

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, a visitor who is seated behind the bar on this side of the House, Mr. Walter Smishek. Mr. Smishek is a former member of the Legislative Assembly for many years and served with distinction as a cabinet minister, and it's my pleasure to introduce him to you today. Please help me welcome him.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knezacek: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 45 grade 4 and 5 students from Esterhazy East School. Esterhazy is my home town and I'm proud to have these students, teachers, and supervisors here this afternoon.

I'd also like to introduce Darrell Paproski and Diane Godwin, the teachers that have taken the responsibility for taking the class down here; and also to the chaperons: Bernise Verner, Elaine Tochor, Ruth Kunkel, Shirley Melenchuck, and their bus driver, Bea Stevenson.

I hope these students have a fruitful afternoon, that they enjoy their tour to Regina, and I wish them a safe trip home. And I will be meeting them for pictures and for refreshments after question period. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm pleased to introduce to you Mrs. Katherine Schaaf and her grandnephew, Brandon Tomaschefski, from Regina. They're sitting in the Speaker's gallery.

They're the winners of the Bridging 125 contest which brought together seniors and students to write about life in Saskatchewan's past, present, and future. The contest was sponsored by the Senior Citizens' Provincial Council as a special event for Seniors Week.

With them are Dr. Bill Klassen, a Regina member of the Senior Citizens' Provincial Council, and Brandon's mother, Mrs. Lynn Tomaschefski.

Later this afternoon they'll join me for refreshments and the presentation of prizes. I'm sure the members will join me in extending congratulations to Mrs. Schaaf and Brandon on their accomplishment.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you another very special guest — my youngest boy, William MacKinnon, who's a grade 4 student in Saskatoon. And I'm very pleased to have him

with me here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to other members of the legislature two guests from Tanzania. We have David Kirumbi and Aminiel Maro who are here today as visitors to Saskatchewan as part of an exchange program with Luther College.

Both are teachers in Tanzania at the high school level and are teaching at Luther College these weeks. They're here in Saskatchewan for a month. They've been here two and a half weeks already and they're accompanied by their host, Larry Fry, who is teaching at Luther College.

And we welcome them to Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Hamilton: — Mr. Speaker, I would also rise and add to the greeting of the member from Saskatoon Sutherland, and welcome David and Aminiel here.

It was my pleasure to meet with them at the unveiling of an environmental stop in my constituency. And the host couple, Gail and Larry Fry are members of the constituency as well. And I would also like to welcome them and wish them well in their experiences here and their tour. I know they're also looking at the beginnings of a two-party system in Tanzania. And so I wish them well in the move toward democratic reform in their country.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Education critic for the opposition, I would like to welcome our guests from Tanzania, and wish them well in visiting our country.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure and privilege today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, a group of 25 civil service folks who are with us here today. They are here from a number of departments, including the Department of Economic Development, Department of Justice, Community Services, Department of Highways, Department of Social Services, and the Department of Food and Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome them here today and to invite them to stay, watch question period. I'm sure they will enjoy themselves. I want to ask all members to join with me in welcoming them here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to welcome some guests here, and introduce them to you and through you to the rest of the Assembly here. Some friends of mine in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker, Jack and Alice Dzus, who travelled from Kelowna, B.C.

(British Columbia). They knew me when I was much younger than I am right now, if you can believe that. And also with them is their daughter, Judy Konotopsky from Coronach. So I'd ask you to join me in welcoming them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre in China, and our Assembly should not let the occasion pass unmarked. The Tiananmen Square massacre was a brutal and a deadly attack by a government on its own people and it is a warning, Mr. Speaker, a strong warning to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, while nothing so dramatic as the repression of the Chinese government could happen in our own country, we should heed its warning about the vital need to protect the rights of the individuals and to stay on guard against government so eager to do well that they take the easy road of reducing freedom.

The price of liberty truly is eternal vigilance. And that vigilance is needed today in this very Assembly, Mr. Speaker. We have laws proposed in this Assembly that will give politicians the right to forcibly enter private property without a warrant, to give politicians the right to deny evidence to courts of law that might well be vital in proving someone's innocence, and to give cabinet ministers sweeping powers to make decisions about real people in secret and without consultation.

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lorje: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to focus today on our province, because as far as I'm concerned and I think all members at least on the government side of this House would state, that Saskatchewan is a unique and wonderful place and we all recognize that there are many values and benefits from living in Saskatchewan.

There are many examples and the example I would like to focus on specifically today is the Wanuskewin Heritage Park which is opening now in Saskatoon. It's a tourist attraction that's been 6,000 years in the making and puts Saskatoon and Saskatchewan on the world heritage stage.

As a former Saskatoon city councillor, I was proud to be part of the decision to proceed with the Wanuskewin Park. We see many benefits in this province from the tourism industry. We see well over 16,000 people employed and \$780 million spent directly in tourism. We expect that with the Wanuskewin Heritage Park opening that this will increase. There will be many dollars and much employment generated from the Wanuskewin Heritage Park.

I'm pleased that SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) was able to contribute \$130,000 grant for a gift shop and restaurant. And I'm also pleased that Wanuskewin recognizes and gives body

to the spirit of co-operation in Saskatchewan between the city, the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority), the university, federal and provincial governments, all five Indian nations, and all Indian districts in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

Mr. Knezacek: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the town council of Langenburg community, which is in my riding, for showing the leadership and for taking the initiative to organize its first annual ratepayers' meeting last Wednesday evening. The meeting displayed an example of co-operation between provincial and municipal authorities in an effort to explain to the ratepayers what is happening in local and provincial governments.

The meeting was addressed by the mayor who chaired and explained the format of the meeting. He then introduced the Minister of Community Services who informed the meeting of some of the initiatives taken by the provincial government with respect to municipal concerns and issues. She discussed at some length environmental issues, including the Bills before the House. Topics discussed included funding, regional landfill sites, assessment, and others.

In fact the minister is meeting with the Saskatchewan mayors in Saskatoon this afternoon to discuss their concerns and to set up a process for making changes that would allow urban governments to meet the challenges they face because of the changes in economic, social, and democratic . . . demographic conditions in this province.

The Langenburg meeting then featured a short presentation by each councillor who explained his or her committee duties, put forth the problems they faced, and indicated the direction that they wanted to take in that specific area. The taxpayers were given the opportunity to question the council on their reports and to make suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of community leadership that is taking place in the Saltcoats constituency. I would recommend this type of healthy co-operative exchange . . .

The Speaker: — Order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment today to recognize the hard work, many volunteers across this province, and certainly pay a compliment to the 4-H movement in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, 4-H was something that I was involved in when I was a teenager, and I always enjoyed that aspect of working together with livestock and working with my peers, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the 4-H movement is a way of developing character for young men and women across this province. And I wanted to acknowledge the

many volunteers who give so liberally of their time to serve the young men and women in the province of Saskatchewan.

I'm looking forward to, over the next day or so, just taking a moment to drop in on some of the 4-H achievement days to indeed view the exhibits as many of the 4-H'ers themselves just take a moment to show to their parents, their peers, and anyone interested the efforts and rewards of their work in 4-H.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Speaker, as anyone who enters Saskatoon from the east will know, the 6 kilometre stretch of Highway 5 between the Saskatoon city limits, the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) bridge, and the 41 Highway at the Sundown Drive-in Theatre is a very busy and even a dangerous stretch of highway. Residents of my Erindale constituency are particularly concerned about the safety of the McOrmond Road intersection on Highway 5. Indeed this spring, I personally knocked on doors to survey them regarding their concerns. Some of the comments read: it's an accident waiting to happen; I avoid the intersection if my daughter's in the car; I do a little prayer turning left off the highway.

Recognizing the level of safety concern for this intersection, the Department of Highways has announced that in July it will begin construction of a four-lane highway, including a twinning of the CPR overpass bridge outside Sutherland and a turn lane, with lighting, at McOrmond Road.

I understand that completion, with paving, will take place next summer. And I simply want to commend the Minister of Highways and the department for the co-operation they've given me in addressing this concern. And I'm absolutely convinced that it will end up saving the lives of all Saskatchewan residents who use that stretch of highway, both from Saskatoon and from rural areas.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1345)

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I recently completed the fourth annual business survey in my constituency, and I wish to thank the business men and women who so kindly responded again this year.

An analysis of these recent results indicated that our businesses want the province to: (1) get its financial house in order; (2) the debt under control; (3) some tax relief; and (4) fair tendering by their government.

Mr. Speaker, having talked to local business people last weekend, and having just participated in two new business ventures in Saskatoon, the clear message conveyed to me was that the Government of Saskatchewan is on the right track in these areas.

More businesses in my survey are optimistic about the future of their enterprise than has been the case in the past

three years. Given their optimism, along with the development of the Saskatoon Economic Development Authority and the booming housing sales in April, there is a positive feeling that better days lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the creativity, determination, and contribution of the small-business sector as they show their confidence in working co-operatively with the Government of Saskatchewan and in fact all of the people of this province. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. June 1 to 7 is Senior's Week in Saskatchewan and I think it's a good time to review progress but also to talk about some of the impacts in the budget. Mr. Speaker, many seniors will remember the Depression and the many ups and downs in the economy. And during that time they took leadership in resolving the severe hardships but also still having compassion for the poor.

In considering the budget, the province took into account that Saskatchewan has the lowest incidence of senior poverty in Canada and the highest incidence of child poverty. Based on this and other information, it was decided that seniors could play a role in solving some of the financial problems and directing resources to those most in need. Mr. Speaker, I know that all MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) would appreciate seniors letting us know if anyone is experiencing undue hardship.

Mr. Speaker, through the legislature I want seniors to know that we in the province are thinking of them during Seniors' Week. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Why is the Premier on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to revert back to introductions for a brief moment. Guests arrived late.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, members. I would like to introduce to you, sir, some special guests in your gallery, seated to my right. They are visitors from the Sakhalin region of Russia. And I will introduce the members of the party to you. Seated in your gallery is the governor of the Sakhalin region, Governor Dr. Valentin P. Fyordrov, and his wife, Tamara. With them is Mr. S.V. Golubckov, the vice-president; Mr. Grinco, chief of foreign relations; Mr. V.I. Lozovoi, the director general. And they're accompanied by Mr. C.M. Kapoor and Mr. G.V. Shankar, chairman and president respectively of GPCP in Saskatoon. And also in the gallery with them is the Member of Parliament for Regina-Qu'Appelle, Mr. Simon de Jong.

Now Governor Fyordrov and his party have just returned from a G-7 meeting in New York city. The governor and

his group are here to discuss the possible use of Saskatchewan goods and services for the development of the Sakhalin region. As members will know, the Sakhalin region is an island off the Russian Pacific coast. It is rich in coal, oil and gas, forestry and fisheries. This inland region has a significant impact on the Republic of Russia through its unique topographical position and its close proximity to Japan.

We wish the governor and his entourage all the success, and hope that our province and our business community can contribute to the economic and social development of Sakhalin and that part of the Republic of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to meet very briefly with the governor. Unfortunately not enough time today due to other commitments. But I would ask you, sir, and all the members of the House to welcome this distinguished group of visitors to the legislature and to the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too on behalf of the opposition would like to welcome the visitors from Russia. It was a pleasure for me to travel to Kiev and to Moscow and St. Petersburg in February this year to visit with members of parliament from the Ukraine and from Russia and I spent a very pleasant time there.

And I want to say that we want to encourage you to continue in your democratic reform and your initiatives in relation to the economy. We want to encourage you to keep your eye on the positive aspects that you've already accomplished. Thank you very much for coming.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Effects of Legislation on Individuals' Rights

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister, recent announcements, legislation, and actions taken by your government have many people concerned about the direction you are taking this province with respect to justice and human rights.

In 1987 the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal ruled that it was unconstitutional to charge the owner of a vehicle for an offence if the driver of that vehicle could not be determined. Mr. Minister, while there may be a few reasons why you intend now to circumvent that ruling to allow charges to be laid against people who may be innocent, even you must recognize the dangerous precedent being set. As one lawyer recently said: if it goes so far that you can be convicted for something when it wasn't you, then there's something wrong.

Mr. Minister, won't you agree that allowing the justice system to charge and convict an innocent person goes against the fundamental principle that a person is indeed innocent until proven guilty.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question, which is a very important question indeed.

The idea of being able to charge and convict the owner of a vehicle for a wide variety of matters is of course well established in Canada and has long been followed. For example, all of our parking tickets — ticket the car and the owner is responsible regardless of who was driving at the time.

And there is of course a logic, which I know the hon. member appreciates, in reducing the dangers of high-speed chases and that sort of thing.

With respect to the unconstitutionality of the previous provision, the member will know that it was the possibility of the owner being imprisoned that was found to be contrary to the charter — imprisoned in a situation where the owner had not himself or herself actually committed the crime. And that was found to be unconstitutional.

Now if that is changed, if the option of a jail sentence is taken away, then the law will be the same as it's been in Saskatchewan for a long, long time and the same as it's been in, I think, every other Canadian province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Well I thank you, Mr. Minister, for your response. But I must remind you, Mr. Minister, and I believe, that most people in the province and indeed in Canada still feel that to allow for traffic violations to be sent to a person rather than being given to them personally goes against the personal rights indeed of individuals. We are certainly in favour of guarding against the possibility that some . . . we are in favour, Mr. Minister, of people being charged with an offence that they've committed, but we want to guard against the individual rights.

Imagine being able to charge and convict an individual for possession of stolen property merely because they found documents in their office that were left there, Mr. Minister.

My question is simple, Mr. Minister. Did you consider including in your legislation a provision for individuals to be found innocent should they provide an alibi?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I think that that's a very good point that the member raises. We, of course, as the member, believe very strongly that people are innocent until proven guilty. And the member will know that in the enforcement of this type of legislation across the whole country these provisions are common. There are some circumstances in which the identity of the driver can't be discovered, or can't be discovered without a very high level of risk. For example, the drivers of school buses has petitioned our government, as they did yours, with respect to people who go splashing by a stopped school bus where children are being disembarked from the bus. And that creates a very dangerous situation and you know the law provides a very severe penalty for it.

