

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Goodale:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to draw your attention, and the attention of all hon. members to the presence in your gallery today of a very special visitor from Australia. Miss Karen Forest is visiting Saskatchewan for a number of months as an exchange student, spending a good portion of her time in the community of Assiniboia, and I've had an opportunity to meet and to visit with her there. She is from Phillips Island in Australia, and she is accompanied today by her Regina host, Mrs. Darlene Elchuck, and I would invite all hon. members to join with me in welcoming both of them to our Assembly this afternoon, and wishing Karen, in particular, a very happy stay while she's in Saskatchewan and Canada.

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

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to ask you and all members of the Assembly to welcome my parents, Reg and Trudy Prebble, who are sitting in your gallery, to your left, Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted to have them visiting in Regina, and I'd ask all members to join me in welcoming them to this Assembly.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Free Trade Negotiations

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Trade and Development, who has just returned back to the House from Ottawa, and it pertains to free trade. Mr. Minister, when the free trade negotiations began, your Premier described them in these terms: that we have everything to gain and nothing to lose.

In the light of the softwood lumber fiasco, the cedar shakes and shingles fiasco, the potash anti-dumping fiasco and action, and in the light of the current state of negotiations which seem to be going nowhere: will the minister admit on behalf of the government now, that this initiative has been ill-conceived from the outset, bungled in its negotiations, and ought to be scrapped at this point?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Thank you for the question, Mr. Speaker. In response to the hon. member's question, I think that shows and demonstrates the traditional approach of the NDP, of being totally against trade . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — A lack of understanding.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — . . . total lack of understanding of trade by Canada with the United States.

Let me make this point, Mr. Speaker. Canada exports 77 per cent of everything that it exports to United States. In the latest figures, that'd be in 1986, Canada exported \$90 billion worth of merchandise trade to the United States. The next highest trading partner, the next largest customer of our products out of Canada was Japan with something less than 6 billion. Now 90 billion is a very, very important market for Canada. I think the Premier, I think all the premiers, recognize that and want to find a mechanism by which we can assure ourselves of that continued market in United States of \$90-plus billion.

Now it's easy for the opposition to say, no, don't trade with the United States; go trade it someplace else. But 37 per cent of all our trade is in automobiles, and I would challenge anybody to suggest where we might sell Canadian manufactured automobiles other than to the United States and Canada.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Economic Trade and Development. Mr. Speaker, it's not that the members on this side are against trade. To the contrary, we're for trade everywhere including the United States.

What we are against, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, is the way this initiative has been so badly handled from the beginning, now approaching its apparently unsatisfactory conclusion. Part of the bungling, sir, is the fact that nobody can get a straight answer from your government as to what issues are or are not on the table.

And my question to you, therefore, is this: for example, in some quarters it is said that agricultural issues are not on the table, yet your very Premier says that's not true, that farming and agriculture is on the table.

Will you please tell the House and the farmers of this province of Saskatchewan: is agriculture on the free trade table; and if so, how do we know that Prime Minister Mulroney will not, in a desperate attempt to get a last minute deal, do away with the Canadian Wheat Board and other orderly marketing agencies?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, it is true that the hon. member absolutely knows nothing about what is being dealt with in the trade negotiations, as he absolutely knows nothing about agriculture.

Now the premiers and the Prime Minister met yesterday for an extended period of time with Simon Reisman, the chief negotiator for Canada. Clearly the decision of the premiers and the Prime Minister was not to go out into the world and start to tell everybody exactly what was and was not on the table. It would simply tie the hands of our negotiator in the last three weeks of the negotiations to the point where it would not be possible to probably consume a deal, if one is possible now.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Economic Trade and Development. I readily admit that I don't know all of the aspects pertaining to the

negotiations on free trade. In fact, I'd go so far as to say that nobody in Canada knows what's being talked about in free trade. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would even go so far as to say that the Premier and this government doesn't know what's going on in free trade.

And my question to you therefore is simply this. In the light of the fact that all of these discussions have been in secret, in view of the fact that we don't want a spirit of Meech Lake applying to free trade with the possible negative consequences, can you not tell the farmers and the people of this province clearly, today, that the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing and farm issue are not on the table? How about giving us that assurance?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, there is nobody at that table of the 10 first ministers and the Prime Minister that knows more about the issue of agriculture than the Premier of Saskatchewan. And I don't think that is a debate, even amongst the 10 first ministers, that would suggest that.

The hon. member from Riversdale likes to make the allegation that somehow the Canadian Wheat Board is what we're talking about in the free trade negotiations, or medicare is what we're talking about, or whether we'll have the CBC, all the classic yesterday old-fashioned issues that he always wants to talk about. Not about how we: (a) assure ourselves access to the U.S. market, number one; and (b) how do we have a mechanism that can deal with disputes in a meaningful way represented by both countries, so that we avoid the anti-dump action that we see in potash, or the countervail action that we see in soft wood lumber, and the security of supply legislation that we see in uranium.

