me once again slowly for the record point out what's happened to that net equity, because the member asked. The assets of the province now are 4.2 . . . \$4.4 billion as of October 1, 1991, for which we have the latest statistics. The liabilities are \$9.9 billion and there is no longer any net equity. We have a net debt of \$5.5 billion, something which we began to address in this budget so that we can begin to go the other way and guarantee a future for this province and the people who live here and the future generations who will live here.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, the member from Elphinstone said in a question period here earlier that money earned from rates in Sask Power Corporation would be used to pay down Sask Power Corporation debt. In the same question period the member from Regina Churchill Downs said, well we've got to use this money to cover all of the other liabilities in CIC.

Now which one is it going to be? Are you going to allow the CIC consolidated debt from all of the Crowns . . . pay down the debt in CIC, or are you going to move it to the Consolidated Fund every time you want to have these debts written off?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, that question the member is going to have to ask the member . . . the minister in charge of the Crown Investments Corporation because he is responsible and the Crown Investments Corporation is going to have to provide the answers.

(1200)

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I asked you a question yesterday and as I review *Hansard* there was no . . . the answer wasn't there, so I'll repeat the question. Would you tell us, out of your budget, what portion is supply that has to be voted on . . . part that will be interim supply, and what is the statutory amount that we are not talking about in interim supply?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I refer . . . so that we don't have to do . . . the member doesn't have to do any writing, I did pass over that information on the information which I provided, I believe, the member from Kindersley, in which it is all outlined in three separate columns or four separate columns.

There is a total to be voted, the total budget of each of the departments which is the amount to be voted and then also the total non-budgetary amount which is, I believe, the statutory. You have that. Ask the member from Kindersley and he'll give it to you. Also in the second column, it is an indication of what the one-twelfth provision will be and in the third column a clear indication of where it exceeds the one-twelfth provision. So the information has been provided and should be available to you.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I haven't looked over the figures but you're saying that the statutory amount that's in the entire budget for the province is not part of this interim supply and yet you're asking for one-twelfth. You have a number of provisions there that are going to be over and above the one-twelfth. Where do you come up with . . . where does that debt portion fit in there? Why are you asking for one-twelfth when you're saying the debt portion, which is a significant portion of the budget, is not in there?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I know the member is new and, I mean, that's understandable. But all that we're asking here in the interim supply is for monies that have to be voted on. And that's all identified in the Bill and the information the member opposite has. We're not asking for anything else for the committee to have to concern itself with, because that is something we will discuss when we look at the whole estimates of the Department of Finance.

Statutory funds are not voted in the House. They're provided by statute, under the statutory provisions, and therefore they are not included in any of this because we're not requesting the House for anything to do with funding that is statutory.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Minister, I believe it's the opposition's responsibility to ensure that the monies spent by the government are being spent properly.

When you ask for interim supply, I believe, we have to know what the money is being spent on, the public has to know what the money is being spent on, and I believe you have to justify what you're spending that money on.

We need to be able to ask you those particular questions dealing with the money you're asking for for this one-twelfth, which isn't actually one-twelfth but something else. Will you answer the questions for us on those issues where you're asking for the one-twelfth and more than one-twelfth?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, we have provided that information already. I explained in some detail yesterday where the request is beyond the one-twelfth and what it is for. The member can check *Hansard*, and it's there.

All that we're doing in the interim supply Bill, and the members have to understand that, is asking funding for the ongoing operations of the government for one-twelfth of the year. That's why it's an interim supply Bill.

The member wants questions about specific programs and expenditures of specific programs — that's the questions he's going to ask when Committee of Finance considers each specific department.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — When we ask questions in estimates for each budget, each department, you've already had this money and you've already spent it. So it's pretty tough to get it back afterwards.

I'll ask you a question dealing with the Department of Education. In administration under personal expenses and other expenses, you have a number here for the year. Are you asking for one-twelfth of that? And then it says at the bottom here that part of this is voted on the Executive Council. What portion of that is in there?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, as I explained yesterday, in the Department of Education we're asking in . . . this interim supply Bill is requesting one-twelfth of the funding that has been allocated in the budget, which has been presented to the House, plus an additional amount of \$79.8 million in excess of that.

And as I explained yesterday in some detail, the additional amount is for funding to the K to 12 school systems because this will bring the funding up to six-twelfths because of the provisions in the legislation which require that that be provided. It provides money for teachers' pensions because they have to be provided at this time, and also monies for the official minority language office of \$2.6 million which is recoverable from the federal government. Those are the monies in excess of the one-twelfth, which is part of the normal operating operations of the Department of Education.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm glad you mentioned teachers' pensions. I look in the budget book, and the teachers' pensions have almost doubled in the amount that you're supplying them this year. How much of that are you supplying in this one-twelfth?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well once again I want the member to listen carefully. The reason that the amount in teachers' pension is what it is, is because this government believes in leaving the money with the pensions as the pensions earn the money. What the former government did — and the new member probably doesn't know that — the former government stripped money out of the teachers' pension fund even though there is a liability in the teachers' pension fund, stripped it away. We have stopped doing that, and therefore there's that additional amount of money.