And yet the driver can't see the driver of the car and can't identify them, and they're gone, and there's no police in the area, but they can see the licence plate. And they have brought this matter to our attention. So we think it very important that people are innocent until proven guilty, but yet there has to be some way of handling these situations for the protection of the public and the due administration of the Act.

Now I think the member is also aware that there aren't many people charged as the registered owner. I mean, the police and the prosecutors have not used this provision very much in the law, although it has been in the law for a very long time. But it is necessary, I think, in a band of cases that this be available for the police and for the prosecutors. And that's what this is all about.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Well, Mr. Minister, yes we are concerned about the situations where people may pass school buses, but I would also suggest that maybe many school bus drivers also recognize many of the vehicles, especially in rural Saskatchewan.

But there are also examples of individuals who have been caught in the unfairness of this kind of legislation. An example of an Alberta woman who had left her car with a mechanic for a test drive was charged and convicted for an offence committed by the mechanic. Surely even you would admit, Mr. Minister, that this is unfair if not unjust.

Mr. Minister, another simple question. Should the innocence of this individual be the priority, or do you believe that the system is more important than the innocence or the guilt of the individual?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Oh, I believe very strongly that innocent people should not be convicted. I mean that is quite, quite obvious. And of course it is available in every case for a person who has been charged to come before the court, or for that matter to contact the police, and say, I wasn't driving my car that day, my car was being driven by Sally Brown. And that will be the end of the matter.

And certainly that would be a defence in court and that continues to be available and it should be available. We're not into wanting to convict innocent people of crimes. We're just simply looking to enforce The Highway Traffic Act as it has been enforced in this province for years and years and as it is enforced in every other province.

We've got to protect people. And I mentioned the example earlier of the children in rural Saskatchewan disembarking from a bus and there aren't a lot of police out there to enforce these laws as cars offend the rule against passing a bus while it is stopped. And it would seem to me . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think the minister has answered the question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I believe this legislation paves the way for the introduction of photographic technology which would enable the province to fine and convict owners of cars travelling at a rapid pace, or for whatever conviction they may lay. This legislation also allows the province to collect fines from small businesses, such as car rental companies who own the cars that have been involved in traffic violations.

Mr. Minister, is the true reason for the implementation of such measures another means of increasing the revenue for your government, given the fact that you have increased your take of traffic violations from 7 per cent to 25 per cent, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — With respect to the last item, the 7 per cent to 25 per cent, the member will know of course that what we are trying to do is simply recover costs. This is not any kind of a revenue- or profit-making enterprise that we're talking about, was simply a matter of trying to recover the province's costs.

With respect to the use of those photographic cameras to assist in highway traffic enforcement, the member will know that they have been in place in Alberta for some time, as well as in Nova Scotia. And recently their use was challenged in the courts in Nova Scotia and, if my memory is correct, were found to be unconstitutional or contrary to the charter, or something like that. That's my memory.

And if that's correct, we would certainly want to await the result of that sort of . . . or that case, and have the courts pronounce on it before that's considered in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I believe this government is living proof that the dispensing of injustice is always in the most capable hands. And we see a very disturbing pattern developing through legislation that is coming into this House.

Mr. Minister, the environmental management Act directly attacks individual rights, giving a minister or any of her political appointees the power to enter any land or building she thinks necessary without a warrant, without the consent of the owner or occupant, without consent, Mr. Minister. That seems to be an underlying trend in many of the Bills that are coming forward.

Mr. Minister, how can you justify giving power to a minister that even the Royal Canadian Mounted Police don't have? Even they must obtain a search warrant.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I must confess to the member, Mr. Speaker, that I am not familiar with the provision that he's referring to.

I want to say as a general point, as a general answer to the member's question, that this government is conscious of the rights of people in this province fully. We fully respect the individual's rights and freedoms.

And I think that you will find, if you're in a fair-minded mood about this at all, that none of the legislation that we bring forward and none of the steps that we take as a government will be contrary to the rights and freedoms of people in this province. And I challenge the member to give us any example where we have trampled on the rights and freedoms of Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, certainly you are the minister in charge of the judicial system in the province. And we on this side of the House are very well aware of the need to protect our environment, to protect our people from murder or the problem of narcotics. There are all kinds of crime. But we also, as you indicate and I would like to reiterate, we want to protect individual rights.

Mr. Minister, before an RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) official can forcibly enter private property in the pursuit of evidence of murder or drug trafficking or any crime, we as citizens demand — demand, Mr. Minister — that that officer obtain a legal search warrant. As the highest Justice officer, I ask you, sir: what is it that makes you believe that people should trust that any bureaucrat with powers should be able . . . that any bureaucrat should be entrusted with such powers while an RCMP officer doesn't have the same trust?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well the question is difficult to cope with. I think if the member is referring to a piece of legislation which has been proposed to this House, then with respect I propose that we deal with it within the context of that Bill. It's just a little tough to deal with these in general.

But as a general proposition, I want to assure the member that we're certainly not proposing to trample on the rights and freedoms of the people of this province. And I just refer you to my previous answer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Before the member continues with his question, I think I should draw to the attention of the members, if, as has been alluded on both sides, that the member is referring to a specific Bill, that question would be out of order in question period. Those questions are directed to the ministers in third reading or Committee of the Whole. So if the member is reading from a particular Bill, I would rule him out of order.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the purpose is to bring to the attention of this House, and certainly of the minister — and I believe the minister indicated a few minutes earlier that he may not be familiar with all the Bills . . . and we're not delving into all the Bills specifically as we will get into that when we get into committee, Mr. Speaker.

But a question to the minister is certainly, Mr. Minister, there is a disturbing trend that we have seen coming forward in many of the Bills being brought before this House — the mining Bill and certainly the environmental Bill — that put the power . . . or greater powers in the hands of ministers, ministers of the Crown, greater powers than are even available to the police forces in this province, Mr. Minister.

That is the problem we have, Mr. Minister, in the fact that we are very interested in individual rights and freedoms, the question we are asking you: how can you give those powers to the ministers rather . . . or how can you give ministers such excessive power, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said to the member, we should discuss the specific matters within the context of the particular Bills. And if there's four or five Bills involved, we'll discuss it within the context of those Bills. What I want to say is, as a general proposition, I have tried to answer the question a couple of times. If the member thinks that he sees signs that this government is going in the direction that he's suggesting, then all I can say to him, with all of the kindness and consideration that I can muster, is that he's misreading the signs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, when you first entered this House you did so with a great deal of respect from all members in this Assembly, including members on this side of the House. You have continually since that point eroded the position of the office you presently hold. You started by swearing that no patronage existed in your government, and that was so transparent as to elicit laughter from this side of the House.

Now you stand as the minister of injustice and tell this Assembly that a frontal assault on the rights and freedoms of Saskatchewan people is just. Mr. Minister, did you personally as Justice minister have any input into the decision to give civil servants more power to search and seizure than you give to the police?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I'm a bit puzzled by the question, which could be capable of being interpreted as a personal attack upon me. I'm sure, I'm sure the member did not intend that. I'm sure his preface to this question was simply to ask me the question of whether or not I knew that these provisions were in the Bill, in the Bills.

As I stand here I'm sure I don't know what the four or five Bills are. We'll be more than pleased to discuss them in the . . . when the debate comes up for the Bill, and I'll be pleased to try and address those questions at that time.

I want to assure the member though that this government does not have as part of its agenda, trampling on the rights and freedoms of Saskatchewan people. To the contrary, we will protect their rights at every turn.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, we all realize that you've been very busy on constitutional affairs and maybe haven't had the time to really keep up on what's happened within the front benches of your government. But in addition to search without warrant, you have Bills before the Assembly, Mr. Minister, that deny evidence to the courts that might have an impact on a person's innocence or guilt. Bill 13 provides, Bill 13 provides . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I've warned the member before if he's going to get into specifics of Bills I will rule his question out of order. That is reserved for Committee of the Whole in detailed study of the Bills. If the member continues I will recognize another member in the question period.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And it behoves the opposition to try to bring some of these facts to the public, and I believe question period is the period that most people really . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I think the member knows that that comment is out of order. I ask him to get to his question. Order.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I thank you. The question, Mr. Minister, was the fact of whether we're giving more authority to ministers rather than judges and our courts. Mr. Minister, do you approve this action to make civil servants immune from testifying in a court of law?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I'm speechless — I am speechless. I would love to answer the member's question. I've tried hard to answer all of his questions today. And I'm sure that when he asked that, he has reference to a particular Bill, and I will be glad to either answer that question myself or have the minister responsible answer when it comes before this House. I look the member right in the eyeball and say, I'll be glad to answer that when I have a clear understanding of what the question is all about.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it was mentioned earlier that we want to protect the children of the province, I believe the minister mentioned that. We want to protect rape victims. We want to protect victims of crime, and in every one of these cases we . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Please just have order on both sides. Let the member ask his question, let the minister answer.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, in every one of the cases . . . and yes we will get to the specific Bills in estimates, but in every one of the cases . . . many of the Bills coming forward, Mr. Minister, have things that really have caught our attention. In every one of these cases we insist that the accused be prosecuted, that the guilty be prosecuted. We do that by insisting that all the relevant evidence be available in courts. Is it the position of this government that the best way of protecting children is to conceal evidence as we have seen in some of the Bills?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I must say again that I haven't the faintest idea what the member is talking about. I want to

say to the member that our approach to legislation is an approach which is based solidly upon all kinds of precedents. If we're talking about the powers of inspectors, and I gather from your question that that's one of the things you're talking about, then the provisions that we have included are based upon all kinds of precedents within Saskatchewan, within Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario.

Many of the Bills . . . many of the precedents were created by the previous government of which the hon. member was a part. So I . . . without knowing exactly what the member is talking about or asking about I tell the member that we're not seeking to change things along the lines that he suggested, and we intend to be fully respectful of the rights and freedoms of Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Are there any further questions? Does anybody have any further questions? I will not recognize the member from Moosomin.

Effects of Budget on Livestock Industry

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister of Agriculture, I want you to admit to this Assembly that you didn't have the time of day yesterday to meet with the livestock association, the feeder association who wanted to tell you about their industry. You wouldn't consult with them before you cancelled their programs. You wouldn't talk to them after.

Mr. Minister, they present a brief to you which clearly shows that you have threatened the livelihood of 1,500 Saskatchewan families because of your ill-advised measures. I trust that you have had an opportunity to review that brief. Will you admit that this estimate is right on the money?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I think I described often enough the events of the discussions that were held yesterday. Our agricultural caucus, who is very familiar with the agricultural issues — much more familiar than the members opposite — had a good discussion with the livestock industry.

I want to mention to the member opposite that this morning I met with another sector of the livestock industry who are making positive proposals about the development of further livestock industry in Saskatchewan; who want to take the responsibility themselves; who recognize that government, under the circumstances you have left it, is not in a position to take a role in other than a facilitating role. And they know they can do business in Saskatchewan, are proposing methods of doing business in Saskatchewan, are organizing themselves with other elements of society to do business in Saskatchewan.

And I hope the member opposite will join with those who positively want to work towards building a livestock industry in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, you said in the *Star-Phoenix* yesterday, and I quote: Wiens said all of those numbers were wrong. That's what you were quoted as saying. And I want to tell you and the members of this Assembly that this brief was put together by Hartley Furtan, who you said was . . . all of the vital information as it related to GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) was right on the money. So today are you saying he is wrong today? Is Mr. Hartley Furtan and his numbers wrong today?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I don't challenge the numbers of other organizations. I said there have been a number of studies and a number of pieces of information that we will discuss together. I think I did make reference to the fact that the manner in which the member opposite was quoting numbers seemed to be inconsistent with the truth, as I knew it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Publication Costs

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member from Kindersley asked me a question, to which I took notice. And he asked about the cost of the accounting initiatives briefing package production costs, which were produced by the Department of Finance. Mr. Speaker, the accounting initiative briefing package was 10 pages long. It was produced on April 14, 1992. It cost a total amount, Mr. Speaker, of \$23.73.

The member also asked me, Mr. Speaker, the cost of printing budget . . . budget printing costs. Well I am pleased to report that I am able to provide the answer today on budget printing costs, Mr. Speaker. In 1989-1990 under the former government the costs were \$490,231. In 1991-1992 the cost of printing the budget was \$231,403. I am able to say the costs of printing the budget and documents for this year under this government, Mr. Speaker, were \$52,539.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, perhaps the reason that your budget cost so little to print this year is because you had half of it leaked before the budget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Minister, would you not agree that that is the most partisan budget that has ever been delivered in the province of Saskatchewan? And, Mr. Minister, I ask you now wouldn't it be more appropriate for the New Democratic Party to bear that \$52,000 cost than the people of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, the truth may seem like it's partisan to the member from Thunder Creek but it is the truth. And the truth is that under the previous administration they paid no attention at all to how they managed the taxpayers' dollars. That's why in 1989-90 they squandered \$490,000 to print the budget to one advertising agency, untendered, and that's with similar

numbers in 1991-92. But if you look at the facts, Mr. Speaker, this government has managed well and has basically reduced the cost almost to nothing compared to what the former government spent, and that's good management.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Why is the member on her feet?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, to introduce guests who arrived during the question period.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly 50 grade 8 students from Silverwood Heights School in Saskatoon accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Carlson and Mr. Neufeld. I trust that these students have enjoyed the question period. I'll be meeting with them later, after they have a tour of the Legislative Building, for pictures and refreshments. And I would ask that all members join me in welcoming the students from Silverwood Heights School.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. My point of order relates to the Minister of Finance who has been wilfully bending and twisting the rules and regulations of this House. And my point of order is that yesterday when the question was raised, he took great lengths to answer the question and then upon sitting down, said, I take notice of the question. And you, sir, reprimanded him for doing that. Today, sir, he gets the floor a second time to further answer that question. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is an abuse of the parliamentary system of this House.

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday during question period, the Minister of Finance clearly took notice of a question. *Hansard* clearly indicates that and it was allowed by the Assembly.