Each of those industries are very critical to our province. And I quite frankly find it hard to understand why the member from Riversdale, who has ambitions to become the premier, would not have a concern about (a) the jobs, and the nature of the income that we could receive from those fundamental resource industries that are so fundamental to the economic well-being of this province and of this country.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the Economic Trade minister. Mr. Minister, quite frankly I'm shocked — not totally surprised — at your description about our concern about Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing being something as an old-fashioned issue. Because I want to tell you frankly, if that is the characterization, then indeed we are old-fashioned, because this side does support the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing. Make no mistake about that.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — I want you to tell this House, and this is my question: how do we know that when the eleventh hour of the negotiations are here — and they're not here — when the negotiations are coming to the crunch, how can we be assured, that some sort of an arrangement

that might protect, for example, the auto trade in Canada is made, but made only at the expense of Saskatchewan and Canadian farmers, such as the Canadian Wheat Board. Can you tell me clearly that the Canadian Wheat Board and agricultural issues are off the table? Something which you have refused to do today and your Premier continues to refuse to do.

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear, two points. Number one, western Canadians — not only just Saskatchewan people — western Canadians will not stand by should the situation arise where somehow we were traded off against the auto pact. That would never happen, nor should it ever happen. And number two, the Canadian Wheat Board is not at dispute in these trade negotiations. To my knowledge it never has been, and I don't believe any of the 10 premiers would even suggest that they would even discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board is a fundamental institution in this country, supported by this government, and we will defend, and the Premier of this province will defend, the wheat board, stronger, I would suggest, than any elected politician in this country.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The minister in his last answer to me, sir, used the words — and you will recollect them of course — words to the effect that say, so far as I know, so far as we know, the Canadian Wheat Board is not on the table, or so far as my knowledge pertains, the Canadian Wheat Board is not on the table.

Look, Mr. Minister, I have a simple question for you. You were at that meeting. Did not you, or at the least the Premier of this province, get up and ask the Prime Minister a simple, straightforward question to assure the farmers of Saskatchewan that it's not on the table? What in the world were you doing there in Ottawa?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province has defended agriculture, has defended the Canadian Wheat Board as a model by which the world could market its grain and market its wheat. The Canadian Wheat Board has never been an issue at the table. I simply say, to my knowledge, because I don't actually sit at the table with the premiers as you should full well know, so from that point of view, the Premier is not prepared to deal with the Canadian Wheat Board, nor is the Prime Minister, nor are the other 10, or other nine premiers.

**Mr. Romanow:** — One final question, a new question, if I might, of the minister, Mr. Speaker, and this has to do with respect to the question of the United States motions with respect to the anti-dumping so-called in potash. According to the *Leader-Post* on Saturday, an unnamed trade official of the delegation of which you, sir, is the responsible minister, is quoted as saying that the Premier and you would go down to these conferences keeping in mind what the Americans had done to the Saskatchewan potash industry on their anti-dump.

My question is this: did you or the Premier take advantage of the special relationship that the Premier has with Mr. Mulroney and urge Mr. Mulroney and his special advantage with the President of the United States to specifically raise the issue of what the Americans have done to Saskatchewan and Canada on potash. And it's not only Saskatchewan; it's softwood lumber and everything else.

Did you raise this specifically and say to the Prime Minister of this country, look, Prime Minister, we say to the President of the United States the following: stop that United States anti-dumping action on the potash to save our potash families and towns, or we walk out of these free trade talks? Did you at least do that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say this: I welcome the first question from the member from Riversdale on the issue of potash. I'm glad that he has now taken an interest in this dimension of the debate as it relates to potash.

The Premier will be in the House tomorrow, but I can assure you that the Premier not only laid the lumber to the people in New York, I understand as well . . . I understand that . . . The members opposite do not wish to see the Premier walking at the national . . . or the international stage, but the Premier was in New York, and the Premier delivered the message in New York that we are playing, and we're going to playing hard on the potash question.

The Premier also delivered the message to the recent premiers' conference, and I am advised that he delivered that message yesterday in the meeting with other first ministers and the Prime Minister, and he delivered it with a great deal of force.

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

#### **Alleged Patronage Appointment at Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan**

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, a few months ago PCS fired approximately 180 employees, and at that time PCS indicated the reason for the firing was that the potash markets were simply too poor to maintain the staff level.

I notice now that the American president, Chuck Childers, has begun rehiring again. And my question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: can you confirm that a Katrina Forrest has been hired by the PCS as the U.S. liaison officer? Katrina Forrest, Mr. Minister, is the daughter of Chuck Childers.

Would you tell me, Mr. Minister, was this position advertised, and how many Saskatchewan residents applied for this position?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the

potash corporation that the individual was hired, not by the potash corporation but by PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan International) (sales) International. I'm not aware . . . Well, you know, the hon. members don't understand the distinction. However, having said that, I think I'm giving the hon. member a more precise answer to the question than the one that he asked. And secondly, I am not aware that there was any competition for it.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — It's not surprising, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It's not surprising that there wasn't any advertising or competition. Mr. Minister, may I remind you that PCS International is not an offshore marketing . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes, it is an offshore . . .

