

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply

The Chair: — The business before the Committee of Finance 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. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we concluded at 5 o'clock, the minister made some observations about the Potash Corporation, and I'd like to ask him if he would be able to tell us what was the price of the potash shares when they started? What was the lowest price they went to and the highest price?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — All the information I have here is the information I provided when the shares were privatized or sold. As a part of the privatization, they were \$18; I am informed that they are now selling at \$25.

Mr. Martens: — Well, the Minister should reflect a little bit and find out that they probably went down to 12. I believe 12 was the lowest that they sold. Now you tell me which is the price to sell these shares at.

You talked about losing money, and I can clearly recall the discussion as it related to Saskoil, as it related to the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation, in that when we said it was \$18 a share or when it was established at \$18 a share, when you were on this side of the House there was just criticism all over the place. The shares wouldn't sell. One time it's too high. One time it's too low.

So what do you sell a product that has no . . . is not moving in the market. And that is what we had to do. And consequently when we were in the process of the shares selling and they moved down in price, we had criticism in this Assembly for selling the shares too high. We didn't know anything about the market. Now when they go over \$18 a share, then you get criticism, well you didn't sell them high enough. Now what is right? That's the question that you need to answer. And I think you should take and evaluate before you give a response.

I just want to make another observation. You mentioned prior to the break that the member for Thunder Creek was a part of the treasury benches and you were mistaken on that one too. So I just want to point out that you get some of your facts straight so that we can at least understand where you're coming from and why you're doing it.

Have you got an observation about the prices of the potash?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what this has got to do with interim supply and you might want to consider what the member is up to. But I do have an observation. My observation is that you don't sell a paying asset, especially a paying asset when you knowingly take a loss of \$442 million. It wasn't our decision. It was your decision. You were there. It was an

asset that was paying dividends. It was paying taxes. It was operating very well. You decided, for strictly ideological political reasons, to privatize it. You spent tens of millions in dollars hiring advisors from Great Britain from Margaret Thatcher's advisory group to tell you how to do it.

And, Mr. Chairman, in the end you sold it, you lost \$442 million, the assets gone. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is operating at 50 per cent of its capacity. And the Saskatchewan taxpayer is paying interest on \$442 million of debt because there is no asset to pay for it and eventually we have to pay off the principal and the capital.

What is right is that you should not have sold those shares in the first place, nor should you have sold the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in the first place. It was a mistake. You know it was a mistake. The Saskatchewan public knows it was a mistake. And it's too bad that it was done because it's part of the price that we now have to pay.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, there were a lot of mistakes made. And I'll tell you where the mistakes were made. They were made in buying the potash mines in the first place. They never created one more new job in this province. In fact I had some people from the oil patch down at my place on the weekend and they said that was the most ridiculous thing that the NDP (New Democratic Party) government ever did was to buy potash mine — didn't create one single new job. And that was a billion dollars put into the economy taken and made available to the potash mines. And it's like the member from Thunder Creek said: it went to New Brunswick and is in exact in competition with the province of Saskatchewan.

In fact, Mr. Minister, the president of Sask Power Corporation was in Manitoba for years, earning significant dollars dealing with trying to get some potash mines established in Manitoba that would be in direct competition and now he sits at the head of the Power Corporation. Is he going to do the same thing with Power Corporation that he wanted to do with the potash? That's the kind of things that we're really wanting to know and find out about.

I don't believe that at any time that it was right for you to buy Intercon. I don't believe it was right for you to buy the Biggar malt plant. I don't believe it was right for you to buy Intercontinental Packers. I don't believe it was right for you to buy the pulp mill at P.A. (Prince Albert).

And, Mr. Minister, I can clearly recall in 1971 when you paid \$10 million to Parsons and Whittemore down in New York because you didn't want to put a pulp mill up at Meadow Lake. And what is there now? One of the best kind of pulp mills that you could ever want to have, completely integrated within itself. And that, Mr. Minister, we could have had a pulp mill there to help the economy in the province of Saskatchewan.

You made an observation earlier. You said that you had built in the '70s. Well, Mr. Minister, you name me one thing that you built. You bought but you didn't build. You

put on the record here one thing that you built in the 1970s.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the record speaks for itself. In 1982 . . . '81-82, March 31, '82, the net equity of the province was \$2.608 billion. In 1991, October 31, the province no longer had a net equity; it had a net debt of \$5.5 billion.

If the members opposite can say that they built, I ask the member from Morse to explain why this difference occurred in short 10 years.

Mr. Martens: — There was an article in the paper just on May 30 that I thought was interesting.

The NDP must end its long-standing affair with using Crown corporations as its primary tool for economic development. It's too expensive and, what's more, doesn't work.

And, Mr. Speaker . . . or Mr. Chairman, I agree with that 100 per cent. It doesn't work. Because what you're doing is exactly what you're planning on doing with the SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). You want to have your insurance program here, subsidizing all over Canada. And you, Mr. Minister, were a part of the treasury benches that made a decision on SGI to have reinsurance insure some ships in Ireland for somewhere around \$54 million.

And that, Mr. Minister, is why we have some of the serious problems, is because in the 1970s you did not build. You did not build anything, and that's the seriousness. You didn't build nursing homes; you didn't build hospitals; you didn't build infrastructure for the economy to grow. You didn't do anything of that sort. All you did was buy. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the heritage that you have to carry forward into this whole process.

And, Mr. Minister, what we're here to check on is to see whether you're going to be buying more and more and more. As I see the Bills coming forward, that's all I see is you're deeming this to have established that and purchased that and do a whole lot more of exactly what you did before. And that, Mr. Minister, in my view is not right, nor is it a good thing to do.

On dealing with the debt carried forward from all of the funds into the Consolidated Fund, it says here you're going to have \$160 million worth of interest. And would you expand on that \$160 million on page 45 of your budget speech. Would you expand on that to see whether there's any of that money involved in the Appropriation Bill that we have before us today.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment on the member's comment. He talked about we didn't build. That's right. We didn't build debt. The members opposite built the debt when they were in the government. We built prosperity. That's what we did in the 1970s. And that's why in the 1970s we had a credit rating of AA plus. Because the members opposite, when they were the Conservative government in Saskatchewan, did nothing but build debt and accumulated it at a tremendous rate, we now have a

credit rating of BBB plus.

I mean that's the difference, Mr. Chairman. The numbers speak for themselves. The public has passed judgement. I'm really quite amazed that the members opposite have spent now three days, not talking about interim supply, not once, but talking about their record. It's almost like a reaction of guilt, Mr. Speaker.

For three days they now have wasted the time of this House, held up the funding for non-government organizations — 200 of them — held up the funding for school boards so they're now having to go and access their lines of credit. And all they've done is talk about their record when they were in government. Well, Mr. Speaker, the public has passed judgement on that record. I don't intend to debate it at great length. The public has had that debate.

If the member wants to continue to talk about that record of the former Conservative government instead of the interim supply which is what we're considering here, he can stand here for the rest of the night for as long as he wants. I'm prepared to listen to him. But quite frankly, nobody out there who's watching the final game of the NHL (National Hockey League) play-offs or the Blue Jay baseball games gives a care about what the members opposite are saying. And they said so on October 23, 1991.

Mr. Martens: — Can you tell me how much the special warrants were that you issued as a part of cabinet? Can you give me the value or the volume of dollars in the two special warrants that you had?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, you might want to consider passing some judgement here at some time. But this afternoon I was asked the question on the two special warrants. I gave the answer. The member from Morse now gets up again tonight again to just kill time, asks for the question, the same question again. I'll give him the answers. The April special warrant was 316.925 million. The May special warrant was \$360.882 million.

Mr. Martens: — Earlier I believe in the discussion that we had, you made an indication that the province had a special warrant prior to March 31. Was there any money, special warrants in that period of time?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — If the member would clarify what he is talking about, I might be able to answer the question.

Mr. Martens: — Well I'm not sure what you were talking about. I wanted to know . . . I think you indicated that there were special funds that you had paid out of special warrants prior to March 31. Were there any dollars paid that were there because you had authorization, and then you moved money back to 1990?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The answer, Mr. Chairman, is no, there was never money moved back anywhere.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, as you undoubtedly know, the transfer of

monies to the provinces from the federal government is governed by a complicated formula and this formula includes a cash component that, according to officials of the federal Department of Finance, can change an amount over the course of a year.

Mr. Minister, how can you assure us that the figure cited as one-twelfth of the province's expenditures for 1992-93, in this Appropriation Bill, will indeed be one-twelfth of this expenditure when this figure can change over the course of the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, clearly the member from Saskatoon is talking about apples and oranges. She's on one hand talking about federal transfer payments and the uncertainty there. We can only estimate the revenues on the basis of the existing formulas that are in place, whether it's equalization or established program funding. That's got nothing to do with the interim supply Bill which talks about expenditures and has nothing to do with the revenues. The interim supply Bill simply provides one-twelfth of the expenditures, because it's for one month of the total budget that's been presented in the House, plus any additional expenditures because of payments that have to be made at a quicker rate than on a month-by-month basis.

Ms. Haverstock: — Perhaps what you can do, if you're not interested in talking about the revenue side, is to help me to understand if you can assure us that you've not overestimated the amount that you'll receive from the federal government and as a result underestimated the size of the deficit.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, I don't think we've overestimated. On the basis of the knowledge that we had when we put together the budget, that's as close an estimate as we can come with. We tried to be precise as we can. We tried not to overestimate, especially never to overestimate, because that would have a very deceiving indication of what the revenues are going to be. We have existing arrangements with the federal government. On the basis of those existing arrangements, there are certain amounts of monies from the federal government — part of it by contract and agreement, most of it by contract and agreement — that we can expect. On the basis of that expectation, we make an estimate. And at the end of the fiscal year we'll have to determine how close we were. I predict that we will be pretty close.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Minister, in preparation of your budget did you employ the services of any polling or marketing firms?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — In the interim supply Bill that we're considering, there was no polling or marketing firms that are being appropriated for, and therefore we're not considering that. But the Department of Finance has indeed done some polling throughout the year — yes.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. If so, could you tell us at what cost this polling was done and the firm and be willing to table the results?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well because we're considering interim supply I don't have that, but I'm quite

happy to provide it for the member opposite. And we'll arrange to have it, and I will make it available. I've indicated, quite frankly, to the media — because of the freedom of information — that we will publish the amounts expended. We will publish the questions of the poll. We will publish the results of the poll during the 90-day period of time during in which the provisions are for that.

Ms. Haverstock: — I thank you, Mr. Minister. The NDP, while in opposition, raised heated objections about the government of the day coming back to the House for special warrants to cover its budgets shortfalls.

And my question to you, sir, as you seek approval for this interim supply Bill, is this: what study has your government done with respect to the new taxes, the cuts to jobs, the changes in programs to analyse the financial impact that this will have and to assure the taxpayers that the numbers projected in the budget, at least in terms of the revenue side, are accurate.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in response to the member opposite, the government obviously has to consider the impacts of any budget provisions. One of the reasons why the deficit is \$517 million rather than considerably less is because we had to balance the need to bring the deficit down and then set a trajectory so that it would come down each and every year until it's balanced in four or five years.

We were able to determine from our internal studies and evaluations that the economy would remain fairly stable. The Investment Dealers Association of Canada, which has analysed the impact of the budget and has released its report since then, has indicated that the real provincial GDP (gross domestic product) is forecast to expand by a modest — they say modest — 1.2 per cent. If we're able to achieve that I will consider that to be fairly significant. That's their outlook. The Royal Bank has a similar estimate.

But we had to make sure that that balance was there so that . . . because I want the member to contemplate this. If she thinks that by continuing to build a deficit the rate at which the former government did would not have a dampening impact on economic development and economic growth in the province, that would be very wrong.

The most important thing for us to do is to begin to restore confidence in investors that they will be able to invest in Saskatchewan and know that in the long run growing deficits will not just end up being more taxes. A deficit is nothing less than a deferred tax. We have had deficits for 10 years. Therefore we have had some deferred taxes, some of which we had to impose this year.

As much as I would have preferred not to do it, it was important that we do that to begin to narrow the spread between the revenue side and the expenditure side. And we did it, and we're on the right track.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister of Finance once again, and I remind him that I campaigned on a deficit reduction act, amongst other things. I ask you,

has your government done a study with respect to the new taxes and the cuts to jobs and the program cuts that you brought in and modifications to programs and analysed their financial impact.

I don't have to remind the minister any more than he needs to educate me about the fact, with people leaving the province, with industry leaving the province, that in fact that changes all of the numbers. And I'm wondering if he'd be willing to table any studies done by the Department of Finance that could help us to know that, at least in terms of the revenue side, that his numbers are correct.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Of course the government would, in considering and putting together a budget, consider all of the impacts that it might have. We had internal evaluations made for the consideration of the cabinet. I'm not going to table them because we don't . . . as a government will not table the internal analysis that we do.

The member can look at various analyses that others have done of the provincial budget. They will give you the same kind of information as we're looking at. We're basically working on the assumption that the result of the budget will be that the economy will remain at a stable position for this year but that next year, assuming things stay normal, we're going to see a growth of somewhere like 3.2 per cent.

In order to be able to get that kind of growth you have to take the steps today to get the deficit under control so that you can benefit from the growth. Because if you don't, then all of the benefits would be eaten up by the increase in the interest on the public debt.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Finance Minister, the NDP was not only justified, but they were relentless in demanding to see an impact study done by the Conservatives when Fair Share was imposed. And I don't think I'm asking for anything much different.

Are you saying that the implementation of the largest tax increases and most onerous changes to our health care system in the last 20 years do not merit impact research to determine whether your estimates are correct?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — We do the evaluations internally. The member asked whether we can be sure . . . she asked earlier whether we can be sure why fluctuations won't throw the budget off. I want to remind the House that we have things like equalization which are a stabilizer. If for some reason — we don't anticipate that; in fact the price of oil is higher now than we had estimated that it would be; it's something like \$22 a barrel; our estimation was at \$20 a barrel — but let us say that for some reason the price of oil happened to drop below that.

That would not be a full impact on Saskatchewan because of equalization, because equalization would take up the difference by and large. So we have that protection. That's why we have fiscal federalism. And if equalization is working — we don't think it's working as well as it should be because of the federal government's arbitrary cut-backs that they have made — but that

stabilizer is there in the event that there are certain shortfalls on resource revenues, for example, oil.

So I can assure the member that we said we were going to have a deficit of \$517 million. We're going to have a deficit of \$517 million or less unless there are some extreme, unexpected events that take place. Fortunately, we've had a good forest-fire season so some of those unexpected events likely will not take place. Still another period in the late summer in which that could happen.

No one can predict what the crop is going to be. We base our estimates on a normal crop year, not the kind of exceptional crop that we had last year. If there is a better than normal crop year, the growth in the economy will be greater than we estimate. But all we can do is estimate, and then there are other factors that'll impact on the final result.

Ms. Haverstock: — I will pursue this further I think when we're dealing with some more specific estimates.

Did you know about the reduction in the province's bond rating before today?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — You never know for sure what the bond rating is going to do until the announcement is made. The announcement was made today. We had indications, of course, what the considerations were going to be, but I don't make assumptions on anything like that until I know what the facts are, and the final facts came down today.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Minister, did you calculate what impact a reduced bond rating might have on estimated expenditures to the province?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, and earlier this afternoon I did explain that to the House. I want to tell the member opposite, I have expressed my concern about what the legacy of the last 10 years will cost the Saskatchewan taxpayer and Saskatchewan families because of this reduction in the bond rating. They're really two components.

What might happen is there may be an increase in our costs for borrowing of up to a quarter of a per cent — 25 basis points. What that would mean, that if we borrow a billion dollars, if the province borrows a billion dollars, there would be an additional cost of two and a half million dollars in interest charges, assuming that our costs go up to that amount. It's too early to tell whether they go up to that amount. We'll see what the markets do after the announcement today.

The other part of the impact is more troublesome. The part that is even more troublesome is the fact that there will be certain investors, certain institutional investors, for example most pension funds, who will not invest or will only invest a very small part of their portfolio in BBB bonds.