I think the real issue here is why the members are opposed to the Minister of Finance giving an answer? Why are they opposed? I'll tell you: there are times in life in this Assembly when the truth hurts and this is one of them.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I've heard the member from Rosthern. The member ordinarily would make a good point of order. I had reprimanded the minister yesterday, but that was the first time it happened in this House during this session and if it does happen again in the future, I will

certainly not recognize a minister in answering a question. I felt that the question was important enough that the member from Kindersley would want an answer to it. And that's why I allowed it.

But I think your point is well taken. In the future, if a minister answers and then takes notice, I will not recognize the minister in giving an answer.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Speaker: — What is your point of order?

Mr. Neudorf: — On a different issue, Mr. Speaker, so it's a point of order that occurred during question period — of course, this is the first time that I have an opportunity to rise to address that point — and I refer to the line of questioning that my colleague from Moosomin was engaged upon and although it was frustrating to get an answer — but that's not my point of order — you, sir, did warn him that not to get specific. Now the question, Mr. Speaker, that he was getting at was because of the inability of the Minister of Justice to answer these questions . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. That's not a point of order, that's a debating point, that's a debating point. I want to clarify, however, my decision on the member. I had warned the member at least two or three times not to get into specifics of a Bill. I think everybody understands that. The member did not adhere to that warning. He went on another two or three times after I had warned him. He did not heed my warning, therefore I thought he was not recognizing my decision and that's why I did not recognize him for another question. And I will proceed in that fashion in the future. That's a well established tradition in this House. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Neudorf: — Point of order or point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, if I might. I would suggest or I'd ask you, Mr. Speaker, to check the records as to the exact question that he asked prior to . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I've made my decision. Order. I've made my decision.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Saskatchewan Savings Bonds

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise to report to the Assembly on an important initiative announced by the government today. In the past few months, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have had an ample opportunity to examine the current financial situation of this province and see clearly how we got to where we are today. That is the important information. But, Mr. Speaker, it is only one-half of the story. The other half, and some would argue the most important half, is what we are going to do about it.

Today our government has taken a major step forward in attacking our fiscal problems with the introduction of Saskatchewan savings bonds. These bonds are more than just another financial instrument. Saskatchewan savings bonds are the way to put our community spirit to work for

our children and for our future. Saskatchewan people deserve a positive investment opportunity and the means to do what we do best, working together to build a better future.

Mr. Speaker, these bonds are available exclusively to Saskatchewan residents in \$100 denominations, have no maximum purchase limit, can be cashed annually at the investor's option for the full investment amount plus interest, are freely transferable within Saskatchewan, and will be on sale June 15 to July 3, 1992 at all authorized financial institutions.

On or about June 11 the government will announce the interest rate for this year's bond issue. It will be at a competitive rate. It is our intention to raise \$150 million at a minimum through this year's issue. For Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, these bonds are a simple, safe, secure opportunity to confront the province's financial difficulties head-on by bringing the debt home and by investing in building for our future.

For the province, it is a means to reduce our dependence on outside investors and put interest payments into the pockets of Saskatchewan people instead of into the hands of outside bankers and bond dealers. For our children, it is a ray of hope for the future. And when all is said and done, the consummate duty of any government is to secure the future of our children.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition are pleased the government has decided to allow Saskatchewan people to invest in their future, invest in this province through the issuance of this bond.

As everyone in the province is well aware, Mr. Speaker, the former administration realized the benefits of allowing Saskatchewan people to become involved in the financing of a great part of government's activities. In that way Saskatchewan people had the opportunity to invest in Crown utilities such as SaskTel, SaskPower, and PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Inc.).

Each of these bonds met with immediate success. Many more people than were allowed in fact, Mr. Speaker, would have invested in these particular areas. Unfortunately some of these were stopped, I think, Mr. Speaker, for purely political reasons.

The former administration saw the merit in introducing the community bond program because it did many of the things that the Minister of Finance just spoke about — that rekindling of a co-operative spirit amongst Saskatchewan communities, pride in allowing people in villages and towns to use their own money in conjunction with others to benefit their particular area.

I think the continuance of the concept through the Saskatchewan savings bond is an excellent idea and I commend the minister for it. Indeed, I think our own Leader of the Opposition called for a such a measure on April 15 of this year. We must pay that type of interest, Mr. Speaker, to our own people rather than foreign banks.

However we are somewhat concerned and perplexed, Mr. Speaker, over the government's decision to cancel any further bond offerings in the Crown corporations. One would think that the benefits of a Saskatchewan savings bond would also hold true for our utilities, as was certainly the case by the tremendous response in the previous administration.

We sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, we sincerely hope that this wasn't a narrow-minded political response and we hope that the government reconsiders that situation as they begin to market the Saskatchewan savings bond in the province, and we wish them all the success in the world with that marketing.

National Access Awareness Week

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to declare June 1 to 7 National Access Awareness Week. This week we recognize the barriers faced by people with disabilities, barriers that prevent them from participating fully in all aspects of life.

The idea for National Access Awareness Week came from Rick Hansen after he finished his man in motion tour. It's a week to bring together in partnership and co-operation people with disabilities, community groups, business, labour, and government to foster changes, changes that will result in equal access and full participation.

Many communities in Saskatchewan have improved the access to services and facilities, and many others are working toward this goal. At a time when financial resources are limited, we have taken steps to address the need for improved accessibility for the disabled.

Special allowances under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan for the disabled for food, clothing, and personal needs are being increased by 25 per cent. The transportation allowance for the disabled will be increased by 15 per cent. It will provide replacement vehicles and establish new services in some communities.

The focus of National Access Awareness Week is on transportation, housing, employment, recreation and education. Communities are encouraged to understand what barriers exist in these areas to disabled people and to take action to remove the barriers.

I want to recognize the vital work of all the organizations serving people with disabilities, groups like the Voice of the Handicapped, the Canadian Paraplegic Association, the Saskatchewan Association for Community Living and the Saskatchewan Abilities Council.

This week should serve as a reminder to heighten our awareness of the difficulties faced by disabled people every day and to challenge us to work together to help. It is with great pleasure that I declare June 1 to June 7 National Access Awareness Week in Saskatchewan.

(1430)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Firstly I'd like to thank Madam Minister for sending me this here ministerial statement. It's appreciated very much, Madam Minister.

Firstly I'd like to thank you, and then I'd also like to thank the last minister of Social Services, the member from Rosthern, who did this same thing before. I think it's a great gesture for the disabled people that we're honouring them and thinking about them this week of June 1 to June 7.

I think that we should congratulate the disabled people and the handicapped in this province of Saskatchewan. I've been quite involved with quite a few of them throughout my own life, and they're a great group of people. I'd say nearly all of them, given a chance, are doing everything they can to make a life of their own. And I really congratulate these people. I've met some tremendous people that have done things to make life go well for them.

I'd like to congratulate the communities throughout the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that as I travelled throughout the province I see that they're trying so hard and making a good job when they build new buildings to make access for the handicapped. And I'd like to encourage the government. I thank them for this new money that has been announced recently for the handicapped, and I congratulate you for that, Madam Minister, and your government.

But I encourage the government to do more and especially to encourage the communities, which I think are doing a good job, to help make more accessible for the handicapped. And one main thing is to really encourage the people to make what they can of their life. And I'm sure that all governments that I've been involved with throughout our great country of Canada have been doing this, and I'm happy about it.

Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly tell this Assembly about a man that proves beyond doubt the great potential of disabled people — proof that if we are aware of their abilities instead of just seeing the disabilities, how much these folks have to contribute. This man, and one of the greatest scientists in the past generation, was a fellow named Stephen Hawking. This fellow was completely physically disabled. He had the full use of his mouth and his mind, and with those two things he created a revolution in science. Many people will be familiar with his little book called *A Brief History of Time*. Mr. Hawking used his mind, and with a stick in his mouth, he used a computer to write that book and to write many papers that changed the theories and expanded the knowledge of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the minister for making this statement today. And, Mr. Speaker, I again want to congratulate all disabled people and handicapped in this province for the things that they're doing to try to make a life for themselves. And may God bless each and every one of them.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. McPherson: — Introduction of guests, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to welcome to the Legislative Assembly, to you and through you to the Legislative Assembly, my wife, Heather, and sons Cameron and Carson.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply

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

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

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — I recalled and I'm being reminded that the member from Morse asked me a question during the last time the committee met about the special warrants for April and May. And they are ready and they're coming over, and before the end of the day I'll make sure that he gets it. But they're not here at this moment but they'll be here.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, I believe the minister has a new official in today and I know the gentleman but some of the new members don't, so if you would . . .

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, I thank the member from Thunder Creek. I should have also done that when I was on my feet, and that is introduce the associate deputy minister of Finance, Mr. Bill Jones, seated on my right.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make a few remarks and I will indicate to the minister right now that the opposition is going to allow the Appropriation Bill to proceed this afternoon. But I think there are a few things that have arisen during the debate, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to summarize because I think they are important for Saskatchewan taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, as was noted time and time again during this debate, that probably before this Assembly rises you will have nearly half Saskatchewan's budget expended. You have had two special warrants. We have an

Appropriation Bill before us today, an Appropriation Bill that the minister has indicated has several components that are more than one-twelfth. They are in fairly large areas of expenditure in the province of Saskatchewan, everyone recognizes — Health, Education, Social Services.

Some of these areas do have requirements that are based upon agreements, that are based upon the time of year, that are based upon long-standing, traditional needs for third parties to finance themselves in the province.

The opposition has never questioned, Mr. Chairman, that those third parties have needs. But what we were questioning the minister . . . because this is the very first time, the very first time that the opposition has had the Minister of Finance in this Chamber since last December — last December — when we saw the minister come in and set aside the rules of this Assembly and put the members of this Chamber through a charade. At that time the government wasn't willing to call estimates, wasn't willing to have its ministers come before this House and answer questions.

We have not yet completed one estimate in this House, Mr. Chairman. A classic example, the Minister of Finance on many of the questions posed by the opposition said those are too narrow in scope; they would be better defined by the minister in charge. Well the minister in charge of SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) was in this Assembly for a number of hours, having fairly narrow questions placed to him about the debt in SPMC and where it has migrated to. And you know what? The minister of SPMC's response was, well you'll have to ask the ministers involved with those individual areas.

Now the Minister of Finance has indicated that he has taken \$715 million in debt. He has taken it out of SPMC, and he has rolled it into the Consolidated Fund. And he says you'd be better off asking the minister responsible for SPMC those questions. Well that was the exact point, Mr. Chairman. The minister was asked, and that minister said no, you can't ask me; you've got to ask somebody else.

Well the rule of thumb, Mr. Chairman, in Saskatchewan is that the Finance minister . . . that's where the buck stops. That's who writes the cheques. It's his officials that design the budget primarily. It's his officials that have their John Henry on the cheque. It is the Minister of Finance who has the ultimate responsibility for the expenditures of funds. Therefore when we get the first opportunity in a long time to have this minister before the House — admittedly spending, probably, by the time we're done this Appropriation Bill today — he will have spent nearly a third of this year's entire budget without any questions being answered in the House.

He has been able to take debt from all sorts of places around government: from the Crowns, from the line departments, from SPMC. He has been able to take debt supposedly from all of these areas and roll it into a different format.

He's changing the accounting systems of the province of Saskatchewan when it is politically expedient, and yet he

doesn't want to answer the questions, questions about what would certain amounts of debt be in 1992 dollars. Questions I think that are very legitimate if Saskatchewan taxpayers are to make fair comparisons, not comparisons that are tainted with political rhetoric, but fair comparisons as to what the debt of the province of Saskatchewan is. How much, by doing the changes that the minister has done, have those changes resulted in additional debt load? By using those figures repeatedly in the public, has the minister in effect changed Saskatchewan's bond rating?

The minister, I know, was warned very early on in his time as Minister of Finance to be very careful with public pronouncements and about the way that things should be done in the province of Saskatchewan vis-a-vis our necessity to garner revenue and funds, garner funds outside of the province of Saskatchewan in order to support our infrastructure.

Yet this minister has always chosen the political route. He has always used every opportunity available to him to accentuate write-downs, to accentuate the debt of the province because I think he felt he was scoring some sort of political points against the former government. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, in effect what he has maybe done has scored some points against the Government of Saskatchewan which unfortunately he won't pay for, but Saskatchewan taxpayers will.

We're at the point now, Mr. Chairman, where I notice in the paper of June 3, *Leader-Post*, where Saskatchewan's two major cities won't even buy Saskatchewan bonds any more. Saskatoon and Regina are prohibited by law from buying the bonds of the province of Saskatchewan. And I honestly believe, Mr. Chairman, that some of the moves that this Minister of Finance has made has resulted in that very situation.

(1445)

Because this minister, all through the questioning which we placed to him, did not want to reveal answers. The member from Morse asked a number of very pertinent questions about the beef stabilization fund which had accumulated a large deficit over a period of some 17 or 18 years. The land bank, once again very large numbers accumulated over a period of nearly 20 years. The Water Corporation, which as Mr. Chairman knows, is an amalgamation of departments back in 1983 of various departments in government that were associated with the delivery and development of water projects in the province of Saskatchewan, tied to which are a number of very large debt related issues.

All of these things had simply disappeared off the books of the province of Saskatchewan where they normally resided over that length of time. And the minister has now woofed them over, he says, into a particular area; doesn't want to answer any particular questions about them, has obviously added to the debt on the consolidated side by doing so, has obviously incurred interest costs by doing so, has obviously meant that he will have to go to the money markets to get money to service that debt.

So, Mr. Chairman, the questions are not answered. And

yet in reviewing the verbatim of similar debates from last year and the year before, going through over a dozen members of the former opposition personally — I read some 200 pages of verbatim — we found a very wide-ranging debate. They went on for several days in fact.