**Mr. Rolfes:** — . . . Or is an offshore marketing agency. Would you mind telling me what the qualifications were for Katrina Forrest; and if Mr. Chuck Childers is an American, certainly he knows the American market situation. What contribution can Katrina Forrest make in an advisory capacity or as a liaison officer to Mr. Childers? Would you mind telling the House this?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I'll take notice, Mr. Speaker. I do not have the individual's resume, but I will get the qualifications for the hon. member.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, while the minister is taking notice of this, would he also mind asking the PCS International how much is being paid to Katrina Forrest; and if you could indicate to me, were there any other people interested in the position at that particular time? Did you do a search within the people who have been fired, of those 180 people that were fired. There are a number of people, not only in Saskatchewan but also in my own constituency, who I think could have qualified for that particular job. Would you bring that information back to the House tomorrow?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I'm certainly prepared, Mr. Speaker, to supply the income positions of the senior officials in the traditional manner of the Assembly. I've indicated that I'll get the qualifications for the hon. member. The assurance I have from the officials that she was a highly qualified individual.

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister tell me if Mr. Chuck Childers did not do the direct hiring. Was the chairman of the board, the defeated PC candidate, Paul Schoenhals involved in the hiring of Katrina Forrest, directly or indirectly? Directly did he do the hiring then?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well I will have to try and get the information from the hon. member. The only advice I have is: one, that she was hired; that it was PCS (sales) International; and that the individual was highly qualified, as I've indicated.

**Special Security Section of Property Management Corporation**

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the minister responsible for the property management corporation of Saskatchewan. It deals again with the special security unit that the government has created within this corporation.

I thought perhaps the Deputy Premier wanted to get a word in there. It deals, once again, with the special security unit that the government has created within the property management corporation.

Mr. Minister, you have said that this five-person security unit will provide increased security to cabinet ministers. I want to know, Mr. Minister, do you honestly expect Saskatchewan people to believe that the Premier and his cabinet ministers require bodyguards over and above the adequate service already provided by Wascana police? Or is the real reason for this security unit to further insulate the Premier and cabinet ministers from the public of Saskatchewan to give you another excuse for avoiding listening to the public's complaints about your incompetence and uncaring policies.

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize the question was asked yesterday when I was out in Yorkton, Saskatchewan with 250 people in small business, without any security, listening to their concerns.

However, in reply to your question, Mr. Member, this is the continuation of the Vital Points agreement that was brought to this province on behalf of the federal government and the federal RCMP in 1981. That's when the Vital Points agreement first was taken between Saskatchewan and the federal government. So let me indicate to you, from that, in 1983 a Vital Points agreement and service was instituted in this province.

There are some people that have been hired, highly qualified, to execute that. But for you to rise in this House and lead in your question about trying to insulate oneself from the people of Saskatchewan, to try and let on some innuendo that is simply not correct, when yesterday when you questioned on this I was exactly in Yorkton, Saskatchewan by myself with 250 people that were darn glad I was there to listen about small business interests . . . Now if that's insulating this government from the people of Saskatchewan, I'd like to hear your viewpoint on that.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a new question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation and, in doing so, remind him of rule 25, which deals with needless repetition and useless repetition.

Mr. Minister, since your government came to office, we have seen computerized security posts installed in the legislative buildings. For the first time ever the public can't move about this building on their own. Access to this building is controlled 24 hours a day. Public demonstrations have been banned from this most public of all building in Saskatchewan. This legislature has been

turned . . . this legislature, Mr. Speaker, has been turned into fortress Saskatchewan. Now you want bodyguards. Now you want bodyguards.

How can . . . Mr. Minister, how can the minister possibly justify this kind of expensive attempt to insulate his government from public criticism?

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened with amazement again to the inflammatory type of statements from the member opposite. It's strange for me to see the member opposite who once occupied the chair that you're in today, a respected chair in this legislature, who realizes full well that the security within this Legislative Chamber and within this building is under the direction of the Board of Internal Economy; it seems strange to me that a member who was a high-ranking member in that government, the Speaker, who realized that when they were the government they got the start on the vital points program — it was in agreement with your government.

Now I can't see how a person can stand in this Chamber and say there's any type of insulation, any type of personal protection. There is a unit within the SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) that will provide surveillance of building should we go out of this building to hold a meeting. And if the members on the opposite side — as I said to the member of the press the other day that interviewed me — if the Leader of the Opposition or the aspiring leader of the opposition feel that they want that type of service, it's available to you.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, a final question to the minister, since he's neatly avoided answering the last question I asked him. Now the minister should answer this question. It's about the mandate of this new security unit which is answerable only to you and your cabinet colleagues — not to the Speaker, not to the Sergeant-at-Arms, not to Wascana police, but to you, Mr. Minister, and your cabinet colleagues, in secret.

Over the last five years a number of civil servants have been so disgusted with your government's patronage and incompetence and unfair policies that they have leaked information to the media and others. Are information leaks part of this unit's mandate; is it a plumbers' unit assigned to plug the embarrassing leaks of information to taxpayers; and will the minister table the report's vital points?

