

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
August 28, 1992

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to read the following petition:

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in Legislature Assembled:

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

that back pain and other highly prevalent neuro-musculo-skeletal disorders are extremely costly to the Canadian economy;

that scientific evidence clearly illustrates that chiropractic treatment is the most cost effective and efficient therapy for such disorders;

that in the face of an ever increasing pressure to adopt expensive new forms of high technology treatment, chiropractic care has proven to be a low technology, low cost, conservative, and safe form of treatment, consistent with the true wellness model of health care;

that the government publicly asserts it remains committed to the basic principles of medicare, namely universality, comprehensiveness, accessibility, portability, and public administration;

that the government is acting to destroy these principles as they apply to chiropractic patients;

and that the government's proposed restrictions on this therapy will clearly cost more both in dollars and in patient disability.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment, and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

This whole stack of petitions, Mr. Speaker, come from right across the province.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have as well a great number of petitioners with regards to the same issue that my colleague just read the prayer from. So I will take great pleasure in presenting what appears to be between 7 and 800 names and table them here today.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too have a number of pages of petitions that I'd like to present to the Assembly, coming from . . . signed by individuals from all across the province — from Regina and Saskatoon and Unity and Reward and Biggar, Kenosee Lake, and Carnduff, Mr. Speaker, and Estevan, Conquest — certainly a number of locations across this province where people are voicing their concerns and asking the government to give heed to their request regarding chiropractic treatment.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a number of pages of petitions relating to the same subject, Mr. Speaker, in the numbering of probably 15. And, Mr. Speaker, they reach all across the province, up to Lloydminster, St. Walburg, down as far as Swift Current, over to Unity, Biggar, over to Kyle. As a matter of fact, I guess it would be quite relevant to say they cover the whole province, Mr. Speaker — something over 200. I would be pleased to table those petitions.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions here from chiropractors concerned about the changes in the fee schedule. I want to present them. They come today from Regina, Lebret, Middle Lake, Saskatoon, Warman, Swift Current, Gull Lake, Cabri, Morse, Beechy, Perdue, Dinsmore, and Pilot Butte.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some petitions as well with respect to chiropractic care in the province. These petitioners come from all over southern Saskatchewan, Weyburn area particularly and Saskatoon, Regina, and Yorkton.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have several hundred signatures on petitions with respect to chiropractic care. And I could just summarize with the last part of the last sentence. And it really just says that we:

. . . humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

These people that have signed are from Qu'Appelle and Fort Qu'Appelle, Abernethy, Wolseley, Balcarres, Battlefords, Landis, various places in Saskatoon, more from Fort Qu'Appelle. I've got a large number from Regina and Saskatoon, but places like Lipton, Indian Head, Cupar, those from Lemberg, more from Fort Qu'Appelle, Kindersley, Eston, Leader, Regina, several people from Swift Current, Eatonia, people from Radville, Weyburn, Creelman, Yellow Grass, Stoughton, Weyburn, Yorkton, Estevan, Manor, a large number from Weyburn again, Mr. Speaker, and from Lampman, a large number from Regina.

And then places up in the north-central prairie like Meadow Lake, Melfort, Pleasantdale, Carrot River, Gronlid, Saskatchewan; to name a few. Quite a few from Bjorkdale, Porcupine Plain, Nipawin, Tisdale, Carrot

River, Macoun and quite a few in that area. Again a large number from Regina and Saskatoon and several from White City, Mr. Speaker.

I now table these petitioners.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions today concerning chiropractic care in our province. I'll only read the prayer to the Assembly:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have 32 pages of petitions. It's over 400 names from across the province of Saskatchewan. If one looks at all of these locations, it indeed would be a road map of our province and obviously a fair representation of the will of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions to table today pertaining to chiropractor patients. And I won't read any of the prayer or anything because my colleagues have read that, Mr. Speaker.

These are from . . . I'll just give a few, just a few: Lloydminster and Maidstone is that page, and Yorkton, Watrous area, Coderre. And we have from Esterhazy, Mr. Speaker, Yorkton. This page is pretty well all Yorkton, and then we have some from Yorkton, Bredenbury, Canora area. This page is pretty well all, Mr. Speaker, Tisdale and Lake Lenore, Tisdale. And this whole page here is all Tisdale, looks like, Mr. Speaker.

Another page is all Melfort, Tisdale, Porcupine Plain. They vary from all over. Tisdale. And this whole page, Mr. Speaker, is all Saskatoon. It looks pretty well all Saskatoon. And the next page is . . . some from my own constituency, Colonsay and Saskatoon, Dundurn area. Those are all my constituency, Mr. Speaker. And then the rest. There's four pages here that I picked out here. And they're all Regina. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that pretty well finishes every home in Churchill Downs. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To add to the 15,000 petitioners on the chiropractic issue, I have several hundreds of names to add on a new petition, Mr. Speaker, which reads:

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly in Legislature Assembled:

The Petition of the undersigned citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly showeth:

That provincial funding of Level 1 and 2 Special Care Facilities is important and necessary to maintain the health and well-being of Saskatchewan residents currently residing in or on

a waiting list for such facilities and elimination of this funding is immoral and contrary to the government's policies and promises by which it was elected into office.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government to immediately reverse its decision to cease funding which will place an unbearable financial and emotional burden upon the already over-taxed people of our province.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I have one further petition to lay on the table:

To the Honourable Assembly of Saskatchewan in Legislature assembled:

The Petition of the undersigned concerned citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly showeth:

That in the 1991 general election the voters of the province voted 62.62 % to prevent the Government of Saskatchewan from paying for abortion procedures;

and that this margin far exceeds the support of any political party represented in the Legislature;

and that the government is placing greater and greater costs on Saskatchewan people for an already financially stressed health care system;

and that it would be to the benefit of our democracy for governments to listen to the duly expressed will of the voters as well as to the benefit of our health care system to more judiciously husband our health care dollars.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to stop the funding of abortions in Saskatchewan.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, and I submit another 6,000 names to that effect.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Deputy Clerk: — According to order, the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 11(7), they are hereby read and received:

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the Assembly, two visitors from sunny River Heights in Saskatoon, my constituency. In the west gallery, Mr. Speaker, I'd like you to join me in welcoming Shelly Banda and Tom Walker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, also in the west gallery, are three representatives from the ACFC (l'Association culturelle franco-canadienne), the francophone parents' association. Their president Gerard LeBlanc; Roger Gauthier, and Richard Nadeau. If the Assembly would join me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — And, Mr. Speaker, in your gallery is a member of that organization, well known in the province as well, Florent Bilodeau.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — I just wanted to join with the Minister of Education in welcoming Tom Walker and Shelly Banda who were former constituents of mine, but they moved out of my riding immediately upon my being elected. I don't know if those events were related or not, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roy: — Merci, M. le Président. Je veux vous présenter à toi et les autres collègues, les autres députés dans la législature, les gérants, les directeurs de la PPF (l'Association provinciale des parents fransaskois), M. LeBlanc, M. Gauthier, M. Nadeau. Aussi également je voudrais demander à les députés d'accueillir M. Florent Bilodeau, le directeur de l'ACFC ici à Régina. Je vous demandrais à tous à les accueillir chaleureusement. Merci.

(Translation: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly, the managers and the director of the PPF, Mr. LeBlanc, Mr. Gauthier, and Mr. Nadeau. I would also ask the members to welcome Mr. Florent Bilodeau, the director of ACFC, here to Regina. I ask everyone to give them a warm welcome. Thank you.)

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Crop Insurance Corporation Firings

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the minister responsible for Crop Insurance Corporation. The other night, Mr. Minister, in Estimates I asked you why you fired three individuals from the Crop Insurance Corporation — Mr. Jim Walters, Geoff Bartlam, and Ron Osika. They were all hired prior to 1982. And your answer was, re-organization at the Melville office and the Melville office only, you said, where the

re-organization was at.

Mr. Minister, my question to you is this: could you please tell us why Mrs. Brenda Hanley was fired as the manager of the Rosetown Crop Insurance office?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Chairman, as the member opposite should well know that it's not the minister's responsibility to be involved in personnel at the lower levels of the Crop Insurance Corporation. And whatever decision was made there, was made by management. And I am not aware of or at liberty to speak about individuals in the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely not factual because nobody from the Rosetown office fired this person. I talked to her individually, and she came in . . . she told me that someone from the Melville office came in and said, at 8 o'clock in the morning, you are fired.

The next question I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: can you tell us whether she was fired with cause or without cause? You probably know that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Chairman, as I said, those are management decisions. In this particular case I do not know whether or not she was fired with or without cause. I can find that information for you if you would like.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, the minister knows right well when they fire a manager — there's only a few of them in the province — he knows right well whether they're fired by just or unjust cause. He knows quite well.

Well I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you, that she was told she was fired without cause. Because we have in fact learned that she was fired because several years ago she refused to approve an unethical crop insurance contract for the wife of your friend, the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this is despicable, absolutely despicable. A women who has been working diligently for Crop Insurance Corporation for more than a decade, hired under the former NDP administration — she was hired under the NDP administration — fired because she would not allow double-dipping into the crop insurance by the now Minister of Agriculture.

My question, Mr. Minister: are you aware that both the Minister of Agriculture and his wife are now holding crop insurance contracts for the same farming operation and that a refusal to go along with that scheme was the reason for the firing of Mrs. Hanley?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I think we've reached a new low in question period here. I think, Mr. Speaker, that again the members use the protection of the

House to make slanderous remarks which they probably would not make outside of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of reasons for the management decisions that were made, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that was not the reasons. The members opposite continue to point to political patronage of members that were . . . of civil servants who were hired by NDP (New Democratic Party) governments in the previous administration. Now does that make sense that they're being . . . if they were political appointments we would be firing ones that were hired by the previous government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in the normal running of a Crown corporation or a government department there are people who must move on and do different things. That's the way of the world, Mr. Speaker. And to say that we should never have people dismissed, that, I believe, is ridiculous. And to make those sort of allegations is really slanderous, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, that's all they can think about is political patronage, and I never mentioned political patronage in my question. But they got it on their minds at all times, so that's why the answers.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture's always stated the biggest reason for the change in the 1991 GRIP was moral hazards. Do you agree that the two persons living on the same house — man and a wife — using the same yard to farm from, both have crop insurance contracts. Do you agree that this is the moral hazard that the minister is talking about?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, again the Minister of Agriculture has never said that. The thing . . . What I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that we have rules and regulations whereby we allow or disallow contracts under Crop Insurance. The Minister of Agriculture is subject to the same rules and the same regulations as any other farmer in this province, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think there's just too much yelling on both sides of the House, and let's get it to order.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — And I would like to . . .

The Speaker: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — I would like to point out as the member opposite has already made the point, the previous administration was the one who approved this contract for the Minister of Agriculture. If that, Mr. Speaker, if there was wrongdoing it was done by your administration not ours.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Appointments to Government Boards

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health.

Madam Minister, in deliberation of one of your Bills the other day, upon questioning by the member from Rosthern about the make-up of various health boards around the province of Saskatchewan, you made the statement that these boards should be above politics and that there should be no political influence in boards.

Do you still agree with that statement, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The boards throughout the province are selected on the basis of competence and what the individual can contribute to the process.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the same minister.

Madam Minister, upon receiving complaints from people in the city of Prince Albert, a little further checking has revealed that a number of the individuals on the new health board appointed in that city are long-term contributors to the NDP party.

In fact, Madam Minister, in fact, Madam Minister, as we have pointed out with so many other boards, there is a price tag attached, a price tag attached, it seems, for serving in this province.

Madam Minister, in the face of your own statements how can you condone the fact that it looks like about 350 bucks is the going price for health boards in the province of Saskatchewan? Can you answer that, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, the criteria that we use in selecting members of boards is first of all, we go to the stakeholders who are involved and we run a number of names by them and they make nominations and the stakeholders agree to every single member on that board.

So the stakeholders involved in the process in Prince Albert agreed to the names of the board that came forward. The member opposite is obviously criticizing those stakeholders. The Department of Health does not look at whether anybody made a contribution to the PC (Progressive Conservative) Party or the NDP Party. And I'm not surprised if people contribute to the NDP Party since by far the vast majority of people voted for us.

Now the fact of the matter is, is the statements of the member opposite are about as accurate on many occasions as the one made by the member from Rosthern yesterday about Dr. Hindmarsh which were absolutely despicable under the circumstances and which was very upsetting to Dr. Hindmarsh, and you owe him an apology. Now the . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the same minister. Madam Minister, every community in this province is living in fear of what has been pointed out with Prince Albert, that rather than the community being able to make decisions based on the good of the community, you seek at every opportunity to put your partisans in place to make sure that Madam Minister's and the Minister of Finance's will is imposed upon that community.

Madam Minister, the donations of one of these persons stretches back to 1982, and if you remember 1982, everybody in the province was a PC. So I would suggest a New Democratic Party contribution in '82 and continuing all the way through signifies some degree of partiality.

Madam Minister, in the light of this information and the held fear of so many communities that this is what you're up to, would you now give this Assembly the assurance that these boards in the future will not have this criteria attached to them?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — There never was that criteria attached to them. We will continue to go to the stakeholders, and we will get nominations, and we will appoint a board of qualified and competent people from the nominations provided to us. That's what we will do. That's what we did in the past. That's what we'll do in the future.

And I want to say something about the health reform that's taking place. And I'm going to in this instance call the member to Rosthern to listen to this, what Dr. Hindmarsh is saying about the health reform. He says: the one premise I hold to is this; it is a day and age to urge co-operation to facilitate the changes that are necessary. That's what he says.

The last thing we need right now is to set up an atmosphere where there is no co-operation. But instead the member from Rosthern drags a name through this Legislative Assembly and attributes things to him that aren't accurate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Economic Plans

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, we are likely going to wrap up this session today and we're all going to be able to assess your government's performance in the first few months of the first year of operation. And people across the province in petitions by the thousands and tens of thousands and people who have been misled are saying that your first year is an absolute failure.

Pensioners, the youth, 60,000 farmers, labourers, business people, diabetics, and others have been abandoned by your administration. What we've seen in this Legislative Assembly has no connection at all to your Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Deputy Premier, on behalf of your administration, looking at all of the things that you have failed to do and your tax increases and your cuts, can you now admit, Mr. Deputy Premier, that you had no plan at all when you were elected except just to get elected?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to respond to the Leader of the Opposition to this question, and I want to say this to him.

In 1983, the Leader of the Opposition said in New York this province had so much going for it that he could afford to mismanage it. And he did.

He dragged this province into a debt situation that is greater than any province in Canada and made it difficult for the future generations of this province to provide themselves the thing that they should have a right to have.

Since November 1, 1991, Mr. Speaker, this government has turned that around.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — And that's why the people of Saskatchewan are saying, Mr. Speaker, that they are relieved that they finally have a government in office that is honest and open and accountable and providing good management of their taxpayers' dollars.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we heard that at the opening day and we hear it at the end, and in between, Mr. Speaker, we have the real facts and the truth. The truth is, is that the hon. member admits clearly that he is taxing and he is cutting and his deficit is increasing and his credit rating is going down. He is practising patronage; rural people are being abandoned; health care people are being abandoned; and he says, well we're finally in power and we're living up to the plan.

Mr. Minister, what the people are asking is if your credit rating's falling and if you're increasing taxes and if you're cutting services and you're abandoning rural people and you're charging those that are sick, won't you now admit that you didn't have a plan at all for the people in the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I happen to have here an editorial from a recent edition of the *Swift Current Sun*. Is it *Swift Current Sun*?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Which very clearly portrays the performance of the opposition in this legislature since this session began in April when an editorial says: most of what we hear from the opposition lately is closer to ravings than rhetoric.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — And, Mr. Speaker, I might say that the people of Saskatchewan recognize that to be the case. And they know that what this government is doing, and it started it with this session and this first budget of this administration, that we are returning the future of this province back to our children and their children and guaranteeing the future by turning away from the kind of mismanagement and waste that took place here in the nine and a half years between 1982 and 1991.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, it's good to know — and I'm sure the media will be really happy to know — that the Deputy Premier has read John Penner's report to the legislature . . . from the legislature to the people of Swift Current.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Because that's what you've done. Because nobody else is saying that. Nobody else is saying that. In fact the media report card has failure, failure, failure, failure . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we have failed pasta plants; failed airplane projects; failed Piper; failed AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) agreements — you've broken those agreements; problems with respect to breaking agreements with other provinces, with the national government. You have no economic analysis that shows that you have any direction at all. Your credit rating is going down. You promised 700 companies are going to be in here doing work, and in fact you have young people leaving. You have senior citizens absolutely, totally disenchanted with the fact that you're charging them and cutting them off. And your credit rating's falling and your deficit's going up. And in fact it's a higher deficit than when you took office. And last night you admitted, well it's really just the accounting principles that were different. You just stacked it up.

Well, Mr. Deputy Premier, why don't you tell us your plan, your economic plan for jobs, for economic activity, how you're going to help rural people in a crisis, health care people in a crisis. Rather than blaming the federal government or rather than blaming someone else two years ago, what are going to do today?

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition sounds like this may be his last day in this Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — And I think, Mr. Speaker . . . I think, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to accept that at face value and give him that — and give him that.