We had the member from Riversdale asking questions of the Minister of Finance about GRIP and NISA (net income stabilization account) and what the per capita cost was to individual Saskatchewan taxpayers and what was the cost in comparison to the province of Ontario and the province of British Columbia and other provinces. The Minister of Finance answered those questions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this minister was very indignant that the opposition would ask those very same type of questions in his first opportunity before this House after expending a third of the entire budget without any answers. It's sort of amazing, Mr. Chairman, to see the shoe on the other foot, to remember, as I do after seven years in this Assembly, all of the rhetoric, all of the talk about the evils of special warrants, all of the talk about ministers of Finance hiding things.

And yet we went through three days of absolutely no answers, no relevance to what happened to the debt, no relevance between the accounting system that has been used since Tommy Douglas till present and what the minister is attempting to do. There is no relevance because he refused to put the numbers — there were questions — the numbers into 1992 dollars. Because that is the only way that relevance can be achieved. But he insists on mixing and matching his numbers all the time and, by doing so, confusing Saskatchewan taxpayers even more so than what they are confused at present.

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, I suspect before this Assembly is done that we will have an opportunity for the Minister of Finance to come before this House with another special warrant package. I suspect that will be the case. And I would just say to the minister that when that next opportunity comes, and we still may not have that many estimates done in this House, that he had better be prepared to come with some of the answers that were asked this time, because I can assure him that they will be asked over and over and over again the next time that we have interim supply brought before this House.

Because until those things are clarified, until we get clear answers as to what has happened to hundreds of millions of dollars of debt, till we get those numbers put into 1992 dollars and until we get a clear picture from this minister, a clear picture and plan for the province of Saskatchewan, then we can only surmise, Mr. Chairman, that what the minister has done to present is purely a political exercise, a purely political exercise which he is using to try and get Saskatchewan taxpayers off his back.

Because, Mr. Chairman, ever since the budget delivered in this Assembly when every promise of that minister and his government was broken a short six months after the promises were made, we have seen nothing but an attempt to blame everyone else in the world for the problems that he is creating, problems that clearly show no consultation with Saskatchewan taxpayers.

The questions that have been arising in this House over the last few days concerning issues such as FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) and the destruction of the Saskatchewan cattle feeding industry is a good example. We have fuel dealers all over this province saying to the minister, we are faced with another day of work each month simply doing paperwork because we were not consulted on the best ways to cut down on slippage in fuel tax. We have sector after sector in our society today saying, you know, if you'd only come and talk to us we probably could have pointed out ways to solve the problem or work with you in solving the problems that you have fiscally in this province.

And it doesn't matter if it's optometrists or chiropractors or the 44,000 women in this province that don't have a pension plan any more. All of them have said to this minister and this government, if you simply would have come and talked to us ahead of time. You didn't have to give us details. Just come and ask us about our opinion on the goals that you're trying to achieve and we will do our best to work with you.

We would have the Saskatchewan Pension Plan modified to the point where maybe the government match didn't occur for a while, where we as single, employable people, where we as people who work in small business, where we as people who do not have benefits that many other sectors in our society have, can work with you to help the province of Saskatchewan achieve its fiscal problems.

And yet during questioning in these interim supply estimates, the minister has repeatedly refused to acknowledge the contribution of groups like that; their suggestions and their willingness to consult. And I think it was only appropriate, Mr. Chairman, that we in the official opposition place those questions on behalf of people like the Saskatchewan Pension Plan holders, like the fuel dealers, like the people involved in livestock feeding, like the thousands of farmers in the province of Saskatchewan today who are taking the government to court because they weren't sent proper notification on the GRIP plan.

Literally tens of thousands of Saskatchewan families are being affected by the decisions of the Minister of Finance and his government — decisions made without consultation and decisions which I say to you, Mr. Chairman, are destroying the ability of Saskatchewan people to contribute, to contribute in a meaningful way to solving the fiscal problems that are in this province.

People without work, people without hope, people with no clear direction have a difficult time being contributing taxpayers to our province. If the 1,500 families that are associated with red meat production in this province lose their ability to contribute, we in effect, Mr. Chairman, will have to go and borrow money to replace those 1,500.

And that, Mr. Chairman, will go on through segment after segment after segment of our society because decisions have been made without any consultation from a government that said, we will be new, we will start the healing process, we will talk to anyone before we make

moves that affect the lives of Saskatchewan people. And I guess of all the promises that were made last October, of all the promises that were made last October, that's probably the one that hurts Saskatchewan people the most.

It's like a gentleman from Bethune that phoned me over the dinner hour. He fed 200 head of feeder cattle last winter. He hired two young individuals from the city of Regina who were laid off from their jobs last winter. Those two individuals worked in that feed operation all last winter, continued to be contributing people to our society, and said that they would be back next winter if he was going to feed another 200 head of cattle.

Well he said to me today, because of the decision of the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues, that those 200 head of cattle aren't going to be in his feedlot because his margins were between 65 and \$70 last winter, and after you take \$42.50 a head off each one of those cattle, that margin isn't there any more. And he can't handle it himself and he can't afford to hire those two young fellows from Regina again this winter because of it.

Mr. Chairman, you are going to see that go on and on and on and on. And I say to you, that isn't the way that we're going to solve our deficit problems in the province of Saskatchewan. And those people don't have the opportunity to contribute to solving the problem because it will take each and every one of us putting our shoulder to the wheel to solve that problem.

And that's why, Mr. Chairman, we asked so many of the questions that we did in interim supply. We're going to have a third of the budget expended before a single estimate is passed. That third of the budget being expended is affecting the lives of people like my young farmer from Bethune. And it's affecting it over and over and over again.

And that's why I say to the minister, the next time we do interim supply in this House, I think it would be appropriate if he was prepared to come and answer those questions, because we will by that time have probably a half of Saskatchewan's entire budget expended and we still will not have been through the estimates of this House.

Mr. Chairman, the official opposition is going to be watching this minister very closely. This minister went to Washington, D.C. (District of Columbia) with a shelf filing early on this spring, a shelf filing that has the potential to borrow a billion dollars, U.S. (United States). It cost the Saskatchewan taxpayers over \$400,000 to prepare.

It's very clear, Mr. Chairman, that we need to watch this Minister of Finance. We need to watch these borrowings, and we need to know what he's doing with the money. And if he has already borrowed on that shelf filing, then next time we do interim supply, we will be asking him those questions also.

With that, Mr. Chairman, the official opposition has no more questions for the Minister of Finance.

Motion agreed to.

(1500)

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to move the second motion that is required under this procedure. The motion I'd like to move is that:

Be it resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993, the sum of \$469,935,000, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolutions be now read the first time and second time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the resolutions read a first and second time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: —

That Bill No. 44, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending on March 31, 1993, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly and under rule 51(2), I move that the Bill be now read a second and third time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill read a second and third time and passed under its title.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 3:12 p.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

- Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act
- Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act
- Bill No. 5 — An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act
- Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act
- Bill No. 4 — An Act to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act
- Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act, 1983
- Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Marriage Act
- Bill No. 15 — An Act to amend The Wills Act
- Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Jury Act, 1981

Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Commissioners for Oaths Act

Bill No. 18 — An Act to promote Regulatory Reform in Saskatchewan by repealing Certain Obsolete Statutes

Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Doukhobors of Canada C.C.U.B. Trust Fund Act

Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend The Auctioneers Act

Bill No. 44 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending on March 31, 1993

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 3:15 p.m.

(1515)

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 13

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. MacKinnon that **Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Adoption Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We just had some Bills passed through this legislature, and I'm glad to see that. But there's been some new Bills that we were talking about in question period today, four or five that aren't quite the same, and this is one of them, Mr. Speaker.

I feel that the members opposite should be in a disarray over Bills like Bill 13. It is not all right, Mr. Speaker, to place the minister and her office employees above the law, and that's what's happening in this Bill, Mr. Speaker. They're placing themselves as ministers about the law. It is not all right to leave, once again, at the discretion of a minister the entire personal details of someone's family life.

Mr. Speaker, the trend we have all been talking about is just as evident in this Bill 13 as it is in several other Bills introduced to this Assembly by this government. And that trend, Mr. Speaker, is slowly taking civil liberties away from the people and replacing them in the hands of the minister.

Ministers, Mr. Speaker, should not have this power. Why, Mr. Speaker, should ministers have more power than the courts? Not only does this Bill threaten . . . 13, sorry, this Bill 13 give additional powers to the minister, Mr. Speaker, it actually places the minister, any officers or employees from the Social Services Department who have worked on specific adoption cases, above the law.

This Bill actually states that the minister or any person in her or his department in a court of law does not have to give any evidence whether by oral statement or written information that they may have in their possession pertaining to a court case. Mr. Speaker, this is wrong — absolutely wrong. I thought this day would never come in this legislature when we see something like this.

What's more, it doesn't have to even be a court case, Mr. Speaker. The minister, her employees, don't even have to give vital information if there is a hearing or any other proceeding. And this is absolutely wrong, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the members opposite: scrutinize their own Bills before they bring Bills like this before this House.

Let's talk about blanket legislation, Mr. Speaker. What happens if for instance there is a case before the court involving adoptive parents and alleged child-abuse problems? If the minister's office has information pertaining to this case which could decide something as basic as whether the couple is guilty or innocent, whether we are talking about the minister herself, an officer or employee of the Social Services department, or all three, Mr. Speaker, they don't have to bring any evidence before the court.

Now this Bill is especially threatening, Mr. Speaker, in the event someone has been wrongfully accused of child abuse or something just as serious and the accused is not guilty. What assurances are left to the accused, Mr. Speaker, that they can disprove false accusation and in turn clear their names? What assurances do these people have that they can receive fair treatment through the justice system when the hands of the judge are tied by the Social Services minister?

Mr. Speaker, the ministers opposite would only just look seriously at what they're doing here, is taking the power away from the courts and the judges and giving it to the minister. I can't believe this is happening, Mr. Speaker.

What happens when a couple is turned down for an adoption on the basis of a letter written by a person wrongfully accusing the couple of a wrong-doing? And there's been instances like this that's happened. Since this Bill was tabled, Mr. Speaker, I have instances where people have come to me saying that when they went to adopt children, someone came forth with information to try to cause harm to these individuals and the adoptions were stopped. And it turned out they were not true.

And they had to wait . . . when you wait two or three years for adoption and something like this happens . . . But in the past they've been able to come forth and prove they're innocent. And they now have their families in the cases that came to me. But in this case, under this new Bill, it would give no chance of recourse of law for these people, Mr. Speaker.

If this couple is able to dispute the letter, to find out who wrote it and why, then able to proceed with an adoption. And that's what's happening. I'm just giving a hypothetical case. But that's what could happen. But it has happened, but it turned out all right, Mr. Speaker.

It doesn't look like it from Bill 13, though. In Bill 13, Mr. Speaker, this can't happen. In fact if there is any sort of a hearing or even an inquiry, nobody from the Social Services department has to say a thing. No one in Social Services has to tell where this letter came from, what information it entails, or anything else about the details that will affect this couple's lives.

Mr. Speaker, when the member sitting beside me, the member from Rosthern . . . this couldn't happen when he was minister of Social Services, but now under this Bill 13 these kind of things can happen. And that's why we're getting calls in our office, Mr. Speaker.

And I think very, very few people in the province of Saskatchewan really know about these Bills. It isn't out there. Because this government does like they do with all things — they do not consult. They'll consult and tell the people after the Bill.

Now if this doesn't sound ridiculous to the members opposite, they aren't thinking about how many people they will hurt in this Bill. Mr. Speaker, there are very serious considerations to think about — very serious cases that could easily come up. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to make some changes in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, before it becomes law.

I for one cannot support a Bill that takes the rights of a just trial away from an individual. Never before in this province, Mr. Speaker, have we had the rights of the court . . . of a trial taken away from you. And this is the rights are taken away from an individual, and this is wrong.

I also could never support a Bill that could hurt so many people, Mr. Speaker. And there are other concerns as well within Bill 13, Mr. Speaker.

I also find it interesting the government has to start advertising for adoptive parents. Where has this government been, Mr. Speaker? Anybody that wants to adopt children, it takes several years. Now they must not know this because now they're going to start advertising for adoptive parents.

Why is it necessary to spend money on advertising when couples already wait sometimes several years to adopt a child of their own? That means, Mr. Speaker, that the government opposite who put these type of Bills together, that they're not even looking into the real situation.

Is it really necessary to start a "parents wanted" section in the paper? And I don't agree with it. You don't have articles in the paper by the government Social Services: parents wanted. There's parents out there. There's no end.

If we could just stop abortions in this province, it would help a lot more yet. And if we had a government that believed in controlling abortions, there would be many more children yet, because there was a . . . it usually runs around 2,000 abortions in this province a year. And you wouldn't have any problems finding parents, Mr. Speaker. The parents will come to Social Services looking for children.

Mr. Speaker, other adoption agencies aren't mentioned in the same category. Who does this government think they are, Mr. Speaker? Who do they think they are that only they in this Bill are the ones that's going to advertise? Why didn't they put the adoption agencies in same category?

While the Department of Social Services can advertise for prospective parents, why doesn't the government

mention that adoption agencies may also advertise? Maybe it's because the government has no intention to allow independent agencies to advertise. I don't know what the answer to this question is, Mr. Speaker, but I do know it is not clearly stated in this Bill, unless adoption agencies are not intended to be included.

And those are some of the questions that we'll be asking the minister when he gets into Committee of the Whole. We want this very, very clear. Maybe the NDP (New Democratic Party) want to even monopolize babies like they're trying to monopolize every other aspect of private life for Saskatchewan citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to understand why the government finds it necessary to advertise in the first place. While we are cutting millions of dollars from health care and education, why would we spend any money on advertising for parents?

And these agencies are concerned, Mr. Speaker, because I have talked to some myself, and this is one of the many concerns they had with Bill 13. From my own investigation, I can see very clearly that once again this government did not consult with anyone who will be directly affected by this Bill.

And that's what this government's guilty of, Mr. Speaker; they're not consulting. No matter whether we're talking about agriculture or no matter what it's about, whether it's about these Justice Bills that we're talking about today — the member from Moosomin brought up comments and he was talking about four or five Bills . . . and that's what the trouble is, Mr. Speaker; the government is not consulting. They haven't talked to the adoption agencies. I've talked to some of them, and they have not talked to them. They haven't held open meetings including adoptive parents and others who have been adopted themselves, Mr. Speaker. They've done nothing but satisfy their own caucus, and that's not right, Mr. Speaker.