Interim supply Bill asks for one-twelfth of the amount that the member refers to plus an incremental amount of \$5.7 million beyond the one-twelfth, because there is requirement that it be funded by the end of June.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. I

believe that as pensions are accumulated, the funds should actually be in place. But I find it surprising that you're pointing out just that the former government was the only one that was doing this. I believe this practice started back in 1975. Is that not the case?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Oh, I wish to correct the member. This practice did not start till about 1987.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Minister, did not Donald Gass in his report point out that there was three-point-some billion dollars of unfunded pension liability in the teachers' fund? That did not accumulate over simply nine years.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The member should be reminded that the Gass Commission talked about unfunded liabilities from the past. What we're talking about here is surpluses of the existing fund, some of which were taken by the former government and transferred to the Consolidated Fund, rather than left in the teachers' pension fund.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just can't help but get into this, following the weird explanation that we're hearing from the Minister of Finance here as he answers my colleague. Let's talk about the unfunded teachers' liability fund.

Mr. Minister, could you tell me by how much this unfunded liability on the pension fund for teachers grew during your last reign . . . years of administration?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, we're here considering interim supply. Interim supply has nothing to do with that question the member is happening opposite. The teachers' superannuation unfunded liability has grown since the plan was first initiated and I don't know offhand what the total amount is, but there is a total amount that has to be dealt with.

We announced in the budget that we'll be establishing a panel of experts and other people to review the whole question of pension unfunded liabilities to make recommendations to the government on how it should be dealt with, but it's not something we're dealing with in interim supply.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, this is just a bunch of nonsense, total nonsense. Because the minister himself was the one that got up and started talking about the Saskatchewan teachers' pension fund and the unfunded liabilities. It was his weird explanation that caused me and prompted me to get to my feet. And now when I'm asking him some serious questions he ducks the whole issue and says: I'm not going to answer, this is not the forum to do it. You, sir, brought it up, and I'm asking you: what was the amount under your administration that the teachers' pension funds . . . unfunded liabilities rose? What was the amount? You, sir, brought it up.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I want to tell the member what we have been talking about here. During the term of the former government, there was a surplus accumulated over the annual requirements in the teachers' pensions.

**An Hon. Member:** — You bet.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Yes, I'm glad the member agrees. Now I hope the member will also agree that in the 1980s it was that government who began to strip those surpluses until they almost came to zero, to take it out of the pension fund and into the Consolidated Fund to help make their deficit look better.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I hate to, Mr. Chairman, on a Friday when we're just about ready to dismiss ourselves for the weekend, to show the Minister of Finance of the province of Saskatchewan that he knows not whereof he speaks.

Now as a teacher, sir, I find that kind of remarkable. Because when you talk about the Saskatchewan teachers' pension plan and the unfunded liabilities of \$1.2 billion that you folks in the '70s refused to put in . . . During the super '70s when this province was on a roll, you chose not to put in the government's portion of the Saskatchewan teachers' pension plan.

When we were elected in 1982 we decided that this could no longer continue, and so we tried to make up through your errors by putting in additional money as years went on to try to get that unfunded liability portion as low as possible.

And then you, sir, are correct in saying that we took some of that money out. But that was the additional money that we had put in in trying to make up for your own errors. That, sir, is the way that the situation has developed.

And for you to stand there then at one point . . . When I initiated these questions, you said you were not prepared to talk about it. And now for the last six minutes you have been answering, trying to answer my question. So I'm glad now that you have set the precedent so that in this committee we will actually get some answers from you.

And I would recommend highly, sir, that when my colleagues continue to ask you questions, that you continue on as to what we're doing right now with the teacher's unfunded liability pension fund and answer the questions that we are asking you.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now that we're on this good roll and now that we have finally broken the ice so that the minister is actually committing himself to answer the questions that we are asking him, then I want to just ask a few question as far as the Department of Health is concerned.

(1215)

You, sir, as a government and as was brought forth during question period today, have perpetrated an almost unbearable hardship on many of the citizens of this province. And the unfortunate aspect of that, Mr. Minister, is the fact that you are picking on the most vulnerable within our society. And I'm not talking now, sir, about those people that are on social assistance, because I recognize that their wants and their needs, albeit at a low level, are taken care of.