But what I want to say in response to his questions directly, that the member from Estevan's failure was

taking a prosperous province in 1982, with a provincial budget surplus of \$139 million, and squandering and wasting and turning a have province to a province that is a province that is no longer a have province and is dependent on the federal government for equalization payments, which we cannot always rely on. That is the failure of the member opposite.

The success of the present government, Mr. Speaker, is that we almost completely are either in the process of or have implemented the program of the New Democratic Party, which we distributed to the people of Saskatchewan during the election campaign, the first of which was to bring common sense financial management to this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker. I have here, Mr. Speaker, the missing brochure that the NDP administration failed to campaign on but now have implemented in the province of Saskatchewan — the missing brochure that the media know about, the public really knows about, and tens of thousands of petitioners absolutely know about.

And it says, when you promise no taxes, what you really want to do is increase sales tax, increase the personal tax, increase the phone rates, increase power rates, increase natural gas rates, increase SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) vehicle insurance, increase the E&H (education and health), increase the fuel tax and the tobacco tax and cut services to people and charge for health care, increase the prescription drug plan.

And the brochure, the missing brochure is rather deep when you look at what you've done in the last few months. Tell us, Mr. Deputy Premier, what is your real plan, given the fact that your credit rating has gone down, you've gone down in popularity, your taxes are up, and you have a crisis in rural Saskatchewan and no idea what to do to help them? What are you going to do now?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, my answer is going to be straightforward and direct to the member from Estevan.

I want the member from Estevan to know that the direction of this government is to take hold of the financial disaster created by the member from Estevan when he was the premier and bring financial stability and good management to the province of Saskatchewan so that we can guarantee for future generations — our children and their children — a prosperous future in which all of the programs and services that they have a right to expect will be assured them, rather than jeopardize as the member from Estevan did during the time when he was the premier by his mismanagement of the finances of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the missing brochure goes on to talk about all the campaign promises that you really planned to implement, that you were afraid to tell people

— like closing rural hospitals, not funding level 1 and 2 nursing homes, making sure that rural people had to pay more and more, encouraging rural people to defend their health care system at the local level by raising mill rates. In fact you know you've got community fighting against community, rural people fighting against urban people.

Mr. Deputy Premier, in the real brochure, the missing brochure, you have all kinds of things that you have implemented in this Legislative Assembly in this session that you didn't campaign on. Why don't you tell them, Mr. Deputy Premier, what your real plan was, which was totally patronage, increase taxes, cut the services, do anything at all to get in power, and once you're in power, do anything to stay in power?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from a brochure called "Let's do it . . . *The Saskatchewan Way*," which was the election program of the New Democratic Party. And I want to tell the member from Estevan that we said at that time that we would do the following:

First Things First — Common Sense Financial Management.

New Directions, New Priorities.

Jobs, Fair Taxes, and Wealth Creation.

Doing away with the regressive provincial GST (goods and services tax) which he had implemented.

We would provide "A Better Quality of Life." And in order to do that, we have to clean up the financial mess which he created.

We would fight for agriculture and rural communities. And this government has done that, even though the members opposite would not join, time after time, in supporting resolutions urging the federal government to provide third line of defence.

And that this government would provide "Open, Honest and Accountable Government."

On every single one of those commitments which were made to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, this government has delivered.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker and members of the public and members of the Legislative Assembly and members of the media, this NDP platform, this contract to the people is just as valid as the 60,000 GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) contracts that you broke. And that's a matter of fact.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — You broke the contract with the public, you brought in legislative changes and rule changes undemocratic, unparliamentary, and you broke the

contract just like you broke these promises because you had no intention of keeping them.

And you said you're just going to base it on common sense. It's common sense to rip up rural roads, common sense to break contracts, common sense to increase taxes when you promised to reduce them, common sense to cut services and charge for health care, Mr. Deputy Premier.

Why don't you admit that you had no intention at all of living up to any of the promises you made except just do what's necessary to get elected, and once you're in here, practise patronage and do the opposite — anything at all, just to stay in power?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the member from Estevan, I want to remind him about a statement that his former deputy premier, Mr. Berntson made in the Public Accounts Committee with respect to their attitude towards this province and governing in this province when he was asked the question.

He said, we're going to do what we can, though, to make it very difficult for you people to take it over again when you get back into power. And they did apply that principle, Mr. Speaker, with a scorched earth policy prior to the election, knowing that they were going to be defeated.

Well I want to say to the member from Estevan, in spite of that, in spite of the damage that they did to the future of this province with their mismanagement, we have taken up the challenge. And this government, with the help and support of the people of Saskatchewan, is . . . and will turn it around to make sure that that future is a bright one because the people of this province have confidence that this government is heading in the right direction and turning us away from the kind of direction that the member from Estevan and the member from Thunder Creek and Rosthern were leading us . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

New Training Program for Nurses

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to inform this Assembly of a new training program for nurses to be offered through the Wascana Campus of the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The new course which we expect to begin accepting students in the spring of 1993 will provide advanced clinical training for nurses. The course will prepare nurses for work in northern Saskatchewan and will also prepare nurses for an expanded role in the province's health system.

Mr. Speaker, in order to improve the effectiveness and the

efficiency of our health system we must make better use of all our available health resources, both technological and human.

One of the ways we can achieve this objective is to create expanded roles for our health professionals including nurses. Mr. Speaker, as we reform our health system nurses will take on greater responsibility for providing health services in many communities. In this role they will be working in new partnerships with medical and other professionals.

I'm pleased to report that both the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association have expressed their support of an expanded role for appropriately trained nurses.

The new clinical skills training program is the result of discussions between a number of important health groups including the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Saskatchewan Medical Association, the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association, and the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses.

Our government recognizes that retraining and skills upgrading are critical if we want to empower nurses to take on challenging new roles. This new training program represents an important step towards a reformed Saskatchewan health system, a system that will see nurses and other health professionals with enriched roles, working together towards wellness for the people of this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Obviously anything that can be done to assist and facilitate working toward wellness is something that they will have the support of in general terms from the opposition. However, in the mean time we must recognize that there is a sickness problem out there. So let's not get carried away with wellness at the expense of leaving the sick element not properly taken care of.

Madam Minister, when it comes to nurses and expanded role for nurses, I would support that. I think quite frankly, Madam Minister, that the nurses have, for a long period of time, been underutilized and their skills and the perfection that they bring to the service of the sick could be expanded.

Madam Minister, I think if you're going to be taking a look at the expanded role of nurses, then perhaps we should take it a step further and take a look at the role of nurses when it comes into the entry level within the sickness program. I think there's a lot to be said for nurses' expanded role in that system as well.

(1445)

So let's not just stop at this particular aspect or component of it, Madam Minister, but take a look at the real, expanded role that nurses would be able to play. And certainly you will get our support in a situation like that.

Madam Minister, the one concern that I would express at the same time is let's make sure that when we talk about extra training for nurses and an expanded role for nurses that indeed there are going to be jobs for nurses. That is a concern that nurses are expressing to me in your helter-skelter rush for a more fiscal responsible situation that you are not in the mean time actually going to cost nurses jobs. That, Madam Minister, is something that will not be acceptable to the nurses, to the people, and thereby not to the opposition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act

The Chair: — Before we begin the Committee of the Whole, I'll ask the minister to introduce the officials who are with her this afternoon.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chair, to my right is Mr. Duane Adams, the deputy minister; to my left, Mr. Lawrence Krahn; and immediately behind me, Mr. Brian Middlemiss; and to my left, behind me, Rick Hischebett, Justice.

Clause 1

Mr. Neudorf: — Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister. It's been a while since we discussed this particular topic on the MCIC (Medical Care Insurance Commission) Bill which is the Act to change the medical care insurance Act. And primarily for the numbers of hours that we were involved in discussion on this Bill, we primarily pursued the concerns of the optometrists in the de-insuring of their services that you were contemplating as a minister and as a Department of Health and the Government of Saskatchewan.

Now many of the discussions that we had at that time translate rather directly over to the concerns that are being expressed by chiropractors, but more importantly, so many of their patients.

Perhaps to summarize the discussion that we have had, in so far as optometric services are concerned, I should perhaps read the petition that so many thousands of people have signed and asked us to present to this Assembly, which of course we have done.

The petition that was signed in almost all cases was this one:

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in Legislature Assembled:

The petition of the undersigned concerned

citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly showeth:

that impaired vision is a highly prevalent disorder costing millions of dollars and causing distress to thousands of Saskatchewan people;

that early detection of eye disease and related medical conditions by optometrists is a highly cost-effective, painless, and effective part of our health care system;

that quality optometric care is vital to the working poor and that there is a direct correlation between work-place safety and good vision;

that the government publicly asserts it remains committed to the basic principles of medicare, namely universality, accessibility, comprehensiveness, portability, and public administration;

that the government is acting to destroy these principles as they apply to optometric patients;

and that the government's proposed de-insurance of optometric care will clearly cost more both in terms of dollars and patient harm.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to de-insure optometry, and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against optometric patients by refusing them coverage under medicare equal to other patients.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Madam Minister, will you honour this petition?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The Government of Saskatchewan supports the fundamental principles of health care, and that is that access to health care services is universal and health care is publicly funded.

Now that has never meant in this province that every single health care service is funded. Dental services aren't funded, for example. Optometric services weren't always funded. It doesn't mean that every possible health care service is funded.

The government has set up a safety net to make sure that people who can't afford a service have access to it. Going to a doctor, to see a physician for a medical problem, getting admitted into the hospital is fully funded by the government. With respect to chiropractors, for example, there are many jurisdictions that don't fund chiropractic services at all.

In Saskatchewan we have a strong health care system. We've set up a safety net to deal with people who can't afford some of the non-physician type services like the optometric routine exams. We've set up a safety net in

other areas as well, and the Government of Saskatchewan is committed to universally accessible, publicly funded health care, and we are also committed to reducing inequities in the system which I spoke about this morning — the increased funding for mental health, the increased funding for northern health, for example.

And this government has put forward to the people of Saskatchewan a health reform paper that opens the whole area of health care up for discussion by the public. And we will be meeting with the public and having discussions of that nature.

Mr. Neudorf: — Madam Minister, what I would like to know is, prior to you making the decision to de-insure optometric services for the citizens of this province, what did you do to make sure that everyone was aware of your intentions?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The decision to de-insure optometric services, routine eye exams, was a budgetary item and therefore was not . . . it did not go to the public for public discussion prior to the budget coming down. It was a budgetary item and the budgetary process was followed.

Mr. Neudorf: — Top secret, right, Madam Minister? Top secret. This is the open, honest, forthright government that's going to involve citizens every step of the way. But you decided upon instructions from the Premier and your Minister of Finance that no one, no one should have any inkling of what you proposed to do to them. So this was top secret. You didn't do any consultation. There was no attempt on your part to find out, not only from the recipients of the service, but no attempt to find out from the providers of that health service, what the impact of your decision would be.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — When the member opposite fired some 400 dental therapists, there was no consultation with the dental therapists; they were just shoved off into a room, herded into a room. That's how the government opposite fired 400 dental therapists. And when they fired some 400 nurses, the April leading up to the election, they didn't go and consult with those nurses; they just did it. And I'm assuming they did it as a result of the budgetary process.

And now all of a sudden we have this new-found allegiance to consultation on the budgetary process and budgetary items. And they had a whole list of things that they were going to do in their January 1 budget. They were going to put co-pays with respect to optometric services and co-pays with respect to chiropractic services. And did they consult with the optometrists and the chiropractors on that? Would you answer that question for me?

Mr. Neudorf: — So from your answer, Madam Minister, I am to understand that you are using the wrongs that we did in the past to justify the wrong that you are doing now. Am I understanding the logic of your argument? We apparently did two things wrong, and so therefore that legitimizes what you have done. I thought it was all understood by everyone in this province that the Conservatives lost in the fall of 1991. Is that not correct?

So you can attribute some of our wrongs as contributing to our loss. Now you're trying to say that, well you did it. So therefore we can do it.

Madam Minister, they elected you because they thought that you would do better.

(1500)

An Hon. Member: — We will.

Mr. Neudorf: — And the member opposite says, we will. Well I would say to the member opposite that I don't think the people of Saskatchewan have time at the rate that you are decimating this whole economic structure and physical structure and social fabric of our province at the rate that you're going.

So, Madam Minister, I want you to know that as far as consultation is concerned, I'm just going to read a little bit to you. This is from the *Star-Phoenix*, May 5, 1992. And the headline says, "Optometrists decry lack of consultation process." Now, Madam Minister, that's not me; that's the optometrists. And a few paragraphs:

The government wants to cut health care dollars first and talk later, giving the . . . (L-word) to its consultation credo, Saskatchewan optometrists say.

Then they continue to say that:

While they were consulted (Madam Minister) on a regular basis by the Conservatives, the optometrists have been unable to get a meeting with the NDP until the budget leak . . .

So, Madam Minister, not only did the citizens of this province not know what was going to be happening, the optometrists did not know what was going to be happening.

And I suggest to you, Madam Minister, in all sincerity, you didn't know what was going to be happening. I don't think that you realized that in your wild pursuit to follow the orders of the Minister of Finance and the orders from the Premier to save money, I don't think that you honestly realized the impact that your decision was going to have on the people.

So, Madam Minister, I think a fair question for me to ask of you would be: at what level of discontent that the people are exhibiting will you listen to them? Now I know there were 4,000 families represented in the petitions that were handed in to this legislature in protest over your optometric service deletion. That figure's not high enough for you, Madam?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I want to comment on the member's comments about: they did some wrongs and we are just continuing to do the same sort of wrongs they were doing, and didn't they lose the election, and therefore we should learn from their wrongs.

What I'm commenting here is the hypocrisy of the members opposite when they stand up here and say, oh

dear, you shouldn't have done anything to optometric services; you shouldn't have done anything to drug plan; you shouldn't have done anything to chiropractic services. And yet they had a secret plan to cut physios with a co-pay of 30 per cent; chiropractors, 30 per cent co-pay; optos, 30 per cent; drug plan increases to 30 per cent; de-insure List 3 Labs; and it goes on. Wholesale program changes. They had a whole raft of things that they were going to do after the election if they were re-elected.

And now they stand up here and they criticize our government for trying to deal with their deficit. That's the hypocrisy that I'm speaking to when I made those comments earlier.

The fact of the matter is, is that we are monitoring the situation with respect to optometrists and chiropractors. I am advised that the Department of Health is having ongoing discussions with the professional associations. Our caucus and cabinet will have ongoing discussions. We will be monitoring the situation.

We've established a safety net so that people who can't afford to pay are looked after. People who can't afford to pay will be looked after. And the fact of the matter is, is this government can't spend money it doesn't have, but we will look after those who can't afford to pay.

And I also want to point out that I've been advised by my officials that apparently there are a number of signatures that have repeated themselves in some of those petitions. And in fact in one case, it was 11 times.

Mr. Neudorf: — I don't know what you're saying about the people of the province, Madam Minister, or the chiropractors or the optometrists. To whom are you casting aspersions by making that comment? I don't think we ever made a comment like that during your tenure here and the petitions that you handed in, with Saddam Hussein and all those kinds of names that appeared on your petitions, Madam Minister. So you're not a very good person to talk about some perceived irregularities on some of the petitions.

So, Madam Minister, you're right. I'm going to support you on one of your comments, that we are saying that you have no right to do these things. You don't. You don't. And we didn't. But you don't have that right because you were elected under false pretences. Because you said you wouldn't do that.

You don't have a mandate for what you are doing. You knew the deficit was \$14.2 billion. Your Premier said that in the leader's debate for everyone in the province to hear.

So you knew that. You did not have a mandate — you do not — to make those changes. You don't.

People were not expecting that. They were expecting better of you and more of you because you said you would. And they took your word.

You say, Madam Minister, that you are monitoring. That's a colloquialism for something that I'm not quite sure of

what you mean by that — you're monitoring. Is that supposed to be some solace for these people out there? Are they supposed to take some comfort in it that you're going to change? Because if you are, then please say so.

Because if you're saying that you're monitoring it, the information that I'm getting back from these service providers is that patients are dramatically down — patients are dramatically down. That's what they're telling me. So if you're monitoring it you should now be aware of some of the impacts that your program is having.

Madam Minister, chiropractors, chiropractors, your consultation. First of all, it says — the headline here, also from August 12, '92, from the *Star-Phoenix*: Petitions oppose chiropractic fees. I know for a fact, Madam Minister, that we have approximately — and I will say approximately — 15,000 petitioners that have signed opposing your program. Now if there are 11 of those names that are duplicates, then of course we'll have to subtract that from the 15,000.

Again, Madam Minister, I ask you what is the entry level in terms of the number of petitions that must be signed before you will honour that petition? I know that 4,000 obviously was not enough for the optometrists. So I ask you, is 15,000 enough?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chair, we will be talking to the public of Saskatchewan and the professional associations involved as . . . in the months to come. And if there is a hardship being created to low income people, we urge the professional associations to make sure that these people get in touch with us so we can provide them with coverage. And other than that there is nothing else the government can say. We will make sure people who are on FIP (Family Income Plan), SIP (Saskatchewan Income Plan), and SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan) are fully covered. And we will have ongoing discussions with the associations.

Mr. Neudorf: — Madam Minister, let's make one thing perfectly clear once and for all for whoever is listening and watching and for whoever may be reading *Hansard*. I am not talking about FIP, SIP, and SAP. That's 90,000 people under social aid and some form of assistance. We know that.