Back in 1980-81 — I forget the year — but this same government brought in a Bill to change The Adoption Act. And I'm so worried that maybe this is something the same kind of a Bill, Mr. Speaker. You can't . . . when they're giving the powers to the minister, anything could happen. And when this happened before, this Bill almost slipped through. I wasn't the critic for it, but I got involved in it. And so we started having meetings and we advertised throughout Saskatchewan what was happening, that they could retroactively open up adoption contracts. They could retroactively open it up.

So we got the word out, Mr. Speaker, throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and we had . . . there was approximately 10,000 letters came to the minister of Justice. And the then minister of Justice who is now the Premier of this province, he was . . . done the right thing and he pulled the Bill.

Now that's what has happened in this case, Mr. Speaker. The now Minister of Justice needs to sit down with the now Premier and discuss what they did in 1980-81. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, of that year. But they pulled that Bill because it was going to cause too many hardships and unhappiness for people.

We'll use some examples. If you have people that . . . we have many people in this province that could be 50, 60, 70 years of age, and their parents still could be living. They could still have a mother living. And when they adopted, they had a contract that there was no way they were going to find one another, but then in later years it got changed. In later years, it was changed, Mr. Speaker.

So what I'm saying is that they should not be having retroactive legislation that can affect the lives of so many people. If you had a contract that you signed when you adopted — say in last 5, 10, 15 years — and they were different, well then leave it that way, Mr. Speaker.

They should not go beyond today. Whatever today's law is . . . if they want to change the law on adoption, at least the parents, when they adopt their child, least they'll know, Mr. Speaker, these are the rules that we adopt under. But don't take it back to people that are maybe . . . been adopted 50 . . . half a century ago and start advertising for one another because that wasn't their contract. And this is quite serious, Mr. Speaker.

And this is not the sort of matter that should be decided by one minister. No one minister should ever decide about the things that I'm talking about. The Bill provides for this, for a very small group of people, Mr. Speaker, in his department. So much for open and consultative government.

He keeps talking about open government. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not open government. This is giving the powers to a minister. Bill 13, Mr. Speaker, is just another extension of this government shutting the door to democracy, shutting to the very civil rights each person in a democratic country should be able to count on.

Well I say to the people in Saskatchewan: look out because the NDP government has no respect for your rights. Instead this government will stop at nothing until the government controls the private lives of each and every one of us.

Now I'm sure the members opposite will get upset and say, yes we do care about civil rights. But, Mr. Speaker, cry as they may, the proof is in what they're doing. The proof is in their actions.

How can this government claim to care about civil rights when they're trying to give ministers the power to bust into any building or land he or she chooses? Mr. Speaker, even an RCMP today would have to have legal permission from the courts or whatever to be able to go in on a drug bust. They can't even go into a person's house without . . . or possession of his buildings, but now under some of these Bills they've got, they can just walk over anybody to do what they want.

(1530)

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

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a point of

order.

The Speaker: — Yes. What is your point of order?

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, the rules in this Assembly require that individuals restrict the use of lap-top computers to the Committee of the Whole or Committee of Finance, and I notice the member from . . . the Associate Minister of Finance is using his. I wonder if the Speaker would rule on that?

The Speaker: — The member just caught me in the act of writing a note to the Associate Minister of Finance and reminding him about the rules and procedures, Rule No. 17, which clearly states:

that lap-tops be permitted for use in Committee of the Whole and Committee of Finance only;

and I ask the Associate Minister of Finance to please remove the lap-top computer from the Assembly.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To continue, how can this government claim to care about civil rights when they're trying to give ministers the power to bust into any building? I am repeating that, Mr. Speaker, because the point I'm making is that the present laws, the RCMP don't have as much rights to go and break into places, to search for drug busts and prostitution, things like this that are of a serious nature — they have to have search warrants.

Now under this new government and their Bills, some of the Bills they're bringing forth, they'll have the rights to go and do what they want. It's not right, Mr. Speaker. How can they pretend to care when they are giving ministers the right to release any personal information they feel like whether on television, radio, NDP Party letters, anything, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, how can they claim to care about individuals when they are putting legislation forward that will put retroactive laws into effect for almost 20 years. I touch on this further in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and the first part of my remarks. And this is serious. You start bringing retroactive legislation where you can go back 20, 30, 50 years.

Like I said, I know of cases of adopted people that are 60 years old, and we don't know, they could easily have a mother living, and their contracts were not able to go retroactive that time, and I don't think this is right. I know in some cases people say, well we like to find our ancestors, and all that. And it's quite a controversy. But a contract is a contract. And I don't think that this government should be allowed to go back and give the minister the full right to have a sweeping power over the people of Saskatchewan. They may affect a lot of lives and cause a lot of unhappiness.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the public sees what is happening and the NDP are taking very serious steps. I would like to warn the members opposite of their actions. The people of this province don't like Bill 13. That's just a few that we've talked to. Wait till the whole province finds out about it. They'll get their 10,000 letters again.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite already know they are a one-term government. The member from Regina North even said so recently on a radio interview. If you want to be around in 10 years or in 5 years, for that matter, if the career politicians over there still want to have a career, reconsider now what you are doing. Only then, Mr. Speaker, will there even be an NDP Party.

Mr. Speaker, speaking purely from the free enterprise point of view, it would be nice to no longer have any NDPers running this province. But I'm sure the members opposite don't share that same view. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I guess the NDP can consider themselves forewarned. And they can also expect to be receiving lots more angry phone calls — many, many more.

They will hear . . . They will not be able to put these Bills through. They'll get them through. If they have to move closure, they'll get them through. They'll get them through, Mr. Speaker, and then they'll inform the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm doing my best out there and that's why I asked for an adjournment a few days ago on this Bill, because I'm trying to get the word out to people. And I haven't contacted anyone, not one individual or group of people, that believes that Bill 13 is the best for the private individual in this province of Saskatchewan, the best thing for their lives.

Bill 13 is evidence of it, and there is much more evidence. That is plain to see for anyone, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible for people who have fought to be able to live in a democratic society to watch their civil rights go down the tubes. The people have to be the ones making their own choices, not an NDP minister.

And I'm so afraid, Mr. Speaker, that once this Bill passes . . . And I don't believe for one minute that the Minister of Social Services means any bad intent by this Bill. I don't believe she really does. I don't believe that she really understands . . . She's been new, she's only been . . . never was elected till last October, and now she's the Minister of Social Services. She's being directed by someone in the department. And I don't think that the back-benchers around sitting in here today, if they got serious about this, would not want to give the right to any minister. It may affect their own families and their own constituency. It has to.

If these people would go out and talk to their own individuals in the community and say: do you believe in retroactive legislation which could make retroactive adoptions come forth . . . The member from Humboldt, Mr. Speaker, nods his head in agreement . . . not agreement with what I said; agree that they agree with retroactive legislation. So we have it on the record, Mr. Speaker, that they agree with retroactive legislation. They believe it in the GRIP program, they believe it almost . . . many Bills have come down; they believe in it.

Do they understand? I'm going to give you an example, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to tell you just what it means to my own family. My wife is 58 years of age — she doesn't probably be too happy with me that I just put her age out in the world today, but I don't think she'll mind — but she's an adopted girl.

And they adopted under a contract that there is no way that her parents that brought her up and took care of her until they passed away . . . that there was any way of ever opening up a document to ever find her real mother. Her mother . . . my wife is 58. She could easily have a mother living in this city of Regina or she could be living in Manitoba — she could be living. It's not right that we see an ad in the paper asking for Helen Duff to come forth; your real mother wants to see you. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. And that's what this Bill will allow.

And then another example in my family. That's a contract that was made in 1933. And then I have a son and a daughter-in-law that adopted one of their three children 11 years ago. The contract was different. They will have the right — they knew that when they signed — that they know where the mother of their child is at. They know what town she was at, at the time of the adoption I should say, Mr. Speaker. And they know that if either one comes forth and they're both agreeable, that they can get together, the mother, after this child is of age. But they adopted under that law, under that contract, and they must live with that and they adopted that way.

But I'll tell you, anyone that was under the old law didn't do that. And this is breaking contracts and this is playing with people's lives. This is serious, Mr. Speaker. And I know that this is the same thing that this government was going to do in the early 1980s, just before they lost government. And now, like I said before, the now Premier of this province, when he got all these letters, pulled the Bill.

So I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I'm asking that this government and the Minister of Social Services not bring this Bill back into committee until they go out and consult with the people in the province of Saskatchewan to see what their feelings are, to see what they want. Please don't bring it back because we will be very upset on this side of the House if that Bill comes back into committee and more likely will go into committee today.

We're not going to talk about it. I have another colleague that's going to be talking about it. And from what I understand, we're going to let it go into committee. But I'm asking the Premier and the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Social Services, please don't bring it back into committee until they do their homework, please.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the member from Arm River, has made some very important points today. The Bill before the House today troubles me greatly. Mr. Speaker, it also troubles many of the people that I have talked to in the past week which directly affects their lives which is directly affected by this legislation.

Bill 13 confirms once again that this government, this NDP government, has no respect for individuals or individual rights, Mr. Speaker. If they did, the NDP would have respected the wishes of individuals when they voted

on plebiscites in the provincial election. If the NDP respected the individual, Mr. Speaker, they would not be basing the gross revenue insurance program on an entire group of producers; it would still be based on each individual farmer. And, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP had any respect at all for individual rights, they would not be doing what they are doing today.

If the members opposite have any respect whatsoever for basic, fundamental rights, there is no way Bill 13 would be written as it is before us today. Because this Bill throws the rights of the people of Saskatchewan right into the lap of the minister responsible for Social Services.

The very basic right of privacy exists no longer because we have a government across the way today that doesn't think it is important. Once again the bottom line is that the minister has the final say, period — whatever she thinks is appropriate, Mr. Speaker.

It used to be that a person in this province had a right to choose what private information they wanted to become public, if any. That's the way it should be, Mr. Speaker. The right to privacy, Mr. Speaker, is a right no government, no one, should be able to strip away from any citizen in a democratic society. But then again we are talking about the NDP Party and its MLAs who, when the freedom of information Act was introduced, voted against it. They voted against freedom of information for individuals at first and then finally caved in to pressure.

But the NDP through Bill 13 is trying to strip people from their right to privacy, Mr. Speaker. Just think of those individuals who are adopted themselves, or parents who have given children up for adoption, who do not want any aspects of their private life exposed. Just think of a mother who is 30 years old, who was an adopted child herself and is quite happy with her life the way it is and has no interest in knowing who her birth parents are. She has no choice in the matter, Mr. Speaker, if the minister decides to divulge the information.

Last week I heard from a woman that was one of the protesting parents the last time the NDP tried to pass this sort of legislation. She is directly affected because she has two adopted children.

Mr. Speaker, over 10 years ago this mother was so upset about her children losing their rights to privacy, and thousands of other parents and children too, that she took it upon herself to inform as many people as she could and hundreds of them signed petitions urging the government to change their mind. Over 10 years later, Mr. Speaker, she still has those petitions because she had heard the NDP would do the same thing again if they were given the chance to form government.

Over 10 years later, here we are. I guess it is true the NDP never change.

When the NDP tried to pass very similar legislation when they were government way back when, they didn't do it. There were groups and individuals concerned about this very issue that signed petitions and lobbied the NDP to reconsider. And, Mr. Speaker, for whatever reason the NDP stopped the Bill back then.

Watching events unfold in this House today, I know it wasn't based on the rights of the individual, so it must have been something else. Nevertheless, it did not go through. That is exactly what should happen to this Bill. As you can see, Bill 13, if it passes as is, will cause hardship for many, many people, Mr. Speaker.

Bill 13 even goes a step further — a step more dramatic. I know that many people are concerned about the control this Bill places on the court's right to hear evidence. It actually denies the courts in section 21.1 any access to evidence in the possession of the government that might bear on such basic questions as the guilt or innocence of an accused. Instead only the member from Saskatoon Westmount, the minister responsible for Social Services, only she, Mr. Speaker, is trusted to be both judge and jury when it comes to the very personal aspects of other people's family life.

(1545)

It is hard to believe this makes sense to any person in this Assembly. It is hard to believe the members opposite really have what is best for the people of Saskatchewan in mind when they are doing what they are doing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they don't have the people of this province in mind. All the NDP care about is power — more and more power for the government and less and less for the individual.

Bill 13 is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, a tragedy. And, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP care at all about basic civil rights, this Bill should not pass as it stands. I ask the minister to withdraw the Bill and consult with interested parties in this province. If you will not withdraw the Bill, remove the offending portion of section 3 which refers to the minister being allowed to release private information.

Also remove section 21.1 which protects the minister and her agents from providing evidence to a court concerning any of their statements either written or oral. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the minister withdraw the Bill and make the necessary changes to protect the individual rights of the people of Saskatchewan. Thank you.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 14

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. MacKinnon that **Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of concerns about the amendments that your government is proposing in regards to this Act. Now some of the members opposite say this is a good Bill and I didn't read it. Well I did read it. And maybe when we get further into this Bill, maybe we can get answers and they will be right, but maybe not. But from what I see, what I see about it, it's serious.

The most serious concern is the fact that this amendment will give the minister responsible sweeping powers. Now

any responsible minister across the way believes giving sweeping power to the minister . . . same as Bill 13 and some other Bills that have come down in this House; sweeping powers to the minister. I'm not suggesting that the minister responsible will abuse these powers but I will say there's a great potential for abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear on why the minister or any government minister would need, at his or her discretion, to release confidential information on a client. What circumstances would necessitate such an action?