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

**Hon. Mr. Taylor:** — Well certainly, to many of the things that he asked me: first about any types of leaks; there's no relationship to that at all. It comes out of a system from across Canada — across Canada — advocated to all legislatures in Canada by the federal RCMP Police and the federal government, a Vital Points program to put a minimal amount of security available to members of the legislature.

You should know, and if you have forgot I'll remind you, that the security of this Chamber and this building is under Mr. Speaker and the Clerk of the legislature. I offer to you, I offer

to you or any other member, the same type of security from the property management Crown that is available to me or anyone else. All you have to do is ask for it, and it's available to you.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### PRIVATE BILLS

#### SECOND READINGS

##### **Bill 01 – An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities**

**Mr. Johnson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before moving Bill No. 01, I would like to take a few moments to make a few brief comments.

It is my very distinct pleasure to rise in this Assembly to move second reading of a private member's Bill regarding the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. This legislation has been presented for consideration of this Assembly to allow the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities the statutory authority to operate their own liability insurance system.

Members of this Assembly may recall that about three years past, insurance companies began raising premiums and premium rates to municipalities for basic liability insurance. In response to this concern, 299 rural municipalities in this province, who are members of the Saskatchewan association, stopped to investigate the feasibility of operating their own liability insurance system to cover the needs of our rural municipalities.

I'm advised by the association that upon Royal Assent of this proposed Bill they are in a position to commence a liability insurance program October 1 of this year. I've also been advised that 211 rural municipalities have indicated their desire to participate in the plan.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents an historical occasion, I think, for the province of Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities is believed to be the only provincial organization which has been able to develop a self-insurance program approved by the majority of its members.

And this is a typical attitude of the leadership evident in rural councils across the province. They did not come running to the government to ask for money to solve their problem, nor did they ask the provincial or federal government to solve their problem for them. In their tradition, of course, of self-sufficiency that always has made rural Saskatchewan strong and vibrant, these municipal leaders looked for a resolution to the problem on their own.

And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that for the benefit of all members, that the proposed coverage under the self-insurance plan provides more coverage than is available or was available in the market-place. It now includes a provision for \$500,000 worth of environmental damage protection. That protection simply cannot be purchased anywhere through the commercial insurance programs.

Mr. Speaker, the rural municipalities have an excellent record over the past years for claims under the liability policies. It's certainly the position of the Saskatchewan association of municipalities that if they didn't cause the rising claims and subsequent rising premiums that have become evident in liability insurance market, like world-wide, the associations have certainly taken the position that if they didn't cause the problem, why should they pay for it?

So, Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation, I think, is straightforward, requires little or any further comment, I think, at this time. And I would urge all members to support this historic legislation. And it's my pleasure to move second reading of Bill No. 01, An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, and at this time refer Bill No. 01 to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a word or two on this Bill. First, I want to indicate that I and my colleagues will be supporting the Bill.

Secondly, I want to compliment the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, their executive, and Lorne Wilkinson, their past executive director I believe his title was, certainly chief executive officer, for the work that they have done on this project. It shows an outstanding amount of initiative of the sort of thing we have come to expect from the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities).

I was disappointed that they had to launch what is, in effect, their own insurance company. I would have felt it better if the public insurance company, SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) had been able to offer a liability coverage on a reasonable premium based upon loss experience here or on the Prairies and not in Bhopal or Baltimore or wherever else the accidents have been happening which have driven up liability insurance premiums.

I would also have thought that our public insurance company might have offered the environmental hazard insurance which, I was advised, was simply not obtainable by rural municipalities.

But leaving that aside, we can have an opportunity to debate those issues on another occasion. My purpose now is to compliment the SARM for their initiative, for the work they have done in organizing the large number of rural municipalities across the province, explaining the benefits of being self-insurers, and this legislation as a result of their initiative. And on that basis, I will be supporting it.

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

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

##### **Bill No. 02 – An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Briercrest Bible College**

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to move that Bill No. 02, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Briercrest Bible College, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

### **Bill No. 03 – An Act respecting Our Lady of the Prairies Foundation**

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Before moving second reading of this Bill, I want to say a few words about the Our Lady of the Prairies Foundation. I think the foundation really needs no introduction to most people in this province. It is a charitable foundation which deals a lot with religious groups and does try to accomplish its objectives mainly in that particular area, but not exclusively.

The objectives of the foundation are set out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, in section 4 of this Bill, and I think if we go through those very quickly, it will indicate to the members here that everyone, I think, can support those objectives: 4(a) says one of the objectives of the foundation is to:

(a) propagate the Christian faith and gospel as taught by the Roman Catholic Church;

(b) promote a greater devotion to Mary the Mother of God . . .