But by the same token we have to look at the other folks —

those people who are determined to make a go of their own lives by being as productive citizens in this province as they possibly can be. They do not want to be on social aid. I don't think very many people do. But that young woman that I brought up this morning is a classic example of the hardships perpetrated upon these folks by your government's cognizant decision, made in full awareness of the effect that it was going to have, has had on the people of this province. Where not only do ministers not answer questions in question period, but ministers do not answer the telephone when people phone in and say: I need help. I need guidance. I need advice. What can I do? I don't have money. It's costing too much. And then those phone calls are not answered. Those phone calls are ignored.

Now I'll give the Minister of Health the benefit of the doubt in this particular case, whether she was actually aware of it. But, Mr. Minister, she is totally responsible for her department. And if it was the staff that was not passing on and communicating this sad state, this deplorable state of affairs, then it is up to her to rectify it.

But you're sitting there now as Minister of Finance, and up until this point have refused to answer our questions. And I'm glad, I say again, that you have finally consented to be more co-operative and give us the answers that we seek. And I look forward to now getting more answers out of you.

But I want to ask you now, considering the . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Seriousness.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Seriousness — as my colleague says and helps me out here for a moment — the seriousness of the situation for many of the citizens of Saskatchewan, what can you see in this interim supply Bill that will alleviate the concerns that many of our vulnerable people in Saskatchewan have as far as their health is concerned? I purposely phrase the question rather broadly so that you can give me an answer to that question.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the member asked the question. That's why we have an interim supply Bill. The purpose — if the member would pay attention — the purpose of the interim supply Bill is to make sure that the people of whom he speaks are provided the funding that is necessary in order to bring for them the services which they need.

We could wait until the end of the budget debate in the consideration of the estimates, and the government could stop making these payments without an interim supply Bill. Without the passage of an interim supply Bill in June, the payments stop because there is no funding available, if this House does not pass an interim supply Bill, to pay for people for their drugs or to pay the school boards who will then have to go out and borrow money at interest charges in order to fund their operations or to pay the amount requested here to rural and urban municipalities who will have to go and get access to money somewhere else.

The purpose of an interim supply Bill is to make sure that the kind of people the member speaks of are provided the

services within the amount of budget that is provided for any fiscal year, can get those services. That's why we are asking for an interim supply for the month of June.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I don't think you have to lecture me as to the process of how the interim supply Bill process works. You say that this interim supply . . . and obviously it's going to be one-twelfth, here or there. As you suggest, some departments, a lot of departments are not one-twelfth for whatever reason you've given on those issues. This is to pay the bills on interim supply based on the estimates that are hopefully going to be passed, as far as you're concerned, sometime in fall. So we'll have to wait for that period of time to find out.

Now you say this is to pay for the drugs. Well, Mr. Minister, just how much of that money is going to be used to pay drugs?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Once again we're just providing the department their allocation. If you want to know the specifics of each department, as was ruled by the Speaker in previous interim supplies, you're going to have to ask the department. We don't have that information in the interim supply presentation that is made to the legislature. That's a question you can get your answers to when you consider the estimates in the Committee of Finance for the Department of Health.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Now, now, now, Mr. Minister, we were doing so well there for a little while. Now you revert back to your old ways, withdrawing into your shell and developing that bunker mentality, and that's not going to get us anywhere. We're going to be in here, I'm afraid, for a long, long time until, sir, you are going to be co-operative.

Now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, he says, it's all right with him; he gets paid for it.

Well the question I think that most people in Saskatchewan are asking themselves right now is whether they're getting their money's worth. And the reports that I'm getting in my constituency, sir, are no; you're grossly overpaid for the kind of benefit, and certainly the havoc, you're creating with the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, I have here a document that is being sent out to many of the people who are drug plan users in the province of Saskatchewan, and it's being sent out by the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association. And quite frankly, this is — and that's why I'm holding it in my hand — the best document that I have seen that attempts to put some organization into the drug plan and how you have decimated it. It's a good summary, and, sir, I would advise you perhaps you could get a copy of this for all the details and so on because it's a real good summary of the situation.

But, sir, I ask you again: how will this interim supply that we're dealing with now help and benefit people who used to pay \$125 per family, but now in the drugs they're going to be paying \$380, which is more than triple, plus paying more — from 35 per cent of the rest of it instead of 25 per cent.

Now I understand the six months, and I understand how you've made it so easy for these folks to pay their bills, but what are you planning now as a government, as a Department of Finance, to help these people that are indeed going to be very painfully put up in trying to pay these bills? What have you got in place for them to make it easier for them?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, the Department of Finance will provide, within the constraints of the finances available to the province, the appropriate monies requested by the Department of Health for the various needs the Department of Health indicates it has to make sure that people are looked after — people in hardship situations, people on low incomes, people on Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. We will provide, as we are providing in this interim supply, one-twelfth . . . The member asked earlier, and I did not quite answer his question, I admit, because I didn't have the information in front of me that I had yesterday.