Our concern are the low income people just beyond that, that are going to have to make choices; that are not going to go to an optometrist; people that are not going to go to a chiropractor; people that are not going to do what they need as far as diabetes is concerned and the resultant damage to their eyes — glaucoma and so on.

Those are the ones — the ones that are just beyond that. Those are the concerns that we really have because people are going to make choices in terms of their quality health care. And very often those people are going to choose to buy a present for their daughter, or simply food for the table — to use your terminology when you were on this side.

I don't think you have consulted, Madam Minister. And yet in this article on October 12, and I will quote, Mr. Chairman:

Simard said the government consulted with the chiropractors' association before drawing up the legislation and the association agreed to the amendments.

Madam Minister, that's what this newspaper article says, not me. Now either the newspaper article is wrong, that James Parker from the *Star-Phoenix* doesn't know what he's talking about, or Madam Minister the chiropractors are wrong. Because the article continues:

But Jack Nykoliation, its president said the consultations were a joke.

"We had some talks with health officials. You could technically call it consultation, (okay) although most of our ideas were summarily ignored. The government has forced us to agree."

Let that sink in: the government forced us to agree. I'll continue:

"The whole idea originated in the Treasury Board," said Nykoliation.

"They want it to look like they are saving money. This isn't something that is well thought out. And this isn't something that is going to save money."

And that's the bottom line, Madam Minister, that all of these people are telling us — all of the care givers, the professionals out in the field — that this is counter-productive. It's not cost-effective. And you talk about consultation. Now these are not my words. As a matter of fact it's the words out of a newspaper article.

An Hon. Member: — That's the problem.

Mr. Neudorf: — And the member across says, that's the problem. All right, so James Parker is the problem. I don't happen to think so. I happen to think that I'm looking at the problem. And not just you, Madam Minister. Again, elected Treasury Board, the Treasury Board — that's all you ministers there. You're on Treasury Board. You're the ones that are making decisions. You're in cahoots with the Minister of Finance and the Premier. It's your decision to save money, and you don't have the mandate to do that. That's what I'm telling you. Because you never said that you would do that.

You said that you would spend more on health, more on education and universities, and I could go through that litany. And you're doing the opposite. You knew all along what problems that you were developing.

So, Madam Minister, how do you explain why you would be doing that and at the same time you didn't tell us about it? You're aware of this ad that appeared in the *Leader-Post* August 19: when you voted NDP did you expect Medicare User Fees? That's what this ad says, Madam Minister. That's what this ad says. And then it goes on and talks about that: the Government has introduced legislation that would bring a \$10 user fee . . .

User fee — by the NDP government, Madam Minister.

Do I have to remind you about what you said in the past when you were critic here, about user fees? I don't think I have to. And yet now you're doing precisely that. Madam Minister, that's where the disagreement comes in.

Before I go into that, I want to ask you, Madam Minister, if you are aware of any studies that have been done to compare the relative cost-effectiveness of an entry-level chiropractic treatment as opposed, let's say, to going into the physiotherapist at that level? Are you aware of any studies along that line?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — With respect to consultation, I want to advise the member opposite that on April 28, 1992, officials of Saskatchewan Health met with the Chiropractors' Association. April 30 they also met with Dr. Nykoliation, Dr. Howlett, Johnstone, Stewart, Armstrong, Johnstone. May 13 there were further meetings. In fact I was present at that meeting. May 21 there were meetings with the officials of the Saskatchewan Health with the chiropractic . . . May 29 and June 2, again, Mr. Chair.

Now I know that when a group in another meeting on June 11, it's pointed out to me, when a group meets with the government and doesn't achieve what it wants out of the meeting, it naturally feels there hasn't been consultation. That's a natural feeling that comes out of meetings where a group may not get what they want.

(1515)

The fact of the matter is we're talking one, two, three, four, five, six, seven meetings — seven meetings, Mr. Chair. The fact of the matter is, is that the department has had extensive consultations. The government was facing a budget line, the government was facing a budget line, and it was . . . the government was facing a budget line and the consultations that took place with the Chiropractors' Association was asking for their consultation on how we implement and how we deal with the difficult financial situation.

Now with respect to studies, there are studies that have been done about the effectiveness of chiropractic treatment and there is no question that chiropractic treatment is effective. We've never said it isn't. In fact members on this side of the House use chiropractors.

The fact of the matter is we can't fund everything. This government cannot continue to spend the sort of money it's been spending for the last ten and a half years which has caused this province to be virtually bankrupt. We can't spend money we don't have. So we try to set up a system that provides for low income people, and that requires more consumer participation because we can't continue to fund services endlessly.

It's crucial that we get the debt under control. When that is the situation — when it's under control — we can then take a look at improving social programs.

The Chair: — Order. If I may intervene, with the co-operation of the members of the House, the Chair would seek leave to introduce guests who are in the Speaker's Chamber. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Hagel: — Ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly, it's always a pleasure to invite back to Saskatchewan someone who has served with great distinction at this Table — for two decades as a matter of fact, from 1969 to 1989 — Gordon Barnhart who was Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan and left the province in '89 to now serve as Clerk at the Senate and Clerk of Committees of the House of Commons.

I assume that he's accompanied today by his wife, Elaine, and I believe his son and daughter, David and Sarah. And I would ask all members of the Assembly to show a very warm welcome back to Saskatchewan to the former Clerk and his family, Gordon Barnhart.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I would be remiss if I did not add my words of welcome to Gordon and his family. I was, as you're aware, presiding officer of this House as well, back in 1986 on, and Gordon taught me all I know about the rules. And I'll tell you one thing Gordon, it's sure coming in handy now as being House Leader of the opposition side here.

So I appreciate what you've been able to do for me from that perspective, and I hope I do you well for what you have taught me. Furthermore, knowing Gordon and his family, I can just imagine that he bicycled all the way here from Ottawa. But regardless, I hope you enjoy your stay here, Gordon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — On behalf of the government, I'd also like to welcome Gordon and his family back to Saskatchewan and to the legislature. And I would like to say that I worked fairly closely with Gordon when I was legislative counsel and law clerk for the Legislative Assembly. And he is definitely a hard-working individual, a man of integrity, and very competent. And I'm sure that they're really benefitting from your participation down East. Thank you, Gordon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act (continued)

Clause 1 (continued)

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. If we could bring our minds back to the previous answer that the minister was giving in response to some of my comments and my questions, I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, that if there are any chiropractors that happen to be watching proceedings, I think your response, Madam Minister, must have been an insult to them, quite

frankly. It was an insult to them the way you spoke about them.

Now we're not only talking about being effective. Madam Minister, we all recognize that chiropractic services are effective. The point I'm trying to make to you is that they are cost-effective. And there's a big difference between that, and I want you to recognize that, that you are not saving money by de-insuring chiropractic services, period. That is the point that we are trying to make and the point that you have to come to grips with.

You didn't answer my question to satisfaction, Madam Minister, because I have here copies of reports and studies that have been done literally all over the place that confirm the comments and confirm what the chiropractors are telling us, that yes indeed chiropractic treatment is cost-effective. You can take a look at the project that was done, called Canadian co-ordinating office for health technology assessment, of February 1992. Chiropractic treatment of neck and back disorders.

There's the Curtis study of 1988, Madam Minister, the Cassidy study of 1992. I draw your attention, to you and your officials, of those studies. And then there's another study done by economic evaluation of chiropractic services, an economic analysis draws the same conclusion. I invite you to read that, Madam Minister. Then there's the famous Mead study, the Mead study done of 1992. I could read you the results of those to re-emphasize perhaps the cost-effectiveness of this type of a procedure. Then there's the Greer paper also of 1992 called: The issues surrounding chiropractic fee negotiations in Saskatchewan, Madam Minister.

So, Madam Minister, the point again that I've been trying to make is that you should reconsider de-insuring these services because you're creating a dilemma for many, many people in this province. You're creating a dilemma and being counter-productive again, both in terms of dollars and the actual health of our people.

Now, Madam Minister, I have a letter here from the Chiropractors' Association of Saskatchewan. It's from Jim Nykoliation, and it's dated August 20 where he makes mention of the June edition of the chiropractic journal of Australia, entitled: mechanical low back pain, a comparison of medical and chiropractic management within the Victorian work care scheme.

Now that particular thing doesn't mean too much here, but some of the results of those studies, Madam Minister, confirm the clear trend. And it's the scientific literature that chiropractic management, while more intensive, produces major overall savings through reduced compensation costs and chronic cases.

With respect to management cost, the average chiropractic case cost \$1,345, that's for treatment and compensation, which was 58 per cent less than the average medical cost, which is \$2,308.

Chiropractic patients were only half as likely as medical patients to suffer time loss from work — another benefit, Madam Minister. Chiropractic patients who did suffer time loss from work averaged half as many days — half as

many days. Average loss for time loss compensation was \$392 for chiropractic patients and \$1,570 for medical patients.

So, Madam Minister, this again illustrates that chiropractic is a low technology, wellness-based, Madam Minister, efficient, and cost-effective form of therapy for highly prevalent and costly disorders such as low back and neck pain. And that's the letter that I said came from the president of the chiropractic association.

I have another letter from him. This letter, Madam Minister, was addressed to you, so this is no news . . . and I should point out that the other one was also addressed to you and carbon-copied or xeroxed to me, as is this one. And this one is dated August 27 where he states that:

. . . we propose to you that the government defer passage of Bill No. 71 and refer the issue of chiropractic services to the recently formed Health Services Utilization and Research Commission for review. We would suggest that all interested parties be permitted to make submissions to the Commission, and that the Commission make its findings public (as you have agreed that the commission's findings will be made public). The government would then be in a position to make an informed, rational decision on chiropractic care, based on the facts, in a depolitized atmosphere; an approach consistent with the fundamental principles of wellness.

The chiropractic profession in Saskatchewan is willing to publicly put the cost effectiveness and efficiency of its services to the test. Accordingly, the CAS would respectfully request that the government invest the small amount of time required to make a logical, sound, wellness based decision concerning access to chiropractic care.

Now, Madam Minister, that sounds very logical to me. That sounds logical to me, that you take Bill 71, defer its passage until you can do a proper assessment, a public assessment with public input by your own commission that you've set up.

And then if it proves that that is not accurate, if it proves that the chiropractors and the 15,000 petitioners are wrong, then you would have at least removed all doubt about the driving force and the motivation as to why you are doing this. And then indeed, Madam Minister, the citizens of this province will be well served. Would you do that, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — With respect to the letter that the member has just read, I am going to read my response to the chiropractors' association:

Dear Dr. Nykoliation:

This is in response to your letter of August 27th requesting that we defer passage of Bill No. 71.

You are well aware of the fiscal problem facing this province and the need for us to make some very difficult decisions. We understand and are

well aware of the scientific research concerning the effectiveness of chiropractic care. I would point out that another aspect that must be considered is the degree to which coverage can be provided through publicly funded insurance programs.

We believe, perhaps even more than some practitioners, that individuals who feel that chiropractic services are of value will continue to seek chiropractic care even if they are required to pay a fee.

And I want to just digress here a minute and say that there is no evidence in the provinces where chiropractic services have no insurance or where there is a co-payment that people do not seek chiropractic services when they are needed.

You should also bear in mind that Saskatchewan continues to be the only province in Canada (and I'm quoting again from the letter) that does not have visit or dollar limits for chiropractic services.

With regard to the involvement of the Utilization Commission there may well be issues related to chiropractic care that we will want them to look at. It is important to understand that the activities of the Commission will undoubtedly influence the development of health policies in the years to come. However, government is not abdicating its management responsibility for health programs to the commission.

I appreciate your position, however, we'll be proceeding with the Bill and the implementation of the co-payment arrangement at the earliest possible date.

(1530)

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I have a letter here from a Shirley Prescott from Martensville, Sask. I don't know the lady, but she has also written to you, and I want to put this letter on record because I think it summarizes quite succinctly her feelings and the feelings of many folks. She says:

I am strongly opposed to the chiropractic user fee. This is only going to force patients to tolerate their pain for longer periods of time while they wait to get on physiotherapists' waiting list. Why pay a user-fee when a referral will get you to a physiotherapist for free?

I'm also opposed to the plan to divide Saskatchewan into health districts. They will create more management positions — just what we don't need — and at the same time reduce the actual amount of care available to residents.

Your "team" of supporters lack the conviction to stand behind their own ideas by putting the responsibility onto regional boards instead of shouldering it themselves. When an area is forced to close a hospital you can all sit back comfortable

in the knowledge that you didn't directly do it yourselves.

What happened to the foresight, direction, commitment and promises that got this government elected? Have we been cheated again?

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 5

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have advised the Clerks of the Table that I would be making an amendment at this time on clause 5 and I see they are giving the amendment to the minister at this point. Mr. Chairman, I move that we:

Amend clause 5(b) of the printed Bill by adding immediately before clause 15(h) as being enacted therein the following clause:

"(g.1) services provided by physicians to terminate a pregnancy unless a continuing pregnancy is likely to cause irreversible physical injury; and"

I so move.

Mr. Neudorf: — Madam Minister, I have asked you on a couple of occasions what the entry level of acceptance by your government is in its promise to be open, forthright, and listening to people. I thought that perhaps I would be able to persuade you to do away with Bill 71 by promising not to de-insure optometrists. There were only 4,000 people that signed petitions to object to optometry being removed as an insured service.

Then we went to the second part of your Bill, and we find that there were 15,000 people that said don't de-insure chiropractors. And I asked you, Madam Minister, was that enough for you to listen to the wishes of the people. And you proclaimed, no that is not enough.

Well, Madam Minister, if you're bound and determined to have your way with Bill 71, de-insuring vital services to the people of this province in a non cost-effective way, then I'm going to suggest to you, Madam Minister, that you agree also to de-insuring from public funding, abortions that are not medically necessary to save the life of the mother. That is my amendment, Madam Minister. And I say that, I think, with some force, not the force of my voice, but the force of the voices of the people of this province.

You know, Madam Minister, that there were almost 63 per cent of the people of this province that unequivocally demanded that the Government of Saskatchewan cease and desist in its funding for abortions in this province — 63 per cent. More, Madam Minister, than the PC caucus got during the last election; more, Madam Minister, than the Liberal Party got in the last election; and more, Madam Minister, than your party got in the last election. Sixty-three of the people said no.

Subsequent to that, Madam Minister, there have been enough people willing enough to step forward and sign their names on petitions requesting that you stop publicly funded abortions in the province of Saskatchewan. Thirty-six thousand people, 36,000 petitioners, Madam Minister, have requested you to do exactly that. Madam Minister, I ask you: are 36,000 people enough?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — We will not be agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. Neudorf: — Madam Minister, I'll give you another opportunity because I'm sure that you would not want to insult 63 per cent of the people of this province. Do you not agree, Madam Minister, that they deserve more of a response than that? Would you want to, would you mind, would you condescend, would you come down to the level of actually explaining to the 63 per cent of the population of Saskatchewan when here I presented you with a wonderful opportunity to concede that they are right, and do what they are wishing you to do? Would you give those people an answer?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The member opposite has raised this issue in the Assembly throughout this session on numerous occasions, and we have responded in detail and at length. And he still, for political purposes, tries to make this issue a political issue. It has nothing to do with his personal feelings on the matter. It has to do with politics.

He knows full well that it's unconstitutional, against the charter of rights. He knows that. We've explained it at length. There has been numerous debate in here and he's still trying to grandstand on an issue of this nature.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, I'm disturbed with the minister's answer, that she would deign to cast aspersions on my motivation, saying that I don't care. Madam Minister, this issue — now listen carefully — this issue means so much to me that I'm going to make a statement that you will be able to use against me as a politician.

In 1985 when I was out on the hustings to become elected in this province, one of the stands that I took was that there are certain issues that I will not compromise, and the life and death issue is one of them. And I went from house to house and I made it abundantly clear to everyone that I talked to that if the occasion should rise and we formed government where a decision would have to be made for me to choose between life or politics, I would choose life. And if the constituents of Rosthern said to me, Neudorf, you vote for abortion, I said I will not do that no matter how many of you say, Neudorf, you do that. I made the commitment that I would not do that. I will not compromise that. And I said, then you can throw me out on my ears on the next election.

So don't you cast aspersions as to what my motivations are. And it's not only my motivation; it's the motivation of 63 per cent of the population that galvanized me into action. That's the strength of my conviction, and that's what I'm talking to you about, Madam Minister.

Now you are trying to hide behind the constitution.

You're trying to hide behind the charter of rights . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well if you say the Saskatchewan charter of rights stands in your way, the charter of rights in this province has been made by politicians. It was created in this room. It's the creature of the creation of this room and the will of this Assembly. Why not change the charter? It's within the will of these politicians within this room. If there's something within the charter that stands in your way, Madam Minister, then identify that for me and we'll take care of that.

Now as far as the other issues, you are fully aware, Madam Minister, you are fully aware that this is another situation where there are legal opinions. And legal opinions are exactly that — they're exactly that; that's all they are, legal opinions.

I have a legal opinion here, and the conclusion of the legal opinion from these barristers or lawyers, whatever you want to call them, says: a province could de-insure in hospitals any medical procedure not medically necessary for the purpose of maintaining health. A law firm.