(c) assist and provide scholarships or bursaries to any deserving person intending to become a priest, brother or sister in the Roman Catholic church;

One other objective is to:

(d) found, create and make payments in the nature of scholarships, bursaries, prizes or otherwise to deserving students, regardless of race, colour or creed, to further their education;

(e) assist, aid or contribute to works of charity, educational institutions, missionary institutions or religious institutions in Canada or elsewhere;

(f) do acts of mercy and contribute to, aid or assist, in Canada or elsewhere, any person engaged in the advancement of, or in a pursuit which would tend to advance, the objects of the Foundation;

And lastly, Mr. Speaker:

(g) do any and all other things that are incidental or conducive to the attainment of the objects and purpose of which the Foundation is established.

I think all members in this House would find that those objectives are laudable objectives, and we could

certainly support those. And I think in that sense it is not a controversial Bill. I think it is worthwhile to point out that the trustees of the Our Lady of the Prairies Foundation, the trustees are Joseph B. Leier, James A. Leier, and their sister, Patricia J. Sikler, and two other trustees may be appointed.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of a Bill respecting Our Lady of the Prairies Foundation Act.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

### **MOTIONS**

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, the House Leader of the Opposition and myself have agreed to an arrangement whereby we could simply stand everything up to motions for returns (debatable) on page 21 and deal with the motions for return (debatable), Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)**

#### **Return No. 16**

**Mr. Prebble** moved, seconded by Mr. Hagel, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 16 showing:

Regarding the Premier's early 1986 announcement of plans to build a new College of Agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan: (1) the current estimate of the total cost of the project; (2) the portion of the total cost that will be contributed by: the provincial government, the University of Saskatchewan, the federal government and the general public; (3) the amount that the provincial government has spent to this point on this project; (4) the date construction is to begin and the date the project is scheduled to be completed.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 16 showing:

Regarding the Premier's early 1986 announcement plans to build a new College of Agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan, we would like to know: (1) the current estimate of the total cost of the project; (2) the portion of the total cost that will be contributed by the provincial government, the University of Saskatchewan, the federal government, and the general public; (3) the amount that the provincial government has spent to this point on the project; (4) the construction schedule and the date the project is scheduled to be completed.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is straightforward information that ought to be available to all members of the public, all members of the Assembly. The question of support for this project is certainly not in dispute. I think that all members of this Assembly are anxious to see the project proceed as quickly as possible. It's to the credit of

the government that it is proceeding. It's not to the credit of the government that it's proceeding so slowly, Mr. Chairman, and we look forward to receiving this information and seeing firsthand what kind of a financial commitment is going to go into the construction of this province from the provincial government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'll move that, seconded by my colleague, the member for Moose Jaw North.

Motion agreed to.

#### Return No. 199

**Mr. Anguish** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

For the period April 1, 1986, to the date this return was ordered, a list of all highway construction projects tendered by the Department of Highways and Transportation, including: (a) a full description of the work involved in each project tendered; (b) the names of all bidders and the total amount bid by each bidder on each project; (c) the name of the successful bidder on each project; (d) where applicable, the reasons why the low bidder was not awarded the contract.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if I could have leave of the House to deal with both motions at the same time, Mr. Speaker. One is for the . . . the one that we're dealing with now is for the period from April 1, 1986 to the date of this return . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — We're going to give them both to you, so just move them both.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Okay, I understand from the House Leader that they'll both be provided.

So that I would move that an order of the Assembly do issue a return:

For the period April 1, 1986, to the date this return was ordered, a list of all highway construction projects tendered by the Department of Highways and Transportation, including: (a) a full description of the work involved in each project tendered; (b) the names of all bidders and the total amount bid by each bidder on each project; (c) the name of the successful bidder on each project; (d) where applicable, the reasons why the low bidder was not awarded the contract.

I so move, seconded by the hon. member from Cumberland.

Motion agreed to.

(1445)

#### Motion No. 200

**Mr. Anguish** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 200

showing:

For the fiscal year 1985-86, a list of all highway construction projects tendered by the Department of Highways and Transportation, including: (a) a full description of the work involved in each project tendered; (b) the names of all bidders and the total amount bid by each bidder on each project; (c) the name of the successful bidder on each project; (d) where applicable, the reasons why the low bidder was not awarded the contract.

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the hon. member from Cumberland, that an order of the Assembly do issue a return showing:

For the fiscal year 1985-65, a list of all highway construction projects tendered by the Department of Highways and Transportation, including: (a) a full description of the work involved in each project tendered; (b) the names of all bidders and the total amount bid by each bidder on each project; (c) the name of the successful bidder on each project; (d) where applicable, the reasons why the low bidder was not awarded the contract.

Motion agreed to.

#### Return No. 201

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Prebble, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 201 showing:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered: (1) the amounts paid to the firm of Mercury Printers Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case, the nature of the work performed.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 201 showing:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered . . . the amounts paid to the firm of Mercury Printers Limited (for) . . . each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of . . . Government of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case, the nature of the work performed.

And, Mr. Speaker, the reason for moving the motion is that I have heard some dissatisfaction voiced in the business world about the manner in which the printing of this government is allotted. Let me give you an example. Some printing plants are running idle, not having a full work-load. Other printing plants are backed up with government orders and have other government orders coming in.