So that means we will have lost some of the normal, regular investors that buy Saskatchewan bonds and it will make it more difficult to borrow the money that the province needs to pay the bills, to provide funding for

third parties, to run government, to develop new programs. It's going to be much, much more difficult because of the huge mountain of debt that we have in Saskatchewan today.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, the purpose of interim supply, as I understand it, is to grant funds to the government in order that it be able to pay its bills and operate its programs and departments. Now in the past, the last people to be paid have been private suppliers of goods and services who have had to wait as long as six months before receiving payment on services and goods which had long since been consumed.

What assurance will you give the Saskatchewan small-business communities that steps have been taken to ensure much quicker turnaround in the processing of payments to private business from government departments once this supply is granted?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — We've actually succeeded quite well. The turnaround, by and large, is I believe 30 days. After that, if that is not accomplished or achieved, the government pays interest on the money that's owed. But every effort — and there are systems in place — is being made to make sure that there is a turnaround of no longer than 30 days.

We are keeping a running check and if we find some troubled areas . . . if the member knows of some areas in which there is a problem, please let me know and we will address it, because suppliers should not have to wait longer than that. And we are making any effort to make sure that they don't.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Finance Minister, I do commend the government if this is indeed the case. It's been an issue that's been raised with me. And I will take you up on your offer and turn some names over to you.

This will be my last question to the minister. And it really is a comment and a question combined. In view of the many crises which face our province in agriculture, employment, and most certainly the economy, I believe that far too much time is wasted asking questions that are not specific enough to interim supply, which as I understand is purely about whether the government of the day can have access to a portion of money from the budget presented.

Although turn-about I believe is fair play, and although the New Democrats did exactly the same thing to the Conservatives, in what the Conservatives are presently attempting to do in holding up interim supply, quite honestly in the feedback that I've had from people who have called my office, they are saying that the whole process seems overly political and without . . . or rather with little salient purpose to the people of our province at this desperate time.

So in the interests of the taxpayers and of the image of those of us who do serve in this House and serve the public, I would like to ask this. Will the government and the opposition consider exchanging written questions from the opposition in order to move this process along more quickly at this juncture?

(1930)

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well I want to say this to the member opposite. First of all, we did not do exactly what the official opposition is doing in the legislature in the last few days.

Secondly, I think any minister would welcome any written questions prior to coming to estimates. And in fact when we were on the opposition, during the last few years in fact took that route on a number of occasions and wrote to ministers on the Conservative front benches in advance of estimates indicating that we would be asking certain questions. And you know, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, never got any answers. They ignored them. But if the member from Saskatoon Greystone has some questions that she wishes to pursue when the different estimates are considered, we would welcome advance notice of those questions. And I can assure that the operations of the House would then run much smoother because there would be better preparation.

Now interim supply, you're right. The member is right, Mr. Chairman. Interim supply is simply interim supply to provide an interim amount of money for the one-twelfth of the fiscal year. That's why in May 10, 1990, the Speaker of the House, or was it the chairman of the House, made a ruling. And the ruling said that:

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

. . . 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 (time) . . . 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 quite appropriate, Mr. Chairman. I remind the House and the Chair and I would welcome that. By delaying the interim supply, all that the members in the official opposition are doing is delaying the opportunity to consider in detail the estimates of each of the departments.

Now if they want that information so badly, I cannot help but be somewhat amazed that they would continue to delay the interim supply and therefore prevent themselves an opportunity to ask the detailed questions of the Department of Health or the Department of Agriculture or the department of the Executive Council or whichever. I can't explain that. They're going to have to explain that.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well I want the minister to realize that in all probability, one of the reasons why we are evading going on in the process and waiting for detailed questions to be answered later is because we haven't, in the last couple of weeks, been able to get any legitimate answers.

If we can't get answers in the process to date, where is the confidence that we could get answers by delaying or being patient or waiting some time in the future. I think we'd better start to get some answers here and now, before we proceed, so that we can see that this government is going to be accountable to us and that they will in fact answer our questions as we pose them.

And there are several questions that I have for you, Mr. Minister. A lot of things have been talked about, and so I'm going to ramble from one subject to the other just a little. You said earlier that it was bad business for the government to have sold some particular shares and then they went up in value. Would you tell me, considering that Saskoil shares were sold at between 9 and \$10 — they varied at the time when they were originally sold — and now they are selling for between 4 and \$5, was that good business on the part of the government or bad business on the part of the government to get rid of those shares at that time, at that price?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I think I'd like to ask the member to tell the House which questions he's not been able to have answered. The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation is the only department and I think they have begun on the Public Service Commission. SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) was the only department that's been here for any length of time.

And I read the *Hansard* and I found that the minister in charge answered every question that was asked — in fact found that most of the answers that were asked, he was able to have paper on which the answers were prepared passed over to the members opposite. So for the member to say that questions are not been answered is stretching the point, I might say to some considerable degree.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of Saskoil, Saskoil was privatized once again as part of the former government's privatization agenda. It's hard to know what the benefits of it had been but the member can explain to this legislature how all of the people of Saskatchewan have been able to be benefitted by the fact that Saskoil has moved a great portion of its operation to Alberta rather than taking the initiative in Saskatchewan. I'd be quite happy to hear the member's explanation of that.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well I think I alluded to this type of questioning in last fall's session when I think, fairly clearly, indicated to you that in four years we will be in your chairs and then we'll answer your questions. So in the meantime would you mind telling me whether or not you think it was a good deal or a bad deal for Saskoil to have sold shares at 9 and \$10 and now see them at 4 and \$5? Was it good or bad business for them to get rid of those shares at that time?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I don't mind answering the question. The whole privatization agenda of the former government was a bad deal for Saskatchewan. There's no question about that, but the member is getting way off the subject. He's getting way off interim supply and I would ask the Chair to rule on that.

Would the Chair rule on whether I raise a point of order on this, whether that line of questioning has got anything to do with interim supply because interim supply has nothing to do with Saskoil.

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

Mr. Neudorf: — I'd like to speak to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have been listening very patiently all afternoon to get some answers out of the minister. And all we've been getting out of the minister is rhetoric — political rhetoric, blatant political rhetoric — instead of any kind of answers. And a case in point I give you the 25 minutes from 4:35 to 5 o'clock, just before the supper hour when he took it upon himself to prevent us from getting to our feet to ask questions and all he did for 25 minutes was going on a rambling political rampage which was so wide-ranging that, Mr. Chairman, that I would actually challenge you as chairman to find out anything that we're speaking here that is not pertinent to the point as raised by the member. So I would suggest that the member's point of order is just totally out of whack and not well taken at all.

The Chair: — I'll consider the member's point of order and the comments from the member of Rosthern. And I would tell the House that the purpose of interim supply is to grant money for the operation of 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 time. For this reason members must reserve their detailed questions on estimates and government financial policy for the regular review of the main estimates.

If a member has a question, and I gather in this case with respect to Saskoil, has a question with respect to Saskoil, then a member should attempt to relate it to the purpose of interim supply.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand that the government still owns a sizeable block of Saskoil shares. So with all due respect, Mr. Minister, how is the effect of the share offering going to affect the interim supply bill? And will there be any more shares sold off, and will that money show up in this particular group of money that we're discussing here today?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, that has nothing to do with interim supply. We're dealing with expenditures of the government. The minister in charge of the Crown Management Corporation, which will be as responsible for any shares owned in the various enterprises, is the minister in charge of the Crown Management Corporation. And the member is going to have to ask that minister when he comes before this House for his estimates so that he can get the answers.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly will do that, Mr. Minister. I suggest, though, that you did earlier in the day make some reflection on the fact that certain shares that had been sold and then went up in price were in fact bad business because the government had lost money. And of course here we have another situation that explains exactly the opposite situation. So

you can give some and you can take some. And I think that was the point I wanted to make.

Now I want to talk to you for a few minutes about rural development because of course I have a little bit of experience in that area. And I want to know from you . . . Before we go into that, I want to get something clear in my mind. We have folks out home who have said to me, the government is operating under special warrants so far this year; now they are going to go to interim supply. And one of my constituents asked me what was the difference between the special warrants and the interim supply? And I said to him that I would ask you that question when I got a chance so that you could explain it, and we could have it on the record as to what your interpretation is. Because I have made my interpretation, and I would like you to make that interpretation for my constituents.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the member, special warrants are a special provision that is provided by the rules of the legislature by the various legislation so that the government can provide funding for expenditures of normal government expenditures when the House is not in session.

Also there will be from time to time at the end of the fiscal year the need for some expenditures of money which may not have been budgeted because of unexpected circumstances. That's what special warrants are for. They're meant for special, unexpected circumstances. Interim supply is when the House is in session, a budget has been introduced but a budget has not yet been passed because all of the various estimates have not been considered.

And therefore each month — or for a two-month period, that's not uncommon — the government will come to the legislature, as it should, to ask for interim supply. But when the House is not sitting the only thing available, and rightfully so, is a special warrant procedure. We had two special warrants — one for April, one for May — because of the lateness of the budget due to the lateness of the last election, due to the need for a special session in December, and therefore . . . Due to the need to open up the books, the results of which were not known till about the middle of February, the government only had about three months to prepare the budget and therefore had to have the special circumstances of special warrants in order to provide the funds that were necessary for April and May.

Mr. Goohsen: — I thank you for your answer. Other than the political rhetoric it was basically what I had thought, and I'm sure that my constituent will appreciate your answer. His next question . . . in lieu of that answer which he had anticipated, he asked me, if you had convened the Assembly in January, would this process have been necessary then?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — If we had been in the Legislative Assembly in January this process would not have been necessary until the new fiscal year of April 1, because the last fiscal year would have come to an end. So this process would have been necessary as of April 1 — the end of March or April 1 — providing that there was a budget introduced by that time.

Mr. Goohsen: — I think I've made my point on that issue, so I want to talk to you for a minute about rural development. You earlier stated that we were getting answers to our questions, and while we didn't do this in a supply debate, we did have some Bills before the Assembly that we have discussed where we asked some questions. I particularly asked for a formula with regards to the cost sharing and the revenue sharing in the rural development area. And we haven't received that in my office here in the Assembly yet, and so I say to you that you haven't been providing the answers as of yet.

And we are unable, to some extent, to ask the questions in detail about this supply Bill as a result of that because we don't understand, for example, how the monies are being allocated to the rural municipalities in the cost-sharing formula at this particular time. The government has alluded to a 7.4 per cent decrease in sharing, when in fact a lot of municipalities have come to us and told us that they have had up to 80 per cent reductions. Now we wanted to get a hold of that formula so that we could provide it to an accountant and have him go through the formula and try to determine whether or not there had been any mathematical errors or any kind of slip-ups in the process because we have so many people saying that in fact their reductions are much, much more.

Now can you explain to us how much of this money is going to be going to rural development? How much of it goes out in these formulas? How much goes to each municipality, and what the percentages are for each municipality in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, that's a detailed question which the member is going to have to ask when the Department of Rural Affairs is before the Legislative Assembly. I don't know what kind of research staff the members of the opposition have, but the construction of the revenue-sharing formula is public information. It's available. Tell your research staff to dig it up and explain it to you and you will have no problem.

But as to the various fundings that are provided, Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that. That's an answer that can only be given per your ruling by the Minister of Rural Development when his estimates are considered in the House.

(1945)

Mr. Goohsen: — You see that's exactly the point we were trying to make is that each time we ask a question you put us off to some other area or some other time in the future. And then somebody else gets up and gets smart and says, be patient, wait, and we'll get you the answer some other day. And we eventually will go home for the summer and still never know where all this money went. And I think it's incumbent upon us to find out what you're planning on doing with this money. You want to have the faith of this group of people over here to trust you with a blank cheque. And I don't think in all fairness that that's quite the right thing to do.

After all, I've been involved with municipal government for 12 years, and I've looked at a lot of budgets, and I've

never seen one yet that I didn't understand. And when I first got involved in provincial politics I thought all you've got to do is add a lot of zeros behind those numbers and a budget should be basically understandable. But I walked in here and find out that I was totally wrong there. This budget is nothing like an ordinary budget that you'd watch any place else in the world of ordinary people.

I have never seen such a mixed up mess in all my life to try and figure out. And I quite honestly don't understand where the money of the people of Saskatchewan is going to. And if I can't figure it out, sitting here with all the things that you have supplied us, along with the things that we've asked for that we haven't got, how is the rest of the people of this province supposed to figure out where their tax dollars went to?

So I say to you, you've got in the Department of Rural Development much more . . . and it's underlined here, and I thank you for that. The copy you gave us, you have got this one underlined. And you say that much more than 12 per cent is going to be spent in Rural Development. Okay, where is this extra money going to? What's it for? Why is it more than 12 per cent for Rural Development?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I know that the member used to think that all you had to do was add a bunch of zeros and explains the provincial budget. But I want to assure the member that that's the process that was used when the former government was in power.

Now that we have a different government, we're dealing with the principles of open honesty and accountability. And that's why if the member wants to know where all the money's being spent, I invite him to take a look at the estimates. Every single dollar that is going to be expended by the provincial government this year is outlined here, subvote by subvote, program by program. Pretty straightforward, all you have to look do is look at the estimates.

Now, this will now be the third time in three days that I'm giving the answer to the question that the member opposite asked. I don't know whether he bothers reading *Hansard* or whether he bothers listening to the answers and the questions of his colleagues, but this is not a new question. This is simply the same question being asked a third time because the members have run out of any really good questions so they're now killing time by repeating the same questions.

The answer to the member's question is that in Rural Development there is one-twelfth allocation which is \$4.948 million. Sorry, there is a . . . yes, that's the one-twelfth, isn't it?

The interim supply amount that we're asking for is \$7.159 million. That means that there is an addition to the one-twelfth of \$2.211 million. And as I explained to the House on Thursday and on Friday, the purposes for that is for the lands branch due to the seasonal nature of the pasture operations which have a peak period over the summer months.

We need \$300 million there in excess of the normal one-twelfth and grants for Rural Development for the first

quarterly payment of unconditional revenue-sharing grants, \$1.9 million. We don't pay them on a month by month basis. We pay them on a quarterly basis. The end of June will be the end of the first quarter.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well that may very well be, sir, and I guess we're going to wait for interim supply to see if your answers are right, but I seriously doubt that the figures are going to work out to this. Now I know that some municipalities have had their money for a period of time already, so it can't be that they're all going to fall into the end of June period.

Now in the event . . . and you've mentioned something about the grasslands and things like that and the costs of leases of grassland, so it sparked my questioning to wonder when you increase the pasture rents by 67 per cent for the ranchers in the Cypress Hills area, for example, is that money going to be built into this 12 per cent of the budget? And where does it show up?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we're here dealing with expenditure. We're not dealing with revenue items. Interim supply has nothing to do with revenue. The member is asking a question on revenue. He will have to ask that question when the Committee of Finance considers the Department of Finance estimates, but better yet when the Committee of Finance deals with Rural Affairs.

He will then get the answer precisely the way he needs it, and I invite him to pay attention to the rules of the House and ask the question in the appropriate place.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. I certainly will try to pay attention to your rules. And I will ask you then, in the area of expenditures, how much money are you going to be spending to help the ranch and farm community this year, in this interim supply. Do you have any contingency fund laid aside for a disaster?. For example, if the drought situation should spark a sudden hatch of grasshoppers that gets out of control — we don't know if that'll happen or not, but that's what an emergency is about — is there anything built into this mess of figures that provides for that type of contingency?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — No. The answer is no. This is strictly a request for one-twelfth of the expenditures except for those areas which we have already explained.

Mr. Goohsen: — I'm afraid that I just can't understand why this wouldn't be important in an interim supply in the middle of the spring season in Saskatchewan where we often have disasters of one type or another. You could have a tornado go through and cause a lot of trouble. You've seen your own people talk about the lightning strikes in the community pastures and the PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration) pastures and the federal grassland pastures down at Val Marie. So you've already seen one of your own members get up in this very Assembly and talk about the catastrophe down there and how there should be a disaster fund put into effect.

So I fail to see where it wouldn't be important in this particular estimate whether or not there is any contingency fund or any kind of monies available for

those kind of things that the provincial government might find itself responsible for.