This power could be extremely dangerous, Mr. Speaker, extremely dangerous. The minister may not fear mistakes being made, after all he or she would be exempt from legal ramifications. That's the problem with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what mistake that the minister makes, and the same in Bill 13, Bill 14 that I'm involved in, if they make a mistake or their deputies make a mistake or somebody in the department makes a mistake, there's no recourse because they cannot be brought back to court or whatever. There is no recourse to get at them. This damage may not go deep; it merely caused some sense of discomfort. But it may cause an individual much more. What about the individual, never mind the concern it may cause the department people, Mr. Speaker, but the cause it could cause an individual.

Will information that is not justified or proven be released? Those are one of the questions that we have to have answered and we will have answered, I'm hoping, when it gets to committee. Will information that is not justified or proven be released? Now that's a serious thing to an individual.

If an individual has been wrongfully accused of child abuse, are they at risk? What about the individual out there in Saskatchewan? And I agree that if there's individuals that are abusing children, they have to be taken care of, arrested or whatever. But we've got so many cases, and there's been so many brought forth to me in the last while, where this wolf question comes in here — which is telling the truth and which didn't. And there has to be far more serious . . . we're going to bring, when we talk further about this, we'll be bringing many, many incidents to the minister, Mr. Speaker, about what Social Services is doing today and not handling their own powers today right.

If they're not handling the powers they've got today in a right and proper manner, then what in the world would happen if they get more power to the minister? What safeguard would be in place if a situation such as this occurred? What protection would there be for individuals who fall through the cracks?

I do not have to inform the Minister of Social Services that horrendous acts such as child abuse are not always cut and dried. A simple adoption case may not be cut and dried. Custody cases sometimes take an ugly turn. People's children are on the line and a parent will attempt to protect their young by all means at their disposal.

Animals — there isn't an animal that God placed on this earth that won't fight for their young. And it should be the same and is the same with parents. And in some cases and

in many cases throughout the world, we have to deal with parents that are abusing their children. We have to help them.

But we're going to get into a lot of details here, Mr. Speaker, in this Bill. Could a mother or father's life be ruined by false information being released by the government minister? They're giving so much power to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that what if some of the accusations that somebody makes turn out to be false and if it goes public then it could ruin them for life. It is so serious, Mr. Speaker.

There's a case in Regina here last week. I'm not going to get into details on it because to protect the names involved, but I had a case come to me. There's a case come to the member from Morse. And these are serious, serious cases where individuals are being abused by the minister's office — when I'm saying the minister's office I don't mean here in this building, Mr. Speaker, I mean the department, and I call that the minister's office — because they're not living up to their own rules and regulations.

So if, Mr. Speaker, that we give this power to the minister, and they can't handle what they've got now, what in the world would happen if they had full sweeping powers? Could a mother or father's life be ruined? Yes of course it could. False information could ruin them, ruin them for life. So that's why we have to shudder here in this here room here to think what this is all about.

We just can't have these Bills go sweeping through and not discuss it. Because I'm going to ask all people, all people in the government's side, the back-benchers, to look at it very, very seriously to make sure they're right. To consult — which is not a habit of this government to consult — consult the same as I said in Bill 13, consult with the people now, before the Bill.

You heard me say, Mr. Speaker, how we . . . and I was the individual that got it going throughout the province of Saskatchewan in 1980-81. And I give great credit to the now Premier who was minister of Justice then, that he pulled that adoption Bill, and it wasn't near as bad as this Bill. These Bills give power to the minister.

And I'm sure that if the members opposite will go back and talk to the people in their ridings and ask them and then go talk to the now Premier, who was minister of Justice, that these two Bills, Bill 13 and Bill 14, will be pulled. I guarantee if they go and ask.

But don't do like they did with the GRIP program, Mr. Speaker. They changed the GRIP program and then had the meetings. They had meetings throughout the province. They started talking about changes in GRIP back as early as December and then they had the month of January, February, and March and then they started having meetings at the end of March and April telling the farmers of the change. They should have had it before.

The same thing in these two Bills. They must, and I plead with them. For our sake as a Tory caucus over here, it's better for us that they don't because it turns people against them. But that's not what I'm talking about. We're talking

about the lives of people. So I'd rather have the lives of people protected even if we had to leave you there for years, for ever, if you can protect the lives of people. But you're not going to stay there if you walk over people like you are in these Bills.

Another concern is how this information would be released, Mr. Speaker. How would it be released? A line to be added reads: "The information mentioned . . . may be released in any form that the minister considers appropriate." Well now that has got to be more than I can take, Mr. Speaker . . . any way that the minister sees appropriate.

Now I do believe that the minister responsible for Social Services means no harm in this Bill. But I do believe that, like I said for Bill 13, that she's inexperienced and their department people have brought the Bill forth.

And I plead with them to go back and talk to the experienced . . . There's some experienced cabinet ministers in the front row. There is a few. The House Leader, Mr. Speaker, the member from Elphinstone is an experienced member. We have the Minister of Justice who was here for four years — not that much experience, but he has got some. And he's an individual that should be sitting down and going through the details.

But I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this caucus is . . . It's such a large caucus that I wonder if it even gets to that caucus till it goes through the details. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if they have a committee that goes through every detail in every Bill that comes and then reports back. I wonder if they do. I ask that question.

Confidential information on someone may be released in any form that a minister considers appropriate. Now if that doesn't bother the ministers and all the members opposite, well then it's more than I can understand. How did they get elected if that's the kind of thinking they've got? And if they keep on thinking that way, there is no way that they're going to get elected again.

Mr. Speaker, just to bring this point in now . . . and I don't think it's the wrong time because I'm going to relate it to the Bills; it's the Bills like this. I had an individual contact me yesterday and ask me to leave this Assembly and want to talk to me for an hour. And she said where she lives in Regina, in some kind of a large housing area, and she said there was only two windows that didn't have NDP signs at election time. And the people in that building today are organizing petitions to deal with this government because they are hurt. They are angry. And that is absolutely honest fact. The lady asked to have her name not mentioned because she doesn't want it brought forth, but it will in time.

If this amendment is passed and we are to see news releases go out on clients involved with Department of Social Services, is that what we'll see? I ask the government members opposite, carefully consider what they are proposing. Is it necessary to transfer all of this power to the minister? Is it necessary? If they've got some changes in the Bills that they want to change in The Adoption Act and in The Child Care Act, if they've got some changes, Mr. Speaker, make some changes and let's

talk about that. But why give all the power to the minister?

I know what the minister's going to say because they'll be talking to her. She'll get her advice. Like I said, she's not experienced. But she'll get advice from her fellow colleagues that are experienced. And they're going to say, oh well. Mr. Speaker, what they'll say is, we'll not use those powers.

If they're not going to use those powers, don't put them there. They said, oh, we'll never use them. Now I'm warning, Mr. Speaker, warning each and every individual in the province of Saskatchewan, what this government is doing is giving sweeping powers to ministers.

The now Minister of Justice is a clever individual and I'm sure he's decent enough. If he's the one that could understand this Bill . . . I'm absolutely sure that he's been so busy in this last few weeks . . . he's been so busy that where would he get time to go through the details of these Bills that give sweeping power to ministers.

So I'm going to ask him, Mr. Speaker, to do what the minister of Justice did . . . to do what the minister of Justice did in 1980-81. As I said, I wasn't sure of those dates. That when the letters came in from the country, the province of Saskatchewan — approximately 10,000 phone calls and letters — and the then minister of Justice pulled the Bill.

So I'm going to ask the Minister of Justice: will he look very carefully at these two Bills? He will look very carefully and consider, and, Mr. Minister of Justice, I ask you to look very carefully to consider how it affects the lives of people. And I trust you to do that.

(1600)

These Bills, Bill 13, Mr. Minister, went into . . . is going to go into committee; we let it go. This one here, we're going to ask you to hold onto for a while yet. But we're asking not to bring it into committee until you've consulted with the people. This is too serious. You maybe affected the lives of people when you let . . . when you consulted with the people and the farmers over the GRIP program after the fact. But in this case, please do not do it after the fact. I want the minister to understand the seriousness of that Bill 13 and the seriousness of Bill 14. They go hand in hand. I ask the government members opposite to carefully consider what they're proposing.

Have any third-party interest groups been consulted on this amendment? Mr. Speaker, I ask them: have they consulted with third-party personnel on this amendment? I doubt if they have. But I'm pleading again very, very sincerely to consult, do what they haven't been doing on other things as government been doing, consult.

Just don't stand up in this legislature and say that sweeping 51 per cent of the vote gave us that power. That 51 per cent of the vote did not give you the power to do the things you've been doing. You've changed and affected the lives of people. Have the members opposite even asked one individual who has been adopted, who has been a victim of abuse if they agree with this amendment?

If on any Bill, Mr. Speaker, consultation must take place, it's on this one. It must. The magnitude of what is being proposed is overwhelming. Have you sit down . . . has the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Social Services sit down and discuss this with the RCMP, the people that are involved, all the personnel in Social Services that are involved day to day with child abuse?

Because child abuse out there, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, I do believe it's serious. And there's so many things happening in people's lives today. The economy is affecting people and they seem to be doing things that they normally wouldn't do. And those people must be controlled for the sake of the children. But what also must be protected is the innocent parents and the innocent people and the innocent children. They must also be protected.

There has to be a balance, Mr. Speaker. There must be a balance. And it's not up to us on this side of the House to bring in the laws that does put that balance in place, it's up to us to pressure you to do it.

So I ask the government opposite to bring in Bills that protects the balance of the people on both sides. I'm not asking this out of distrust for the Minister of Social Services, not in the least. I'm not doing that. I know that she is an honourable member. But I do ask this on behalf of those individuals that it will affect. We've said what it may affect to all the members in the back benches and all the members that's in government, each and every one in this building because we'll be the ones contacted. But on behalf of all the individuals . . . I know that the numbers will be large, Mr. Speaker. I know they will.

I would ask that the members opposite consider the potential harm that amendments such as this could cause. I would ask that for a moment you put yourself in another person's shoes. Perhaps one of you may have experienced a situation such as this. Perhaps one of you may have been wrongfully accused in some instance — just think in your own lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members opposite to think any time in your life if you've ever been wrongly accused, the feeling that it does to you. How can it affect you in your community if you've been wrongly accused? And as you'll be . . . some of you are new MLAs and some are experienced MLAs that have been here for a while. You must know what happens yourself. When you're wrongly accused out there publicly — because you're in the public's eye — think how you feel. Now think how people that we may feel that . . . the instance that we'll bringing forth, the member from Morse and myself and the member from Rosthern. I know we've all got cases that we'll be bringing forth where parents and families were not handled in a right and proper manner. I want you to know how they . . . think how they might feel.

Perhaps any one of you may have experienced this situation. I'm sure you have in your life, and I ask you to consider very carefully. Consider in your heart just what this may do to individuals. Would you want the confidentiality of this information to be at government ministers' discretion?

If you have something out there, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite have something happen that they're wrongly accused and it gets to be public information, and you've got no recourse through the courts to come back to protect yourself. The minister has it all. Just like we say the member from Canora sitting there or the member from . . . or any place, that if something happened in their life, in their own constituency or in their community, and they're wrongly accused by the minister's office — something that's happened — they have no recourse to come back to protect themselves because the minister's office has got more power than the courts.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, on Bill 13 we let go and we'll discuss it in committee, but we ask them not to bring it back until they've consulted. And now, Mr. Speaker, on this Bill I'm asking for a second adjournment on this amendment until appropriate consultation has taken place. I'm asking them to adjourn it again until we have consultation from the people opposite.

The Speaker: — Order. I have to remind the member that there is nothing in the legislative rules that permits one member to adjourn twice, so either the member continues to speak, or another member, or the question will be asked.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand the rules, and so we'll have many questions to ask in committee. Mr. Speaker, we'll have many questions. We'll be asking in committee many, many questions, but I want to leave it this way. Please, on Bill 13 and Bill 14, don't present it back in committee until you've gone out and consulted and come back with the answers.

But more so, I want to close with this statement. I'm asking the now Premier, who was the minister of Justice in 1980, and the new Minister of Justice to talk it over with the Minister of Social Services and pull Bill 13 and Bill 14.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 19

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter that **Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Contributory Negligence Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.

Bill No. 20

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter that **Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 23

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. Simard that **Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act, 1990** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 24

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. Simard that **Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Queen's Printer Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE Consolidated Fund Expenditure Public Service Commission Vote 33

Item 1 (continued)

The Chair: — Would the minister please introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — The members will recall from the last week that the official sitting beside me is Ms. Shiela Bailey, chairman of the Public Service Commission. Behind her is Ray Smith, who is executive director of employment services, and behind me is Mary Kutarna, who is the director, administrative information services division. Those are the officials.

I have as well, Mr. Chairman, the response to questions raised by the member at the last session. And I will . . . thank you. I'll ask the page to give me some assistance, if I could. Table those.

The Chair: — Is item 1 agreed?

An Hon. Member: — You would wish. You will wish.

Mr. Muirhead: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the minister opposite would just wish that I didn't get to my feet.

The first question I'd like to ask him, Mr. Chairman, is you're responsible for the SPMC and also Public Service Commission, and it may not be appropriate but I want to ask the question why we didn't finish SPMC that night and we just . . . I just quit asking questions and all of a sudden in come PCS. Why did that happen, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — You are right, it's not appropriate. But I will answer it anyway. The members opposite will know that traditionally just opposition members ask questions in estimates. But any member of the Assembly, government or opposition, can ask questions.

I had been told earlier that some members of the government benches wished to ask questions and I adjourned the . . . and they weren't here that night when we finished, so I just adjourned them to permit the

members to bring forth their questions at a time when they were present.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you. I just was wanting an explanation for that. Mr. Minister, I was a little bit surprised that night because we asked our last question and all of a sudden PCS was there. We didn't go through the books.

An Hon. Member: — And we've got lots more now.

Mr. Muirhead: — So now after this . . . now we've got so many questions that we'll have to take that long again because I'm sure we can come up with several hundred more questions. But the minister answers questions so good that won't be a problem.

And forgive me, Mr. Minister, if I ask you the odd question, because as you can see I had two Bills this afternoon and PCS . . . I went and got my folder and I haven't got the *Hansard* and I didn't get a chance to read . . . I may ask you the odd question that was asked before.