So I'm concerned that there is a more equitable distribution of the government printing in the province of Saskatchewan, and I think with this question and subsequent ones we should be able to determine that.

And this is seconded by my seat-mate, the member for Saskatoon University.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move a minor amendment that will just clean this up a little bit and still provide the information that the hon. member has asked for to do the comparisons that he has indicated that he wants to do.

This amendment will simply kind of cut down a little bit on the amount of work that's going to have to be done, because the way the motion reads, he wants an itemization of each of the departments of the government with each of the ... in subsequent motions, each of the agency's name. And we're providing all of the information with the exception of that itemization. The amendment would be as follows:

That return no. 201 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "showing" and substituting:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered, the amounts paid to the firm of Mercury Printers Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

I move that, seconded by the Minister of Health.

The effect of that amendment is simply to eliminate the requirement for itemization on each one of those categories.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to unduly burden the government with extra work in providing the answers to these questions. However, I think it's quite clear that these questions have been on the order paper for months and months and months and have not been dealt with up until this time.

And I don't see that the request in the original motion, which said ... which the minister by his amendment is deleting, in each case the nature of the work performed, is a difficult feat to perform, since the people who will be researching the answer for this particular question will have that information readily accessible to them. And I would urge the members to defeat the amendment that's been offered by the minister and pass the motion in its unamended form.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 202

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 202 showing:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered: (1) the amounts paid to the firm of Brigdens Photo/Graphics Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation, and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case, the nature of the

work performed.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, with great trepidation I rise to move that order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 202. I see the Deputy Premier shuffling through his papers. No. 202 is similar to a previous motion which was dealt with by this Assembly, and it provides that information be produced:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date of this return ... when this return was ordered: (1) the amounts paid to the firm of Brigdens Photo/Graphics Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation, and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case, the nature of the work performed.

And I do so move, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, without advancing the argument, because it would be repeating the identical argument of the passed ... immediately passed motion, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 202 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "showing" and substituting:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered, the amounts paid to the firm of Brigdens Photo/Graphics Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation, and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 203

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 203 showing:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered: (1) the amounts paid to the firm of Roberts and Poole Advertising Corporation by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case, the nature of the work performed.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 203 showing, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 203 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "showing" and substituting:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered, the amounts paid to the firm of Roberts and Poole Advertising Corporation by



each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 204

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 204 showing:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered: (1) the amounts paid to the firms of Dome Advertising Limited and Dome Media Buying Services Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case, the nature of the work performed.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 204 showing:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered: (1) the amounts paid to the firms of Dome Advertising Limited and Dome Media Buying Services Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; and (2) in each case, the nature of the work performed.

And I might say, in moving this motion which is seconded by the member from Cumberland, that I would hope that the Deputy Premier will not take the opportunity to amend this by deleting "the nature of the work performed" because I suspect that the work performed by this agency is of a, by and large, a high political order. And as a consequence, we would like to know precisely the nature of the work performed.

And it's with a great deal of pleasure that I move that search for information.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 204 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "showing" and substituting:

For the period March 1, 1984 to the date this return was ordered, the amounts paid to the firms of Dome Advertising Limited and Dome Media Buying Services Limited by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation, and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 205

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 205 showing:

With respect to one Dave Tkachuk, what salary, contract payments, expenses, or fringe benefits did he receive from the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its departments, Crown corporations, boards, agencies, or commissions during the 1985-86 fiscal year, including in each instance: (1) the amount of the payments; (2) the purpose of the payments; (3) his exact duties and responsibilities respecting each payment; (4) where applicable, whether or not the work in question was awarded public tender.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move than an order of the Assembly . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — I suppose you're going to tell me this one is political.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Do you want to make your speech before me?

I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 205 showing:

With respect to one Dave Tkachuk, what salary, contract payments, expenses or fringe benefits did he receive from the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its departments, Crown corporations, boards, agencies, or commissions during the 1985-86 fiscal year, including in each instance: the amount of the payments; (2) the purpose of the payments; (3) his exact duties and responsibilities respecting each payment; (4) where applicable, whether or not the work in question was awarded by public tender.

And I do hope that all members of the Assembly will joint me and the member from Cumberland who seconds this motion, in obtaining this information.

Motion agreed to.

#### Return No. 206

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 206 showing:

With respect to one Dave Tkachuk, what salary, contract payments, expenses, or fringe benefits did he receive from the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its departments, Crown corporations, boards, agencies, or commissions during the period April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, including in each instance: (1) the amount of the payments; (2) the purpose of the payments; (3) his exact duties and responsibilities respecting each payment; (4) where applicable, whether or not the work in question was awarded by public tender.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move than an order of

the Assembly do issue for a return no. 206 showing:

With respect to one Dave Tkachuk, what salary, contract payments, expense, or fringe benefits did he receive from the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its departments, Crown corporations, boards, agencies, or commissions during the period April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, including in each instance: (1) the amount of the payments; (2) the purpose of the payments; (3) his exact duties and responsibilities respecting each payment; (4) where applicable, whether or not the work in question was awarded by public tender.