You alluded to fighting fires a little while ago, in the forests. And you claimed that it was a great victory, that we wouldn't have to be spending money there to fight forest fires. Now if we happen to have more prairie fires, are they not as important as a forest fire? And is there a contingency fund?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I'm being patient with the new member, but I think the questions he asks I'm sure are sincere and legitimate. But, Mr. Chairman, there is in interim supply Bill never assumptions of things dealing with actual expenditures. We're dealing here with actual expenditures. The legislature is in session. If there is a need for additional expenditures, I'm quite prepared as the Minister of Finance to come before the legislature and ask for additional expenditures.

We have said to the federal government already, and we will continue to say to the federal government . . . It's only unfortunate that the member opposite who asks the question voted against the request that was made by this Legislative Assembly by resolution, urging the federal government to pay the \$500 million in third line of defence which they promised when the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program was put in and have been derelict in their responsibility in paying that money out. That resolution was in the House. It was debated. Every member of this House including the Liberal member, I believe, voted for that resolution. You, sir, and your colleagues voted against it.

But if there is a need for some additional funding beyond interim supply, there is a legislature in session, and the government can come before the legislature and request the legislature to provide it.

Further there is provision in the legislation of the Department of Finance for payments under provincial disaster assistance program. That provision is there. There's a nominal sum of 150,000 that normally put into that because you don't know if you're going to have this kind of a disaster. But if we do, we have a legislature. It's in session. The members, including the member opposite, will have an opportunity to debate it.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well I want to thank you for that, Mr. Minister. You've actually given me a solid figure of something that is said to be there available for these problems, and it's the first time in about three or five hours that you've actually given us an honest figure that is there for something to really happen. And I really appreciate that answer. We know now that we can draw on your government in case something happens out there, like the drought getting worse or that type of thing or if grasshoppers in fact do occur or if we do get some more prairie fires.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, in this supply Bill, I've been trying to find out where expenditures for the Liquor Board come in and what those expenditures would be. It's been pointed out to me that it is my responsibility to follow this area, and so I want to ask you why I wasn't able

to find the heading any place in here and where is it?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, because the government doesn't spend any money on the Liquor Board, there is no request for any money for the Liquor Board in this interim supply.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well it's good to know. I didn't know that you didn't spend any money on the Liquor Board. I presumed that you may have in fact hired a minister to be in charge of that and that perhaps somebody's portfolio covered this and that he might actually get some wages and that he might in fact even hire some people that might advise him on how to run the operation. And maybe some place the government is paying those people a salary.

Now of course I could be all wrong; they might be volunteer workers. And I'm sure that in Saskatchewan, with your ideas of co-operation, that wouldn't be too hard to find.

I did want to answer your query about the fact that we voted against one of your Bills, and of course you realize as everybody that is watching this production tonight realizes that through your trickery and deceit the original motion was not the one that was voted on. We in fact voted on a motion that you people put a whole different context to why an amendment that totally and ridiculously destroyed the motion as it was set out to try to help the people of this province. And we voted against you and your trickery and deceit, not against farmers getting money.

I would like to ask you, sir . . . we were also asked to check, seeing as how we can't find out anything about the expenditures that you're going to make on the Liquor Board, we were also asked to investigate with you what expenditures you will be making in the Department of Highways.

We have seen in the last few days, your minister getting on the public airways and telling folks that you're going to tear up a thousand kilometres of our paved roads and that sort of thing. And I've had everything from the pot-hole government to all kinds of other things thrown my way as queries about which direction we're going in the province with highways. And I do note that we do in fact have the Department of Highways listed in here. And you have what seems to be a straightforward amount. And I want to ask you if, in your expenditures, you take into account these miles of roads that are going to be torn up or if they are to come into future estimates?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I remind the Chair and I remind the House that this is also the third time this question has been asked. It's repetition. I don't know whether the rules of the House provide for this kind of wasteful use of the time of the legislature. But for the third time, the third time the question has been asked and the third time I'll give the same answer.

And furthermore, rather than giving the answer, I'll remind the member that on Thursday last I passed over to the member from Kindersley a complete list of all of the expenditures that are being requested in the interim supply. The member from — is it Moosomin or Maple

Creek? — Maple Creek has that information. And for him to get up in the House, even though he's got that information in front of him, it clearly tells you what the members of the opposition are doing.

They're delaying the process of this House for I don't know what reason, except that for some reason they're determined to make sure that the payments to the school divisions don't go out on time. They're already late. They're determined to make sure that 200 agencies that the Department of Social Services provide funding, money won't go out. Many of them do not have a line of credit. They're going to have to shut down their operations because the members opposite choose simply to ask questions to which they already have the answers.

But to expedite the process of the House and in order to help the members, let me just say this. In the Department of Highways, one-twelfth of the interim supply would be \$14.949 million. This interim supply Bill is asking for \$21.592 million which is \$6.643 million more than the one-twelfth. The reason for that is because there is 3.8 million that's being asked for the rural surface transportation because the majority of the activity is performed during the peak period of the summer. You don't build roads in the middle of the winter or maintain roads of this kind in the middle of the winter.

And secondly, maintenance of highways and transportation, because the majority of the activity is performed during peak periods of the summer on the maintenance side. The answer is very simple. And I hope that now that the member has that, that he is satisfied that he has all the information that he's wanted and which he's had for three days.

(2000)

Mr. Goohsen: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm rather sorry that you're offended by the fact that I would pursue the critic areas that I've been given. I haven't spoken on this issue yet in this House, and the answers that you are giving . . . you are giving to me to follow my responsibilities as a member. And I take those responsibilities as a member of the opposition very seriously. And I think that in all fairness that you should answer the questions without all of the rhetoric about these things.

You brought up school divisions not getting their money. And even though that's not my critic area here, it worries me that you have stated that the school divisions are now not going to get their money. I fail to see how that is. Is this not a fact that your special warrants allow you to continue to pay bills until the middle of June and that interim supply doesn't take effect until the middle of June?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I just hope too many people aren't watching because they'd truly be disillusioned with the process of this legislature.

I remind the member that the special warrant for April was expended in April. The special warrant for May was expended in May. We now are in the legislative session in interim supply voted by this legislature so that the funding could be provided for June.

The fact that the interim supply has been held up for no good reason means that school divisions have not been able to get paid because the Department of Finance, until an interim supply Bill is passed, has no authority to issue any payments for anything. Can't pay pensions, can't pay wages, can't pay school division grants, can't pay funding to non-government organizations, can't pay funding to our hospitals, can't pay funding to our nursing homes.

The legislature has to authorize the interim supply Bill in order for that to happen. Because the members are continuing to repeat questions and to delay this House, those payments are not being made. And every day that the members opposite delay this House is going to be another day that payments will not be made, increasing the costs to school divisions and other bodies that rely on provincial funding.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well, Mr. Minister, it really surprises me that a man of your past experience, as you have pointed out several times . . . You've patted yourself quite nicely on the back about how you were the minister of Finance back in the '70s. And I have no doubt that you did a good job and that you seem to know what you're doing, so if you know what you're doing, then obviously if you knew what you were doing, then you must have known, better than I, the kind of problems that you were going to be facing by this interim supply Bill possibly being held up for a couple of days while people inquired of you what's going on and where the money is happening to be spent.

And then if you're that knowledgeable about the whole process, how come you didn't bring this in two weeks ago? Why are we doing it today? Why at the last minute? How come at the eleven-thirty hour here? Why not two weeks ago then, and what's the hold-up? Are you trying to put the opposition on the spot so that we get the credit for delaying the payments? Are you trying to make us look foolish in the eyes of the people because we ask the questions about your supply, about where you're spending the money?

Or were you hoping that you could ram this thing through in a couple of minutes time because you knew that we might feel sorry for the folks out there not having their money. And you tried to ram this thing through to cover up where you're spending some of this money and the way that you're covering up on how you transferred debt from last year . . . from this year to last year and all those kind of trickery things that we're watching. Is that factor another one of your games that you're trying to perform here, is to give the people the impression that it's our fault they're not getting paid when in fact you should have done this two weeks ago — what do you think about that?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the member has a short memory. This interim supply Bill was introduced last Thursday in the month of May. It is now Monday in the month of June. There was sufficient time. The tradition of this House, Mr. Speaker, is normally to take a few hours, at the most a day, to consider interim supply.

Mr. Chairman, 1989-90, there were 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 interim supplies, each of them took one day; 1987-88, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 interim supplies, each of them took one day.

Nobody can predict how much time the members opposite want to waste in interim supply Bills but that's a choice they have to make. It's not our choice. I think there has been sufficient time to consider this Bill, to provide time for the House to consider specific estimates of specific departments which . . . so that the public can scrutinize those departments through the work of the opposition. If the members are that anxious to get all that information then they should get on with it and let the specific departments come before the House.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well I really have to say, Mr. Minister, that I couldn't care less how disappointed you are in me. We'll let the voters in my constituency decide that next time around. I think they might probably even expect that I should continue and not be embarrassed and continue to try to ask some questions to find out what in fact is going on. Another one of my critic responsibilities, as you may recall and may have caught on to by now, of course, is the labour area. It used to have a lot longer name but we shortened it right up.

I am told and I understand through the debate that we've had over the past few weeks that the new labour Bill will cause and effect that contractors will in this province, who do work for the government, have to use all unionized labour and that that unionized approach to all unionized labour will provide a monopoly situation for the unionized contractors. In effect that that gives them the opportunity to charge more money of government than would have happened under the old process. My figures are that we can expect to pay 20 to 30 per cent more for labour contracts done for the government by contractors when this Bill becomes law and I'm sure it will before very long. Is, sir, this 20 to 30 per cent increase in costs built into the amount of money that you have pointed out here for the labour costs, the one-twelfth part?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I really don't want to seem unco-operative because I'm quite happy to answer all the questions, but really I would ask the Chair to rule on whether discussing legislation that's before the legislature is an appropriate topic to discuss when we're talking about interim supply.

Mr. Goohsen: — Again, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the Bills before this very House are going to cost you money. They're going to cost taxpayers money are they not? I mean, if you implement the Bills and the Bills require that expenditures be made, will you not have to take those expenditures out of the 12 per cent of interim supply, just as you would have to do for the whole budgetary year? Is that not a normal process that those Bills that cost us money will have to be paid for?

The Chair: — Order. The member is raising questions about the impact of a Bill which, as I understand, is not yet before the House. The member will have opportunity during discussion on the Bill to question the minister as to the impact of those Bills. If those Bills have any monetary implications, the member has a further opportunity to ask questions of ministers during estimates.

At present we are not dealing with the *Estimates*. We are debating a resolution as it pertains to an interim supply Bill. We are not voting individual department estimates.

Supply Bills are to issue money required in advance of complete parliamentary sanction. Debate should focus on the need to grant, reduce, or refuse supply in respect to the resolution before the committee. I would invite the member to discuss departmental policies and details of programs under the appropriate departmental estimates.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well I guess we better talk a little bit, Mr. Minister, about where exactly some of this money is going to be spent and how we can find accountability for it. Again I want to go back, just a minute, to rural development even though I know that you have discussed that area quite a bit. But it is a major concern to us and we would like you to explain how many of these dollars are going to go to new programs to create incentives for people to build roads in rural Saskatchewan, to provide jobs for the summer for our contractors?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a detailed question that is better answered by the minister when the Department of Rural Affairs is in Committee of Finance.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we've been debating interim supply for a few hours now. Certainly the debate on interim supply has taken a little longer than probably what some would expect. And maybe I should accept the recommendation made by the member from Saskatoon Greystone, and first of all pass my questions across to the minister so that I can then pose the question and while I'm half-way through the question, the minister can respond such as they did in Crown corporations.

Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that the process of addressing interim supply has been taking a bit of time. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, what we've seen over the past number of years — and certainly we've been going through *Hansard* and looking back at April 1990 — we see interim supply introduced on the sixth, and we're still in interim supply on April 9.

And as the minister has even indicated today, we've been all over the spectrum. In fact the minister would reprimand members on this side for being somewhat broad in their comments and statements, while at the same time standing up and just giving us a 25- or a 30-minute lecture as to why the government has made a move in this area or why the government had to do this, pretty well basically putting the blame all at the feet of somebody else rather than accepting the fact that they've been government for some better than six months now. And certainly the 1991 budget fiscal year was . . . six months of that fiscal year was their responsibility.

We're now three years into 1992 fiscal year. And believe you me, Mr. Chairman, I would just as soon be doing something else rather than cooped up in this stone fortress here in Regina at this time of the year especially when it's so nice outside.

It would seem to me, Mr. Minister, that possibly we wouldn't be quite into this debate if indeed the government of the day would have followed up on the promises they made to the people of Saskatchewan and

brought this House into session much earlier and certainly had their budget presented.

And the minister would tell us, well because of the complexities and the way they found the books when they were elected in October, it was impossible for them to put a budget proposal together. Well it would be easy for me to go back and remind the minister of the fact that the process that had been taking place the last two years . . . trying to let people across Saskatchewan know where indeed the province was financially and some of the fiscal responsible decisions that would have to be made. And I think the minister and the government were quite well aware of it.

The minister also indicated that he needs the money so that he can pay the bills so that people can receive their portions of funding for the month of June. It would see to me, Mr. Chairman, that . . . maybe I'm wrong, but I believe most of the cheques either go out the middle and the end of the month, and we've already had special warrants for April; that's covered. May is covered. And whether or not the Bill passed tonight or tomorrow or the next day, the money I believe will be in the hands of the third parties in record time anyway.

Mr. Minister, in this interim supply Bill . . . and I have a letter that came across my desk which I believe was sent to you, and I was cc'd (carbon copy) a copy of the letter from an individual in my area who has written and is indicating a number of the areas that are of grave concern to him as a farmer and a small-business person in our area.

In your interim supply Bill I understand one of the main areas of concern . . . in the budget period, is the fact that the FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) program has been eliminated. And I also believe, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that there are many farmers today that are looking for money from the FeedGAP program. And I'm just wondering, Mr. Minister, how much of this one-twelfth of the interim supply that you've asked for right now will address the current need for funding under the FeedGAP program that is still in place, if any?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, once again the interim supply Bill provides one-twelfth of the funding. There are no exceptions here for the Department of Agriculture and Food. If the member wants to get specifics on each specific program, he's going to have to ask his question when the Department of Agriculture is before the Committee of Finance. We're not capable of answering those questions because this is interim supply, it's not the Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Toth: — Well I'll just remind you, Mr. Chairman, and also, Mr. Minister, yes the question is related to the Department of Agriculture and Food but what we're discussing here is the one-twelfth allocation of their funding. And maybe I could word the question this way. Is there any funding . . . You say there's one-twelfth of this funding is going to Agriculture and Food. Is there any part of that one-twelfth going to address the FeedGAP program? Are the cheques going to be rolling out of this one-twelfth to address the FeedGAP program as it sits today?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Whatever programs the Department of Agriculture is providing this year, we're providing one-twelfth of the allocation for those programs. And the exact amounts that are flowing from each of the various programs that the Department of Agriculture and Food runs, it has to be responded to by the Minister of Agriculture.

(2015)

Mr. Toth: — Well we certainly trust, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that . . . and I'm sure this farmer who sent this letter to you is hoping that indeed there will be a cheque coming from the Department of Finance through the Department of Agriculture and Food to address the FeedGAP program and certainly the funds that would be coming to him.

Mr. Minister, as well I want to . . . I know we can get into some specific questions and it's very difficult when you're addressing the one-twelfth and trying to assess where all the funding is going, and I can appreciate that. Here again, another question that is somewhat specific, but can the minister kind of indicate what kind of funds are available to address the tax . . . or fuel tax rebate program out of this portion of funding?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Department of Finance also gets one-twelfth of its allocation. There are no exceptions being made here. Whatever expenditures are being made by the department for the period of this year will be made on the basis of the programs that are there, and in this interim supply we're asking for one-twelfth.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, I'm moving off of agriculture for a minute to address another concern raised in this letter, and certainly a concern raised on the street as I was coming in today and talking to a number of constituents.

The letter before me as well raises the concern that a number of people across this province have, and it kind of it falls into an area of responsibility I have regarding women's issues and Women's Secretariat. The fact that the Saskatchewan Pension Plan has now been disbanded and the program, Mr. Minister . . . I'm sure you've had a number of calls. Your office has had a number of calls because certainly our office has had many people calling it, and I know that many of my colleagues have indicated that they have had calls about the program.