But this provides for the Saskatchewan prescription drug plan one-twelfth of the amount that was presented in the budget which the members opposite has, plus an additional \$3 million because of cash flow requirements of the department. But the department and the government through the Department of Finance will provide to the Department of Health those funds that the Department of Health requires within the constraints that we have within the budget and the revenues that are available to us.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — This cash flow, Mr. Minister, that you're talking about that the department requires, this extra — how much was it? — \$3 million, what is that used for?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Just ongoing costs to pay for the Saskatchewan prescription drug's portion of the cost.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — But, Mr. Minister, in my books \$3 million is a lot of money. Now what do you mean you need \$3 million extra to pay for ongoing costs? Is this extra money or just the normal course of events?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — It's normal. It's a request the department has identified as a need for this particular time. It's part of the normal expenditures that are made under the Saskatchewan prescription drug plan, nothing extraneous about it at all.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I don't buy that. If it's the normal process, then why is it not considered to be part of the one-twelfth figure written into it and then spread out over the whole year?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — The history of some of these programs is that the cash flow isn't always even. There are certain times of the year for reasons I don't know — you'd have to ask the Department of Health to see whether they know — where the demands seem to be greater than other times of the year. This happens to be the case now.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Minister, the cost of the drug plan at \$125 would have been a certain amount. What would that amount be?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — We don't have that. You'll have to ask the Department of Health in estimates.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — The amount now at \$380 deductible per family, what will that amount be?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — In the budget you will find that the prescription drug plan requirement in the budget is, I believe, \$67.8 million.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Well if you have that information, then, sir, perhaps you can tell me how much money you're going to be saving now that you've de-insured the insulin for diabetics.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm only giving the information which is the global number, as the interim supply is, which the member can find in the estimates. But when it comes to specific questions dealing with specific items of any particular items here, you'll have to ask the Department of Health when that department is considered in the committee.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Minister, next question I would have to ask you, you as the man that signs the cheques and your deputy minister beside you: how much money are you going to save now that you have de-insured the chiropractic services?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, this is interim supply. That's a question you're going to have to ask when the Department of Health is here before the Committee of Finance. All we're doing here is providing a global amount of money, in most cases one-twelfth, to the departments so it can pay for its operations during the month of June.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Minister, you have also decimated the optometric services in this department. How much is the Department of Finance going to save by de-insuring optometric services?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, we're not dealing with that here. The member said something earlier which was very instructive. He said about the Minister of Health, she is totally responsible for the Department of Health. That's true. And that's why it is necessary for the Minister of Health or the Minister of Economic Development and Trade or the Minister of Community Services to answer those kinds of specific questions. It is not the purpose of the interim supply to deal with those kinds of specifics.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Minister, I know well how the monetary process in government works. You sit on the treasury benches, you have your cabinet meetings, you discuss from priority and planning committees and so on and from the treasury committee how you're going to be spending the money that the government takes in. And I know full well that sitting around that table when decisions are made sits the Minister of Health, as do other ministers.

All of you are fully aware — and I hope, sir, that certainly that you are aware — of decisions that are made around the cabinet table. And without breaking any cabinet

secrecy you could very well discuss with me right now some of the answers to some of the questions that I have because you're fully cognizant of it.

And I know further well that the Minister of Health will, when you have determined with your officials and your toy minister and your Premier what direction your government wants to go, that you say, we're going to have an across the board 15, 20, 25 per cent reduction in the expenditures in each department.

You call each department in, sir, and they sit down with you and your treasury branch officials, and you go over those areas that are going to be decimated, those areas that are going to be cut, and those areas that are a priority with you that you are going to maintain. And so all of those decisions, sir, that you make, are made directly in consultation and in concert with the Minister of Health and your officials. So don't tell me that you don't know.

All I want is some of the impact of the decisions that you and your Premier have made and how it's impacting upon the citizens of this province. I would expect an answer.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I as the Minister of Finance do not speak for the Department of Health. I as the Minister of Finance do not speak for the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I speak for the, in this case, what is being provided in the interim supply Bill.

If the member looks at the *Estimates* he will find that in the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission there is provision for \$266.4 million. That's the amount that's there.

I can speak for the global amount of dollars as the Minister of Finance. But if the member opposite as . . . he used to be on the Executive Council, he knows how he had to answer questions for whatever department he was responsible for.

I'm sure that the member opposite knows that when the Minister of Health is here, she will, because she speaks for the ministry of Health, will be able to respond to those specific questions to which I cannot, because we're not dealing with that here today. We're dealing with interim supply.