But I'm sure I did ask you for your minister's staff and I'm sure you gave that to me. And then I asked you for a list of . . . I didn't ask you for their titles, and salaries, job descriptions, or education, employment history, including their last place of employment. I don't think I asked you that.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — You did ask that and you've already been supplied with that information.

Mr. Muirhead: — I don't think I got their employment history, Minister, was on that list.

An Hon. Member: — Okay, good.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, we'll go through our material. As I said, I may be asking you some questions on the start here that I do have the information for.

Mr. Minister, do you have any persons working on personnel service contracts?

(1615)

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — No. The Premier stated this government's position on that. People who work and assist ministers will be in the minister's office, accounted for appropriately in Executive Council, as is the appropriate case. We will not, as you people did, have all kinds of people squirrelled away working on contracts. There are none for me. And I can say, Mr. Minister, for the benefit of your colleagues who may come on subsequent estimates, there are none in this government.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well you can say that, Mr. Minister, but as you know, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, that you did change your stories quite a few times the other night. You're the one that said it was absolutely never was a political firing or political hiring, and then later on that same night you said well . . . When I got you backed into corner, Mr. Minister, you know very well that you said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, we all know. We heard the House Leader yesterday. He said, well it's common

knowledge, common sense that we all know that we have some political hiring. Well we know that. We all know that. All governments have done that. But what did you misrepresent me for so long by saying we didn't have any. We didn't have any.

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that when I'm asking questions that the minister wouldn't keep answering as I'm talking. He will not keep quiet. If he wants to have the floor, let him talk the clock out.

But what I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate that he's not answering while . . . He'll get the chance to answer. Please let me ask and not always keep chirping away from his seat. I know he's so anxious and so full of vim and vigour because he was kept out of cabinet. And he was so down he couldn't smile around here, and all of sudden he doesn't need . . . his feet don't even touch the floor any more when he walks around this building. He's happy. You see him smiling there now. And I know that he wants to get up and talk, so I'll ask you questions and please give me the chance to, all right.

Now to the rest of the Public Service Commission I want a list of the actual names of any persons who were terminated, their salaries, and the standard information about those individuals. Now you gave me that list. You gave me some of that list, but there are some things that I didn't get, I don't believe I've got because I ask . . . I said I'd apologize if I do double up on questions and your staff will know whether I've already got it here or not. And I'm sorry that if I do double up.

But as you know, that night we were only in here 20-25 minutes, and we got into a little bit of discussion and kind of threw us all off kilter. So we don't know what we asked, what we got or anything that happened.

You understand what I'm asking for is not at all a difficult matter. In each case where we discuss an individual, I want you to provide me the job title that's on all that list. I don't believe all the stuff is on there, and I don't expect you to give it to me today because I've got a long list that I want to read off here. And you're pretty near going to have to . . . I can give you a list in writing. When I'm through with this, I'll have them just give you a photocopy, or you can wait till *Hansard* gets out to get it back to me or whatever.

A job title, a job description, complete compensation details including salary, expenses, allowances, special payments, and so on; the length of time employed including the date the person first started to work for the department. If a new employee, the employment record including the last place of employment, employment qualifications including education. Where contract exists, copies of those contracts, the physical location of the person's place of employment, where they actually did their work. If a new employee, the name and some details for the person they replaced. If terminated, why this position was terminated as opposed to some other position. What was the process and the resulting rationale for getting rid of the employee or individual or person?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, I'm quite prepared to do my job. I do object to having to do the

work of the opposition as well, which is what the member is asking me to do.

An Hon. Member: — No.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Oh, yes. The member's asking . . . the member's repeating his questions. The very least one would expect is that the member would know what he's got and go from there and not repeat the questions.

In part you've got . . . We have given you the information from the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. If you're wanting details with respect to who was deleted, why they were deleted, who was terminated, why were they terminated, etc., etc., that will have to be asked of the department. That's not information within the purview of the Public Service Commission. You'll have to ask that with respect to each minister who comes forward. We just don't have that information. We don't have all the information you ask.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, I don't want the minister opposite getting up and say we should be reading our material when he just tabled the information. It was handed to me while he was talking.

So don't be so ignorant, Mr. Minister, to say that we aren't doing our business right. And I mean absolutely ignorant — that you would have the . . . You could see that the page took it over and left the information there. Then you stand up and says, why don't the members opposite read their information? Do your homework. Well then it's handed to me while you're talking.

How do I know what's in this information? I very nicely gave you the information I wanted. Now I don't know whether it's there or not because I didn't read that long list off the other night. There's no way I did. Might have had some of it till we got into the other discussion. But we'll go through this. But you'll also have it . . . When I get through with this page of questions and I'll table it and you'll have the information or wait till *Hansard* comes out tomorrow.

For those individuals terminated, Mr. Minister, I understand there are no job relocation assistance or counselling assistance. This, Mr. Minister, is a fundamental function of the Public Service Commission. Why was this service denied the individuals in question?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I wonder if we could just get someone to read the *Hansard* from last night's proceedings because we're going over this . . . There's no point in us standing up; we might as well just have someone read *Hansard*, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, those questions were asked and were responded to last night. Now I regret . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . In great detail; that's right. A great deal more detail, I must say, than your government ever responded to those questions.

I am happy to respond to them once. I do get a bit testy when you ask the same question again and again and again. I don't know whether the member is short of material or what you're short of, or whether you have not . . . but the questions were answered. I say to the

Opposition House Leader, he asked those questions.

An Hon. Member: — Fifteen minutes is all he had with you.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I don't care how long he's had with me. He asked those questions the other night; the information was provided in so far as we could. And we've given you . . . we've given you what of that information we can. So as I say, I don't mind, I don't mind answering questions. But when the member repeats the questions, you can't expect me to respond in a very gracious fashion.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, you know that when we started that I told you that I would apologize if I had to double up on questions. So don't go blaming me that I get your . . . just a few moments ago . . . there's no way that I have, when I'm asking the questions, that I can go through that and see if you really did give us the information or not. Because in SPMC you said the same thing. We go back to our office and check through it, and you've answered about half the questions right. You just answer what you want to answer. That's all you do.

Don't stand up here and try to think you can make fools of us because you can't. You have tried it before in this House, Mr. Speaker, and it backfired before, and it will backfire again. Don't try to make fools of the opposition. Don't try to make . . . don't try to make a fool out of me, Mr. Minister, by saying that I should've already . . . You think I've got a photographic mind that's supposed to be able to read this as it's passing through me and sitting on my desk?

And I very nicely . . . We don't need to be arguing, we don't need the members back there yapping their head off either, we'll never get any place. Mr. Minister, I'm trying to do this in a right and honourable manner, and I expect you to do the same thing. If you treat me properly through these estimates, I will give you the same . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well we won't go too far on that, Mr. Chairman.

Will you provide, Mr. Minister, a list of all positions created since November 1, 1991?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I am told by the officials that it is the Department of Finance that creates new positions, and the question should be asked of them in their estimates, not here. So I'm told by the officials that's a proper question. That's a proper enough question, but it should be asked in Finance estimates.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker. We're in the same snowballing that we got from the Minister of Finance on The Appropriation Bill. If you think that . . . We're going to be down to one person pretty soon. We'll go through all the estimates, go through everything, and we're down to one person who answers it all, because you wouldn't answer anything.

Now, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I want to make it very clear, very clear that my colleagues have gone through the *Hansards* and you are the one that's mixed

up. You're getting mixed up on questions I asked on SPMC because I did not ask those questions in PSC (Public Service Commission). So you stand up and maybe get somebody to read your *Hansard* for you, Mr. Minister, and then apologize to me. Will you do that?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I said with respect to the member's last question, there's nothing improper about the question. It's reasonable enough except that we don't have that information. It's not PSC's job or responsibility. That is the responsibility of the Department of Finance.

If you want the list of people who were terminated and the reasons why they're terminated etc., etc., I said previously that must come from the departments themselves. It's not information that PSC has.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, that isn't the last question I asked you. In case that I was doubling up too much here because you were trying to confuse me, I turned the entire page. I turned the entire page and so give my colleagues a chance to see if I did ask those questions because one thing that I will say, I have a good memory. And I know that there's some double-up of questions. There will be in all the estimates.

Those questions asked of SPMC — you tried to insinuate that I asked them in PSC. They have checked the *Hansard* and I did not. So I asked you if you would apologize to me or give a comment of why you said that we didn't do our homework and you give me all that information. Because I have four pieces of paper here with some names on; that's all I ever got the other night. And then what was handed to me today. And it's not was asked before.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Okay, I may have misunderstood the member. If you want a list of the positions deleted for PSC, that's what we gave you. If you want a list of positions created in PSC, I'm told there haven't been any since November 1.

I'm sorry. I thought the member was asking for these questions government-wide. If you're simply asking it with respect to the staff of the PSC, that's different. I misunderstood the member's question.

I think you've got the list of the positions deleted that was provided to you earlier in the day. There have been no positions created in the PSC since November 1.

Mr. Martens: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can you tell me whether Janet Abells was hired through the Public Service Commission or whether she was hired independent of the Public Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — She's not an employee of the Public Service Commission and does not . . . was not hired and then is not employed by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Martens: — When the minister asked for individuals to come forward, did the Public Service Commission provide any alternative names for her to consider, or did she only consider the one?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I'm afraid I don't follow the

member's question. Did we only consider one position with one person with respect to what position?

Mr. Martens: — The minister's assistant to the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — You'd have to ask that of the Minister of Education. We wouldn't have that information at all.

Mr. Martens: — Did you have any information as it relates to Duane Adams, deputy minister of Health? Did that come through the Public Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Department heads are order in council appointments. You would have to ask that of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Martens: — What about Mr. Garry Aldridge?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — That's Executive Council.

Mr. Martens: — Did the Public Service Commission have any involvement in his hiring?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — None at all.

Mr. Martens: — What about Don Axtell, special advisor to the Minister of Health?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — No he is . . . You'll get a chance to ask that. There are Crown Investments Corporation or Crown Management Board estimates. He is working in the Crown Management Board, and in due course when those estimates come forward — as they will; there is a statutory grant to CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) — you can ask those questions under CIC.

Mr. Martens: — Could you give . . . or maybe you have already given the response already. If you haven't, I'd like to have it for Shiela Bailey, and whether she was initiated from within the Public Service Commission or whether she came from outside.

(1630)

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — She's worked continuously for the government since 1976. If I'm not mistaken, we did give you the employment history of Ms. Bailey the other night.

I'm told that that information was not . . . we did not give you the employment history. She's worked for the government. But if you want to know where in the government she worked, there's no problem with that, and we undertake to supply that.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. We'd like to have that. I'd also like to have . . . if there was any connection with the Public Service Commission dealing with Janice Baker.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Can you tell us which department she's in.

Mr. Martens: — Chief electoral officer.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — No. We would have no connection with that. That would be Executive Council.

Mr. Martens: — What about Mr. Gary Beattie?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — He had a contract. He was the acting chairman of the SPMC. Again the Public Service Commission would have no connection with that.

Mr. Martens: — What about Gary Benson, SEDCO executive?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — No, we would have no connection with that. SEDCO is a Crown corporation reporting to Crown Investments Corporation.

Mr. Martens: — What about Reg Boyle?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — He doesn't work for the Public Service Commission; that's all I can tell you.

Mr. Martens: — What I'm asking is: does the Public Service Commission do any of the selection for hiring for the ministers' offices in any of the ministers that we have here today?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — No, the Public Service Commission is not involved at all with the hiring of the ministers' personal staffs, either secretaries or ministerial assistants.

Mr. Martens: — Does the Public Service Commission do any of the hiring or inquiring about the heads of Crown corporations or the heads of various departments?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — No, department heads are order in council appointments normally hired . . . the hiring process is through Executive Council. The heads of the Crown corporations are hired through Crown Investments Corporation which as I stated earlier does have a statutory grant and will have estimates, and you can ask those questions then.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, I know that when I was the head of a Crown corporation, the Public Service Commission did in fact do the inquiries in relation to the investigation and providing names to bring forward for Crown corporations. Is that a change of policy?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Yes, I'm informed by the staff that that policy has changed. The presidents, CEOs (chief executive officer) of the Crown corporations are now hired under the supervision of Crown Investments Corporation. PSC is not involved.

Mr. Martens: — Would you give me a copy of that policy?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Well it's not their policy. If you want to ask again in the Crown Investments Corporation whether or not there is a written policy to that effect, I will get the answer for you. And if we have, we'll supply it. But it's not something these people have . . . it's not something these people have; they're not involved at all.

Mr. Martens: — Well it's interesting, Mr. Minister, that you just mentioned earlier that there was a change in policy from the Public Service Commission. And I wanted to know whether they had any letter that said that there would no longer be that involvement by the Public Service Commission.

The second point I want to make is that Public Service Commission has generally been considered to be the non-political arm. And that, Mr. Minister, is the kind of thing that you're possibly misrepresenting to this Assembly on the basis of what you've just said.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Oh indeed, we all know how religious you people were about keeping politics out of the Public Service Commission. It was an absolute article of faith when you were in office. We all know that.

I say in answer to your question, as distinct from your comment, there was no written policy that there wasn't . . . that the PSC was not going to hire people for Crown corporations. It is the approach of this government that that should be done in a thorough and systematic fashion, and there is a structure set up within Crown Investments Corporation to do that.

Contrary to the approach you people took when we did your Crown Investments Corporation estimates, when you didn't know the time of day — And that's almost true; we didn't get any information from you. When Crown Investments Corporation come before the Assembly this time, I intend to answer all of your questions. So contrary to the way you treated us, we're going to be forthcoming with you when that comes.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, you said you were going to be forthcoming with the questions that we asked. I'm going to ask you the question that you raised last Monday about the fact . . . when you were sitting there you waved the piece of paper that you later on tabled and a letter. You said you had more information. Would you table that too?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I don't that I would . . . I would want some comment from other members of the Assembly, particularly the member for Arm River, before that's done. There are other material. I'm not sure what's there. I don't think I will undertake to table that without a discussion with the member from Arm River.