And no less than half a dozen people that I ran into, that was the first question on their mind, Mr. Minister . . . was the fact that this program . . . and I want to just read a little bit about the Saskatchewan Pension Plan as seen through the eyes of an individual who was able to take advantage of the plan and become involved in setting aside a pension for himself when he retired.

Mr. Minister, I read here, quote:

The Saskatchewan Pension Plan was one of the best ideas any Gov't has had since Medicare. And the statement that it only helped the well off is a total false hood as the gov't only matched the under \$23,000 income (earner) and only to a \$300

max.

And then the individual goes on to ask the minister what his income was and how much he paid in making contributions to his pension plans. The member also . . . or this gentleman also brings out the fact that his income on the T-4 slip last year, his net was only \$8,900.

So he wants to bring out the point that the Pension Plan certainly was there for a lot of individuals, not just the 45,000 women that were involved in the program, but farmers like this gentleman here who had no other source of setting, establishing, a pension plan for himself.

And certainly we have heard a lot about pension plans over the last four days, and we know that there are six members in this Assembly who are on the old pension plan who have a guarantee of what their pension is going to be when they retire tomorrow, whereas a number like myself and I guess some of the new members on the government side of the House too that realize that the pension isn't going to be quite a rosy as what the Premier and the Minister of Finance are going to have when they retire. But our pension will be paid out according to our contributions and how much it accumulates and the value of that fund when the pension is put in place.

Mr. Chairman, why . . . I guess when we look at the Pension Plan, and I would have to ask why the department and why the government would even consider disbanding a plan that was being very helpful, that was going to aid a lot of people, that would have indeed, Mr. Minister, taken them off of the government payroll. Certainly had people been able to continue at . . . had the Saskatchewan plan continued to be implemented, Mr. Minister, down the road when these individuals retire — many of them single parents, single mothers, many of them housewives with no other access to a pension — would have had the opportunity of being able to set aside funds that would have enabled them to live more independently, rather than coming to government once they retire.

Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that you've cancelled the plan, the one-twelfth allocation that you're asking for today — and in your recent letter indicated you will be sending back or forwarding or sending back to people the amount of money they put into the plan — does this allocation at this time cover any of that funding or cost?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, because the funding that will come out of that will come out of the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. What the member opposite does not admit to in his description of the Pension Plan is that there were people . . . is that the Pension Plan never considered family income. There were situations where families were earning 100, \$150,000 a year, \$75,000 a year, \$80,000 a year and the Saskatchewan taxpayer was expected to supplement the matching grant of \$300.

The plan was poorly targeted. It needs a complete review. The government in 1978 addressed the pensions that existed then, made sure that anybody entering the public service, including MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) after 1978, were on a money purchase plan so they would not be a drain on the treasury in the

future. The plans are fully funded. We addressed that at that time.

We have had to make a lot of expenditure reductions in this budget. We have had to make a lot of those expenditure reductions in this budget because when the member from Souris-Cannington sat on the government side of the House, he supported every measure of waste and mismanagement that the cabinet of that day perpetrated on the province of Saskatchewan. And therefore they have created a debt of \$15 billion. They have created an interest on the public debt in this fiscal year of \$760 million. When the taxpayers, through their legislature and their government, have to spend \$760 million in interest on the debt, it reduces the options for providing funding for many, many programs that any government would like to provide to the people of Saskatchewan.

I think the member from Souris-Cannington should take a deep look at himself and ask himself the question, why did he sit back, why did he . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Moosomin, I apologize. I don't want the public to be misled — the member from Moosomin — especially his public. I want the member opposite to examine why he sat back and let the government that he was a part of get away with that kind of waste of taxpayers' money for 10 years.

Mr. Toth: — I'm glad the member corrected himself because I certainly didn't want to be tied into the former member from Souris-Cannington. That, Mr. Minister, we can all and certainly we can all, if we want to I suppose we could all raise everybody else's dirty linen but I'm not sure we want to really get involved and into that.

I think the taxpayers out there and certainly the electorate in Saskatchewan, not just Saskatchewan but across Canada and across North America, are looking for men and women who are entering the political sphere to be more forthright, be more upright, and give them a reason as to why they should be supporting individuals who would seek political office.

Coming back to the Pension Plan, Mr. Minister, you've given us every reason why it should have been scrapped. I would suggest to you though that there were many people out there, even if it was individual rather than family income, yes probably some people with higher family incomes didn't get in on the Pension Plan, but the fact is there were many people, Mr. Minister, who didn't have that opportunity even with the family income to hit that higher tax bracket. And therefore . . . well even if they did, Mr. Minister, the government wouldn't have matched that funding and they would have just made their contribution and then the money would have been put into a fund or I believe it's in a fund, accumulating whatever it can through interest so that it can build on itself.

I think the other argument that has been presented too was the fact that there was a minimum pay-out and so individuals who maybe were 63 or 64 years of age could have made two payments and collected \$15 a month for, say, the rest of their life and that certainly would put the Pension Plan in a position where it would start off not

being able to carry itself. But I think, Mr. Minister, looking at the Pension Plan if it would have been allowed to develop over the years, in due time . . . in fact I believe it was just last week or the week before there was an article in one of the local papers, indicated that by I believe the early mid-'90s or whatever the Pension Plan could have carried itself.

And so, Mr. Minister, I would again ask you to give due consideration to this plan, take a serious look at it because I think what you're receiving in your office, many people are asking you to look at ways and options of which the plan could still be saved and still address the needs of individuals out there with no other form of pension plan.

The question, Mr. Minister, regarding funds that will be refunded to individuals I understand from some of the questions that came forward in the House earlier, that there is a process of negotiation regarding the taxation of these funds. Mr. Minister, can you inform the House as to whether the individuals are going to be facing that challenge of having to pay the taxes on these funds as they're allocated now or are they going to be able to work it into another form of an annuity to at least allow that money to work for them.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well I indicated on several occasions that that's discussions that are taking place with the federal government. That kind of information will come forward when the legislation is brought before the House. At that time we'll be able to explain all that.

As soon as we have an indication from the federal government whether people will be able to roll this over into an RRSP (registered retirement savings plan) or other such provisions without any tax penalty — I hope that they will agree to do that; I have no reason to believe that they won't — then we'll be able to indicate to the member what those provisions are.

I want to remind the member from Moosomin that this pension plan which was created by the former government on the eve of an election to try to get some votes is going to have an unfunded liability in another three years of \$80 million — \$80 million in additional unfunded liability.

So I ask the member opposite . . . I mean we're all open-minded here. We should all be prepared to consider various options. I ask you whether he would favour this. Would he favour continuing the Pension Plan but eliminating the taxpayers' matching grant of 300 and doing away with the guaranteed minimum income and leave the Pension Plan in place? Would you be prepared to accept that, Mr. Member?

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, and certainly Mr. Premier . . . since the Premier seems to be paying attention right now. I think there are lots of people out there, Mr. Minister, that have indicated that they recognize there's a debt. In fact the letter here indicates . . . and your office may have even responded to it. I'm not sure. It just came in very recently.

The individual says here, I agree with paying off the provincial debt. And he says, I am going to be paying

more or many other personal costs at my level as well to help pay off the provincial debt. Many people out there agree that we should be paying off the debt. Many people agree that we should begin to live within our means. And certainly it's something that I have said over the past number of years, that we must all learn to live within our means, Mr. Minister.

But what I want to remind you of, Mr. Minister, is that while you told the people of Saskatchewan one thing — the fact that \$4.5 billion would be enough to operate the government on — since you've brought down your budget I notice it's well over the \$5 billion that were going to the expenditures that you brought in this present budget.

And the Premier talks about opening the books. And certainly, Mr. Minister, I believe your commission indicated that the books were in fact open. The books have been available to anyone who wanted to look at them.

And what the biggest problem we have I guess in government, whether it's provincial, whether it's federal, it doesn't matter where it is, the fact that I guess, and I guess my own argument comes to play here, is that maybe our parliamentary system of democracy, it's got some things that could be changed to kind of change the system.

But, Mr. Minister, what we have here as well is unfortunately a lot of political rhetoric taking place, and it comes from both sides of the House. Of course when you look at the last interim supply and I find out, looking at the *Hansard* from last year, Mr. Minister, we were into a lot of rhetoric on interim supply. And certainly this isn't going to be held up through the summer; I want to be out golfing. I think I'd like to try some golfing especially after my wife just went and spent some money on new golf clubs for me, and I think many of your officials would like to enjoy that as well.

But, Mr. Minister, the questions we're raising here and that I'd like to raise before you tonight are the fact that the questions that have come across our desks as well. Just to make sure the government is aware of the concerns out there and as I indicated earlier . . .

Your government in your throne speech indicated that there will be a broad consultation process working together with individuals to help design programs.

(2030)

And coming back to a comment made by a number of government members, what was our plan. Well, Mr. Premier and certainly Mr. Finance Minister, we did lay out a plan. And the former minister laid out a plan last spring which I indicated to many people in my constituency was not the type of budget you would bring in prior to going in to a provincial election. You wouldn't tell people that times are tough. You would want to be in fact opening the purse strings.

And I guess, Mr. Minister, what part of the process of our whole political system is getting people to begin to

understand politics as well. And if indeed they want the debt to be paid off, then the voters out there are going to have to realize that they can't have everything handed to them as well. We must work together, and I acknowledge that. And I'm just sorry, Mr. Minister, that you weren't as open and forthright and honest with people prior to October 23, as you all of a sudden appear to be right now.

But at the same time, Mr. Minister, will you take the time to consult and at least ask for people's input on the Pension Plan so that we could, working together, design something that would help those who do not have access to a pension plan?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, once again this has got very little to do with interim supply, but we have been consulting. We've been listening to what the people have been saying on everything that is under the purview of the Government of Saskatchewan.

But extensive consultations prior to the budget, I think the number of meetings was something like 52 or 55 meetings that we had all around Saskatchewan, asking people what some of their priorities are. It was from some of those meetings that the idea came forward to us that the Saskatchewan Pension Plan needed a look at.

I ask the member from Moosomin again — because in the consultation I'm quite prepared to consult with even members of the opposition; this is the new, open government — so I ask the member from Moosomin: would he favour continuing the Pension Plan, but doing away with the \$300 matching for the time being while we've got this horrendous deficit problem and doing away with a guaranteed minimum income which is going to create the unfunded liability of \$18 million. Would you be helpful and indicate whether that would be of some interest to you?

Now I want to make a comment on two things that the member said. He said something about \$4.5 billion should be sufficient for the Government of Saskatchewan to spend — I agree. And because I agree that's why this expenditure in the budget this year is \$4.25 billion and not \$4.5 billion. It is less than the expenditure in 1991-1992. The only thing that we were not able to do anything about, because we have no control over it, is the interest on the public debt which is \$760 million. That's there, we can't just cut that or eliminate it or reduce it. You created it; we have to live with it. And we're going to manage over time until we can begin to cut that back. We're beginning to repay the mortgage which the former government created.

Now I want to say also, finally to the member, that in the interests of Saskatchewan people, and in the interests of guaranteeing a future for them and their children and my children and your children, I'm prepared to give up the odd golf game this summer if that's what it takes in order to get that accomplished.

The Chair: — The Chair would like to intervene. The Chair has made a ruling earlier this evening regarding the directing of questions to the interim supply Bill. I've listened carefully, and it seems to me the member's question as well as the minister's response varied

substantially beyond the provision of interim supply. And I'll ask both the members, as well as the minister, to keep your comments to the provision of interim supply.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, I just would like to remind the Chair of the broad range in debate that certainly has taken place, and I appreciate your ruling . . .

The Chair: — I simply remind the member that the ruling has been stated here earlier this evening and I'll ask the co-operation of members on both sides of the House, including the minister, to co-operate with the Chair's previous ruling.

Mr. Toth: — Boy the Premier sure has an . . .

The Chair: — I will ask the member to try to be less provocative of others in the House and direct his attention to the Bill before us.

Mr. Toth: — Well, Mr. Chair, I won't take a lot more time, because I think there's an important hockey game . . . I guess my responsibility is to be in the House.

Mr. Minister, in light of the ruling of the Chair, a very simple question and straightforward question, what is the surplus in the Pension Plan as it is today?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we're not dealing here with the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. That is not a question that has got anything to do with the interim supply. There's no money here provided for the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. The member can ask that when the Department of Finance is here in estimates. I'm trying to abide by your ruling as best I can.

Mr. Toth: — I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance is the person we are directing our questions to tonight. And possibly the minister would have knowledge of the answers or at least to have some answers for the questions we've directed.

Mr. Minister, I just want to ask a question regarding the harmonization of the education and health tax with the GST (goods and services tax). Mr. Minister, can you inform the House what revenues were forfeited by the government of the day by not harmonizing that tax?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'd ask, in light of your ruling, to determine whether that is an appropriate question since it's dealing with revenues and we're dealing with expenditures in interim supply.

The Chair: — The Chair is of the view that the question is out of order as it doesn't pertain to the interim supply Bill.

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to, on my point of order, relate a short quote from *Hansard*, May 3, 1991. And this I think deals with the type of question that the member from Moosomin is dealing with. It's the member from Riversdale:

I'm elected to ask those questions on behalf of farmers in Norquay and my place is right now —

grievance before supply. And the farmers have a grievance and I want some answers from this Minister of Finance (and I want it) right now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the debate in question — if the member from Riversdale will listen — the debate in question was on NISA (net income stabilization account) and GRIP.

The Chair: — Order, order. I will ask all members of the House to come to order and allow the member to make his point.

Mr. Swenson: — Now, Mr. Chairman, previous to this the chairman had made the same ruling that you did, sir. The member from Riversdale then proceeded through one, two, three, four, five pages of *Hansard* asking very detailed questions on GRIP and NISA. How much the per capita cost was to each taxpayer in the province. How the federal-provincial sharing arrangements on GRIP and NISA work.

And I must say that the minister of Finance of the day was very forthcoming to the member from Riversdale. I mean the spirit of co-operation of answering questions was there. And the member rightly said, the minister of Finance is here. This is grievance before supply. And I think it's only appropriate, Mr. Chairman, that the member from Moosomin is asking very broad questions dealing with the Pension Plan, not the detail that the member from Riversdale asked last year.

The Minister of Finance is the minister in charge. And it is grievance before supply.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Chairman, to the point of order.

The Chair: — On the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The member said this was something that he found on the debates on May 3, 1991. It was Friday. Well I followed up on that as well. And I found out that after that the chairman of the committee made a ruling. This is May 3, 1991, Friday. And the chairman said that:

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

That was a ruling that was quite appropriate in May 3, 1991, Mr. Chairman. And that is a ruling that is quite appropriate on June 1, 1992.

Mr. Neudorf: — If I might, Mr. Chairman, above the hollering of the House Leader opposite and the Premier, I would like to make my voice heard on this point of order as well and speak to it, if I might, sir. Thank you.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I'd heard you say that a question dealing with revenue was not in order, that

we're dealing with expenditures only. Well I submit to you, sir, that that cannot be the case. If we are going to be . . . if the government opposite is going to be asking us as members of the opposition to approve spending, surely to goodness, sir, we have the right then to be able to ascertain whether the revenues are going to be there in order to pay for the expenditures that the government opposite is asking us to pay.

That's all we want to know, sir, is will the revenues be there in order to pay for the bills, since we're all agreed that the deficit is something that we don't want. And that's why we're pursuing this line of questioning dealing with the revenue, to make sure that the monies will in fact be in place to pay for the bills that the government is asking us to spend.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the specific point of order raised by the Minister of Finance, and that is this. Will the questions be too detailed?

Now I think you recognize that the premise on which this House operates is not only on specific rules as outlined in our rules and procedures book, but rather also on tradition and exercise; the way things operate. And I've got quotes galore, Mr. Chairman, of a previous . . . one of the chairmen that sits right where you're sitting right now, questions that he asked during interim supply, detailed questions.

I'll just give you one quick quote here from Mr. Van Mulligen. It says, and I quote, from April 9, 1990, and the member from Regina Victoria says:

Well now I really have some questions, Mr. Minister.