(1230)

**Mr. Neudorf:** — What you just told us then, Mr. Minister, is that when the Department of Health ask for the certain given amount, you give them a blank cheque. Is that correct? You give them a blank cheque.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman. We give them a certain amount of money to act within a budget. Now it may be foreign to the member opposite to act . . . to know what it means to act within the budget because the former government never cared to act within a budget. They would announce 800 or \$360 million deficits as it did in 1986 and then end up having a deficit of \$1.2 billion. That's not acting within a budget.

We've allocated to the Department of Health a budget. They now have to spend within the budget and the Minister of Health and the department have to be accountable for what they spend in this legislature before it's voted and later in the Public Accounts when the *Public Accounts* are published a year later.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that the minister gets up and gives me a lecture on . . .

**The Chair:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Upshall:** — With leave, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is my pleasure today to introduce to the Assembly some 30 grade 4 and 5 students from South Corman Park School up near by Saskatoon. Accompanying the students today are Terry Gasior and Orville Krale, the teachers. They'll be listening to the proceedings in the legislature for a few minutes and then I'll be meeting with them afterwards for pictures and drinks.

I would hope that they have had a nice trip down, a good visit to Regina, and wish them a safe trip home. So I would like all the members in the Assembly to help me welcome these guests from South Corman Park School.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was not aware of our guests in the gallery being from South Corman Park School. But I would also join with the member from Humboldt in extending my best wishes to you folks as well. I hope you've had a good pleasant trip and enjoy the proceedings here and have a safe trip home.

And the reason I'm getting involved in the hellos here is simply because South Corman Park School was in my constituency prior to the last election, and a very nice area, I might add. So welcome here.

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

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

### Motions for Interim Supply (continued)

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Minister of Finance reverts quite often back into his former role, and as probably I do as well from time to time, to his teaching career where he begins to give lectures to those people who need some enlightenment.

Well, Mr. Finance Minister, you are telling me about the budgetary process. Now I just want to ask you this question, sir. You are now the Minister of Finance in the province of Saskatchewan. How many times, sir, have you held that position?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I'm proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is the third budget I have had to present. I'm proud to say that in the 1970s I was able to present budgets that were balanced, in fact had surpluses; was not faced with the kind of devastating debt load which the member opposite and his colleagues created in the 1970s.

Now I'm presenting the fourth budget. And I want to tell the members opposite, it is the beginning of the recovery for the province of Saskatchewan, so that our future and our children's future is guaranteed, as we begin to deal with that financial mess which those members opposite left here for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Chairman, I had a very specific reason for asking that question of the minister because I know that, and I knew . . . pardon me. I thought he had only been the Minister of Finance two times total, but he tells us now that he has been Finance minister two times previous to this time.

And my information is, my information is that this man now has the reputation of being a person who has brought in the back . . . His last two budgets, although they were a few years apart, have been deficit budgets. So certainly he knows where deficit budgets are all about and what they're all . . . So it's rather an interesting turn of events, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

The question that I want to ask now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Finance Minister, is relevant to your particular position. Could you, sir, give me an indication right now who your officials are that are with you, and their qualifications? I'm interested in their qualifications.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Forgive me for my impatience, Mr. Chairman. But all of the officials and their status were introduced yesterday when we began these estimates. Now if the member opposite wants to simply kill time, I'm quite prepared to do that, but I question whether that is a useful use of taxpayers' money when we're considering interim supply.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I don't think, Mr. Chairman, it's up to the Minister of Finance to dictate what type of questions I am going to ask and what kind of answers I'm looking for. And I ask you again, sir, I want to know, number one, the names of your officials. I want to know why they were hired. I want to know their qualifications. And I want to know how much they're getting of the taxpayers' money.

Now you're telling me I do not have the right to stand in my place and ask that question and expect an answer?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — No, now that the member has asked the question that he didn't ask in the previous question, I can say to the member opposite that, yes, I can give him that information. In fact we'll get it so that it'll be written out and we'll bring it over to you.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — When?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — We'll work on it right now.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — So prior to adjournment of this morning . . .

or this session here, I can expect that to be brought to me so I can ask some further questions.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been listening with interest to some of the responses from the minister and his assertion that he doesn't need to be specific. And I would remind the minister, as I did in my opening remarks, that there have been many precedents set in this House in interim supply where indeed there were specifics.

I refer the minister back to April, 1990, under questioning by the member from Rosemont, where he actually got into Sask Water Corporation down to the amount of money on a per monthly basis that was being transferred from the federal government to the provincial government and the answers were forthcoming from the minister at that time, the best of his ability. And I would say, sir, they were far more forthcoming than what you have offered.