Then it goes on and it's got about four other conclusions: a province could de-insure physician services which are not medically required. A province cannot collect user fees. A province cannot prevent abortions in hospitals where the hospital charges the patient directly. Ah ha, we're talking about publicly funded abortions here. A province cannot reduce the compensation for medically necessary abortions to an unreasonable amount. An example given here is like down to \$1, which would be ridiculous. A province could de-insure abortions where the pregnancy is not a medical risk to the mother, Madam Minister.

So don't hide behind that. I'd like you to respond.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I made a public statement on this several months ago. We went into detail with respect to the matter. We released the legal opinions or a couple of them that we had received, to the public. I have repeatedly said that to de-insure abortions would violate the Constitution Act, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code and the Canada Health Act.

Several months ago we indicated that we were setting up a family planning committee that was going to take a look at the issue of unintended pregnancies and to try and work together to reduce the number of unintended pregnancies in the province. And we took a lot of time to research the area. And I've indicated in this House — not once but numerous times — what the findings were with respect to our legal opinions.

And the fact of the matter is, it would be unconstitutional; it would offend the Canadian charter of rights and it would offend the Canada Health Act. And that is the advice that we have received and that's the advice that we're going to follow.

Mr. Neudorf: — Those are not the facts, Madam Minister, about the Canada Health Act, quite easily, and in fact we've got records of response from the federal government and so do you, Madam Minister, that that is

not an impediment — that is not an impediment — it's an excuse. That's what you're talking about.

And you're talking about teen-age pregnancies, and of course we're all concerned about that. You've set up a committee to have a look at that. We have a concern about that committee because you're . . . the Teen-Aid issue, these other kinds where the emphasis is not on abstinence, but rather on prevention. And that, Madam Minister, I take a lot of exception to.

You indicated that abortions are a result of teen-age pregnancies. I can only conclude that from your comment, Madam Minister. And yet we take a look at the statistics, we take a look at the quarterly statistics from Saskatchewan Social Services, and we take a look on page 11 of the adoption issue. And we find out that on ward adoptions, on infant adoptions, there are 370 in 1992 waiting, applicants waiting; home studies that are under way, another 78; approved homes waiting placement, another 147; adoption placements, the quarterly total, 11. When you add those together you get 595 people who would want to have adoptions on infant adoptions.

Then we have on special adoptions, applicants waiting, 116; home studies under way, 151; approved homes waiting, 151; and 23 adoption placements on the quarterly total. When I add those all together, Madam Minister, I come out to the total of 1,013 parents who are waiting to have adoptions. Madam Minister, every child is a wanted child, number one.

(1545)

One way out is to kill those children before they are born. That's what abortion is all about, Madam Minister, that's what abortions are all about. So this is a matter of life and death, and I don't intend to get into the dramatics of it. That's not my intent here.

But what I'm asking you, Madam Minister, as sincerely as I can, having and considering all the other things that we've been doing this afternoon, could you then at least be consistent and say that if it's not a medically necessary operation for a mother to have an abortion to save her life, if that's not the case — and goodness knows we know it's a very small percentage of 1 per cent — then that it will not be paid for by taxpayers' dollars.

That's what we're asking, Madam Minister. So on behalf of 63 per cent of the people of this province I ask you again, don't hide behind the law. Don't hide behind the law because that is not an impediment. It's a likely option for you to pursue now to hide behind. And that's all it is, Madam Minister. Will you listen to 63 per cent of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, or is that not enough?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is it's a doctor and the woman who determines whether or not it's medically necessary. The suggestion the member made opposite is simply a red herring. A committee cannot be established. The Supreme Court has struck down therapeutic abortion committees. The decision is left to a woman and her doctor.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a couple of comments regarding the amendment brought forward by my colleague, the member from Rosthern. I must indicate to the minister and to the government that certainly when we look at the vote and the results of the plebiscite that was placed last fall and you take a look at the different constituencies, and there were substantial differences in constituencies. In my constituency it was almost 70 per cent of those who placed their X on that ballot who indicated that they did not agree with funding for abortions.

And, Madam Minister, it wouldn't be right for me not to stand up and indicate the support that has been given in my constituency regarding that question. And the minister has also, over the period of the last few hours, continually said that the government would be responsive to people, that they would listen. We've heard that for a number of years regarding consultation or the number of months we've been in the Assembly regarding the consultative process. And yet the results of a plebiscite . . .

And certainly we can take a look at most recent days regarding the constitutional question. For a period of months, the Premier of this province indicated that he wasn't in favour of a referendum even though some 80 per cent of the population asked for a referendum on the constitution. But most recently we find now that the Premier has changed his mind and indicated that he felt a referendum would be appropriate.

However, we find that there is continued silence, other than that the Madam Minister indicating that even though the Saskatchewan public have voted very loudly regarding funding of abortions, publicly funding, that the government is not willing to listen. And one must question where the government's real objectives are in light of the fact that many of the constituencies represented by NDP members also voted very strongly and very openly regarding their views regarding publicly funded abortions.

Therefore, Madam Minister and Mr. Chairman, I find today that I must support my colleague, the member from Rosthern, and his amendment.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I too would like to speak in favour of the amendment. I would like to draw to your attention, Madam Minister, one or two things that you have not taken into consideration. They talk about 63 per cent. Madam Minister, in my constituency the favourable vote was almost 80 per cent saying no to funding abortions.

Madam Minister, I can't understand your logic. When we will not fund diabetics, we will not fund chiropractic treatments or eye examinations . . . These are things that people have no control over. Madam Minister, I submit to you that pregnancy can be controlled, and abortions are avoidable.

And I can't understand your logic. When you will . . . I believe the figure you quoted was \$1.4 million that you're charging extra to these people who have an affliction or a

sickness that they have no control over. They didn't go out and do anything and contract these problems, whereas in pregnancy there is a responsibility of the persons involved.

Madam Minister, I hope you don't question my motivation in this. Madam Minister, I am very, very happy that my mother did not abort me. And I would ask you to look at your own children and wonder if they would want to be aborted.

Madam Minister, I believe you need to take another look at this. I don't think you have truly told us the truth about your resolve. Madam Minister, I don't believe the impediment is because you believe that you don't have the legal right to do so. If you were truthful and if you would follow what you said you were going to do, listen to the people, you would find out for absolute sure whether this is legal under the charter of rights in the constitution. But you're hiding under the umbrella of an illegal opinion.

Madam Minister, while this is not on the subject, let me remind you of the debate we've had quite extensively here on the GRIP program. That is just the opposite. You're taking a . . . We have legal opinion. You have a legal opinion. Madam Minister, I suggest to you, you really and truly won't listen to the people of this province. Thank you very much.

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, people of Saskatchewan, 68.9 per cent of the voters in my constituency voted no to the funding of abortion with public money. I stand here today in support of that majority.

You say, Madam Minister, that the court may rule against you if you try to do what the people have asked you to do. At this point I would say to you that the people are simply saying, will you do the proper thing and put it to the test? If you are legitimately beaten by a higher authority, they could forgive you. But if you don't put it to the test, then they can't forgive you.

I stand here in support of the amendment, and I ask you if you'll do the proper thing and listen to the people and put it to the test.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support my colleagues on this amendment, and I made my stand prior to the election when I declared my support for no funding for abortions.

And I ask the Madam Minister why she is willing to cut funding to other medical procedures such as chiropractic care, such as the diabetics, such as optometrists when she is not willing to cut the funding to this medical procedure as it has been expressed by the people of Saskatchewan?

In my own constituency it was a higher than 63 per cent vote against funding. It was 68 per cent, Madam Minister. And even in your own constituency there was over 4,600 people who voted no to funding of abortion — better than 51 per cent, Madam Minister, in your constituency.

Madam Minister, will you screw up your courage and

follow the direction of the people of Saskatchewan rather than following the dictates of your NDP membership?

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, last fall during the general election, one of the questions that was put before the people of this province was the following: abortions are legally performed in some Saskatchewan hospitals. Should the Government of Saskatchewan pay for abortion procedures?

Madam Minister, I'd like to report to you that in the constituency of Kindersley, the constituency that I am proud to represent, the people responded in the following fashion to that question. Sixty-five per cent of the people believe that the province of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, should not pay for abortion procedures. Madam Minister, I campaigned that if elected I would oppose abortion funding. The people of the constituency of Kindersley support that view. Madam Minister, the people of Saskatchewan do not want abortion procedures to be paid for by the Saskatchewan taxpayer.

Madam Minister, I will be supporting my colleague in his amendment. And I firmly believe the people of Saskatchewan also would support that amendment. Thank you.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, in my constituency of Arm River there was about 68 per cent supported the vote on not paying for abortions. And I feel very badly that 68 per cent of the people in my riding can voice their opinion, and you as the government don't take it serious. You're not taking it seriously because it's not washing with the member from Arm River when you're saying, oh it's not constitutional. You're not even trying. You've never even tried.

And I can't believe that you're not doing what you can to try to . . . for one thing, is dollars and cents . . . but most importantly to try to slow down the killing of these little babies. To try to stop that, there's what's wrong here.

And I challenge, before we're through that there's a few members that should be getting up to speak on this. There was several pro-life people that . . . 4 or 5 or 6, the member from Swift Current, the member from Weyburn, the member from Nipawin. I'd like them to get up and voice their opinion. And I'm sure there's lots more. I'm sure that the Deputy Premier of this province — I'm quite sure he was one of the ones that said he was a pro-life. But what's happening here, that you've silenced them. You don't even let them speak.

They weren't even able to speak, Madam Minister, on the GRIP Bill because somebody said, no you don't. So if I'm not right, if I'm wrong, Madam Minister, I want to see the member from Swift Current on his feet immediately and maybe the member from Weyburn and the member from Nipawin. Stand up and be counted.

Because when I was elected in Arm River — nominated in 1977 — my nomination night I told the people of my constituency that if you want to . . . on some moral issues, never ask me to carry a message against my moral issues. Any other message I'll carry to the legislature. And I've only had three letters in fifteen years from pro-choice

people. They've all been from the pro-life people because they know better than to ask the member from Arm River to go out and take a stand on not saving the life of the unborn.

The trouble is that we have an NDP Party in Saskatchewan that supports abortion on demand. That's the problem. They support it. They've never had a convention that they don't have 60 to 90 per cent . . . let's kill the babies. You know that.

Let's have the Minister of Health stand up in this House and say that I am a pro-choice or a pro-life and take her stand. I've taken my stand and you know perfectly well if you were a pro-life party and you believed in the life of the little child, that you believe that there's life at conception . . . if you believe that you would stand up and this would be no problem about anything to do with whether you pay for it in hospitals or not. You would see what could happen in a hurry. You could do it. You know you can do it. You don't want to do it.

And I just feel so sorry for the individuals that believe other than you people. But this is different. This is not, Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, this is not getting into which party has the most majority here. Of course, we only got 10 members; the Liberal have one; and you've got 55 or 56.

Sixty-five per cent of the people in the province have spoken, and you don't care. You don't care because you don't believe in the concept of saving a child's life. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(1600)

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few words to say. I want to take this opportunity to point out that I will be supporting the member from Rosthern's amendment to the Bill. The reasons are, I guess, two basic reasons. One is that over 70 per cent of the people in my constituency said that I should support that kind of a move. I am going to go on record as saying that I am doing that at this time.

The second reason is because I firmly believe that this is the right thing to do. In my mind it has nothing to do with politics; it has to do with morality. It has to do with the fundamental right of an individual to live. I want to point out to this Assembly that my mother was the youngest child of 17. And I want to point out to this Assembly that under circumstances that exist in the province of Saskatchewan and across Canada today, that in a different kind of a home that that individual would not have been allowed to live.

The people in the Soviet Union, for example, the average woman in the Soviet Union has eight abortions, and I don't think that that's right. I don't think it's the right thing to do. I don't think it's the right thing for anyone to do.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support the 63 per cent roughly that said no to funding abortion in the province, and I am hoping that the members of this Assembly will also participate in that vote and say yes to this amendment and no to the question as other people in the

constituency and my constituency and in the province said. So I want to thank the Assembly for this time. And I will be definitely supporting the amendment to the Bill.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise today in consideration of this Bill and say that I'll be supporting the member from Rosthern. And I do that because I fundamentally believe that the process of referendum, the process of large-scale democracy, is something that we as Canadians have to accept. Our country is probably going to face a national referendum on the issue of unity in our country. We as Canadians will expect to live by that vote.

Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of people in my constituency — a majority that I could never even dream of attaining as a partisan political person in this province, a majority that I could never possibly attain, I don't believe — said to me that they don't believe that the public funding of abortion is proper, that their tax dollars being invested in this particular procedure do not have any return, any return to the well being of this province.

It's not a question of my partisan politics. It's not a question of anyone's politics in this room. It is a question that people fundamentally base decisions upon on moral values and on their ability as taxpayers to say what they believe is right and wrong in the province. And any politician that in the face of a majority, such as that on an issue that goes far beyond what he or she could ever hope to attain in a partisan role in this province, has to give a second, sober thought to a question such as this.

And it will be no different, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, than the vote that may be upon each and every one of us as Canadians in a very short time in a national referendum where an expression of the will of the majority will determine the make-up and indeed the moral values that we place on being Canadians. And we . . . and I hope vote in the majority, and we vote strongly in the majority to maintain that thing called Canada.

Saskatchewan people have voted, and voted in the majority overwhelmingly that this tax dollar being spent on this issue is absolutely, fundamentally wrong. And any member in this Assembly, any member of this Assembly in the face of that majority has no choice, in my view, but to support the amendment from the member from Rosthern.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to get the attention of the Minister of Health, if she would engage in this conversation. And she tells me that I should listen. Maybe you could just take the time to listen to the public who have spoken out — the public. And the public is wrong. Is that right, from the member from Rosetown? The public is wrong when they vote. The people are always right.

The public, Mr. Chairman . . . We're going to get all of these people who are talking from their seat, on the record on this issue. And the reason they're chirping from their seat, because they're getting uncomfortable. They don't know whether to leave or stay or stand with their

convictions. And I want to talk about that for a minute because I'm going to support the amendment.

A combination of things, Madam Minister — one, we have an opportunity to express your personal views, your personal views. You have and others have in the NDP caucus said you are pro-life supporters. What does that mean? You don't agree with abortion and you don't agree with the funding of abortion. That's what you've said. And if I'm not mistaken that's what the Deputy Premier said and I believe, because you go to the same church that I do, that's what you have said.

And members across the way and members on both sides of the House have said this is their view; they don't believe in abortion. It is wrong and it should not be funded. Your church says that, your congregation says that, you have said that. And you have an opportunity now to stand in your place and be counted, to say I don't believe in abortion and I don't believe in funding it. And we're giving you that opportunity. And what's more, the majority of Saskatchewan people will support you.

In my riding approximately 70 per cent said don't fund abortion; across the province, over 60 per cent. So they will get your support. You will have their support and you will have your church's support and you will have your colleagues' support and you'll have your own conscience as support. Because you have an opportunity here to say, I will include this amendment in the Bill because, Madam Minister, you have opened this door. You've said, well certain things don't need to be funded; insulin doesn't need to be funded.

Well for Heaven's sakes, imagine all the cards and letters, and petitioners have said, I have to have insulin. How can you not fund that? And you say, well I guess we have to charge because we've got a budget problem and some other things. And then 63 per cent of the people said, well for Heaven's sakes, don't fund abortions, and it will probably save you some money at the same time. But no, you charge for insulin and you turn around and you won't de-insure abortions which you tell me you believe in, your church tells us you believe in, your colleagues have said they believe in. And you stand up in front of your neighbours and your friends and others in this legislature and say, but I can charge for back pain and I can charge for insulin and I can charge for eye examinations but I can't de-insure and charge for an abortion.

It makes no sense, Madam Minister. It makes no political sense. It makes no democratic sense because the majority of people believe that you should have some financial support for insulin. And if you have eye problems and if you have back problems, some support. You shouldn't de-insure those.

But if you have an opportunity to save money with the moral support of churches, congregation, political parties, and others, here it is. So we got to ask, Madam Minister: why are you doing this?

An Hon. Member: — What happened to the dental program under you?

Mr. Devine: — The member from Quill Lakes can stand

in his place and vote as he sees fit, and we'll all know. We'll all know. He can stand in there and he can preach that he's pro-life and we'll find out how he's going to vote. He'll charge for insulin and vote for it. He'll charge for eye examinations and vote for it. And when he stands in here and says, well but I'll pay for abortions, we'll see if he'll vote for it or not.

So you are going to be examined today, examined by yourself, your conscience, your community, your church, your colleagues, members of the legislature, and the public. And in democracy the public said, I don't want you to fund it. And then you go on, Madam Minister, and you say, but it might be unconstitutional. Well for Heaven's sakes, that never slowed you up before.

The Law Clerk . . . the Legislative Law Clerk here says you have introduced and you have now passed legislation in his view that is unconstitutional and violates the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. And you steamrolled right through it because you didn't care at all. You wouldn't even refer it to the courts. And you have lawyers inside, outside. And the legislative Clerk of this Assembly said you have violated rights and freedoms. And you didn't care — not one bit.

And you've got 60,000 farmers that have been violated, their communities violated, their rights violated. And in this case, Madam Minister, you've got 63 per cent of the population that encourage you to take it to court if you have to, and say you can change the Saskatchewan charter of rights. You can take this to the Supreme Court if you like. We support you. And it would be non-partisan support.