And I repeat for your benefit:

Well now I really have some questions, Mr. Minister. The government last year announced a \$100 million capital program for municipalities; 25 million of that was to go to rural municipalities, 75 million was to go to urban municipalities. It was supposed to be a six-year program of approximately \$12.5 million annually which, if you multiply it, comes to \$75 million.

And it goes on and on talking about the capital program, and detailed questions. And the minister, Mr. Chairman, if I might, answers it in detail, not as the current minister is doing. So, Mr. Chairman, precedent has it that what we are doing is exactly the way the House operates. And the revenue question I have already addressed and I would ask you to take that into consideration as well. Thank you.

The Chair: — Order, order. In responding to the point of order raised by the member for Thunder Creek, the Chair recognizes that the review of the interim finance Bill before the House this evening is . . . this is the third day that this consideration is before the House and the . . .

An Hon. Member: — It's not as long as it's been.

The Chair: — Order. And the Chair recognizes that it becomes increasingly difficult as time goes by, in review

of the interim supply Bill, to avoid asking questions which are so specific that they should be more appropriately directed to estimate reviews. And therefore it becomes understandably more difficult to keep the questions on line with . . . as appropriate to the interim supply.

Further, the Chair holds the view that the interim supply Bill does not deal with matters of revenue and that those questions are more appropriately directed to the Minister of Finance in review of the Department of Finance. I therefore find that the point of order raised by the member from Thunder Creek is not well taken.

(2045)

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I was just going . . . a couple comments here. First of all the Minister of Finance, in his budget or earlier on or early in the month of May, came down with a budget increase of 1 per cent on the sales tax. What amount of funding is the Minister expecting to derive from the . . .

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated, certainly the revenues must be available for the minister to make the expenditures. Or is the minister just asking this House, asking the people of Saskatchewan, to give him a blank cheque and allow him . . . He keeps talking about the fact of balancing the budget, but how can he balance the budget unless he's able to show that he's got the expenditures available to him in order to — or the revenue — in order to meet the expenditures he's asking in this one-twelfth interim supply Bill?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the member opposite is out of order again. But I want just to reassure him that no, we're not asking for a blank cheque. That's why we have an interim supply Bill which is detailed expenditures, department by department on a basis of one-twelfth, except where there is a need for additional money which has been clearly explained to the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not a blank cheque. We're asking the legislature to vote on this interim supply. But this interim supply is not considering the revenue side of government. That will be done when each of the Bills comes to this Legislative Assembly. They have been introduced. They're in the order paper. And that will come when the Department of Finance is here as part of the . . . as part of a Committee of Finance.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, you just commented or made a comment on the fact that the interim supply you asked for is detailed, and certainly we're into details on expenditure of the interim supply. And I guess that's some of the . . . many of the questions we've been posing, Mr. Minister, have been, yes they have been dealing with some detail. But certainly when you're asking for \$21 million in the . . . for Highways and Transportation for one-twelfth, Mr. Minister . . .

Yes when you talk about detail, I'm wondering what you mean by being detailed before us. Is it just the one page we have in front of us that there's X number of dollars for Health or X number of dollars for Community Services or X number of dollars for Natural Resources? Is that the

detail or are we supposed to be getting . . . Like I mean how do we find out what you really mean by detail when you're talking about a lump sum of money to a department? We're interested in knowing how that lump sum of money is going to be spent or used to cover expenditures within each department for one-twelfth, for the month, in this case for the month of June.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, if the member is really sincere in his question, then he will stop filibustering the interim supply Bill along with his colleagues . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — In order that the various departments which can provide the detail can be brought before this Committee of Finance so that he can ask his questions and get the answers. That's when the detailed expenditures, subvote by subvote and program by program, are considered by the legislature. What we're considering here, Mr. Chairman, as you have so adequately ruled, is interim supply, which is provisions for one month expenditure for each of the departments, except in cases where more or advanced funding has to be provided, such as revenue sharing, school division grants, and some other funding which have been outlined for the purposes of the legislature already on a number of occasions.

Mr. Toth: — Well, Mr. Minister, it's . . . As I've been sitting here and listening to some of the responses and certainly perusing through some of *Hansard* from 1990, it would almost be appropriate for the opposition members to take the time to maybe put into *Hansard* some of the comments made by, even then Leader of the Opposition, the . . . I don't know whether it was 30-minute tirade. The member went on at great length at that time in addressing his questions to the minister of Finance.

And certainly, Mr. Minister, what we have been addressing is bringing before you specific questions on different departments, because we are very concerned about the fact that many people out in rural Saskatchewan are wondering about the funding that will be coming to their areas, whether . . . In many cases most people just do not feel it's going to meet the needs out there, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, I believe in Community Services you have asked for \$16 million. And I'm not sure if this . . . It's an increase of some 4 million over what the one-twelfth would be. And I'm not sure, Mr. Minister, if you've been asked about that increase. I know in a number of cases when the question has been asked, certainly you have brought out the fact that there are other areas and departments where there have been increases that you've had the extra funding available. What would this funding, the extra 4 million, be for in Community Services?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the question that was asked last Thursday and the answer was provided last Thursday. But I will provide the information to the member opposite because it's within the interim supply, and this is the second time I've provided the answer in two days . . . in three days.

The additional amount over one-twelfth is \$4,970,000. The purposes of that additional amount over the interim supply provision, Mr. Chairman, is for urban revenue-sharing to accommodate the quarterly payment schedule which is an additional \$3.6 million; northern revenue-sharing, \$.7 million for the same purpose; and grants to libraries to accommodate once again the quarterly payment schedule of \$600,000. That's why that provision is there. I provided that information on Thursday and I'm pleased, for the interest of the member, to provide it again today.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, would you be able to supply us with the details of the expenditures on the 316 on the warrant and the 360 on the warrant? Would you be able to supply us with the details of the expenditures that you provided for the province?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I just ask the member opposite to check the record. They were special warrants, they were orders in council, they're public documents; members of the opposition have them in their office. But if the member has lost his copy, I will undertake to provide it to the members opposite. It's a public document, and I don't have it with me today. In fact I'll undertake — and I'd ask my officials to make sure that it's done — that we'll send it for the member to his office tomorrow. I will personally make sure that he gets it.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you. Would you also supply a list of the volumes of dollars on the guarantees that we have in the province of Saskatchewan. You've mentioned them as the fertilizer plant, the pulp mill, NewGrade, all of the others. Would you provide them to us too in a detailed . . . not in total like you've got them here but in the detail of each one.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm very pleased to let the member know that he's got it on his desk. It was provided to him on May 7 in very great detail. For the first time in the history of this legislature that information is part of the new accountability, has been provided. If he looks at the budget speech, the supporting documents, all of the detail is provided on page 62 and page 63 under "Consolidated Fund . . . Guaranteed Debt by Purpose".

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you also consider providing the difference between what is in CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) and what is in the Consolidated Fund? Is there any of the debt that is in the items that we have listed on page 40 as part of the provincial debt, have you got some of that in CIC and have you got some of that in the Consolidated Fund?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, there's no other information that needs to be provided. It's all in the budget speech plus all of the supplementary tables that are in the back of the budget with all of the documents. All of the debt, detail by detail, where it is directed to, where it is held both in the Consolidated Fund side and in the Crown corporation side is in the budget speech, which the member opposite has had for a month now.

Mr. Martens: — How much is the total of the volume of dollars that you . . . You transferred \$875 million worth of debt into the Consolidated Fund from CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan). What is the volume of dollars that are there in retained earnings and profits that were there up to 1990 . . .

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chair, once again I ask you to make a ruling. I think the member is out of order. But he also has had tabled in the House for several days now, maybe a couple of weeks, a copy of the Crown Investments Corporation annual report which outlines all of the information he's requesting, and all he has to do is look at it.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, in that report, is there the volume of revenue in the CIC volume of income for 1990 and for the retained earnings?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we're not considering here the Crown Investments Corporation. We're considering interim supply and I ask you to indicate whether that question is in order.

The Chair: — In response to the minister's request for a ruling, that has been ruled out of order previously and continues to be out of order on the interim supply.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, on May 28 you agreed that you were here to justify the need for interim supply, and yet it would seem that we cannot ask detailed questions on how the money is to be spent. How can you justify to the Assembly that you need the money if you will not answer some detailed questions as to where the money is to be spent?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, because as Minister of Finance, I provided a very detailed budget, more detailed than ever in the history of Saskatchewan, which provides information that's never before been provided, and the member knows that. He can get all the information he wants by looking at the budget, by taking a look at the *Estimates* which provides all of the detailed expenditures, and on the basis of those documents, we are asking for one-twelfth as interim supply. Where the money, in detail, is going to be spent is not spent by the Department of Finance. It's spent by the Department of Energy and Mines, Rural Affairs, Health, Agriculture.

If the member opposite wants to know the detailed answers to those detailed questions, let's pass the interim supply Bill so our school divisions can get their money, so that our nursing homes can get their money, and give time for these departments to come forward as Committee of Finance so that they can answer all of the questions that you want about the specifics.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, my colleague had a good question for you. You say you're not responsible for how the money is spent. Whose name is on the cheque?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the comptroller's name is on the cheque. The deputy minister's name is on the cheque, but how the

determination of the expenditure of money is made is determined by each of the individual departments responsible.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, the individual departments determine where the money is to be allocated to. But you, sir, are the one who decides if the money is going to go to those departments. And you're here asking whether or not you can have one-twelfth of that money at this time. And yet it's your department, your deputy minister that does put his name on that cheque when it gets spent. Mr. Minister, I believe you need to answer some of those detailed questions here so that we may know that you are indeed justified in having that money.

Mr. Minister, you have stated previously that some of the budget items are statutory; therefore they're not being funded through interim supply. Could you give us a list of those statutory items? The list you gave us the other day did not include the statutory items, only those that were not statutory.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, can you indicate whether that's in order?

(2100)

The Chair: — Order. Order. The minister has asked for a ruling as to whether the question is in order. The Chair rules that questions on statutory items are not in order on the motion before us in the interim supply for the . . . Order. Order on both sides of the House please.

I would advise the member as well that he will be able to determine which are the statutory items if he reviews the *Estimates* booklet. And for example, just for the clarification of the member, if he would turn to page 66 of the *Estimates* booklet, he would find items no. 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are all statutory items and are recognized as such because they're noted as such in the book. The question is therefore ruled out of order.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in the Education department interim supply that you have requested, does your estimate include any items which may have come up after your budget which may not have been included in part . . . as part of your budget estimates, the total amount of money that you've requested?

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

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, there is a new review panel being struck in the Department of Education. Will it be funded . . . is it in your budget that you presented in beginning of May?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, is part of the interim supply going to fund this new review panel?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — If the review panel has been appointed within the context of the Department of Education, there will have been one-twelfth provided.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, I don't know if this question is perhaps too detailed for the Chairman, but what is the . . .

The Chair: — Order. I will ask the member to not involve the Chair in debate in the Assembly and I'm sure that it was done unintentionally. And I just ask the member to keep that in mind.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Minister, what is the mandate of this organizational review committee?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, that question has got nothing to do with interim supply. That's a question that the department and the Minister of Education will have to answer.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. What I'm going to be doing in the next few minutes is pursuing a line of questioning initiated by the minister during part of his rambling political rampage that he had on in a wide-ranging discussion pertaining to the interim supply Bill. And I would like to pursue some of those issues that he was raising during his dissertation.

One of them deals with the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, which I believe is specifically in your purview, and the fact that you have simply gutted it, removed it, in spite of protestations by many of the people of the Saskatchewan public. And you mentioned, Mr. Minister, during your discussion, that one of the reasons why you felt justified in doing away with the Saskatchewan Pension Plan was because there were many individuals who were earning 60,000 and I believe you said \$80,000 and more. And so therefore you felt it inappropriate that the Saskatchewan taxpayer should be taking 300-and-some dollars and matching that.

Now, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you, was that one of the prime considerations for you doing away with the Saskatchewan Pension Plan in spite of an extreme amount of protestations by the people of Saskatchewan after you had done it and they found out, which means of course that there was no previous consultation?

And I ask that question quite sincerely because it's entirely appropriate for this interim supply since you were the one that brought those issues up in your address. So I want you to answer that question, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, this interim supply addresses none of the questions that the member opposite raises. He will have to ask that question with Saskatchewan Pension Plan comes before this House or when the legislation comes before the House when we can more appropriately answer those questions.

Mr. Neudorf: — Absolutely not. Absolutely not, Mr. Minister. You took political licence by raising that issue and making those points. Therefore you are held accountable for making those issues. Now don't give me that nonsense that I don't have a right to ask you questions about statements that you're making here tonight. So therefore, Mr. Minister, I want you to back up what you

said by answering my question.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the interim supply Bill does not deal with the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. We're considering here the interim supply Bill, not the Saskatchewan Pension Plan and therefore I suggest that the member's question is out of order.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, we did not raise that. It was that member across the way that in the discourse of the debate on this interim supply he raised it. The evidence is there. And this was your response to that and you went further and you justified your actions, your blatant political actions in gutting and doing away with the Saskatchewan Pension Plan based on that issue. And that was the central issue of your answer.

Now I'm just picking up on what you brought forward. It's not something that I brought forward, you did. And the Chairman agreed that that was in order because he did not make any intervention whatsoever. So therefore I'm just pursuing a legitimate line of questioning.

Furthermore, Mr. Minister, you responded by asking our member the question, would we support you if you modified . . .

The Chair: — Order, order. The Chair will intervene because the member is involving the Chair in the debate. I do remind the member that after the debate that you were referring to, a ruling was requested and was made. Still before us is the interim supply Bill and the appropriateness of questions is determined by the interim supply motion, not whether someone has made reference to that topic before or not. There has been wide-ranging debate in the first two and a half days of this motion before us and many questions were put to the minister, which technically he would not have been required to respond to but did. However, a ruling has been made this evening in response to a request for a ruling. And therefore I will advise the member that your question is out of order.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, I know that you're getting antsy about having to face the opposition who is asking questions, demanding answers, and you're stonewalling us. The openness of your government is obviously at question here. And I think you're feeling the pressure by now, as supported by your Premier sitting beside you a little while ago that was making this issue as well.

Now, Mr. Minister, you asked us the question. You asked the question, would we support you if you would have just excluded those \$80,000 income. That's the question that you asked this side, if we would support that type of a change.

Then, Mr. Minister, if that's not true, then I want you to put into your own words once more what you said a little while ago to my colleague. If you're saying that what I'm saying is not true, then you put the truthful words out now. I want to hear them.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I respect your ruling and I recognize the member's out of order. I do not intend to be out of order as well.

Mr. Neudorf: — We're not getting anywhere, the minister from Swift Current says, and I agree with you, member from Swift Current, that the minister has clammed up. The openness of a government is just not there. We, as representatives of the Saskatchewan taxpayers, want to know before we take 460-some-odd millions of dollars of taxpayers' money and just give you a blank cheque as to how it's going to be spent, some indication, some rationale. And you refuse to give it. Why? I'm not quite sure. Whether it's that you're feeling that your time would be more appropriately spent somewhere else doing some other things, but we do have questions.

Now, Mr. Minister, another thing that you said 43 minutes ago, according to the time, is when you made the statement of how well your consultation process had gone prior to the budget. That was what you were saying. And you were saying you had consulted with a great deal of people, great numbers of people. And you're getting cocky and you're being all flippant about it. I recognize that. But this consultation process that you referred to, that set up the budget of which we are now taking one-twelfth in this interim supply, what I would ask you, sir, is the consultative process that you're talking about — who did you consult on this? Did you consult the optometrists? Would you please answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we consulted widely across all of the public of Saskatchewan. We had public meetings. We had meetings of community leaders. We had meetings which involved the various professions. We had meetings which involved, jointly, trade union meetings and chamber of commerces and business people. We consulted probably more widely than ever before has there been a consultation in the province of Saskatchewan prior to this budget.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, I welcome the member's answer which was broad ranging. Would you answer this question specifically then: did you consult with optometrists?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, respective ministers would have consulted with their respective organizations which their departments referred to. And if the member wants to know all of the different ministers and who they consulted with in the preparation for this budget, he's going to have to ask that question when those departments come to Committee of Finance.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, a question that is slightly different. And I know that the Minister of Justice, for example, has committed himself in this institution here, that there has not been one single case of patronage since you folks took over the government. I think he made that commitment — not one case of patronage. Everybody that was hired, was hired strictly on the basis of competence, of ability, and qualifications.