And I take great pleasure in moving this motion, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

Motion agreed to.

#### Return No. 207

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 207 showing:

With respect to D-Mail Services Inc., what contracts did this company receive from April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, from any departments, Crown corporations, boards, agencies, or commissions of the Government of Saskatchewan, including in each instance: (1) the amount of the original contract; (2) the amount of any contract cost over-runs; (3) the purpose of the contract; (4) the work performed by the company; (5) whether or not the work in question was awarded by public tender.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 207 showing:

With respect to D-Mail Services Inc., what contracts did this company receive from April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, from any department, Crown corporation, board, agency, or commission of the Government of Saskatchewan, including in each instance: (1) the amount of the original contract; (2) the amount of any contract cost over-runs; (3) the purpose of the contract; (4) the work performed by the company; (5) whether or not the work in question was awarded by public tender.

This is return no. 207 showing. And I take great pleasure in moving this to determine whether there is any political favouritism in Saskatchewan, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

Motion agreed to.

(1500)

#### Return No. 208

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 208

showing:

With respect to D-Mail Services Inc., what contracts did this company receive in the 1985-86 fiscal year from any departments, Crown corporations, boards, agencies, or commissions of the Government of Saskatchewan, including in each instance: (1) the amount of the original contract; (2) the amount of any contract cover overruns; (3) the purpose of the contract; (4) the work performed by the company; (5) whether or not the work in question was awarded by public tender.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 208 showing.

And this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, deals with the same incorporated company for the fiscal year 1985-86. And I look forward to the Assembly passing this motion moved by myself, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

Motion agreed to.

#### Return No. 209

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 209 showing:

For the period April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, a list of the executive motor vehicle purchased by the Central Vehicle Agency, including in each instance: (1) the make, model and cost of the vehicle; (2) the name and location of the dealership from which the vehicle was purchased; (3) the name and position of the individual to whom each vehicle was assigned.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 209 showing. And I'm joined by the member from Cumberland for seconding this particular order.

Motion agreed to.

#### Return No. 210

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 210 showing:

For the 1985-86 fiscal year, a list of the executive motor vehicles purchased by the Central Vehicle Agency, including in each instance: (1) the make, model and cost of the vehicle; (2) the name and location of the dealership from which the vehicle was purchased; (3) the name and position of the individual to whom each vehicle was assigned.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move than an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 210 showing. I'm joined by the member from Cumberland in seconding this order of the Assembly.

Motion agreed to.

### Return No. 211

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 211 showing:

With respect to executive motor vehicles for the use or benefit of the Premier: (1) the number of vehicles assigned to the Premier personally or to the Premier's office; (2) when these vehicles were purchased, the cost, and when they are due to be replaced; (3) the current guide-lines respecting the make, model and cost of executive motor vehicles which the Premier may select for his use, and when these guide-lines were last revised; (4) the specific revisions made to the guide-lines at that time.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 211 showing, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

Motion agreed to.

### Return No. 212

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 212 showing:

For the period April 18, 1985 to the date this return was ordered: (1) the departments, Crown corporations, boards or agencies of the Government of Saskatchewan by which Terry Leier was employed; (2) in each instance of employment, the exact duties and responsibilities; (3) in each instance of employment, the total remuneration, separated according to: basic pay, expenses, fringe benefits and perquisites; (4) in each instance of employment, the dates on which employment commenced and concluded.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 212 showing:

For the period April 18, 1985 to the date this return was ordered: (1) the departments, Crown corporations, boards or agencies of the Government of Saskatchewan by which Terry Leier was employed; (2) in each instance of employment, the exact duties and responsibilities; (3) in each instance of employment, the total remuneration, separated according to: basic pay, expenses, fringe benefits and perquisites; and (4) in each instance of employment, the date on which employment commenced and concluded.

And it's seconded by the member for Cumberland.

Motion agreed to.

### Return No. 213

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 213 showing:

For the 1985-86 fiscal year, a detailed list of the flights taken by the Government of Saskatchewan's executive aircraft, including in each instance: (1) the purpose of the flight and the minister who authorized it; (2) a list of all passengers; (3) all destination points on the flight; (4) the date of the flight; (5) to which government department, Crown corporation or agency the cost of the flight was charged, and the amount of that charge.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I do move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 213 showing:

For the 1985-86 fiscal year, a detailed list of the flights taken by Government of Saskatchewan's aircraft, including in each instance: the purpose of the flight and the minister who authorized it; (2) a list of all passengers; (3) all destination points on the flight; (4) the date of the flight; (5) to which government department, Crown corporation or agency the cost of the flight was charged, and the amount of that charge.

This particular order for return is seconded by the member from Cumberland.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, just to bring this request into line and to be consistent with the form in which these questions have been answered previously and in keeping with the tradition of this House, I'm going to move an amendment that will have the effect of deleting the requirement for the list of the passengers and substituting the number of passengers on each flight. Aside from that, all of the information asked for will be provided.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 213 be amended by deleting the words "a list of all passengers" and substituting:

the number of passengers on the flight.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sensitivity of the Deputy Premier on this particular inquiry about the executive aircraft and the use thereof. His sensitivity comes about honestly. He not only has been through the James Garner episode, but he's been through the more recent episode of the minister who comes from Kindersley. And I can understand why the Deputy Premier wants to shield people who may be using the executive aircraft.