So nobody's going to buy your argument that you haven't said morally what you believe, and you've got a chance to defend it democratically because people have voted in a plebiscite and they've said clearly this is non-partisan. They voted for all different parties and different percentages, but they voted on this in a vast majority. And then you come up and say in your view it might be unconstitutional. Well what about the GRIP Bill? You've had lawyers inside and outside that say you are unconstitutional — never stopped you at all.

When you have the political courage, the partisan courage to rip up contracts for farmers and thousands of people, tens of thousands of people, no problem. Take on the Supreme Court; challenge it.

Now when it comes to your own moral convictions, it comes to the things you say inside the legislature and out, when it comes to plebiscites and sticking up for democracy and the rule of democracy which means the majority should be respected, what do you do, Madam Minister? You hide. No conviction at all. No legal conviction, no moral conviction, no democratic conviction — no conviction at all.

And the public you say . . . And the members opposite say well the public must be wrong, or you don't like to listen to this because it makes you tired or you don't want to hear about this. They voted and they believed that governments would listen to people. To date now what do we see? We see there will be a national referendum,

and I whole-heartedly support that as I did when I proposed the suggestions to the Senate hearings that went across the province.

If you can have a plebiscite where people can vote for something, not even vote for the person that put it out there, but said this is the right thing to do . . . whether I vote NDP, Liberal, or Tory, or whatever, I want you to stop funding abortions. And I heard the cabinet ministers say they were pro-life. And I heard the member from Swift Current say they were pro-life. And I heard the member from Nipawin say they were pro-life. And I heard the Deputy Premier say that he was pro-life, and I heard lots of people that belong to the Mennonite Church and the Catholic Church and the Anglican Church and all kinds of churches say we are pro-life, but we happen to be NDP. Give us a chance, and we will defend our beliefs.

Well you have that chance. You have that chance. We introduced the legislation so that in fact . . . And you voted for it. You voted for plebiscite and referendum legislation so we could take fundamental questions to the people. You stood in your place and said, good idea. And it's on the record in *Hansard* and in this Legislative Assembly. You voted for plebiscites and referendum.

You said it was good. Then when you get in power, oh it doesn't matter any more. My moral principles don't really . . . (inaudible) . . . Well it doesn't matter. The Supreme Court might call us, say that it was . . . Ah, come on. You have challenged and broke every commitment. Here's a chance to come clean. Here is an opportunity.

It would be democratic. It would be moral. It would be consistent with democracy because people voted for it. And if you're going to believe in the referendum that takes place in the country, then you could believe in the referendum that took place on life in this province. We were the first province in the history of Canada to give people an opportunity to vote with respect to pro-life or not. And they were clear in their majority. And all they asked you to do was exercise it, and you've cut and charged all kinds of fees. And you can't bring yourself to do this because we did it. Is that it? What other justification? The courts might challenge you? Well take it to the court. You'd have total public support. You'd have the vast majority of the public right behind you. And if you needed legislative changes here, we'd be behind you. And you might even win. Wouldn't that be historic?

(1615)

Well you have a chance, Madam Minister, to stand on your feet and defend this. Your colleagues will have an opportunity to vote their conscience. Let them vote their conscience, and we will stop funding abortion like we have de-insured all kinds of other services. It would be perfectly consistent and logical. This is the time to do it.

So, Madam Minister, I will whole-heartedly support the amendment, the motion put forward by my colleague, the member from Rosthern. He is right, the people are right, they voted in a plebiscite so that in fact we could have this move. Here is your opportunity. It fits with your whole agenda of balancing budgets or cutting expenditures, and it has the moral support of the majority of Saskatchewan

people, and we hope it has the moral support of the members of the legislature in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 4:17 p.m. until 4:27 p.m.

Amendment negative on the following recorded division.

Yea — 10

Devine	Martens
Muirhead	Britton
Neudorf	Toth
Swenson	Goohsen
Boyd	D'Autremont

Nays — 37

Van Mulligen	Lyons
Thompson	Lautermilch
Wiens	Johnson
Simard	Trew
Tchorzewski	Draper
Lingenfelter	Whitmore
Teichrob	Sonntag
Shillington	Flavel
Koskie	Cline
Anguish	McPherson
Solomon	Wormsbecker
Kowalsky	Crofford
Carson	Knezacek
MacKinnon	Harper
Penner	Keeping
Cunningham	Carlson
Upshall	Langford
Bradley	Jess
Lorje	

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to.

Clause 8

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chair, I move to:

Amend section 18.01 of the Act, as being enacted by section 8 of the printed Bill:

(a) By striking out "No chiropractor" and substituting "Where regulations are made pursuant to clause 48(1)(i.2), no chiropractor"; and

(b) By striking out "the regulations" and substituting "those regulations".

These were amendments requested by the chiropractors.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

The division bells rang from 4:33 p.m. until 4:43 p.m.

Clause 13 agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yea — 34

Thompson	Johnson
Wiens	Trew
Simard	Draper
Tchorzewski	Whitmore
Lingenfelter	Sonntag
Shillington	Flavel
Koskie	Roy
Anguish	Cline
Solomon	Scott
Kowalsky	McPherson
Carson	Wormsbecker
Penner	Crofford
Cunningham	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper
Bradley	Keeping
Lorje	Langford
Lautermilch	Jess

Nays — Nil

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended on division.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments now be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to on division.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, by leave I move the Bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

The division bells rang from 4:51 p.m. until 5:21 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yea — 35

Van Mulligen	Johnson
Thompson	Trew
Wiens	Draper
Simard	Whitmore
Tchorzewski	Sonntag
Shillington	Flavel
Koskie	Roy
Anguish	Cline
Solomon	Scott
Kowalsky	McPherson
Carson	Wormsbecker
Penner	Crofford
Cunningham	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper
Hagel	Keeping
Bradley	Langford
Lorje	Jess

Lautermilch

Nays — 10

Devine	Martens
Muirhead	Britton
Neudorf	Toth
Swenson	Goohsen
Boyd	D'Autremont

The Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Expenditure
Health
Vote 32

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I have a few questions in relation to a few events in Moose Jaw in the health business. I'm wondering if you could give me a quick update as to where the negotiations with Providence Place are.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Thank you. The Department of Health has been having ongoing discussions with the officials with respect to Providence Place and integration of health care services in Moose Jaw, and it's my understanding that all the basic principles have been agreed upon and there are ongoing discussions that are taking place on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Swenson: — I was looking for a little more elaboration, Madam Minister, than that. When I asked you this question in question period some months ago, that's basically what I got from you. There are a whole lot of things have happened that I don't think we need to discuss in here that I'm well aware of.

And you know the issues that were there. There was governance with the sisters. There was the question of money as the amount that was initially proposed by your officials some months ago, and there is the whole question of going to one acute care hospital. And I think that it would be appropriate now for you to elaborate on some of those issues fuller.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — It's my understanding that Sister Muriel and her board are attempting to resolve the issue of governance, and that that is being discussed at this time and that there are ongoing consultations and meetings taking place to resolve that issue. I don't think it's appropriate for us to give any more details in this forum because it is a question of negotiations and ongoing consultations. And for us to give details of exactly what's happening would be inappropriate in this setting.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Madam Minister, you may consider it to be inappropriate, but the people of Moose Jaw have waited a long time. Moose Jaw and area has waited a long time. St. Anthony's Home, quite frankly, is a disgrace — not because the sisters and the board have made it a disgrace, but because government for too long,

including the one that I served under, did not get on with the job. And it was bricks and mortar, Madam Minister, that was the problem — bricks and mortar.

Now the citizens of Moose Jaw and area, well in advance of Madam Minister, well in advance even of the previous administration, had decided that some things had to change; that they came upon the wellness concept well before Madam Minister probably even thought about it. And they said, we need one acute care facility but we need our St. Anthony's upgraded, that we need to get into assessing how a rapidly rising seniors population is going to remain a viable part of our community — one of the highest seniors populations in our province.

(1730)

And they looked around and said, what have we got? And they haven't had to be coerced into anything, Madam Minister. All on their own, discussions over a number of years have said that we can do away with expensive acute care beds, that we can upgrade, and we can also take on that particular entity in our society, the aged, and do some things that will allow them to remain in their homes with their families, as productive parts of their community. And what that's going to require in our community is to reduce to our institutions from three to two, get innovative, work with our home care system.

And, Madam Minister, when they came to that realization amongst themselves without pressure from government, and came to the former administration and laid out the plan and said, here it is, this is the way that we should be going; this is how we can save the government money; this is how we can make our community a better place to live; this is how we can enhance the trading area of 60,000 people — it was very difficult for the government of the day to say no. And that's why the commitment was made to Providence Place.

And now we have a concept, a concept that talks about wellness like no other that I've seen in this province, a concept that talks about saving the government money, talks about cutting back acute care beds in a very dramatic fashion. It talks about incorporating all of the people in the care-giving business into a cohesive unit. And now all of a sudden, we're running into problems.

You come along as Health minister and your department and you say, well, Sisters of Providence, you've got to get out of town, when St. Paul's in Saskatoon isn't told the same thing. And now after months and months and months, after the argument has been made over and over and over again to you and your officials and we're starting to see some give that we aren't going to kick out of town one of the most important parts of our home care . . . of our care-giving component that we have had in that city, and we're still fooling around and dodging and not coming forth with straight answers.

So the only thing I can surmise, Madam Minister, with these people who were way in front of you, who were showing the way in saving money, it's all got to be coming down to one thing, and that can only be that the community has not bought into your concept of health boards where you wouldn't incorporate any of the

existing people, and that it's strictly something to do with the budget initiatives of the Finance minister. It must be.

Well, Madam Minister, you maybe don't like it, you maybe don't like it, but the simple fact is that people in that community don't like what you're doing either. They don't like it one bit.

And that's why I think it's time, after all of these months, that people that led the way deserve better than what they're getting from you and your officials. And I think it's time that you stood in this legislature and gave the people in that community and surrounding area some definite things to hang their hat on.

That because they led the way, that they've been working for years and years and years on this concept, that there should be some rewards at the end of it, that St. Anthony's Home is going to be replaced, that Moose Jaw can expect assistance that enables their ageing population to stay viable in the community. And if that means a component of geriatric assessment, it makes sense. And that they not be sacrificed to some other plan that Madam Minister has, perhaps involving the Plains Hospital, perhaps other things that are going on.

And I think it's time . . . If Madam Minister has problems with what I say, then she can stand in her place today, she can set the record straight in such a way that no one in the city of Moose Jaw or surrounding area has the least bit of doubt as to where this government's going, what commitments they're going to live up to, and that we can look forward to the beginning of construction on the big, bare lot in downtown Moose Jaw that was purchased by the Sisters of Providence to provide ongoing care to the citizens in Moose Jaw for another 50 or 60 years.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — It's exactly comments like the member made just now that are designed to incite fear and to cause all sorts of dissension in Saskatchewan society. He talked about kicking the nuns out of Moose Jaw. Well that's absolutely ridiculous. This government never intended to do that and never, never tried to do that.

What the member opposite was doing was trying to incite public fear about negotiations and discussions that were going on, which seems to be a pattern over there. It's not constructive opposition that we see. It's partisan . . . Fearmongering is what it is, and political partisanship. It is not constructive and effective. It is an opposition that stands up and distorts facts, tells untruths, and fearmongers. And the people of Saskatchewan are saying, stop it, because we want some health care reform.

Now there have been ongoing discussions with Sister Muriel and her board that are very positive. And the governance issue is being discussed and taken care of. And it's my understanding that people are agreeing as to the best approach, and that's the NDP approach — consultation and discussion and working it out with communities — while the members opposite try to incite people into having unnecessary fears while they try to cause obstruction and dissension in our communities; pitting people against each other, instead of trying to pull this together in a fair and constructive fashion.

The fact of the matter is is that there are discussions going on with respect to St. Anthony's and this government does recognize the need for a replacement. The question is how much and when?

And at the present time we're dealing with the governance issue. And as the member opposite knows, there was funding in this budget for planning and the first steps in that regard. He knows that, but he still wants to say that we're not going to be following through with something. The question is is how much and when? That's the question in Moose Jaw.

The members opposite, let's take a look at Gravelbourg and the members opposite — 1986, 1988, 1991 — promising the foyer every single election and never delivering.

I'm telling you, I think that it is time for this legislature and the people of Saskatchewan to pull together. We have a situation in Saskatchewan that is unprecedented in our history. We need to reform the health care system and we have to get a handle on the deficit. And instead of running around and muttering like the member from Morse is muttering in his beard here causing all kinds of dissension, he should be working co-operatively with people to do what is best for the people of Saskatchewan.

And that's what we are doing with Moose Jaw. We are working co-operatively with the health care providers in Moose Jaw. We're coming together to try and set up a system that's going to benefit everybody. And as far as St. Anthony's is concerned, they know that there will be something. It's a question of how much and when.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Madam Minister, that's about what I expected out of you. That's all we ever get out of you is some kind of a harangue. I mean if anybody taught this legislature about politics in health, it was Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, now Minister of Health, who the day that the Murray Commission was dropped in this legislature ranted and raved. I mean talk about scare tactics, Madam Minister, you taught the world how to do it. You taught the world how to do it. Politics to the hilt. Get well, stay well, or get out of town. Yes.

Well, Madam Minister, the reason I bring up Moose Jaw is they didn't believe your rhetoric when you were in opposition. They got on with designing wellness for the community. They got on with talking amongst themselves about how we cut down from two acute care hospitals to one; how we reform our care giving with the aged; how we look to the future so that we're out in front of the game; how we get rid of those expensive beds. And they did all of that without Madam Minister's help.

And then they went and they bought a bunch of property and they cleared it off because the government of the day said, your plan makes sense. Geriatric assessment in conjunction with St. Anthony's makes sense. Fewer acute care beds makes sense. That's why they had funding approval, which you have withheld.

Now, Madam Minister, the questions are getting down to:

are you going to help these people, who are out in front of the wellness model, do for their community what, by a very large consensus, everyone wants done? And are you going to allow the people best qualified to deliver the health care, stay in place? It's a question of funding and who runs it.

The citizens of Moose Jaw have no desire to have happen to them what you evidently have done in Prince Albert. I've discussed it with a number of people involved. And I agree with you, we shouldn't use names here. But the simple fact is that the board in Prince Albert is viewed as partisan and under the control of Madam Minister by many people in the health care field in Moose Jaw.

It was well-known that some of the people were partisans; that they were known contributors to the NDP Party. And that raised suspicions as to how they got on the health board. Everybody else that was up there, whether it was from the catholic institution or from the public institution was ignored. And quite frankly, Madam Minister, Moose Jaw doesn't want that. They don't want that at all. They have people in the care business who are eminently qualified, people that have developed this plan over a number of years. And they're eminently qualified to deliver the goods.

And I would suggest to you if you want to check their books about the cost benefit, the cost benefit analysis that you would do, you would find that you are getting your bang for your buck out of the Sisters of Providence. You've been getting your bang for your buck out of St. Anthony's. And you've been getting your bang for your buck at the Union Hospital. And you can compare them with any other area in the province of the same population, the same demographics, and you'll find that those people knew a value of a dollar.

Now what they're asking you is, to go along with the plans that they've developed and to give them the ability to keep giving care in that community on a wellness model that is way in front of everybody else. And the plans have been in place, the desire is there. And what I'd like from you, Madam Minister, is not a speech like you might deliver to a class-room full of children, but a speech to the TV cameras in this Assembly, to the people in the city of Moose Jaw that says the commitment is there, the co-operation is there. And that when the local community decides who will run these health care institutions, that you're going to back them 100 per cent, and that you're not going to try and impose some other body over top of them that they may view as being tainted.

Those are the commitments they want from you. That's what they want to hear. They don't want any more excuses; they don't want any more attempts by Madam Minister to take over. They're quite prepared to do the job. They just need a little help from you.

(1745)

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The government isn't taking over. The government's having consultation with communities and with people who are involved in the health care area. In Saskatoon and Prince Albert that resulted in the

canonical law, the control with respect to the canonical law issues, and the catholic philosophy being carried through in those communities.

That was done in conjunction with the government through consultation and it was written into the agreements, and that will be preserved in Moose Jaw. There was never any threat to that except by some people with political partisanship who may have raised it as a concern . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, such as the member opposite.

The fact of the matter is, is that the canonical . . . The threat with respect to the catholic faith was never there. It wasn't there in Saskatoon; it wasn't there in P.A. (Prince Albert). Now the fact of the matter is, is the nuns are concerned about their ability to enforce canonical law, and we will guarantee them that ability. And we are trying to work out the details of a governance issue with them.

We know they have made a valuable contribution in Moose Jaw. We know they've made an extremely valuable contribution, and they have done a lot of the work that the member opposite raises. And that's correct and we recognize that. Now what we are trying to do is work to maybe take advantage of the common administrative services, for example, and to work collectively with people in Moose Jaw. That's what we are doing at this time.

When a board is set up in Moose Jaw it will be done with consultation with the stakeholders and they will be asked. We will run all the names by them so that they participate in the selection of a board as we did in Saskatoon and P.A. They will participate in the selection of a board.