I asked you the other day, sir, a question which you committed yourself to answer. And I'm still waiting for an answer, and I haven't got that answer yet. Specifically, the question was: who are your direct staff? What are their qualifications? How long have they worked for you? And what is their remuneration? Could you pass that over

please.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The member did ask the question. I said that I would have it. I had it the day that he asked the question but he left the House when I had it ready, and he wasn't here for me to give it to him. I have it here and I'm quite prepared to pass it over to the member opposite, if we have a page.

(2115)

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Minister, I appreciate you sending this over, and I notice that there are two gentlemen here that obviously have served in this particular position for a long time and have done a commendable job for the people of Saskatchewan.

I notice however one individual here whose position from January to May of 1992 is the associate deputy minister, an associate deputy minister, budget analysis division for the Saskatchewan Finance department. I notice that he has something, a Master's of Public Administration. He has a Doctorate in History and a Bachelor of Arts in History. And at the same time I notice that he has been special advisor and assistant cabinet secretary, Executive Council; director of research for the official opposition which of course means, I would assume that means the NDP; an executive director, development branch, Department of Labour; and budget bureau in '75,'78 . . . 1987 . . . pardon me, for \$87,000 for the province of Saskatchewan. The point to me is, on what basis did you as Minister of Finance see fit to hire an NDP advisor?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the fact that Mr. Dotson was fully qualified, he had extensive experience in the budget bureau in the 1970's. The member for Rosthern points that out. He's had experience as an executive director. He does indeed have a Master's degree in Public Administration which is important in fulfilling the role which he now occupies. He's a qualified individual, does an outstanding job. And if only we could have more people like that and if only the members opposite had made a point of listening to the advice of people like that we probably wouldn't be in the financial mess that we face in Saskatchewan today.

Mr. Neudorf: — Describe his line of work. What precisely does he do for your department?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — This particular branch is responsible for tax policy, fiscal policy, and budget analysis for the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I asked questions to the minister for exactly an hour and 50 minutes. And I went through these questions and answers by supper hour, and I feel if he had just answered the questions we could have done it in about 35 to 40 minutes, but you weren't answering questions. But we finally did . . . we got you into a corner and some of these questions you did answer. But we lost nearly an hour — I suppose not quite that long — about three-quarters of an hour, Mr. Minister, just for you to admit to the public of Saskatchewan and to the viewers who, you or the department, advises the

personnel that brings in the different credit ratings for the province of Saskatchewan. And you would not . . . you took 10 minutes and then another 10 and then finally you, after three-quarters of an hour, you admit it.

And then finally we got you to admit there was a \$3.5 billion deficit we took over in 1982. But you misrepresented all the people in the province of Saskatchewan at election time when you go out there and said, you've been saying for 10 years, we left a balanced budget in 1982, but finally we have it on the record from you, Mr. Minister of Finance, that we took over a \$3.5 billion . . .

So I'm saying that hour and three-quarters I guess wasn't wasted because you finally said that it's the department, that it's your hundred officials that do the advising, to advise the personnel that comes up with the credit rating. It took a long time but you finally did it, Mr. Minister. And that's quite important. So we did achieve that and we got it on the record about the 3.5 billion.

But I'm very disappointed, Mr. Minister, that tonight you're not wanting to answer any questions at all. We could be off the interim supply Bill; you're just trying to stand up here and stonewall the people of Saskatchewan to make them think that the Tories are the ones holding up this Bill. Well why didn't you . . . As one of the members said a while ago, why didn't you bring this Bill in about two weeks ago? You didn't need to wait until the last minute.

Mr. Minister, I just can't believe this because I've been here for about my 15th budget and I've seen every minister including ours on the Tories side, on the government side, and on your side say, well these questions aren't applicable, you'll have to get the answers from the departments. But in every single case there was some decency among the ministers, in every single case, even when you were minister back in 1982. You gave in, because we looked at *Hansards* and you answered the particular questions about the departments.

What's so different about 1992? Why can't you just answer a few questions that we're asking? It's not out of the ordinary. We went through . . . The Premier was sitting here tonight and he was chirping from his seat that what's the matter with us bunch of goofs over here, and we were reading his questions that he asked. He asked about GRIP and NISA. And Mr. Hepworth, the then minister of Finance says, well I don't think I should have to answer these questions about Quebec and Ontario, but finally with decency the now Premier got his answers. So I'm going to ask you some precise questions and I expect an answer, and so maybe we can yet finish this by 10:30 tonight . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Maybe, we'll see.

I have these series of questions I'm going to ask you, Mr. Minister. It's about the Conference Board of Canada recently did a 3 per cent turnaround on its predictions for the Saskatchewan economy. Before you started your political meddling, the Conference Board predicted our economy would grow by 2.2 per cent. Now after they have seen you in action, they say we will go into an economic decline for about 1 per cent.

You try to explain this away by saying the Conference Board is using predictions about the farm economy. But, Mr. Minister, they're saying that you're using predictions. You said this afternoon it was predictions is what you're going by. And they've used . . . If you read their own report, Mr. Minister, they say they did not make the prediction worse because they are assuming higher world prices for grain — higher, not lower, Mr. Minister — higher prices. So these are rosy predictions really. The fact is if the world price for grain doesn't make a significant jump, the economic decline of the province will be worse.

Mr. Minister, will you give us the analysis of your department in regard to the farm economy? Now that's not too much to ask. That's an overall picture and it's not too much to ask the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we're considering interim supply and not economic policies of the province of Saskatchewan. And when the member from Arm River asks that question during Committee of Finance we'll, as best we can, provide the information that is not internal information for the purposes of government decision making. He will get his answers then.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, you're the one that went for 25 minutes tonight and you covered every political department you could and you were as political as you could be. You threw the debate wide open. Now you did that yourself. And you set your own precedents by Thursday and Friday, and for a while this afternoon you were answering questions. Now why won't you answer a few of these questions.

If this farming economy in Saskatchewan is not important enough, not important enough, Mr. Minister, that you can just slough it off in your arrogant way . . . And I'm the one that put on the record this afternoon that I feel that you, as an individual, are a right and proper man, that I have great respect for you as an individual. I'm not saying anything about your philosophy. We have disagreement there but we both have our God-given right for that.

But there's nothing wrong, Mr. Minister, with you standing here as the Minister of Finance, which there must have been before you talked about the . . . and put this \$469 million together that you're asking us to approve and you're asking us . . . And you can certainly answer a few broad questions and you're refusing to do it tonight. You're just absolutely refusing to do it.

Now it's not reasonable, Mr. Minister. Will you not tell us . . . I'll ask you one more time: what projections are they using and what assumptions? Just give me the analysis, and perhaps there would be for other members, about the analysis of your department in regard to the farm economy. Surely to goodness you can give us an overall thinking of what's going on.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information here because this is interim supply. But I can tell the member opposite that all of the assumptions that are made in this budget are assumptions on the basis of a normal, average crop year, not an exceptional year

like we had last year. That is the way budgets traditionally make their assumptions and that's the way this assumption is made.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, surely if they made these assumptions on averages, what price did they go by? You must know that. You must have used some average.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, as previously ruled, I think the member's questions are really getting out of order and he's trying to kill the time of this House for I don't know what good reason. We're on interim supply and I think we should deal with interim supply.

The Chair: — The minister makes a good point. At present we are not dealing with the estimates, we are debating a resolution as it pertains to an interim supply Bill. We are not voting individual departmental estimates. Supply Bills are to issue money required in advance of complete parliamentary sanction. Debate should focus on the need to grant, reduce, or refuse supply in respect to the resolution before the committee.

I would invite the member to discuss departmental policies and details of programs under the appropriate departmental estimates.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, it is for sure that your department and these hundred officials of your department must have discussed very, very clearly among yourselves — you must have — to come up with the averages of what it is going to cost for the GRIP program in the province of Saskatchewan. I'm sure you did. And so you said you've used averages and that's where you got your figures from. What would your average be if we had a 1988 crop? Now you must have that. You would have to have those figures. And that's not a question that should be out of line to ask in this House.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Both the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, and the Department of Finance will be before the Committee of Finance when those questions can be answered. The member opposite knows that's the appropriate place to ask those questions. We're here considering a resolution to provide interim supply for one month's expenditures based on the overall budget of the government. The overall budget will be considered in Committee of Finance when the Department of Finance is here answering questions with respect to that budget.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, we can't get any answers out of you so maybe we'll just respond to your 25 minutes that you spoke about before the supper hour. And I would naturally have to be allowed to respond to that.

We'll take Department of Health, Mr. Minister, the hardships you've caused the people in the province of Saskatchewan with Department of Health. I looked at television tonight watching the news, Mr. Minister, and I see some people lining up to get their eyes tested. Did that not bother you, Mr. Minister, when they said people could not pay? That you've cut the seniors of this province off, that there's . . . I can't believe you've done it. I can't believe you've done things like this. It doesn't seem to even bother you. You're the last people . . . you call

yourselves the father of medicare. I can't believe that you, the Tommy Douglas government, that have come in here and eroded your own health care department.

What kind of hardships are you causing these people? Are you wanting people to go blind? They can't afford to get tested. I mean that has got to be . . . where's your heart? I can't believe this.

An Hon. Member: — No heart.

Mr. Muirhead: — The Premier, he says they've haven't got a heart. I agree with them. The now Premier just said that they haven't got a heart. And I'm beginning to believe that. Now haven't you not discussed among yourselves, have you not discussed as a seriousness of the deductible on the drug plan?

Yes, the now Premier, Mr. Chairman, he says it wasn't for the Tories. There's that old rhetoric about the Tories. He wants to blame it onto the Tories. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, when the now Premier was in Outlook, Saskatchewan, election time, he was very, very clear where he was going. He said this terrible deficit that the province of Saskatchewan, that the Tories got us in. And he says, here's the figures. He gave them multi billions of dollars but he says, I promise, I promise, that I'll balance the budget. I will lower taxes. I will create jobs — lower taxes, create jobs, save all the farmers, go to Ottawa, get the money.

And then when you sit down, Mr. Premier, you were asked the question — you were asked it very clearly — that the Tories charge too much for central services. What do you think, Mr. Premier? And you have said it many times throughout the province, my promise will be to hold or lower.

An Hon. Member: — I said that?

Mr. Muirhead: — Yes you did, Mr. Premier. And I'll tell you, that is the worst, blatant break of a political promise that I've ever heard. As I said this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that when the member of Estevan, the premier . . . when he became premier in 1982, he promised to take the gas tax off at midnight that night. And he put it back on seven years later — seven years later when the economy of all of North America was failing. But you people didn't wait seven days. You people didn't wait seven days. You just went right after them.

You promised people that we're going to make sure you have no 7 per cent tax on your hamburgers. You'll never be charged a hamburger tax by us. You had the people, the NDP in my towns of Davidson, and Craik, and Outlook, and across the water from the Last Mountain-Touchwood, said the PST (provincial sales tax) is gone. We're going to have 7 per cent more in our pocket.

(2130)

And were they ever an angry bunch when the E&H (education and health tax) came back on. You didn't even tell them that. It came back . . . hah! That means, Mr. Premier, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier is not out with

the people. And that's exactly, Mr. Chairman, is why they were defeated in 1982 and the now Premier admitted it — that we lost touch with people. And I can't believe it.

As I said this afternoon, I said it many times before that I should be happy politically that you're making these blunders because it's only going to leave you another three years, and we'll be back over there, and you know that. There isn't a doubt about it. There isn't a doubt about it.

But I'm not happy about it. Because I would rather . . . and I feel this in my heart that you would do well and make the people feel good. Believe it. Because who's suffering with your blunders and your miscalculations and your tax grabs is the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

When I've got known NDP people in my constituency that would absolutely have never voted anything but NDP in their life are ashamed of the government that they've elected. They are absolutely ashamed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well there was at election time. There was happened to be about 2,300. And I believe now that it's a hard . . . just the same as the Liberals. It's hard to get them to admit what they voted.

I was talking to a Liberal yesterday, and I know that he had a Liberal sign up against me. And he says, boy it's the Liberals that caused all this problem. I'm sure glad I stayed with you, Gerry. They're all wanting to pretend they didn't cause you people to be over there. They all wanted to pretend this.

You've caused so many hardships that I can't believe what you've done. You've got farmers out there that had faith in you. You got many members right around, the back-benchers around here that come off of farms. And they believed you. They believed you. The signs are still on No. 11 Highway: where's the moratorium? Where's the moratorium? Whether we believe in a moratorium or not, you promised it. You promised a moratorium, and you broke that promise.

But your people came in, and they made such a commotion about this, and they put the . . . (inaudible) . . . to you, and so you had a little meeting here in December and says, well let's put a 90-day freeze on before we really kick them off. And that's exactly what you did. You put a 90-day freeze on, and then on March 31, 1982, I was down to the press room when your Minister of Agriculture had his press conference. And I'll tell you, I was actually reasonably pleased of the some of the things he said.

I was pleased because he said we have listened to the people in the province of Saskatchewan. We've had this here debt review panel, and we've listened all over. So I thought well if this is what's coming from the people of Saskatchewan, then I guess maybe he's doing his job. But after I read it and then after I talked to people, many people, some from my own riding that sent in letters, sent in requests, and you never even paid one bit of attention to them.

You had your GRIP meetings. Mr. Chairman, they had their GRIP meetings all over this province, but they had

their GRIP meetings after they changed the GRIP. What kind of a government goes asks the people after you change it? This government hasn't got the fortitude to even bring in their farm Bill. You promised these farmers . . . You've got farmers every day in the courts of Saskatchewan that are paying money to lawyers and even the judges are coming on side and say, well we got to wait. And they're trying to adjourn and do everything they can, waiting on this government because they promised to save the farmers and there's going to be a six-year leaseback.

Well I can tell you today that you've betrayed everybody in the province of Saskatchewan because this morning I met with my credit unions — they asked me to come and meet with them — and I met with the credit unions from Holdfast and Chamberlain and they're all going to meet with me and they said you've been betrayed. Because they said they went along with your program, they were going to go along with your six-year program but you betrayed them because you're not going to fund their extra four years.

Because McKnight says we've already got a six-year program. They've got a three-year lease program, then they've got a three-year equity, and they're going for another three and that will be nine. They have it in place. And maybe if you had of said to them that we'll also fund you for the other four years. But what are you doing? Mr. Chairman, what these people are doing over here, they're absolutely making a shame . . . a sham out of this government because who is the worst creditor in the province of Saskatchewan is Agricultural Credit Corporation which their own people that work there said the directions . . . And I can give the minister, I'll give the minister the names of the people that work for ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) the directions for this new government.

The direction from them is to clamp down on farmers. And I'll give him the names and you better go and take care of the people that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The minister will get the names because they should be dealt with. A gentleman from Watrous and another one, if I call them gentlemen, Watrous and Outlook, Rosetown, right out of his own area.

If the members over there can sit and chirp and they can laugh away but they should be serious about this because they're asking all the lenders in the province of Saskatchewan, including Farm Credit Corporation, they're asking the major banks, they're asking the credit unions, and they're saying, we would like to go along with what the government is asking us to do but they're not setting an example. They're not setting an example, they're kicking them off ACS as fast as they can, just as fast as you can.

They're down in Frontier, Saskatchewan, the sheriff came in and took over a whole farmyard of machinery and didn't even give them a chance to know about The Exemptions Act, he didn't understand. And they're having a sheriff's sale on this guy's farm in a very few days. Now if you think that's being a heart and showing people, well you can at least tell them what the law is, you could tell them that there's Exemptions Act out there,

there's protection for them and who put the protection there, who made The Exemptions Act the way today, the Tory government done it.

Who put the Mediation Board and Farm Land Security Board but the Tories. You bet we did . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They think it's pretty good now after what you're coming up with. They think it's just great.