Mr. Martens: — Well then, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you whether you would provide that to the member from Arm River, being that those are his personal files and that you would provide them to him.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Yes, we'll certainly provide him with copies; we'll certainly provide him with the material.

Mr. Martens: — No, Mr. Minister. We want the ones that you have provided to him, not copies. We don't want it copied either.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — If you're asking for the material that we have, we can certainly return that to the member. I think there's already been copies made, but we'll return

the material to you.

Mr. Martens: — Can we have that assurance that you'll do it within this week?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — We'll do it within this week.

Mr. Martens: — I'll defer back to the member responsible for the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, my colleague from Morse asked a question about an individual I understood had worked for or was working for the Department of Education, and you said you had no knowledge or no connection with any hiring of the Department of Education. Is that correct, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — If my memory serves me correctly, the person worked in the office of the Minister of Education. Those are not hired through the Public Service Commission at all. The minister's personal staff is hired through a process in Executive Council, which I'm sure the Premier will be happy to share with you.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, I asked you a list of all positions created since November 1, 1991, and you said there were none. So let's just change that from not to a list of all positions, of all personnel created since . . . or not created.

We'll say you give me the list before of all the people that have been fired, replaced or whatever, gone or whatever. I've got that long list here between 3 and 400. Now there must be somebody taking over those jobs. Can you give me how many positions got filled?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — The positions were — I'm having a great deal of difficulty with this — the positions were deleted, as I explained the other night. Nobody filled them; the positions are gone.

Mr. Muirhead: — Are you saying that the positions are gone in every single case, that there hasn't been one person hired in PSC to replace the individuals that you deleted? There hasn't been one person hired in PSC?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Nobody has been hired into the positions which were deleted, I think, by definition.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well then did you hire some individuals in new positions then? Did you hire anyone period in PSC (Public Service Commission)? Did you hire any new personnel at all?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — In the PSC the only people we hired were two summer students.

Mr. Muirhead: — In Public Service Commission, Mr. Minister, how many people or personnel are involved in hiring? Say going through resumes, whatever, how many individuals over there are involved in the complete department?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Twenty-six. I gave you the answer but perhaps you didn't hear me. There are 26

people working in the Public Service Commission, all of whom in one fashion or another directly or indirectly are involved in hiring.

Mr. Muirhead: — In those 26 positions that are involved in hiring, looking at resumes or whatever, were those 26 people there prior to October 21, 1991?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Without exception.

Mr. Muirhead: — Could we have a list of those 26 names?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Yes.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Minister, their statement says that your government is having all job applications for senior government positions directed to the Premier's office rather than to the Public Service. What is your reason for doing this?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I don't think your information's accurate. That would only be for the permanent heads and perhaps the associate deputy ministers. But that is not accurate with respect to the hiring below that level.

Mr. Muirhead: — So you're saying, Mr. Minister, that no senior — my question was senior bureaucrats, senior civil servants, whatever — that none of them are going through the Public Service Commission. They are going through the Premier's office?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — No, I'm saying exactly the opposite. I'm saying with respect to order in council appointments, those quite properly go through Executive Council. But it's only with respect to order in council appointments and none other. Otherwise they're being done through the Public Service Commission, as they ought to be and as the legislation provides.

Mr. Muirhead: — What about a senior position in Department of Education, Agriculture, or any department you want to think of. Are you going to tell me that those people are not hired and put their application to Rural Development, to any department you want to think of, Environment, those applications must be coming through PSC?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — The member's correct for once. They're coming through PSC.

Mr. Muirhead: — Maybe I'm correct for once, but I think you're wrong because you didn't answer me right or else you didn't understand me, Mr. Minister. Because my question was . . . not orders in council. I never said that. My first question was on this topic that your government is having all job applications for senior government positions . . . a senior government position would be someone that's in the deputy minister's office of Agriculture or in senior positions in . . . The government's full of senior positions in every department. That's what my question was. That is that going through your department or through the Premier's office?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Well, I have difficulty figuring out whether the member is being wilfully obtuse or whether this is sincere.

The premiers and the Executive Council are involved in order in council appointments. The out-of-scope employees are hired by the permanent head in discussion with the minister, as has been quite properly the case in this government and in the Blakeney administration but was largely violated when the members opposite were in office, I want to say. In-scope employees are hired under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement, as what has been the case under the Blakeney administration, as is the case now, and as was sometimes violated when the former members were in office.

We are following the prescribed rules. There is no patronage system in this government. Members opposite persist in believing that we're as bad as you are. I say to members opposite that . . .

(1645)

An Hon. Member: — No one could be as bad.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Exactly, you took the words out of my mouth. No one could achieve that pinnacle. That will stand as a low-water mark for all time.

You seem to be struck with the notion that we are doing the same thing you did, only you can't quite catch us at it, because — your reason why you can't quite catch us at it — because we don't engage in the same tactics you do. We happen to believe in a professional, competent public service. We are trying to build and create a professional, competent public service which is free of patronage.

I know members opposite don't believe in those concepts and I know you never tried to achieve that. But you really must try to get over your view that the whole world is as bad as you are. As the member from Quill Lakes quite properly said, no one will ever again achieve that.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of points here in relation to the observation just made by the minister, deputy . . . the toy minister.

I'm going to ask you a couple questions about patronage. What does the name Abells mean in patronage? What does the name Archer mean in patronage? What does the name Atkinson mean in patronage? What does the name Banman mean in patronage, Mr. Minister? And I'm only beginning. This isn't even finished with the first page.

You, Mr. Minister, and all of your colleagues are telling the whole world that you have no patronage. In your document which you had read here by the Lieutenant Governor, you talked about 580 people in boards and commissions. What is that? Is that patronage, or is that patronage? And that, Mr. Minister, is what you keep putting down. You said you weren't going to do it. We never ever indicated to anyone that we wouldn't do it. You said over and over and over and over again in the election that you would end patronage.

As a matter of fact I has a poll captain for the NDP call my office in my constituency and ask me for a name of an individual who would provide for her an opportunity to

represent herself as an application on one of your boards and commissions. Have you ever sent that paper out to the province to investigate an opportunity for them to sit on boards and commissions? When and where? Why didn't you provide it to one of your own workers? Why would she have to call my office?

And then the second question is, Mr. Minister, when you did that, why didn't you allow the members of this Assembly and every member — the member representing the Liberal Party, the members representing the Conservative Party — become involved in that kind of thing. You have over and over and over again mentioned in this Assembly, Mr. Minister, that you are not involved in patronage. And that, Mr. Minister, is a direct contradiction to what you asked the Lieutenant Governor in this province of Saskatchewan to read in this Assembly.

And you read it for yourself; 580 is the number that you said there. And you said that over and over and over again. We have lists and lists of people where there's public patronage of every sort all over the province. And do you know what else you did? You fired them all. And if the officials adjacent to you were not a part of a political appointment that we left in this government over the years . . . and, Mr. Minister, over the years we left those people. And I had deputy minister of Agriculture in this province who was a member of the public service since 1974. He was actively involved in running the department and I never, ever questioned him. Did I can him? No, sir, I did not.

And, Mr. Minister, I'll tell you something else. The associate deputy minister was exactly the same way, exactly the same way. And, Mr. Minister, he served us in a serious fashion every day of the day that he worked for my department and each of the departments that were involved. And that, Mr. Minister . . . He was hired in 1971 and if you want to dispute that, you go ask him.

And I will say to you that the heads of the branches of every one of the Department of Agriculture were employed as a part of your administration. And that, Mr. Minister, is also a fact, and I want to point that out. We didn't treat the kinds of things . . . the public service the way have treated the public service. We didn't treat them that way.

And, Mr. Minister, I believe you need to owe the public of Saskatchewan an apology for that because you don't have any idea what you're doing to the public. You go and can over 400 people.

You want to talk about patronage. Let's talk about the Koskie family which you hired seven of them, I believe, in the time when you were government. And you said, no, Mr. Minister, no to the people of Saskatchewan. We will not allow patronage as a part of this . . . the symbol of employment in the province of Saskatchewan. You said that over and over again, and you were elected on that basis. And, Mr. Minister, you're totally wrong, and you're assuming that the public of Saskatchewan aren't fed up with it. They are.

And that, Mr. Minister . . . and I want to mention the member from Quill Lakes, his family is probably now on

the dole again in the public service of the province of Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Minister, is exactly what we're talking about. You're being hypocritical in every one of the points that you make about patronage. And I want you to understand that we recognize this, and the people in the province of Saskatchewan recognize that also. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chair: — The Chair recognizes the member for Arm River, but before I do, I ask the co-operation of the House in maintaining order so that those who are making comments can be heard.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can't believe that we have the member from Morse stand up and give you the exact truth of what's happened in this province and you didn't even, you wouldn't even stand up and answer it.

You and I were going to get along very well here tonight. We were doing well until you got sarcastic about us and our political patronage. There's never been a government since I was born as bad as you people have been in this last few months on political patronage. It has never been anything like it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — I was the Crop Insurance minister for three and a half years, and I'll tell you there was only one person that got removed from that department, and that's because of insubordination. He absolutely wanted to be fired and picked himself \$115,000 severance pay. And the rest of them stayed there.

I did exactly what the member from Morse did. We didn't go clean them out. Course there were some, and we admit it. But you guys are just going blanket. That would be all right. You wouldn't get remarks from us if you wouldn't have said you wouldn't be doing it and said you're not doing it now. You did it back in 1971. The now Premier of this province was minister of Justice in 1971. And a person that was my campaign manager to help me get elected was a person by the name of Jack Nichol, who some of the older people will know here. He used to work for Ross Thatcher, the premier of this province, an EA (executive assistant). And he was given 15 minutes . . . his picture was on the front page of the *Leader-Post* when Roy Romanow — sorry, Mr. Chairman — the member from Riversdale, the then minister of Justice, had someone go to his office, take his keys away, and was told to have it removed in 15 minutes. And that happened over and over again.

And that happened since we've been . . . since we've lost government this last fall. You've done that very same thing. You've gone in there with no heart whatsoever, and we did not do that. We did not do that. Now, Mr. Chairman, they can holler and they can chirp, they can try to out-holler me, but it did not happen.

The Chair: — Order, order. Order, order. Order, order. One of the advantages of committee is that all members have every opportunity to ask questions and make

comments, and so we should pay respect to those who are speaking.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, members opposite, in 1982 when we did . . . we were talking about students the other night when we got into an uproar. And the now Speaker of this House, his daughter or son had a job in a park in North Battleford, and I had an individual, a student job being appointed to that position, and I was asked: do we remove his child or his student from that position? And I said no, we won't do such a thing. And I did not do it.

When we took over government in 1982, Mr. Blakeney's . . . one of his children had a job in this government. Did we fire her? No, we did not.

Did you give Mr. Taylor that same consideration? Mr. Taylor should have lost his job, he was a political appointment. I have no qualms with that. But don't in the same day get a daughter-in-law of his, that wasn't even in the Taylor family when she got the position . . . she married into the Taylor family and you fired her without cause.

Don't tell me that you aren't a bloodthirsty group of people, and you could care less. And we wouldn't be making this here accusations over here, Mr. Chairman, we wouldn't be doing it if you wouldn't so sanctimoniously sit over there and said, we're not doing it. We're not doing it.

How long do you think you're fooling the media? All you've got to do is read the papers every day. They're talking about your . . . it's full of it about your political patronage. It's full of it. Read your own papers if you don't know what you're doing yourself.

I have never seen anything like it in my life, of the misrepresentation that you people have done in this last few months you've been in government. It has never happened before in history of this province. It has never happened.

Mr. Chairman, the minister . . . we could have got well on to the way of many questions being answered, we were doing quite well. But he's not capable, he's not capable about that sarcasm coming over here. I said to you, I will treat you like you treat me, and we will get the job done.

But, Mr. Minister, you just couldn't keep your political mouth shut. You had to come after us and talk about how you Tories treated people. Well, it's not true, it is absolutely not true. We are condemned, I was condemned in the constituents of Arm River: why didn't you clean up those mess of bureaucrats? Why didn't you fire them? Why didn't you get control of PCS? Why didn't you get control? We didn't get control because we didn't believe in getting control like you people did. You got control in 1971, you lost it in '82. But you've admitted to me that 26 people that were hired in . . . that hired and fire people in PSC, you said that they're the same people that we left there. You've left that group of people there. And I'm sure that when we get the answer from you that most of them were there before, unless they were retired because of their senior age. They were there prior to

1982.

You go over to the Department of Agriculture. Go to the Department of Environment. Go to Rural Development. Go to Urban Affairs. You go to all these departments and give us the list. Either give us the list of all the people we fired in 1982 . . . and naturally I'm not going to be down on anyone, no government. And I think it's right and proper. I agree with the member from Elphinstone, the House Leader, that stood here yesterday and has said, of course we do political hiring. Let's face up to it.

He said he wants political people of his philosophy in his office. Of course he should. It's like an NDP that came after me in 1982. Why have you fired 150 people — 150 people. He said, why did you do such a thing? And I said, if you sold your farm and the hired man goes with that farm, and the philosophy of that farm was to cultivate six inches deep, and the new owner says three inches deep, well I'll tell you, the hired man either goes on the philosophy of the new owner or he's gone. And I agree that it should be that way in senior positions. I agree that it should be.

Your philosophy is a socialistic philosophy. And you have your right to change them. But don't have the arrogance, absolute arrogance, to say you're not doing it. That's all we're talking about is your absolute arrogance.

Now when we come back on — we'll be back on in a few days or a few weeks or a month — we'll be back on to Public Service Commission. And I give you my word, I give you my word that you and I can finish it. You talk about dragging this House on. We got condemned yesterday about holding up the Appropriation Bill, for goodness sakes. You bring it in two days before then, we had the Minister of Finance stand up here and say, we had cheques that couldn't get mailed on the 31st. That was an absolutely misleading the people in the province of Saskatchewan because he had to stand up and says yes, the payments went out.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:01 p.m.