The situation in Moose Jaw is changing on a daily basis. And I'm hoping that we can have some sort of agreement some time in the near future. And it will be an agreement where everyone participates and agrees because that's what this government is doing. It's consulting, and it's accommodating the wishes of people and their concerns.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, do you deny that the people in Moose Jaw were told that the deal that St. Paul's got would never be duplicated again in the province by anybody else? Do you deny that?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The difference in the St. Paul's agreement is that there was a clause in there that gave an option for the purchase of the hospital by the government. The nuns had the option to sell the hospital to the government under certain terms. That clause will not be in a Moose Jaw agreement. And when the statement was made that the St. Paul's agreement was different, it was made on that basis.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Madam Minister, maybe what we need to do here then is to have you table in this Assembly the agreements reached with St. Paul's, the agreements reached with Prince Albert so that the people in Moose Jaw, the ordinary folks that are concerned about this, can make comparisons. These are the people that you're going to be asking to co-operate with you that are supposed to accept this board. And from Madam Minister's answers, all I can determine out of this process

is that it's not a question of governance any more. It's not a question of money. The only thing Madam Minister said that's in question is this super board of hers.

So what's going on here? Governance isn't an issue any more. Why do we have to have Madam Minister's super board when these guys have been so far out in front of the government on cutting back on costs and centralizing and doing everything else, they don't need Madam Minister's super board. They've figured this out a long time ago. I mean I want to know what's holding the process up here.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — First of all, with respect to tabling the documentation I will have to consult with St. Paul's and P.A. and the health boards in order to . . . because the agreement was with the health boards and the hospital people. It wasn't with the government.

And so I will have to consult with them. And if they don't have any difficulty with us tabling it, we can do that. I'm advised by my official that Sister Muriel already has a copy of those agreements and is aware of the contents of them and so does the Catholic health association.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, would you answer the rest of the question then. I said it doesn't appear to be a matter of governance; you say that's been solved. It's not a matter of money, but that's been solved. All that seems to be left here is your super board.

Now if these people have been so far out in front of government on amalgamating and cutting back and getting on with wellness, why do we need Madam Minister's super board before we can get on with building Providence Place. It's not money. It's not governance you say. That's all been ironed out. Then why do we have to have your super board? What is there about this that is going to improve on what people in Moose Jaw figured out by themselves years and years ago and have gone on with life?

And I might remind Madam Minister they not only thought of it; they dug into their hip pockets — the citizenry, the RM (rural municipality) surrounding, my RM, the RM where the member from Estevan farms, RMs all around and organizations and clubs — have all dug into their hip pockets and they've ponied up. And there are over a million dollars in trust accounts, Madam Minister, sitting there, waiting to be used. And there will be more. They're not asking for a free ride. They will raise more.

Now you tell me why Madam Minister has to have this super board in place when all of those other things are in place to allow these people to get on with life? Can you answer that, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The member opposite obviously wasn't listening very carefully to my comments. I told him with respect to St. Anthony's, that it was a question of when and how much would be spent. I didn't say it was going to be constructed immediately which is what you're implying by your comments. I said that was still to be worked out and would have to be worked out within the fiscal plan of the government.

Now with respect to the governance issue, if we can co-ordinate and integrate services more effectively . . . home care services, for example, in P.A. and Saskatoon have come under the board, so has public health. And there's discussion of mental health being incorporated, a housing unit in P.A., community health in Saskatoon. So there's much more happening than simply the acute care facilities and special care homes getting together. It's a totally comprehensive delivery, co-ordination, and integration of services, and that's what we're hoping to encourage.

With respect to St. Anthony's, it will depend on the budget because the money's not in the budget this year. And we are having discussions with them on that as well. We recognize the need for movement to a new facility. It's a question of what and when.

Mr. Swenson: — I asked the Madam Minister a little earlier: was the commitment there before? You didn't answer that question.

And I would remind Madam Minister, that as part of the plan presented to government some time ago, well before your government came to power, most of those issues were addressed. Thunder Creek home care has been part of those discussions from the very beginning. The housing of some of those components in Providence Place was in the initial design of the structure. Every last item that Madam Minister ticked off has been talked about by the local people, the local boards, and they know full well that they had to play an instrumental role in Providence Place occurring because of the expenditure of taxpayers' money.

Now, Madam Minister, that was all in the plan, so don't run that one out as a red herring. That is simply not true, all of those people that were in on those discussions.

So, Madam Minister, I want you tell me: was the funding in place? And do you deny that the people in Moose Jaw, long before you came along, hadn't in fact addressed many of those concerns around the design of Providence Place?

I mean I know that they had laundry facilities built in that were coterminous between Providence Place, the Union Hospital. Diagnostic services okay, all of your various machines that you use in a hospital setting, your lab work — all of those things were taken care of in the plan, Madam Minister. There was all sorts of things that were going to be worked out amongst the two of them, so don't tell me that those things have to be sorted out by your super board. You are simply looking for a method to control. And I'm saying to you that Moose Jaw doesn't need your control.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — There was no commitment by your government, like there was no funding in your budget for construction of St. Anthony's; there was only planning money. And we delivered planning money this year.

Now the fact of the matter is, is that there are very co-operative discussions taking place. There are co-operative discussions taking place. And I urge you to

check it out because what you're trying to do right now is cause trouble. And the fact of the matter is, is there are co-operative discussions taking place, and you're trying to make it more difficult rather than to facilitate.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Madam Minister, I guess what you would like me to do is start dropping names in here and the last time I had a discussion with them. Well I'm not going to do that.

But I can tell you, in preparation for these Estimates, that I have taken the time and the opportunity to discuss with a great number of people of where it's at. And I know the kind of tactics that Madam Minister has used and, quite frankly, I don't agree with those tactics.

I was with the former minister of Health at St. Mary's when the announcement was made, and the people were overjoyed and went out and made commitments. I was there, Madam Minister; the commitment was there. It was a done deal to build Providence Place.

And now you say, well sometime in the future after we . . . What I see from this, Madam Minister — and I'm not going to drop names in here, and I have checked — everyone that is on a board in that city today I know very well, personally very well, have worked with over a number of years very well with. And it doesn't matter whether it's St. Anthony's or Providence Hospital or Union Hospital or Thunder Creek Home Care; there's no mysteries there.

Now, Madam Minister, what I need from you is a commitment that your board, your desire to exert control, total control over Moose Jaw and area through your super-board, is not going to be the thing that stands in the road of getting on with providing senior citizens in our community proper housing. It isn't going to get in the road of providing senior citizens in our community proper assessment, that it isn't going to stop us developing a good acute care facility in our community, that isn't going to be shoved aside by Madam Minister's wont to do something else. That's what I need from you, Madam Minister, today, is that kind of commitment that that board of yours, that sticking point isn't going to be what stops people in Moose Jaw and area from getting a good quality of health care designed by themselves, paid for in a large part by themselves, and prepared to govern with proper governance by themselves. Would you give me that commitment, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Many of the community service issues, for example, surrounding mental health and other community services were not worked out in your government's deal, and it has an effect on the number of acute care beds in the province if you move towards integration of some of these other services. And they were not worked out. They were not worked out.

Now the fact of the matter . . . you don't look at one institution in isolation. You look at the whole plan. This is what we're talking about. You look at everything in the community and what's being provided. Not institution by institution, or town by town — you do it in a more comprehensive fashion. That's what the health care reform is all about.

With respect to the board, the Sisters of Providence and the other stakeholders will be able to nominate representation to that board. Ultimately these boards may be completely elected. In the course of the agreement, we will ensure that they retain their ability over canonical law, and I'm not sure what the agreement will look like. It may leave them with a board of governors. I don't know at this point what is being agreed to, and I don't want to get into the details because I don't know what the details are. It's being negotiated.

But these concerns that you raised are being addressed in the negotiations, and the issue is much broader than what the member mentions. It isn't just a question of home care. There are other community services we're talking about. It has an effect on the plan in the city. And we are exploring that with all the stakeholders.

(1800)

Mr. Swenson: — Well it was Madam Minister that wasn't listening very good because everyone of those entities you listed earlier I said people in the local community had addressed in preparation for Providence Place. Now you may not trust them. You may not believe them. But I can tell you, Madam Minister, from sitting in at meetings, that mental health is a big issue. And one of the propositions was to build Providence Place on government property out beside the Valley View Centre because of the questions of mental health revolving around Moose Jaw and area. That was one of the propositions.

Now, Madam Minister, I for the life of me don't know why you would not invite someone like the Sisters of Providence to take their place on your new board, why you would not invite someone from Thunder Creek Home Care to be on the board. Why should they have to nominate somebody? Why should they have to go through this charade that Madam Minister ponies out about this super-board?

People in that community know who each other are. They know who's doing what. They don't need to nominate anybody. They've got qualified people that can step into the place and do the job. And I can guarantee, Madam Minister, that I won't have to go through the electoral givings of the New Democratic Party to figure out who people are. Everybody in Moose Jaw knows who's what on every one of those boards right now, and you won't have to go check out the contribution list of a darned one of them — and there's some New Democrats there, by the way.

You won't have to do that. You can get on with the job. You can simply say, Sister Muriel, would your board be pleased to put someone onto my new board, take the name, and get on with life. And you can say the same thing to the city of Moose Jaw and the RM of Baildon and the RM of Marquis and around and around you go. I mean these are the people that are ponying up the money. These are the people that if there's taxing power put in place over and above what you have now, that'll have to pony up the money.

What we need from you is not more studying and fooling

around; what we need from you is some commitment that the people that have built and put in place a plan that is far in advance of anything else in this province be given the opportunity to implement it and that they be given the governance over it.

So I don't know why you wouldn't want to give today to this Assembly and to the people in Moose Jaw your commitment that if the Sisters of Providence want to put somebody on the board, that they can put it on and so can everybody else. And we just get on with life, and we build the thing. That we get on with the job.

And that's what you seem so reluctant to do. And I think your reluctance stems right from the fact that your seat-mate across the place here has said that we will sacrifice the city of Moose Jaw and its health needs. We'll sacrifice that on some other agenda — an agenda that was so aptly pointed out to him last night in this Assembly — and that that agenda simply isn't compatible with what people in that community have worked on for so darn long.

And they don't like seeing the weeds growing downtown on those big vacant lots that the Sisters of Providence have purchased to build that new facility to start implementing care in our community. They would rather see bricks and mortar there, Madam Minister, not weeds. What they need from you is some assurances tonight that you're going to get on with allowing local people to run their own issues as they have done up to present, and you're not going to stand in their way, and we'll get on with building. Can you give that commitment?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I've answered the member's question several times. I've answered them before. I have said that the sisters will have input as to who is on the board. In fact I think the deputy minister spoke to Sister Muriel herself and suggested she might want to sit on the board.

The fact of the matter is, is there's a co-operative situation in Moose Jaw, not a confrontational one as you want to create. I have indicated that we recognize the need for a facility replacement with respect to St. Anthony's, and I've also indicated the question is, is what size of a building, how much, and when. And it will have to be done within the fiscal plan of the government.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, we're making a small bit of progress now, small bit of progress. I mean if Madam Minister had been so forthcoming about a half an hour ago, Mr. Chairman, if Madam Minister in her first response had stood up and said well — guess what? — we've just made the offer to Sister Muriel that if she'd like to sit on the board she can do it, I suppose I maybe would have negated a few questions. But instead we have to drag it out of you.

So now governance isn't the problem any more. You said funding isn't really the problem; it just has to fit in the framework. So we need to know what the framework is now.

What is the hold-up with some kind of announcement, Madam Minister? I mean just say to them, the budget says

you can't have the bricks and mortar until the spring of 1994. It's that simple. If Madam Minister has made the commitment that if Sister Muriel wants to sit on the board, Sister Muriel can sit on the board, and I presume the other stakeholders have been given the same offer, that we've allowed the stakeholders to sit on the board so governance is out of the issue now.

You can now get on with . . . You say it's funding and the priorities of the government. All Moose Jaw wants to know now is when the time frame. And if that's when it is — it's '93, it's '94, it's '95 — we'll accept that.

But I've got RM councils right now asking me: do I make my next commitment, the commitment that they made on behalf of their ratepayers to the Providence Place fund? Do I make that? Do we go ahead and make that next commitment into the trust account, or do we hold it back? Is this government going to do something different? Are they going to renege on the promise? And what is the point of our ratepayers making another commitment to the Providence Place fund if the government's going to do something else? We might as well take our money and go somewhere else.

Madam Minister, all you have to tell those people is, this is the time frame. This is when the bricks and mortar happen. And I tell you those commitments will come in. As they have in the past, the people in the community will raise money; they will work. They will do whatever they have to to look after their needs of the people in that community and their senior citizens. And that's all you have to do, Madam Minister.

And I don't know why you're so darn reluctant to tell this Assembly and tell that community why they can't have that commitment out of you.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The member opposite wants to negotiate a deal on the floor of this Assembly with respect to Moose Jaw, and we're not going to do it. Nor are we going to go into the details of the discussion with respect to governance more than we have already. So I'm not going to deal with that.

And you can ask all the questions you want, but we're not going to make a deal on the floor of this Assembly. This deal is going to be made in Moose Jaw. That's where it's going to be made — with the people and the stakeholders and with discussions with them.

Now the fact of the matter is, is that with respect to the facilities and when they'll be built, it will depend on the financial situation of the province. And I want to know why you reneged on your promise, the member from Estevan there, to mismanage this province and still break even. And why did he renege on that promise.

Because that's the statement he made, that he could afford to mismanage this province and still break even. And what he's created in this province is a deficit that's unprecedented in the history of Canada on a per capita basis for any province — unprecedented.

And any capital construction that takes place will be done within the context of the mess they've created and that

we're trying to clean up.

Mr. Swenson: — Well it appears, Mr. Chairman, it's going to be a long evening, a long evening . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . it's fine by me too; fine by me too. Because what Madam Minister just said to me in her last response is that I don't give a good . . . what you or any other taxpayer, ratepayer in the city of Moose Jaw or surrounding area cares. I'm going to do it on my time, on my rules, and I'm not going to negotiate anything with any of you.

Well, Madam Minister, you might not want to do it with me, but I can tell you that there are lots of people in that community that talk very freely with me. And if you keep negotiating the way you are, if you keep negotiating the way you are, the sad thing is that we not only aren't going to get a facility, there's a whole lot of people in our community and area that are going to suffer because of it, because Madam Minister says, it's my way or the doorway. And to cover that up we get a long-winded speech, a long-winded speech about other people's problems.

Well, Madam Minister, you've got a problem. And there's a whole lot people that have worked very, very hard. And they expect you, they expect you to take their problems very seriously. And they don't expect games being played. They don't expect any of Madam Minister's hand-picked appointments to tell them what to do, they expect their community. And when they make a decision, they expect that you stand behind it — not Madam Minister, but the community.

And you have an example here that you can hold up to the rest of the province on a wellness model. It has every single component that means anything to wellness built into it. There's something that you could hold up to every other community in this province and say, see this is how it works; this is how it will happen. And instead, we drag them through a knot-hole. And I don't know why you want to drag those people through that knot-hole when they've solved all of these problems a long time ago.

So I just want the commitment, Madam Minister, just say 93, 94; just make it.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — When St. Anthony's is going to be replaced is going to depend on the budgets and the fiscal situation of the province.

Mr. Martens: — I have two things, Madam Minister, that I want to talk about. One is that . . . I want to give a little bit of history into the beginning of a health region system in the province of Saskatchewan. Health region no. 1, Madam Minister, was the Swift Current area, and it was in existence from about 1948 on. The RMs joined together to provide the background for the development of the health region no. 1.

And I find it rather striking, Madam Minister, that today you're building them and in the '70s you were tearing them down. And in fact, Madam Minister, I was on the RM council and was a part of that, observing the tear-down of health region no. 1 by, I believe, it was Walter Smishek that did it.

In that tear-down there was some significant things that happened that I thought were of interest, and I took note of them. And one of them is that Mr. Wood, who was the Speaker of the House and the member for the city of Swift Current, had to put Mr. Smishek in his place, because he said I'm not going to allow this to happen because he had been the minister responsible for Rural Affairs. And he said at the meeting that I was at, that I am not going to allow this to happen and he didn't allow it to happen. But when Mr. Wood was relieved of his responsibilities it proceeded to happen, Madam Minister. When he decided to quit, then is when this began to happen.

(1815)

And you know what, Madam Minister? They were threatened. They had a million dollars in surplus. And then when they were dealing with that million dollars of surplus, Madam Minister, the Department of Health said to them, we're going to take that money away from you. And then what the health region no. 1 did, it went and bought specific kinds of equipment for various hospitals and they lowered their reserve down to a little over \$400,000. And then, Madam Minister, when that was done, then they decided in the Department of Health to take that \$400,000 away.

And you know who had put that money together? It was the doctors and municipalities who had put a bond together, a 50-year bond for \$200,000, and it was just about due right about now, Madam Minister, that the Department of Finance would have that money in that bond — a 50-year bond, Madam Minister.

And I find it very, very interesting that today you're trying to build them, in the '70s you were trying to tear them down. Now I begin to ask the question: why? Why would you do it? Why did you do it then and why do you deal, as the member from Thunder Creek talked about, why are you dealing it in the context that you're dealing with it?

Because, Madam Minister, you want to number one, control the board, dictate the focus and the attention that that gets, and then require that the municipalities provide the funding. All of that we'll say, okay this is as far as we go and then the municipalities will have to provide the funding underneath that.