Why did you add insult to injury? You haven't brought in the farm Bill. You're adding insult to injury. You socked them another 60 cents a gallon for gas, fifty-nine point something. Mr. Chairman, this is the most disgraceful thing I've ever heard. That a farmer's got to pay more for his power, more for his energy bill, more for his SGI . . . for his plates for his vehicles, and then he has to pay 60 cents a gallon with no rebate for another year.

Now that's got to be a terrible thing to do. That's not helping farmers. That's exactly the opposite of what you said at election time. If you were going to do these things why didn't you say at election time, we are going to put taxes so high that you won't be able to afford to farm? Why didn't you tell them the truth?

Why didn't you tell them you were going to put them off the land? Why didn't you say that? You're not saving them. You promised. You can't save every farmer but you promised you would.

An Hon. Member: — Who did? Who did?

Mr. Muirhead: — You people did. We're going to save all the farmers. This here rhetoric I have to listen to in this here building here for last fall and now that the federal government broke their promise on the third line of defence, the \$500 million. And that's the worst garbage you've ever heard of because you people threw it away, because it was very clearly said by the Minister of Agriculture that the third line of defence will be the GRIP program.

And you said it's too rich so you gutted the GRIP program and put your own useless program in that the farmers don't even know today what they're covered for.

It's like me going in and buying an insurance policy for a fire loss on my house and they said how much do you want to put on. And I say, well let's wait and see till the house burns down and see how much the house is worth then. Then we'll put on that.

Let's just be very, very clear about this, that that \$500 million was never promised. It was only the Premier and a plane load of people that took off to Ottawa and said, backed by the Wheat Pool, we want \$500 million. And boy, I wish you could have got it. We need it. And then we need another 500 million, and then another.

But don't say they broke a promise because they didn't. It's you. It's you, Mr. Chairman. It's the members opposite that took the \$500 million right away from them by gutting the GRIP program. Because they were covered under the old GRIP program. Last year they were covered for \$3.2 billion. And what happened on that \$3.2 billion? They didn't have . . . they were very lucky. The federal

and provincial crop insurance corporations and the government that backed up these payments, they didn't have to do it because there was a good crop and the price of wheat went up.

So you paid about \$800 million out . . . Well it's going to be estimated to be paid out if the price of wheat goes to 2.86 a bushel. If the price of wheat goes to 2.86 a bushel, then you will be paying out about this year 7 or \$800 million. So what this smart Minister of Finance does to the poor Minister of Agriculture is says to him, listen, you got to go out there and you got to get those farmers because we can't afford a 1988 crop, because it would have cost us close to \$3 billion, and I'll have to break my promise by never going to have a balanced budget. If you have one crop failure in the next four years, your balanced budget is washed down the drain. You know that as well as I know it. You know it. You know it for sure.

What about the Department of Parks? What about Environment? What about SaskPower? What about all these cut-backs you've had every place? You've been asked and you've been asked and you've been asked and you've been asked and you've been asked. Did you go out and ask the people? You didn't. Because I say that the Minister of Finance has misled the people in the province of Saskatchewan by standing up here saying, we have talked to all the groups of people. We've been all over the province. And I say you haven't been. Yes, in an aeroplane way above where nobody's seen you. That's the only place you ever communicated in Saskatchewan since the election, is in an aeroplane.

Mr. Chairman, Cleve Bennett from Chamberlain says, I sure wish that the member from Riversdale hadn't become Premier because I used to enjoy his visits when he stopped in to get gas. But now he's flying over in a plane and I don't see him no more. He said, I never see him any more. Gone. He's gone.

The Chair: — Order. Order. Order. I'm sitting very close to the member and I'm having some difficulty hearing him. And while I'm making that point, hard as I try, I'm having difficulty in relating the comments of the member to the motion at hand. And I know that he will do so, and I would certainly encourage him to relate his comments to the motion which is to vote a certain sum of money for interim supply.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Every point I've made tonight is connected with the \$460 million because this Minister will not tell us exactly and where the money is going to go. He sent a little paper over here and says, this is what we estimate. And then he won't answer questions how he got his estimations. If he won't talk about the \$469 million and where it's going . . . You tell me. I'll ask you a direct question now. I'll ask you a direct question. Tell me, Mr. Minister, how many in 1990 and 1991 — you were reading a little while ago here about interim supply Bills — tell us in 1990 and 1991, how many interim supply Bill motions were there in this House? How many?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, in 1990-91 there were two interim supply Bill motions. One was introduced after the first of April. It lasted one day. The

other was introduced on . . . in fact it was introduced on April 9 so that parties out there had to wait. The other interim supply Bill was introduced on May 11; it lasted one day.

Mr. Muirhead: — And when you look at those interim supply Bills, which we went through the *Hansards*, the reason why . . . That's exactly the answer I was wanting to get because the minister answered the questions. He answered the questions. You have answered just about zero for Thursday, Friday and Monday. And if you're going to answer no questions, it's going to take time.

Now, Mr. Minister, you're under oath. You're under oath in this House. Will you stand up here and say that if this Bill doesn't pass tonight that there will be hardships in this province that somebody won't get their cheques tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, there already are situations where the cheques should have been out, like school boards for example. The cheques should have been out last month. It is now one day past that time. Yes there is hardship because they're going to have to access their line of credit. They're going to introduce interest costs which is going to become a burden on the taxpayers which the member from Arm River represents, among many others.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, I ask you to table exactly what you said and show that to be a fact, that that there . . . And each and every cheque that has to go out that just doesn't go out because this doesn't get passed tonight. I want that tabled in this House. I want it right now.

You just made a statement that there's going to be hardships. There's going to be people not going to have a . . . different groups or whatever you said, that they won't get their cheques tomorrow. There should be cheques out. Tell us who they are and exactly how much they are because I don't know whether I believe you or not.

(2145)

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — We don't have and nor will we have the list of all of the different organizations, but there are approximately 200 funded agencies which receive funds from the Department of Social Services that usually count on their cheques on the first day of the month. This is the first day of the month. The interim supply Bill has not been passed.

In Education, school boards generally receive their funds on the 31st of the previous month. That should have been on . . . if there's 30 days in May or 31 days in May, it should have been the last day of that month. It is now the first day of the following month.

That creates some difficulties. The member opposite may not think it creates some difficulties, but I know that it does because it's going to increase greater costs for school divisions who will have to wait longer and therefore will not have the money from the province available for their use.

And I'm especially concerned about the many agencies

that are funded from the Department of Social Services because they provide some crucial work, and some of them I suspect don't have accesses to lines of credit.

Mr. Muirhead: — See, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I don't believe your statement because you said the cheques should have been out on May 31. You still had interim supply or you still had special warrants on May 31. Now please, Mr. Minister, I said you're speaking under oath. You tell me whether you had money to send that . . . Let's not laugh about it because when a minister stands up in this House, he's under oath.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier says when a minister lies or doesn't say something to tell the truth in this House, it's just a bunch of boloney. That's exactly what he says, a bunch of boloney. Well, Mr. Minister, I ask you very seriously: was there special warrants to pay that money to these groups you said that didn't get paid on May 31?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The money . . .

The Chair: — Order. Order. I listen with interest to the member for Arm River, and I want to remind him of a ruling that was made earlier in the day with respect to the use of certain language in the Chamber. And that his language on a previous occasion, although not unparliamentary, was inflammatory. And I encourage the member to exercise caution in the choice of terms that he employs.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I didn't realize that my microphone had not been on when I gave the response to the member opposite. When the special warrants were provided, everything was in place. Nobody had to wait for the funding from the provincial government that they required. It was provided on time. Only this month it looks like they will not be provided on time because the interim supply Bill is being held up by the member from Arm River and other members on the other side of the House.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, just be very clear. A little while ago you said that there's cheques that didn't go out, couldn't go out on May 31. Now you've changed your mind and says yes, they've all went out. Now this is the first day of June, and we could still finish tonight and that's only one day. We could still finish tonight, and we have all this rhetoric we have to listen about this hold-up.

And we talked on Thursday, and we talked on Friday, and that was still in May. And you have special warrants to carry it to the 31st which was last night. This is the first day of June, and this is the only day that . . . And so I ask you, what cheques are not going out today? Don't give me the rhetoric about the cheques on the May 31. I want to know what cheques aren't going out today.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The funding for May was provided in the early part of May. All cheques, all payments of the government are stalled because the government has no authorization to spend any money until the interim supply Bill is passed. If the member from Arm River and the member from Rosthern continue to choose to hold up the interim supply Bill, no money can be expended by the province.

Mr. Neudorf: — And I appreciate that very much, Mr. Chairman. The question I would have to the Minister of Finance is a very simple question. On a couple of occasions already I've heard you and your Premier hollering from his seat there, indicating that we're holding up interim supply, that bills can't be paid. Not so. I think we have every legitimate right to stand in our place and hold you accountable for expenditures of half a billion dollars almost — 470 million.

Now, Mr. Minister, if it's so crucial that everything be finished today or tomorrow or the day after, why did you not bring it in the week before that? What was preventing you? It's a very simple question. Why last moment? Did you not know what the figures were going to be? Did you not know what one-twelfth of your budget was going to be?

Why did you wait until the last moment before you brought this interim supply before us? So that we wouldn't be in such a panic position, in a rush position. Where we would have the opportunity to ask questions. Not only the opportunity to ask questions, but even give you the opportunity to give some answers. Why did you bring this forth last Friday? Why not bring it forth, let's say a week prior to that? Or did you not know the figures at that time?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — First of all, the interim supply Bill was not brought forward last Friday, it was brought forward last Thursday, so there was sufficient time. I can ask the member opposite when he was on the treasury benches, why in '89-90 was the interim supply Bills brought in on April 13, May 11, June 14, July 13, and August 15, all for that particular month? Because that is the tradition of the House.

Interim supply Bills are brought in in the last two or three days of the month for the previous month. That is the way this legislature has operated since its beginning. Nothing unusual about that. And we do that, Mr. Chairman, because we expect the official opposition to act responsibly, to keep in mind what the process is, know what the process is, and make sure that those third parties and others out in the province who rely on government funding get their funding, and not hold them up and punish them for no good reason other than the members opposite have not prepared themselves well for this session.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One thing is very clear, Mr. Minister, that when we were in the government we did do things right. We'd do it in the middle of a month. We would do it in the middle of the month. We would do it in the right time. And don't tell me to stand up there and say to me and say to the public and to all the viewers out there that they always went through it in one day, because I remember very clearly . . . and you weren't here the whole nine years because you got womped out of here in '82.

So it happened, and it happened by the members opposite when there was eight sitting here that you let the

bells ring — you let the bells ring. And the now Premier wasn't here because he was wumped out of here too. He wasn't here. There's hardly anybody here that was even there, so how do they know what they done? The eight people sitting here. Allan Blakeney's gone with his \$87,000 severance pay that this government gave him. Somebody made an awful mistake over here, Mr. Chairman. Somebody started to condemn severance pays until one of my colleagues says, yes, Mr. Blakeney got \$87,000, and they went whoops. I guess it would be whoops. But who's the one . . . who did all the pushing for the severance pays? Who wanted to spend all that money? It was the then . . . the now Minister of Finance that got up here and spoke that night on behalf of their party, that I want my bucks.

And also the leader of the Liberal Party. You wanted a severance package. You wanted it for yourselves. You're the one that done it Mr. Minister of Finance. You stood right here and says, as Minister of . . . as critic for Finance and as a person that likes a buck in my pocket when I'm through. And you said how important it was. And I even agreed with you. But it was kind of important . . .

The Chair: — Order, order. The member's comments are not . . . are not to the motion, and I encourage the member to speak to the motion that's before us.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But in my true feeling I thought maybe this government back in power, that there'd be some money for interim supply, that would be going to the new severance package that they be bringing in, because I'm sure that they will. Now that they've got this big sweep, they're going to think about their pockets. We know that.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Chairman, I wonder when they were putting this interim supply together, and they had this cut-back, and they had this here deficit, and they were trying to balance budgets, I wonder what they thought of the funding they did to the hospitals when they cut back on funding in hospitals — the hardships that they've caused to the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

What about your long lists. I remember here when your Minister of Health was a critic for Health, sitting here talking about . . . that you Tories are letting people die for the lack of beds. You're actually letting them die. They brought the name of a person in here. And you people cut back on funding and laugh about it, and say, oh it's the Tories' fault. It's the Tories' fault.

Well I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, if it comes down to it — I don't want to have to go back to gravelled roads on highways — but if it comes down to it, I'll travel a gravelled highway to take care of our ill in this province. They better come first because you're the last people that should be cutting back to funding on hospitals. I can't believe that you've done it and that's why you're so unpopular out there.

Chiropractor — what about the people that have had accidents and they need chiropractors and they got no money? What about them? What about the diabetics? I've had more calls, Mr. Minister, I've had more calls from the

people on the Saskatchewan Pension Plan and also on the people that are diabetic without any money . . . can't believe what you've done. Now why did you not think of the hardships you're causing to these people? Because you caused hardships, and then the Premier says the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, the Premier was not in the House this afternoon. He was not here to be able to hear the comments on the choices, and you did have choices.

And we proved. We proved, and we backed your Minister of Finance right into a corner when he had to admit that on the credit rating of this province of Saskatchewan, it was the information that he got from the hundred people in Finance. Ninety-nine of them are the same people that are there today. And so don't try to kid the people on this side of the House and all the people in viewers' land tonight and all the people in the province of Saskatchewan. Don't try to kid them.

Don't try to fool them that it's the Tories that caused the problem because we've been through it and over and over again. You've admitted. You've admitted, and I'm saying it to everybody in Saskatchewan that's listening tonight. The hockey game will be over, and there'll be a few turning their stations in . . . that you admitted that there was a \$3.5 billion deficit we took over from you in 1982 and the multiplier effect and that runs about 12, \$13 billion today.

So don't say that we left this here legacy out there. Those are your own figures, Mr. Minister of Finance. You put the figures out. You said it. I didn't say. I asked you the figures, the total deficit of the departments and the liabilities and the Crowns and you said \$3.5 billion. Now you've admitted it. Now that's a different story than you would tell the people out there.

And you, Mr. Minister, you said very clearly that Mr. Gass never said that you people knew, and you people did know every bit. We've been over and over that again, and I'm sick and tired of you people saying it. And you're not going to get away with it.

You had seven or eight months in power now, seven months it's on to now, and you can't keep on blaming things on the other side. We did the same thing. We tried to blame it . . . when we took over from you in 1982, we said there's this here deficit, but people didn't believe us that that deficit was there. We couldn't get people to believe that this holier-than-thou government, the NDP, the Tommy Douglas people . . . if Tommy Douglas was here today, he'd be ashamed of every one of you. He'd be absolutely, totally ashamed because he would not misrepresent the public.

I know him well. My mother went to school with Tommy Douglas. He was an honourable man . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes and when he said there was a deficit there would be one. If it's balanced there would be one. But you people went out, and you convinced the people in the province of Saskatchewan that we never took over a deficit, but we did take over a deficit from you. We took over \$3.5 billion, and then you sit there and laugh. You sit there and you laugh and you joke when we're saying to

you . . . ask you questions.

How much money of this interim supply, the \$469 million, have you saved by cutting back on health care, hospital care, chiropractors, ambulance fees? You've just thrown it right to them — hardships, hardships. You've done it, and you don't want to answer a question. You've cut the throat of the farmer. You've cut the throat of the ill, the seniors. You've cut back even on the \$700 that they get. They used to get it if they had . . . a portion if they had \$30,000 income. You've cut that back. You cut back on everybody.

All right, maybe that's the right thing to do, but that isn't what you promised. You broke every promise. The only promise you didn't break, the only group of people that you didn't break a promise to, is a group that the Premier has never met yet, and you know that's a fact.

(2200)

The Premier sits here tonight and he makes jokes of what I'm saying. But he did say — and I take his word for it because that's one thing, I've always taken the word of the member from Riversdale, I've always taken his word — he said he's going to go meet the last of these groups tomorrow. So I want people to realize that, that he's going to go out and meet these people and meet these groups.

And if you go meet . . . Mr. Chairman, if he would talk and go and talk interim supply, about \$469 million, and talk to the chamber of commerce here in the city of Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, and Prince Albert, Yorkton, the bigger cities in this province, and say, do you think what we're doing is right? You won't get a yes from them.