In May 1991 the member from Prince Albert was asking the Minister of Finance questions as low as \$1,600 in regard to Exec Air. What relationship those numbers were to the private flying services around the province, how much per mileage was paid through Exec Air, how much mileage was paid to private people. The minister was forthcoming in all of these things, right down to the per kilometre rate, Mr. Minister.

We had the member from . . . the member that isn't with us from Saskatoon any more, that used to sit in the opposition benches, asking the minister about Social Services and specific numbers — specific numbers — and the minister responsible, the Minister of Finance, answering down to percentage points of specific numbers within the vote from Social Services that was placed before the Assembly.

Now those are only a few examples, Mr. Minister, of what the precedent has been in this House. The members of the opposition today have asked you more general questions — questions, because you are the Minister of Finance, which I think you would be able to ask.

The member from Morse asked a lot of questions in relation to the debt of various assets that you have transferred over to the Consolidated Fund and all the reasons that you did that. You said in this Assembly this morning — and you can check *Hansard*, Mr. Minister — you said we were not responsible for any of those debts.

Now, Mr. Minister, that doesn't strike with what the record will show. We distinctly discussed several areas this morning where indeed there were debts associated with your previous tenure in this province's Finance minister, areas that cover hundreds of millions of dollars.

You say to the Assembly, to the people — you try to fool them — that we weren't responsible for any of this debt that you've transferred out of all these areas now into the Consolidated Fund, and yet you will not balance that debt off with all of the assets that are attached to it.

The minister asks a very legitimate question. You take all of this debt out of a whole bunch of different areas, and

yet you don't want to attach a corresponding asset or liability to those particular numbers. You say that's for the departments to answer. Well we asked the minister from SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation), and he says, no I can't answer that; you've got to ask the individual ministers. So we go around and around and around and nobody answers the question.

Mr. Minister, so that we can have the numbers for next week, would you give an undertaking to this House . . . and I'm sure your officials are quite capable of doing it. The total debt that you ascribe to the province of Saskatchewan at present, would you break that down, sir, in 1992 dollars to debt that was there prior to 1982 and debt that has been accrued since 1982.

Also, Mr. Minister, when you're doing that, would you attach to those particular debt figures capital projects and the amount of debt that you associate with them, both prior to 1982 and since 1982, so that we in the opposition, when we're presented with an interim supply Bill that shows various departments of government that now seem to be debt free . . . that you have no debt servicing costs attached to them, that all of this debt has been hived off into the Consolidated Fund. I think it would be quite reasonable, Mr. Minister, so that we in the opposition and the people of Saskatchewan can understand how much of it was there prior to that day, how much of it there since, what projects it was attached to. Was it schools, as the member from Morse pointed out? Was it hospitals, as the member from Rosthern pointed out?

All of these various things that you have stripped the debt from, moved it into the Consolidated Fund, moved it there so — as you say as the auditor recommended and as the Gass Commission recommended — so that the people can see it.

So let's divide it up. Let's put it in 1992 dollars, and let's put the capital projects . . . because obviously you've said that you've had to write off large amounts of debt with things like the Millar Western pulp mill, the Bi-Provincial upgrader, all of these capital projects that were inside of SPMC.

All of these things that you have stripped the debt off and shoved into the Consolidated Fund, you should be able to match the debt to asset, or debt to share, or debt to liability — ongoing liability either as a preferred shareholder, as an equity partner. I'm sure the minister understands the various areas that government have invested in over the years and would he match those figures to the figures that he has assigned over to the Consolidated Fund so that we clearly understand.

As the member from Morse said, you have assets in Crown corporations. You have retained earnings in Crown corporations. You have monies available to you, monies available to you as pointed out by the member of Morse that cover half of the debt that you've assigned to CIC. And I think, sir, if you did that for us for Monday we would have a far clearer understanding of this whole debt scenario that you've outlined to us this morning. And the public for sure would be able to ascertain in 1992 dollars exactly what we're dealing with here. Because as I said



before, sir, you like to use one set of numbers selectively, and then you fall back on other ones. And the member from Rosthern raised it in teachers' pensions, in the unfunded pensions and the ones that are funded.

And I think it's absolutely clear, Mr. Minister, that the public understand the portion that is attached to the unfunded one and the portion that is attached to the funded one. Will you do that, Mr. Minister?

(1245)

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, I think we need some clarification here. One point I want to make is this: the interim supply Bill is not dealing with the question of debt. It is not under consideration in this committee on the interim supply Bill. So therefore, the answer to the member's question opposite, for the purposes of the consideration of the interim supply, is no.

Now I can, when we get into the estimates of the Department of Finance, in fact I will undertake for the members opposite to make sure that I have here, because it will be a very interesting number — I want the members to know that — I will have a comparison in 1992 dollars the debt for the 1981-1982 in the province of Saskatchewan and the debt in 1991-92.