And that, Madam Minister, is what everyone of the municipalities in my part of the world believe. Because it was done once by your government it can be done twice by your government. That causes us a serious problem, and that, Madam Minister, is . . . And if you want your department officials to check that out, that is exactly what happened. We have a very, very serious problem in reflecting on some of the things that historically your party have done in the south-west part of the province. And we don't like it. And I'd like to have a response to that from you.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I am informed that with respect to the region that the member opposite, region no. 1 that the member opposite was talking about, that what was happening there is they were administering their own medicare program. And they weren't within the

province's universal program. So they were processing their own information and their own Bills.

And what occurred back then was that there was an amalgamation of this function. It was brought into the province's program because it was more efficient to do it on a provincial basis with respect to the processing of Bills.

What we are trying to do here with the creation of districts is to co-ordinate community services, is to co-ordinate all the health care services that are being provided in an area, services such as home-based services and public health and mental health and so on, which is . . . And that is the exercise that is taking place here.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Madam Minister, I'll give you another fact of history. I was hoping you'd say that as a matter of fact because the doctors in that health region were practising at 80 per cent of the fee schedule. That's what was happening.

And at 80 per cent of the fee schedule, the health region then had an opportunity to determine and self-determine what they were going to use those funds for. And that self-determination led to some innovative things in the dental care program and many others.

Madam Minister, they were running their own show and they were doing it very well, thank you. And it was an irritant to the province to have them run their own show because their efficiencies were higher than the efficiencies in the province. And that, Madam Minister, is a fact.

I want to just add one . . . the second point I want to make for your consideration, Madam Minister. I had attended a 50th wedding anniversary in the Vanguard area and, Madam Minister, there were some allegations made by the former member of the legislature from that area. And I have received a whole lot of letters about the closure of the Vanguard hospital because of the references made by him in your presence.

And I want to read a letter into the record because I know it's important for my community, and it goes like this. It's a letter to the Premier:

Dear Mr. Premier,

You cannot seriously be considering allowing the Health minister to go ahead with her plans for rural health care in Saskatchewan. This gallant dumping of responsibility will have such severe ramifications it is impossible even to imagine the chaos that will result.

1. As each hospital, nursing home, etc., jockey for funding in the districts, communities will be pitted against each other, and even within communities, there will be strife. The effects of that will last for generations to come.
2. There will be no quality people on those boards. No intelligent person would even consider accepting any responsibility for the mess you will

be creating.

3. The cost to health care will be far greater than it is now, with the bulk of the money being spent on these boards and administrations with little left over for actual health care.

4. The deficit must be addressed and some changes will be necessary. This fiasco will create an increase rather than a decrease in that deficit. Firstly, the plan itself will cost a very, very large sum of money to implement before you admitted it totally unworkable. Secondly, as people lose their jobs, not just health care workers, but nearly every industry in the province they . . . and hopefully move out of the province to find work. If not, they will create a further drain on our welfare system. In either case there will be an acute drain on the tax base. This alone will have a negative effect on the deficit.

5. The quality of health care will suffer. The best people in the field will leave the province rather than try to work under the stressful conditions the government is creating.

6. People, patients will not know where to turn for their health care needs. The very thought of trying to get help in emergency situations in rural Saskatchewan makes the blood run cold.

Madam Minister, it takes a lot of fortitude to live 150 or 200 miles from a hospital to serve acute care patients and emergency care. And that, Madam Minister, is exactly where you're headed. That's exactly where you're headed.

The city of Swift Current will get the facility. What will Eastend get? Nothing. What will Climax get? Nothing. Madam Minister, what will they have for acute care?

My family have been involved in this kind of service, Madam Minister. They have been involved in this kind of service at Cumberland where a doctor serves once a week. And that, Madam Minister, was very significant kind of health care. Is that the profile or the kind of opportunity you're going to have down in the south-west part of the province? And we say no, we don't want it. A doctor once a week is not enough.

And that, Madam Minister, is exactly what you're aiming at. Going on in this letter, Madam Minister:

Mr. Premier, I realize this that whole thing is political and the government is trying to get out of a very tricky responsibility. However, I would have expected you to learn from GRIP. Slow down. Take time to work out a concrete plan that can work. No one expects you to solve the deficit overnight.

We do expect you to take responsible steps towards a solution. Rushing into it will only make the situation worse instead of better. The solution will take time and hard work on the part of each of us, but we must begin with common sense,

Madam Minister.

I am wondering if Madam Minister had a nightmare one night and presented it as a health care plan. That is how much sense it makes.

Again I cannot stress enough that you must put an immediate stop to this nonsense. Get rid of the Health minister and put someone in there who at least has some common sense. This advice is for your political well being.

And this is a letter to the Premier. You got a copy of this letter. The Minister of Finance got a copy of this letter. The minister responsible for Social Services got a copy of this letter. The Minister of Justice got a copy of this letter. Madam Minister, you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to ask this lady, I'm going to ask this lady if she would be prepared to put it in *The Southwest Booster* so that everybody has a chance to see it because this is the kind of thing that people are worried about.

And, Madam Minister, I never was in that community to stir that up. You and the people who are involved with your party were the ones that involved there. And I never was in that community . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That is a hogwash from the member from Canora. I live in my constituency, and I have all the time that I've been a member here. And, Madam Minister, that was perpetrated on that community by you. I have had only one other instance where I have received as much information regarding a hospital, and that was when a school closed down when nobody wanted it, and I didn't have control of that either.

And, Madam Minister, I never made this happen. You did. And the former member from the Morse constituency should be . . . if he went down to that community, he'd probably be tarred and feathered. That, Madam Minister, is the kind of thing that the people think of your wellness model because they have a long way to drive. They wanted a level 4 care facility there instead. And what are you giving them? The boot. And that, Madam Minister, is not what they want.

And if you can tell me different, so that I can take it out to that community, I'd be pleased to do that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Madam Minister, the member from Swift Current said I never went there. Well, Madam Minister, I still live in my constituency.

And, Madam Minister, I want to have your assurance that that hospital will stay open, and that it will serve the people in that community, as well as Kincaid and Mankota, Lafleche and Ponteix and Climax and Eastend and Shaunavon, Gull Lake, Cabri. All of those facilities need to stay open, Madam Minister. And they need to provide the kinds of care that is available.

I wonder, Madam Minister, if you would be able to provide to this Assembly the cost per patient bed in those communities versus the cost per patient bed in any hospital in Saskatoon or Regina.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — My understanding is, Vanguard has one ADC (approved daily census), and it operates at the

expense of approximately \$750,000 a year, has an average of one patient per day.

Now I will get the detailed information generally as to the cost per patient day with respect to hospitals. Under 6 ADC the cost per year, per bed is \$173,217. From 5 to 9, it's \$102,045. From 10 to 16 it's 83,178. And 17 to 24, it's \$76,207 per bed. Okay?

Okay with respect to a regional hospital, the difference per year, per bed is approximately \$50,000 a year — \$50,000 a year being in the smaller hospital.

Now with respect to Vanguard which is the thing you were . . . the letter you were raising, Vanguard Hospital has not been closed nor has the department said they were closing the Vanguard Hospital. What we are going to be doing is asking communities to come together and take a look at the 173,217 per year, per bed and to see whether we may be able to move to an integrated facility, for example, with fewer acute care beds or whether there's some other options that can go in.

(1830)

So we will want to generate these discussions with communities. And as they get together and talk amongst themselves as to whether they want to explore options and look at options, I think that would not be a bad suggestion to look at options and explore them because what we're talking about is 173,217 per bed, per year on average in a hospital such as Vanguard.

Maybe they want to use some of that money to do some other health care programming, get some other health care professionals out to their community and use their hospital in a broader sense. That's what we're trying to do with this health care reform.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Madam Minister, that hospital has 10 beds in it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know what the average daily census is, and it also is providing level 4 care for all of the rest of them because they don't have any place else to go. They don't have any place else to go, Madam Minister. They don't have anywhere else to go, Madam Minister, and that is the problem. That's the problem all the way through the south-west, and that's the part of the problem.

Then you say well we'll shut down levels 1 and 2. Swift Current doesn't have any room; no place else has any room. Where are you going to send them? Madam Minister, that's where the problem lies.

You know who's picking up the health care costs for those level 1 to 4? The RMs. And I make my point, Madam Minister. I rest my case. That's where the costs comes in, and that's where the people have to pay.

And that's exactly what you're going to do with your wellness model. You'll say, okay we'll just provide this amount of money and then the rest gets paid for our of the property tax. And that's what's wrong with it.

I can see this coming right down the pipe. If I'm wrong I will apologize, not only to this House but also to the

people in that community. But I am more of the belief that I am accurate in what I'm saying than not because of the history that I explained to you earlier. You did not provide a reasonable enough amount of funding to provide services, so the people are taxed for it. And I don't see you doing anything different this time because you're going to take it from history and do it exactly the same way.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, a number of concerns have been raised in our office regarding the Whitespruce youth treatment facility. We have many people wondering exactly what is happening with regards to the Whitespruce treatment facility. Over the period of the first part of this year, certainly since November and into the spring, a number of people have resigned from this facility. There's been a number of problems in the facility and now recently, as of June 24 '92, a letter from the president of the facility . . . of the Whitespruce youth treatment foundation incorporated to the minister. And it's, first of all . . . one question, number one question is the board of the centre now to be represented largely by people from government departments and agencies?

They would like to know what the mandate is, what the copy of their new mandate is for the facility so that the board knows how to proceed and whether they should be getting funding. They want to know where the clients are coming from. In fact from what I gather, Madam Minister, the facility that was built that has had a lot of raving reviews and have got a number of letters, complimentary letters, that have been sent to the administrative staff regarding the work done at the facility.

It appears, Madam Minister, that the present government has just forgotten or has no intention of continuing the services, in fact may be caving into SADAC (Saskatchewan Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission) because SADAC certainly wasn't happy with the Whitespruce facility. They felt they should have more say or involvement. And yet the board was, I believe, built and the centre was built on the basis of having been somewhat independent of the government.

So I'd like to know where things sit regarding the Whitespruce treatment facility at this time.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — As the member opposite knows there had been considerable turmoil in the White Spruce Treatment Centre, and the government moved to appoint a board consisting of community members and some officials from the Department of Health. It is my understanding that there's an interim director appointed who will be there until November and that the situation is been substantially stabilized, that there have been good links made with the referring communities because that was one of the problems if the member opposite recalls.

There have been very good relationships established with the referring communities so that the family link can be made more effectively than what was occurring in the past. I'm advised that there are a number of very positive improvements that have taken place since that board was established.

And the Saskatchewan Alcohol and Drug Commission and the government will continue to monitor what is

occurring there, and there will be sometime in the future a long-term decision made as to who is going to be on the board and the direction White Spruce will be taking.

Mr. Toth: — Madam Minister, how many clients are presently being served by the facility?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The officials advise me, Mr. Chair, that there are 14 in residence, people in residence today, which is sort of the average summer amount because the numbers go down in the summer. In the winter-time I'm advised they're at approximately 21. That the board is working towards trying to incorporate more native youth into the facility because that component has not been there in the way it should be in the past.

And I'm further advised that they are dealing with more difficult to treat cases, and this requires a little more intense treatment.

Mr. Toth: — Well, Madam Minister, I guess a major concern and the concern of a number of staff members . . . and it's certainly apparent that there was some disunity amongst the staff, and I'm not going to get into where the disunity was really arising from. But I look at a report put together by the member from Saskatoon Eastview-Haultain, July 1991.

It talked about Whitespruce very . . . in fact it gave it a pretty good rating on here. It talked about its concept should be introduced to several other areas within the province, particularly to areas with higher populations of youth such as large urban centres in the northern part of the province. It talked about the client operating capacity and how . . . the fact there was a waiting list.

And I also look at a number of . . . the numbers of clients that have been in the centre. And when you look at the June period, and I don't know if this is . . . these could be '91 numbers or earlier. But there were figures of 27 at one time, June 10 — just taken randomly even through the summer — July, of 29 people; and October, of 27. And certainly the numbers have been right up there.

And yet this past little while — I believe since last fall or so — the numbers have been really down. And I think what it has indicated and what the staff is really concerned about, they just don't feel there is a commitment by the province to this facility. And I wonder if the minister would respond.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I'm advised that Alberta used to refer patients to Whitespruce and that they have just opened a new facility and are not using the Whitespruce facilities any longer. I am also advised that there is a real sense of unity at the Whitespruce facility these days, and that we're going through this stabilizing period, at which point we want to make sure the facility is perfectly safe for young people.

And as far as whether or not the government is committed to Whitespruce, it's always been committed to Whitespruce and it's committed to Whitespruce as of today.

Mr. Toth: — One other question, and certainly we could

get into a lot further regarding the Whitespruce facility and some of the concerns that have been raised. But another area, and it's been brought to my attention and it's certainly something that we've been trying to follow up on, we've given a chance for the proper channels to be followed, is the status of one Ellis Quarshie, the former clinical director.

And I understand here, first of all, the board, a Mr. John Labatt, chairman, board of directors, wrote a letter to Mr. Quarshie, indicating that the board, once the board had established their findings, they would present a copy of our findings and give Mr. Quarshie an opportunity to respond accordingly. And subsequent to your response, the board will review the situation.

To my knowledge, those findings have never been given to Mr. Quarshie. And maybe the minister could talk to the member from Churchill Downs and find out what's happening.

And also a subsequent letter to Mr. Quarshie indicated that the board was just terminating his employment and that it was prepared to work out, basically said this is what we'll give you, but it is conditional to the board's offer that you execute a release in a form as prepared by the board.

(1845)

It appeared to me that there was no room for the board even to work with or to come to an amiable settlement. In light of the fact when I look at the credentials . . . and Mr. Quarshie came to Whitespruce with some very high credentials, and in fact as recently as February has been contacted by the personnel department from the citizen ambassador program to go with them to the Soviet Union, to work on a program regarding drug and alcohol abuse, which appears to me, Madam Minister, that a lot of people across North America realize the experience and the work of Mr. Quarshie.

And yet I find that here in Saskatchewan and at Whitespruce it appears that his work and the work he has done is certainly not worth the efforts. And at the present time, Mr. Quarshie just doesn't know where things are at because everything just seems to be stalled.

And if you were to look at the National Black Coalition of Canada, a number of accusations have come out of this. And I'm sure many people would like to know where things are at because the reputation of an individual who has worked and dedicated himself to the furtherance of helping young people is at stake.

And I'm wondering, Madam Minister, if you would make a commitment that you would allow the proper process; indeed that in the end, Mr. Quarshie will be treated fairly. That it wasn't just politics and just a few individuals in the Yorkton area who decided that they didn't like Mr. Quarshie, who have used the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) and maybe even the minister in the department to have a man removed from his office, rather than not being treated as fairly as he should be.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The matter of Mr. Quarshie is a matter between the board and Mr. Quarshie and I'm not

going to get into that in this legislature.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask a very quick question and make a comment, Madam Minister. I know that we want to try to get finished here as soon as possible, so I'm just going to give you an outline of the hospitals and nursing homes in my constituency.

Madam Minister, and I've been requested by all my hospitals and nursing homes to do this, so I must do this. In my constituency, in Craik and Imperial is an integrated facility and then they have their acute care beds; Davidson, Outlook, they have full hospital and facility; Elbow and Dundurn have level 1 and 2 level care; Outlook and Davidson also have a level 3, 4 level care; and Hanley — it's a big large area and they've been asking for a new nursing home, and it was approved under our government. And now they're worried about whether it's going to get built or not.

Now, Madam Minister, this board's going to be set up, and they're going to all sit in this board you're talking about, this master board. And they're going to be sitting down and discussing what's going to happen in my constituency pertaining to all these hospitals and health care. And I know what they're going to come up with; I know exactly what they want now. So they're not going to start fighting one to another unless you see that they do. And it's very simple, very simple, Madam Minister.

Craik and Imperial, all they're asking for, just keeping the funding for what they've got. That's all they want. They have an integrated facility, the two towns, and they're brand-new. All they're going to ask for . . . But Davidson, I know what they're going to ask for. They've been working on it for years, is a new addition to their hospital. And Outlook, I know what they're going to ask for — they're going to ask for a brand-new hospital because their hospital is in bad shape and it's a large area.

And my question to you, after the board all sits and discuss that, they're all going to say this is what we want. And then my question: will they get their request like you said they would, that the people will have their way, or are you just going to say that there's no funding for these people? Just like a comment on that, Madam Minister.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The member opposite is being very simplistic in his approach to the health care reform.

What we want to do with communities is get them together to talk in terms of needs assessment and what is required for the future and so on. We will facilitate them with whatever information is necessary, and I know the communities will be looking at options. Options will be laid on the table as to what could be done with the money that's there. There are a lot of communities who consider options, sometimes think these options are better.

So for the member opposite to simply say, the people in my community only want to keep the *status quo* and they want new facilities and this one wants a new hospital and this one wants a new this and a new this, and so are you going to give them your way, is very simplistic.

Obviously whenever capital construction is undertaken, it has to be done in the context of the province's overall budget. The province isn't going to say, if you need a 200 facility here and you say you want it, you got it. It never did say that. You didn't fund Gravelbourg for years.