Your Minister of Agriculture stands up here every day and talks about agriculture and says, yes the farmers know the trouble we're in. They know we have to balance the budgets, they know that. And you know perfectly well that a good politician can walk into any room of people — you give me 10 people or 2,000 people and I can say, oh it's motherhood; we've got to balance the budgets, and you've got to do this and you've got to do that, and they'll applaud you and they'll applaud you. But when they're getting in their car to go home they say, who's that guy trying to kid. It better not be on my back.

You people never asked anybody on whose back you want to have this here deficit or this budget balanced. You never asked anybody. You just done it; you just done it.

Mr. Chairman, this minister comes in here and he asked for \$469 million and he expects us not to talk for a day or two or three on it. I don't know who he was trying to kid. If he had never come in here and broke every broke promise . . . He broke all the promises, and if he never came in here and done that, we wouldn't be asking you the questions. We have a right to be asking you questions and many, many questions.

Any time that a government breaks every promise, almost every promise . . . The only promise you're coming close to keeping is trying to balance the budget. But don't kid me. Don't kid the people on this side of the House. Don't think you're fooling the people of Saskatchewan. You're

only trying to move money into the right departments and into the right Crowns and get it put in the right spot so you can build up your war chest to win the election, the next election. He's working on his slush fund, that's what the Minister of Finance is doing. And I feel sorry for him because as I said before, he's an honourable man, but he's told what he has to do. He's exactly what I said to the Premier when he was a minister of Justice in 1980 or '81, that when he says, I pull your chain, you go this way. And when I pull it this way, you go that way. He's the boss and everybody in Saskatchewan knows he's the boss. He always has been.

And I don't take that away from him — I don't take that away from him. But let's get the blame where it should be, Mr. Chairman. Let's get the blame . . . why we're talking about this here interim supply here tonight and we're going on and on because we're not getting answers. We know what the trouble is. Because the now Premier has said to all his ministers that you've got to hold the line. We have to balance budget regardless who we hurt. And that's exactly, Mr. Chairman, what's going on.

It's the now Premier of this province has laid it out. And you, Mr. Finance Minister, you have to listen, and so does the Minister of Agriculture and so does the member from Swift Current. We have to cut back. The Minister of Environment, Parks, Highways — they all got to cut back.

Do you think people are happy out there when they're going to go back . . . did you hear the story, Mr. Premier, Mr. Chairman . . . I wonder if you heard the story from one of his NDP supporters from Yorkton that said, I would advise the farmers to grow oats this summer because they're going to be back driving horses. They'll have to have oats to feed their horses. And that's exactly what's going to be happening with this government's going backwards.

Mr. Minister, you've asked no questions tonight so that's why I've been coming back . . . I've only talked — I'm just watching the clock — talking the same 25 minutes. I'm talking the same 25 minutes that you did, and I'll soon be finished it. Because you just went and went and said nothing. But at least I'm saying what the people want to hear out there because I've had phone calls tonight. You're right on. It was in my office when I went back and I got them right here. I got several of them right here. You're right on the money. Give it to them. Give it to them. Take this, deliver this to the Minister of Finance and then to the Premier.

Now I'm going to ask you a question, Mr. Minister, Mr. Minister of Finance. How much money . . . Mr. Minister of Finance, of the \$469 million, how much money was saved by all the cut-backs that you did since October 21. If we had had no cut-backs, what would the interim supply Bill be?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think that that had anything to do with interim supply any more than the member's comments, but I can say that if the member will care to take the time to look at the budget speech, he will find out that we announced in the budget speech that the cost savings because of the reductions that we brought about in the whole budget was \$344

million.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, what we are discussing here is nearly half a billion dollars. That in conjunction with two special warrants of this government will add up to over a quarter, closer to a third of the expenditures because of the override in certain departments which are more than one-twelfth.

Mr. Minister, there's some questions that need to be asked that haven't come up yet in this particular motion that I think are very important. Prior to the delivery of your budget, prior to the delivery of your budget there were a number of leaks that had very serious ramifications. Well they do, sir, because you have outlined expenditures by departments to this House.

And I'm saying to you, sir, that some of those budget leaks had ramifications as to expenditures. We are asking you, sir, now given the fact that it was well known what the price of cigarettes was going to be, what chiropractic services were going to cost, what optometric services were going to cost, and the fact that you have a 10 per cent surtax, a 10 per cent surtax on individual income tax that was well known to Saskatchewan taxpayers prior to your budget — now, I'm saying to you, sir, that some of the numbers that you have given us in these budgetary estimates will be wrong because of those budget leaks — but I want now to ask you, Mr. Minister, given that you've had a month from the time, approximately a month from the time of your budget, and the fact that these leaks occurred, have you and your officials done some analysis to see what happened in those various areas, what the impact was on the Saskatchewan economy because people knew ahead of time, the fact that we had people lining up for chiropractic services trying to get in under the wire, the fact that we had optometric services in the same category, and the fact that some of your tax revenue was probably influenced by those leaks.

Mr. Minister, can you now inform this House, a month in time later, if you have done the investigation that you should have done, and if so what was the results of it.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the budget stands as it is. The numbers in the budget are as they were announced. I will stand by them. And the member will find at the end of the fiscal year, they will be — when they're audited — as the government announced that they would be.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Minister, in some jurisdictions, what happened here in Saskatchewan, you would have done the honourable thing and resigned. I mean the potential for people out there to take advantage of a situation that well known was tremendous. You can't tell me, sir, that people don't go around breaking into stores and stealing cigarettes because they know that they can black-market them, that they can find alternate ways to sell cigarettes because of the high price of them. And when people know ahead of time that you're going to increase a pack of cigarettes by over 75 cents, I would say to you, sir, that there were probably people out there taking advantage of that.

And the same goes when you get into health care. When

there are people that have to have health care services provided to them and they've been getting them for a nominal fee or for free before having a budget leak, that means, sir, that people are going to take advantage of the system. And they had lots of ability to do that, and the numbers were bang on.

It was very interesting the night of the budget to go through your numbers and see that they were exactly the numbers provided to the official opposition. And I say to you, sir, if they were provided to the official opposition, they must have been provided to other people. If you weren't going to do the proper thing and resign because of those budget leaks, at least as a Finance minister who had cared about the integrity of his department, I would think you would have instructed your officials to do some checking around to see if there was any slippage, to see if people did line up.

I'm told that in the city of Moose Jaw, there were about 100 people tried to take advantage of chiropractic services ahead of the deadline. And I would think that those kinds of rumours, Mr. Minister, would have prompted you to do some investigation.

And I think it's quite proper in this discussion tonight on the numbers that you have presented in interim supply, along with your special warrants, because we won't have the budget ratified for some time yet, that you would be prepared to tell this Assembly that you have done the proper thing, that you have gone through some checks, and that you would want to provide to this Assembly what they were.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I fail to understand or see how interim supply Bill has got anything to do with speculation by the media or speculation by the members opposite prior to the budget on what might have been in the budget.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, it can impact significantly. The minister's budget won't be on track if people knew ahead of time. If, for instance, people in this province went out, suppliers, that type of thing, and bought 30 or \$40 million worth of cigarettes at the old figure instead of the numbers that were provided to the minister that there would be X number of packages of cigarettes bought. If that kind of slippage occurred, then, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that the budget numbers, as presented by the minister under this interim supply Bill, won't necessarily jibe with the projections that he's made.

He's told us he's made these projections, that he's living by them. We had a very serious situation occur prior to the budget, questions raised in this House. I would think the minister would want to be forthcoming with the due diligence that he asked his department to take given those budget leaks.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, what we're looking here, and what we're considering here, is a request for an interim supply for the month of June. It is a request for expenditures. That is exactly the amount of money that will be spent in the month of June, no more, maybe less, depending on how the expenditures go, but

no more unless there is prior approval of this legislature.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. This is the Minister of Finance. I can't think of a more appropriate situation to discuss budget leaks than the very first time that the Minister of Finance comes before this House with an Appropriation Bill, an Appropriation Bill asking for nearly half a billion dollars.

As I said in my opening remarks, the minister will have spent, by the time his budget is passed, probably in the range of half of the total expenditures in this budget year. As the minister says, he has a number of areas where costs have to be spent now rather than later. He's identified a number of departments.

What I'm saying to the minister is, does he not consider it serious when exact budgetary items in his budget were brought up in this Assembly a number of days prior to the delivery of his budget? This is the first time that he has had an opportunity to come before this House, before the people in his department, and explain to folks what he has done in the way of due diligence given the fact that the public knew these numbers, to clarify the situation, to assure people that millions of dollars of cigarettes were not purchased, that certain aspects of the health system were not compromised. And I would think the minister would want to inform the House, as he's talking about spending billions and billions of dollars, about that process.

(2215)

The Chair: — Order. I find the member's questions to not be appropriate. Members had opportunity during budget debate to discuss generally the question of budget leaks. The members will have opportunity during discussion on estimates for the Department of Finance to ask the minister questions with respect to that subject.

But at present, at present we are not dealing with the estimates. We are debating a resolution as it pertains to an interim supply. We are not voting individual departmental estimates. Supply Bills are to issue money required in advance of complete parliamentary sanction. Debate should focus on the need to grant, reduce, or refuse supply in respect to the resolution before the committee. And I would invite the member that if he has questions about the subject of budget leaks to discuss these during consideration of estimates for the Department of Finance.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your ruling. But I think it's important on the tie between what the minister on interim supply has brought forward, the very fact that, Mr. Chairman, you can appreciate, the minister has said that he's asked for more than one-twelfth, more than one-twelfth in the Department of Health. That department has asked for more than one-twelfth. He has been very, very vague with what the excess portion of that health budget is all about.

He says, well you'll have to wait till the Minister of Health comes forward to give you the details on it. What I'm saying to you, Mr. Chairman, in regard to those budget leaks is that they impacted on the Department of Health.

The minister has asked for more than one-twelfth in the Department of Health. The potential for problems because of those budget leaks in that area means that that overage in the Department of Health should be of concern to the Minister. And the Minister, I would have thought, would have asked his staff to investigate problems that may have arose because of that. We have not just one-twelfth; we have more than one-twelfth. And if the chiropractic and optometric services portions of the budget which were leaked are impacting in that area, then I would think the minister would want to tell the House about it.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, when, as you ruled so quite appropriately, the Department of Finance comes before the Committee of Finance to consider our estimates, I will be quite prepared to discuss a wide-range of issues. We're here tonight discussing interim supply. What the member is addressing here this evening has got nothing to do with interim supply.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, would you tell us on loans, advances and investments on Agriculture and Food, what category they are in?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Just to assist the member in getting even further information, he will find that on page 91 of the *Estimates* dealing with Agriculture and Food . . . And all the information is provided for you in that page.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What about Economic Development? You're spending \$316,000 in Economic Development. Where would I find that? And can you tell me whether it's on a loan, advance or an investment?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I refer the member to page 82, item no. 2, Economic Development, loans pursuant to The Industry and Commerce Development Act, estimated \$3.8 million. It's a loan to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting arranged by the previous government just before they were defeated in October 1991.

Mr. Martens: — You said, Mr. Minister, that it was 3.8 million. Is three point one six seven hundred one-twelfth of that . . . is that a loan, an advance or an investment?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — As I indicated, I gave you the total number of the loan on page 82. What is being requested in the interim supply is one-twelfth.

Mr. Martens: — Is the requirement for the \$316,000 as a loan going to be extended on one-twelfth? Let's say we have next month another interim supply, June and July. Are we going to have the same amount there, or are we going to have the rest of the \$3.8 million?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The requirements are determined month by month. It's based on the loan agreements. And as each month comes, the amount that will be provided will be determined by those loan agreements and those requirements, and the Department of Economic Development and Trade will have to cover the Department of Finance and make the appropriate request.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, is this to do with the smelter at Flin Flon?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes it does.

Mr. Martens: — On the page 91 of the *Estimates*, this is the advance for the Agriculture and Food on the gross revenue insurance program. Is that correct?

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

Mr. Martens: — And is that a loan, an advance, or an investment?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — If the member will read the page, it says advances. They are advances to The Agricultural Safety Net Act for the purposes of gross revenue insurance plan agreement. They're advances.

Mr. Martens: — Is that an advance on the premium paid or is that an advance on the return that the farmers are paying as a part of their portion of premium? Is this a matching contribution? And is that sufficient to be equal to the contribution of the federal government and the farmers' shares?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am informed that it's an advance on the deficiency of the fund but if the member wants any other information other than that general information he should be asking that of the Minister of Agriculture during Committee of Finance, consideration of the Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. A question on the Education of \$3.750 million. Education under loans, and advances, and investments. What is that \$3.75 million?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — That's one-twelfth of what is provided in the budget. And if the member looks at the book he will see that it says student assistance and student aid fund.

Mr. Martens: — Would the Minister give me the page?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I thought I had — page 92.

Mr. Martens: — Which . . . Mr. Minister, to the student aid fund, is that that the . . . Okay.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Okay. On page 92, Education, vote 141, item 1, \$45 million.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Could you give me the 20,000 on Rural Development as well?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Page 93, Rural Development, vote 144, budgeted \$250,000. The interim supply is asking for one-twelfth of that.

Mr. Martens: — Okay, the last one there is the Gaming Commission for \$583,000. Could you give me an outline of where that is?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The member opposite will find this on page 94, Saskatchewan Gaming Commission, in the middle of the page, loans and advances pursuant to

The Saskatchewan Gaming Commission, \$7 million. This interim supply asks for one-twelfth of that.

Mr. Martens: — Are there any of the other commissions in the regular budgetary expenditures, for example, the Horse Racing Commission. Is that expenditure out of the Department of Agriculture and Food?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — That would be budgeted in the Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Martens: — Then my question is: why is the Gaming Commission separate as it is identified here?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — It's a Saskatchewan Gaming Commission. It has always been separate. Nothing has changed there. It remains just as it was.

Mr. Martens: — Is it an allocation through the Department of Justice or through the Department of Finance?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Saskatchewan Gaming Commission is a self-standing entity whose purpose is to regulate gaming activity in the province of Saskatchewan except for the Horse Racing Commission which is within the purview of the Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to point out a couple of things that I think are significant as a conclusion here this evening. There are some things that I find interesting about what you've done and I really think it's different.

One of the things is that you through the campaign said you were not going to have any patronage. And as I view the discussion in your throne speech, you said you had 580 positions already established through boards and commissions that you had set up in the way of patronage. And I think that that's clearly, Mr. Minister, a problem that we have in dealing with the kinds of things that we have been confronted with here today. We have a whole host of these kinds of items — pages and pages of patronage that I think are really interesting.

And it says, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, that you said you weren't going to do it and yet, in your throne speech in a part of this Assembly, you said you had 580 positions in boards and commissions that you had already changed and that that's exactly what it says in your throne speech — not in your budget speech, Mr. Minister, in your throne speech. That's what it said. I point out that that's a very strange way of handling patronage. You said you would never do it and I say that you should be seriously concerned about how you handle that because you said you weren't going to do it.

You have hosts of people. I could give you lists of them. In fact, Mr. Minister, when we were coming in here tonight, we had our caucus staff print them out, over 150 of them spread throughout government in Crown corporations and all over the place. And that's only the beginning. Plus you said in the throne speech that you already had 580 of them.

And that, Mr. Minister, is the kind of thing you said you'd

never do. You weren't prepared to do that; you weren't going to be a part of doing anything like that. You also said you weren't going to increase the taxes — 1 per cent on E&H, up it went. Mr. Chairman, 10 per cent on the surtax on income tax.

I had a visit from a gentleman on Saturday, stopped by my place. He works for Majestic pipelines. They're building a brand new section on a loop for the TransCanada Pipelines. And he said, I'm moving out. I don't have to live in Saskatchewan. I'm moving out. Why? Because — this is exactly what he said to me, Mr. Premier — he said no, sir; he said, I voted for the . . . He lives in Saskatoon and he voted for us, Mr. Premier. And he voted for us because we were fair to the oil patch.

And what you're doing now, Mr. Premier, you're saying to the people of Saskatchewan . . . the high income people are going to start leaving. In fact, he said, the three people over me in Majestic are . . .

The Chair: — Order, order, order. It being 10:30 p.m., the Committee will rise and report progress.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:31 p.m.