I will provide for the member opposite a comparison of the debt for those two periods of time, as well as the fiscal position of the province as well, Mr. Chairman, as the equity position of the province at that time and what it is now. I mentioned some of that earlier today. All of those things I will provide when this Department of Finance is in Committee of Finance.

But the interim supply Bill does not deal with any of that. And I remind the Chairman, and I ask, Mr. Chairman, you may want to consider about a ruling, which was quite an appropriate ruling, on May 3, 1991 in this House. And I use May 3 because the member opposite talked about May, in which it said that:

The purpose of interim supply is to grant money for the operation of government departments and programs on an interim basis (interim basis) while reserving to the Legislative Assembly the right to complete the detailed review of estimates at a later time. For this reason, members must reserve their detailed questions on estimates and government financial policy for the regular review of main the estimates.

I've said that to the House on a number of occasions, Mr. Chairman. I remind the Chair . . .

**The Chair:** — I'll ask members to please come to order and allow the minister to make his comments uninterrupted.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I'm done.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Minister, the reason that we have to ask these questions is that things keep coming to light. Yesterday in this Assembly you have a line in your interim supply Bill that identifies Community Services. Now we

identified for you, sir, yesterday that you took special warrant monies in '92-93 but you hived them back into '91-92 in the Department of Community Services to pay off recreational grants. Now you weren't adverse to taking '92-93 monies, popping them back into the previous fiscal year, and therefore balloon the debt of '91-92.

Now, Mr. Minister, it comes to light this morning with someone watching this debate, that you have now taken monies and are going to pay one-time grants to various arts groups — and we understand approximately as much as a half a million dollars to art galleries — and you're going to take that, and I see a line in here for Community Services, and you're going to put that back into the previous year.

Now, Mr. Minister, with these types of things coming to light, with these things coming to light . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well that's the information from one of the groups involved; that they have been promised by one of your ministers that that's what's going to happen.

Now if there's a half a million bucks going to be taken out of this vote and popped back into the previous year to pay off art galleries, sir, then how are we . . . why are we supposed to trust you and the words that you say in this Assembly?

And that's why we need to know. We need to know when the member from Morse says: well what were those capital projects? what was that debt? And we need it matched up for the debt that you've hived over to the Consolidated Fund, because we don't know if that 715 million figure is going to match up with the other stuff or how many more little half a million dollar ditties are here, there, and the next place.

I mean, you don't seem to have any problem at all with taking special warrant monies and popping them back into the previous year to pay off somebody's rink. It came up in this Assembly a month ago, Mr. Minister, and you know it. Will you answer that, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, no monies in this interim supply nor any monies in this budget will be nor can they legally be nor would they be approved by either the comptroller or the Provincial Auditor expended in the previous fiscal year. I don't know where the member is getting his ideas from, but the budget that we are presenting in '91-92 can be spent only in '90 . . . sorry, '92-93 can only be spent in '92-93. None of that funding, I can tell the member, can be or will be paying for '91-92 and show up in that context.

The \$23 million in community capital grants that were paid were monies that were previously committed in fact by the previous government; has nothing to do with the '92-93 budget nor this interim supply Bill.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Well, Mr. Minister, are you saying that the questions posed to the minister from Community Services earlier in this session about monies taken from the special warrants to pay off Community Services commitments is untrue? Are you saying that, sir?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, the monies that the Minister of Community Services provided and the government provided was provided in the 1991-92 fiscal year with a special warrant in that fiscal year. Nothing to do with this fiscal year.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Chairman, there was no special warrant in that fiscal year with this government. The special warrants were applied for prior to this budget. The minister had his little charade in the House last December where he set aside the rules of the House to provide supply for the government up until the end of March. We then had two special warrants.

The Minister of Community Services did not deny at all in question period in this House that money from the first of those special warrants was used to go back to pay off the liabilities. The information that we have received this morning is that large, one-time grants were paid out and billed to last year. Okay?

We have no assurance, Mr. Chairman, that what happened previously is not happening again. This, in effect, is a special warrant. The only reason it isn't a special warrant is because the House is in session. Otherwise it would be another special warrant. And that is the only difference.

And that is why, Mr. Minister, we're asking you to account. You've had a number of examples raised this morning with you. You keep saying that this money simply goes off into one particular area that you'll have to ask questions about later. And yet you have a whole number of areas in this special warrant that clearly go over the one-twelfth . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — That's not a special warrant.

**Mr. Swenson:** — It is in every sense of the word, Mr. Minister, except that the House is in — except that the House is in.