There's going to be provincial standards and guidelines with respect to construction, for example, and the administration of other health care services in the province. But we want communities to come together and develop some sort of . . . as a district — not as a community, an island unto themselves — but as a district, some sort of needs assessment that will ultimately improve the quality of services that are in the area and co-ordinate and integrate services in Saskatchewan as hasn't happened in the past.

Mr. Muirhead: — Madam Minister, I just wanted to get that on the record and get your comment. It's going to be your problem. And I'm going to be doing everything I can for the people of my constituency.

But if you think for one moment, Madam Minister, that you can just talk this nicey-nicey stuff and everybody is just going to get along so great. If you think that when they get together, Madam Minister, to discuss this situation that Craik's going to say, well we'll close our funding down and you have it Imperial. And Davidson going to say, well we'll let our hospital go so Outlook can get a new one. Forget it.

Mr. Chairman, I think I'll just wait until I got the attention of the minister. Madam Minister, I just want to leave this comment with you. I hope it works, this new wellness program, for goodness sakes. Not for your sake, I don't hope it works, I hope it works for the sake of the people in the province of Saskatchewan. That's what's most important. That's what's really at stake here. I hope for the sake of the people I've represented for 15 years, and I hope to represent for another three at least. And I hope it works for them. I hope you don't create arguments among them and dissension among them. I hope your program works.

But I've been around a long time. I've been a politician a lot longer than you have. And I could tell you that . . . just what you're . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I sure have been a politician a lot longer and I've had a lot more experience than you've had and I got a lot of experience with people. And I'm afraid of this here program that what you're setting up. But I hope it works.

And I'm just going to close on a few statements that I've been asked to put on the record. And one is from Dr. McCaw from Craik, Saskatchewan. He's been our good doctor that moved in there in 1953. And it's a long time to stay in one community — 1953 to 1992. And we have great respect for this doctor. And the people are his friends around there. He's been a great doctor in the community.

But he spoke at the opening of our integrated facility last fall. He had a written speech, Madam Minister. The member from Last Mountain-Touchwood was there and he read this off, and this was before you did anything wrong because this is right after the election. And he

warned that this — right publicly, with 3 or 400 people at a meeting — warned what this new government would do to ruin our health care system. And he said that before you done it.

Now the things you've done, I'm sorry to say, and he wants it on the record, that he has now put his resignation in because he said he would not work under this NDP government. And it's going to be the same dilemma for many, many doctors in this province.

So I'm putting that on the statement from him, and this man has worked under the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), the NDP, the Liberal, and the Conservative administration. And he said this administration that we got here now is second to none to ruining the health care system in this province.

Madam Minister, I feel sorry for you because what's happened here in this last little while, this last few months, you've had your marching orders from the . . . not from you. You're from the new school. The old school in here — the front benches — have dictated to you exactly what's going to happen in health care, and if you think for one minute it isn't just for the Minister of Finance to try to balance his budget. That's what this is all about.

Because I always thought that this would happen, and here's a little statistics in closing. In 1978 when I was running for a candidate, we couldn't handle the situation out there because they didn't trust the PCs with medicare. But us PCs got elected in 1982 and they learned to trust us, that we would save the medicare and health system in this province from 1982 . . . The member from Canora laughs over this.

But I can tell you that from 1982 to 1991 the people had a trust. Because you never heard at all at election time. Not one of you people heard an issue that we can't trust the Tories. You people here want to be here a long time that's up to you. The House Leader asked me how long it was going to be. I said if there's not a murmur from you people, I'll be 10 minutes and if there's a bunch of racket we might be here till midnight, because I'm leaving this with you.

I'm leaving this statement with you, Madam Minister, that the people learned to trust us from 1982 to 1991 pertaining to health care. And you can sit there and laugh all you want, but you can go to your own constituency, Madam Minister, and they don't trust you today. There's no way they'd trust you with what you're going to do next in health care.

When people are sending back their NDP cards tore up to the minister . . . to the Premier of this province, what do . . . you think you can sit there and laugh and not take it seriously? But for the sake of the people in the province of Saskatchewan, I hope for goodness sakes that you tread on careful ground. And be careful what you're doing because we got a health and medicare system at stake here and we don't want you to ruin it.

We want you to save it. We in opposition want you to save this here medicare and this wonderful system we've got for the people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Madam Minister, the CCF, under Tommy Douglas, was the father of medicare for this province — not for all Canada, but he was the father. And I'm putting it on the record that I do believe that the new NDP government will be the failure of medicare in this province, and between the medicare system and agriculture you are going to be finished in four years. That is something that I can see happening.

Eight months ago I said, no way. But now I can see that she's all over if you keep this trend up. And I hope, for goodness sakes, for the sake of the people in the province of Saskatchewan, that you leave us in opposition another four years, that you do things right for them. Don't do things right for you, so we'll be sitting over there in the next election.

Last words . . . unless something goes wrong here tonight, Mr. Chairman, unless something goes wrong, this is the last you'll have to hear from me because I've done a lot of talking in this session. You've heard from me a lot. But after all this is said and done, I do want to say this to all colleagues in this legislature that we as individuals have nothing against each other, and I'm saying to each and everyone in here, have a good summer at the beach now till December. Have yourself an enjoyable time. And I earnestly say, the best fall, until we come back here to meet again. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — It's too cold right now at the beach, Gerry.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously there are many, many areas that we could delve into at a great depth, but I have one other issue that I want to bring up just for clarification, Madam Minister, and this deals with the dentistry program.

And I'm aware now that the Department of Health and the College of Dental Surgeons recently signed a contract renewing the children's dental plan for another year. My understanding is that the only difference between the old contract and the new contract is the 90-day termination clause. Now from my little knowledge of that situation, I'm sure it's not the dentists that have asked for that 90-day termination clause. And that begs then the question: why was this clause inserted?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — The member opposite is aware that we've talked about the need for changes to the children's dental program. And in fact we've asked a committee of dentists and dental therapists and dental hygienists to review a whole wide range of alternatives and to provide us with some recommendations.

The 90-day clause simply allows us the flexibility to move into a new program, should we be able to do that in the months to come, and that's why the clause was put in the agreement.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, are you still planning to reintroduce a new dental plan to replace the professional program that is currently in place?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — We are looking at ways of getting preventative services to many of our rural communities. Right now residents have to travel to dental services, for example. And so we've asked the committee to take a look at a new plan in that context, and I have yet to receive their recommendation.

(1900)

Mr. Neudorf: — Madam Minister, would you just indicate . . . Did I understand correctly when you said you were looking at preventative services? Is that the term that you used? I couldn't quite hear you.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — We wanted more emphasis on prevention and more of a preventative program emphasis with respect to the dental plan. So I've asked the planning team to bring forward recommendations which would reflect this. And I really can't comment on it any further until I hear what sort of recommendations they bring forward as to how the program could be enhanced and strengthened in the preventative area.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well, Madam Minister, it seems to me that the dentists that are providing the professional service right now certainly would be quite capable also of supplying preventative services. So I'm not quite sure where you're getting at there.

But I think I'll culminate this serious by asking you this question: are you considering, then, the de-insuring of the children's dental plan as well?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Well if we changed the plan, it would mean new agreements with dental professionals and maybe new relationships. It isn't a question whether we de-insure and there's no plan or not. That's not the issue. We want to improve on the plan from the point of view of more preventative programming. That may mean new agreements when that's done, and it may mean new working relationships with dentists and dental therapists.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well certainly I have nothing in objection to changing plans from time to time. But I just want your assurance, Madam Minister, that it won't be the parents and the folks like that that are going to be picking up the bill directly themselves. Can you give us that assurance, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — I am going to wait to hear what the recommendations of the committee are before we determine what the new dental plan will look like.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 37 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 32 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1992
Consolidated Fund Expenditure
Health
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32**

Items 1 to 35 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 32 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1991
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Health
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 32**

Items 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 32 agreed to.

The Chair: — That completes Estimates for the Department of Health. I would ask the minister at this time to thank her officials.

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would very sincerely like to thank my officials for all the work they have been doing in the last few months. They have done a tremendous job. And they have been meeting with all sorts of people across the province as we go through this period of reform and change in Saskatchewan, and I thank them very much. They're working very hard, very long hours and I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1915)

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I too would like to thank the officials from the Department of Health as they work very, very hard in difficult circumstances to deliver the health system to us.

But further than that, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank the Minister of Health for sharing with us many, many hours here on the Department of Health and explaining her side of it and us as the opposition being allowed to express our concerns.

Mr. Chairman, it has become obvious that she has her ideas; we have our ideas. But that's part of the democratic process, and as long as we agree to disagree and can still have this democratic process unfold before us, I think, ultimately the people of Saskatchewan will be the winners.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motions for Supply

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, there are a series of four resolutions that are required to be considered by the Assembly and I am pleased to rise and move them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Five? Five resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, I move the first resolution:

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 \$3,034,001,300 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I move:

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, 1991, the sum of \$475,153,500, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the third resolution as required, I move:

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, 1992, the sum of \$2,584,816,100, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I move:

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, 1991, the sum of \$32,300,000, be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The final resolution is:

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, 1992, the sum of \$93,855,200, be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: — Before I put the question, I am sure that I speak on behalf of the Deputy Chair and thank the members for their co-operation and deliberations during the Committee of Finance and during Committee of the Whole. Also want to take this opportunity to point out to the members that Mr. Charles Robert, who has assisted us during this session, will be returning to the Senate of Canada. We will miss Charles. He has been an industrious, cheerful, and erudite presence for us at the table. I might also mention that Charles is the one who came closest to guessing the number of times that a certain minister who will remain unnamed used the phrase, "the fact of the matter."

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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 and second time.

Motion agreed to and the resolutions read a first and second time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move:

That Bill No. 94, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years Ending Respectively on March 31, 1991, on March 31, 1992, and on March 31, 1993, be now introduced and read the first time.

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

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, and under the 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 7:26 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. 47 — An Act to repeal The Health Research Act
- Bill No. 64 — An Act respecting Arbitration
- Bill No. 83 — An Act respecting Pension Benefits
- Bill No. 81 — An Act respecting the repeal of The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act
- Bill No. 82 — An Act to amend The Victims of Crime Act
- Bill No. 79 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Pension Plan Act
- Bill No. 93 — An Act respecting Labour Relations in the Construction Industry
- Bill No. 91 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Oil and Gas Corporation Act, 1985
- Bill No. 72 — An Act to amend The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act
- Bill No. 57 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Farm Security Act
- Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Farm Financial Stability Act (No. 2)
- Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Farm Financial Stability Act (No. 3)
- Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act
- Bill No. 84 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984
- Bill No. 85 — An Act respecting Fire Prevention and Certain Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of this Act
- Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Superannuation

— (Supplementary Provisions) Act
Bill No. 77 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act
Bill No. 80 — An Act to amend The Interprovincial Subpoena Act
Bill No. 41 — An Act to declare a Day of Appreciation for Scottish Clans in Canada
Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act

Her Honour: — In Her Majesty's name, I assent to these Bills.

Bill No. 94 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending on March 31, 1991, on March 31, 1992 and on March 31, 1993

Her Honour: — In Her Majesty's name, I thank the Legislative Assembly, accept their benevolence and assent to this Bill.

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 7:31 p.m.

MOTIONS

Hours of Sitting Rescinded

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, by leave I move, seconded by the member from Churchill Downs:

That at the adjournment of the Assembly today, the order made August 6, 1992, fixing the hours of sitting, shall be rescinded.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, before I move leave adjourning the Assembly, I just want to take a moment to thank the staff, including your staff, Mr. Speaker, yourself as Speaker of the Assembly, and members of the opposition, and everyone who had something to do with making the session work.

I think it's fair to say that there are always times in a session when it looks like it isn't going to work, but I have to say that in the end there was that spirit of good naturedness and also co-operation that brought us around to the conclusion of the session.

I also want to join with others in thanking Charles Robert for his work at the Table and his patience.

With that, by leave, I would move:

That when the Assembly adjourns at the end of this sitting day, it shall stand adjourned to a date and time set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government, and that Mr. Speaker shall give each member seven clear days notice, if possible, of such date and time.

I so move, seconded by the member from Regina

Hillsdale.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a long session. I just want to take the opportunity to make a few thank you's as well and join the Government House Leader.

There are many people to thank as a result of the working of the Legislative Assembly and the work that's done here.

The Clerks and the pages and indeed our visitors that have come to us from the Senate. I certainly want to appreciate the time and the hours they've put in and the advice, under some difficult circumstances from time to time.

The Law Clerk and his assistant of course because of some difficult issues that they had to face.

A hard-working staff in *Hansard* who work into the night to get the proceedings recorded for the public, which is always difficult.

The television crew, Mr. Speaker, who sit in here as long as we do, which this session has meant many nights that have gone to midnight and later. And they've certainly shown patience and have been very professional.

Our security staff, both the Sergeant-at-Arms and the commissioners, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, yourself and your staff and all the staff and administration through to the tour staff because they have had the opportunity to show people from across the country and indeed from other countries this Legislative Assembly as we sat here.

And I particularly want to recognize the Legislative Library staff, because I can tell you from our point of view at least, and I'm sure the government's as well, without the assistance they provide MLAs in research, this place could not operate as a fully democratic institution because we wouldn't have the information to do our jobs. And you can imagine when you have a small opposition, Mr. Speaker, to have access to the research facilities and to the staff, it is very, very helpful.

I want to personally thank our research staff because this has been the first real opportunity to have our 10 members in opposition go through an entire session. We're clearly outnumbered and we sit some long hours.

But as a result of our very diligent staff, our media and policy advisors — and they're small in number — we have been well informed, and we certainly appreciate the fact that these people have worked so very, very hard. And I think all members would recognize — some of them having been in opposition — the amount of work that a handful of members can do and a handful of individuals can do to be prepared all the time on so many issues.

I want to thank the media for their co-operation because it's been a little enduring at times for them, but we've had relatively fair coverage. And I think that's always

important. It certainly is to keep up the morale of all members on both sides of the House. And I'm going to ask the media to acknowledge . . . And maybe some day they'll even write about the huge work-load that has been accomplished in this session. And I know the House Leader talked about that in his interview.

When we began, the government said it had 50 or 60 Bills to bring forward. Instead we have had more than 90 Bills, Mr. Speaker. We've dealt with 34 Estimates and processes, major rule issues, public accounts reviews, Crown corporation examinations, municipal law, constitutional law, and many other items that were very, very controversial.

And all members had to have the patience and the endurance to get through this session with that on our plates. If you take out the six days of the budget debate, seven days of throne speech debate, and a day of condolence, we have had 62 working days minus a private members' day each week. I haven't added up the private members' day, but normally it would work out to be about one in five. So let's be generous and say there was only 10 private members' days. That leaves us with 52 days to do government business, and we dealt with over 150 major items. So that's three items or almost three Bills a day.

And that was a great deal of effort and I commend all members. While we were arguing and obviously had differences of opinion, we found that we could be as productive as possible.

I want to say that the members of the staff, particularly on our side and I can speak for our side, were extremely helpful in us reaching some of these changes that were made. And I just want to briefly say that the record shows that our efforts in this session have been enormously productive, and particularly in the opposition — and I think I'm allowed to congratulate the opposition, Mr. Speaker, for their homework.

We have convinced the government, with a large majority, to change its mind or change the Bills or modify the Bills. And that's important in democracy. Even though we're small in number, only 10, we did that. We obtained significant amendments to proposed environmental laws, to The Crown Minerals Act, to The Pension Benefits Act, to the agriculture and wildlife Act, to labour, trade union legislation, and several others.

And we worked with the people of Saskatchewan, frankly, to get the government to change its mind on such items as FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) and highways and pension plans and some with respect to health care.

So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am particularly proud of the efforts of our staff and our MLAs and the support of the public which really came forward and said, we want you to stick up for what you believe in and what they believe in. And I'm not going to give a long-winded speech on GRIP or a long-winded speech on some of the things we really fought for. And obviously we had some really down-to-earth and hard-nosed debates in here. But as a result, most of the things that we asked for were at

least listened to.

We won on many things. I'm not so happy to say that we didn't win on GRIP, but we made our point. And I think, Mr. Speaker, when the government comes to addressing an item like GRIP in 1993-94, that it will have in consideration many of the items that we brought forward.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just say in summary that the session has been productive although we haven't agreed on everything. We've made many changes, and I think the fact that the public is aware of what the new administration is all about will be extremely helpful as we look through to legislative changes and legislative assemblies in the months and weeks to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to all members of the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Before I move that this House do adjourn, I ask the indulgence of the Assembly to say a few words. May I?

Just a couple of words. I do want to thank the pages, who have worked so diligently. And I would be really remiss if I didn't thank Charles Robert. He's been just a tremendous support to me in this my first, most difficult session I think, for the Speaker. And I want to thank him very much for that.

An Hon. Member: — There's more to come.

The Speaker: — I will ignore the comment made by the member from Rosthern at this particular time, but there will be another session — I hope.

I do want to thank also all the Legislative Assembly staff.

More particularly I want to thank the people in *Hansard*, who so often we forget about. And they are working there diligently in the wee hours of the morning trying to get ready for the next day, and I do want to thank them publicly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Last but not least, I do want to thank all the members in the House. I hope you have a very long respite from this House until the next session and get acquainted with your families and members of your families and friends again.

Thank you very much for your co-operation. And with that, I move that this House now stands adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 7:42 p.m.