Mr. Chairman, we are simply saying to the minister that the progress of the committee in regards to this Appropriation Bill would be furthered if the minister would attach some assets to some liabilities. And that is the only way, Mr. Chairman, that this committee can be assured that the monies that the minister has been moving willy-nilly from all areas of government into the Consolidated Fund as debt, is the only way that we can be assured that the minister isn't asking for monies under this Appropriation Bill that are inappropriate.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, in order to assist the member and clear up some of his confusion, because obviously he is extremely confused, there were special warrants in the 1991-92 fiscal year. There were several special warrants, as there is at the end of any fiscal year, because you cannot always transfer money from one department to another.

But the special warrants that were passed around March 31 had nothing to do with this fiscal year, including the special warrant for the community capital fund program. That was money that was paid within the context of the budget that was finalized.

In fact even after that payment the deficit was reduced because of other cost savings that were made. The government made significant cost savings by doing away with wasteful expenditures, leaving us some room to pay community owing . . . who were owed \$23 million by the former government who changed the rules midstream and said, instead of providing the money for capital projects in those municipalities, said whoops, we've changed our mind. You go borrow the money — Oungre, for example, and other places — you go borrow the money and you incur the cost.

We thought that was wrong and therefore we provided the money, but it was provided in the 1991-92 fiscal year. It's got nothing to do with this fiscal year. This fiscal year is provided in the budget which we are considering, one-twelfth of which is being requested in this interim supply Bill.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that the minister likes to make the comparison in Community Services. I'm sure if we went to most of those communities today and said: which would you rather have — a pay-out over three years for your rink or your special project, or having the budget that the member brought in where he absolutely devastated all of those communities . . . He cut back on their sharing arrangements, he hit them with a tax on gasoline.

I mean these communities, by that member's own budget, have been hit far worse than anything that would have happened by having their payments on rinks and recreational projects spread out over three years.

Mr. Chairman, it's absolutely ludicrous. One only has to pick up the newspaper, read the Moose Jaw paper. The mayor is in there just about every day saying, whoops, they're taking part of the parking tickets now. Whoops, our gas costs for our bus fleet are way up, whoops — all the way through. I see mayor after mayor after mayor in these times saying that we have been just hammered by this Minister of Finance. And it's undeniable.

And the minister says you took a wrong-headed economic decision when you said no, we'll spread this money out over three years so that the taxpayer gets a break, the community has the assurance that they're going to get the money. They may pay a little bit of interest but they don't get absolutely gutted.

But instead this minister made a political decision as he has done in so many other areas, as we've been pointing out.

He says, I'm going to take all of that debt. I'm going to whap her over into the Consolidated Fund. It's good for politics because I'm going to come along and I'm going to break every last promise I made to Saskatchewan people in the last election campaign. And I'm going to set it up so if I take all my debt now and blame it on the previous Tory administration, I can make myself look pretty good down the road in two or three years.

Now I say to the members of the Assembly, is that prudent financial management that I take 22-point-some million

dollars and I whap it all in at once so that I can try and bloat up my deficit so that I can try and make the Tories look bad? And then down the road, because I don't have to deal with that ongoing commitment — because I don't have to deal with that ongoing commitment — I'll go in and just claw back a lot more out of the various urban and rural municipalities around this province.

I'll tell you what, Mr. Minister. We can stand and talk about Community Services for a long time because I'll bet you if you went out there today, if you went out there today and gave them a choice, I know what the choice would be. I'm pretty darn sure I know what the choice would be in Moose Jaw, given the things that you've done to them in this budget.

I don't know how many Community Services grants they were due under the old program, but they'd gladly trade that any day — gladly trade it any day. Just what you have done to the cost of running a bus fleet or the cost of the ticket collections in that city alone would be more, more than what they were owed under that previous program spread out over three years.

Mr. Minister, there are examples all around this province of that kind of duplicity. And that's why we are asking you to provide to the members of this legislature those lists that balance off the debt and the assets that you so reluctantly don't want to talk about in this committee for some reason. You can take 22 million bucks in Community Services and it's attached to a whole bunch of things, Mr. Minister. It's attached to physical facilities in towns and villages and cities all over this province, that money is. You hive it off over here but you don't want to account what it matches up to on the other side.

Mr. Minister, it's bad enough, it's bad enough to break every last election promise you made to the folks in the province of Saskatchewan just to attain political power in this province, but it's another, Mr. Minister, not to come clean with an accounting of the things that matched one side to the other.

And I think for the progress of this committee it's absolutely fundamental that you do that. When the member from Morse asks you some very relevant questions about the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, it's incumbent that you answer them.

The previous minister of Finance was expected . . .

**The Chair:** — Order. It being past 1 o'clock, the committee will rise to report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:03 p.m.