Now the assumption was made some time ago that the people that use the executive aircraft have a legitimate use and have nothing to hide. Mr. Speaker, the minister is prepared to tell us the number of people that used the aircraft, but who it is that used it will remain a mystery. And I'm sure this adds to the flavour of this government, which it has been established over the recent past, that it's a

government of secrecy. It's a government that wants more security. It's a government that wants to buffer itself from inquiries from the public.

And this amendment that the Deputy Premier offers, illustrates that point in spades. I think the motion, as it was originally put forward, is quite in order. It's quite in order that the people that ride on the executive aircraft should not be offended should their names be public.

And I realize the sensitivity, as I said, of the Deputy Premier on this matter. However, the public need overrides the sensitivities of this government and the Deputy Premier.

We don't know, we don't know, Mr. Speaker, who will be next over there to be using the government executive aircraft. All we want to do is to protect the resources of the people of Saskatchewan, to make sure that the executive aircraft is not used to fly off to weddings in Calgary, or to fly other people around the province of Saskatchewan at great taxpayers' expense to the people of Saskatchewan.

This government says we're in difficult economic times, that it's critical, and is certainly critical when the Minister of Finance can't get within \$700 million of what the deficit of this budget will be. There are serious financial problems around the province of Saskatchewan, created by this government.

And this government intends to hide — hide more information from the public; to retreat back into fortress Saskatchewan, as they're establishing; to retreat back into the cabinet room, rather than out here in the Assembly; to not provide to the people of Saskatchewan the kind of information the people of Saskatchewan deserve.

And therefore I'm opposed to this amendment, and I would ask all members to vote against the amendment and pass the motion in its original form.

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

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 214

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 214 showing:

For the period April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of the flights taken by the Government of Saskatchewan's executive aircraft, including in each instance: (1) the purpose of the flight and the minister who authorized it; (2) a list of all passengers; (3) all destination points on the flight; (4) the date of the flight; (5) to which government department, Crown corporation, or agency the cost of the flight was charged, and the amount of that charge.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that another attempt here to get further information from the

Government of Saskatchewan with regard to use of the executive aircraft, and I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 214 showing:

For the period April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of the flights taken by the Government of Saskatchewan's executive aircraft, including in each instance: (1) the purpose of the flight and the minister who authorized it; (2) a list of all passengers; (3) all destination points on the flight; (4) the date of the flight; (5) to which government department, Crown corporation, or agency the cost of the flight was charged, and the amount of that charge.

And in moving this, Mr. Speaker, it would confirm, without a doubt, who the passengers were on the aircraft that the member from Kindersley took from Regina to Calgary to attend a wedding, and whatever else he did while he was in Calgary. It would confirm who was on the aircraft. And that will be confirmed by the second part of the order of the Assembly which lists all the passengers that rode on the aircraft. And that in turn will serve to protect the people of Saskatchewan from incidents of this kind in the future.

And I do so move, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 214 be amended by deleting the words "a list of all passengers" and substituting:

the number of passengers on the flight.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, what the Deputy Premier has done has reinforced the very statement I made on a previous motion about secret government. This government doesn't want to tell us who is riding on the executive aircraft at the people's expense.

The minister, in moving this amendment which deletes a list of all passengers from the period April 1, '86 to date, has effectively prevented the people of Saskatchewan from knowing who rode with the member from Kindersley to the wedding at Calgary; who were the passengers that accompanied him on the trip.

And he's effectively prevented the people of Saskatchewan from finding out that information to which they are entitled. And therefore I am opposed to the amendment and in favour of the original motion.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 215

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 215 showing:

For the 1985-86 fiscal year, a detailed list of the

aircraft chartered by each department, Crown corporation, or agency of the Government of Saskatchewan, including in each instance: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided the charter; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the government department, Crown corporation, or agency to which that cost was charged; (4) a list of all passengers; (5) all destination points on the flight; (6) the date of the flight.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 215 showing, and this order reads as follows:

For the year 1985-86 fiscal year, a detailed list of the aircraft chartered by each department, Crown corporation, or agency of the Government of Saskatchewan, including in each instance: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided the charter; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the government department, Crown corporation or agency to which the cost was charged; (4) a list of all passengers; (5) all destination points on the flight; (6) the date of the flight.

(1515)

The variation between this motion and the previous motion, which the Deputy Premier amended to delete the names of passengers, was that this particular motion deals with chartered aircraft as opposed to the executive aircraft. And I would expect that the Deputy Premier would have no objection to giving us the names of the passengers who fly on chartered aircraft.

And I would therefore move the motion, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That Return No. 215 be amended by deleting the words, “a list of all passengers” and substituting:

the number of passengers on the flight.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not intimidated. However, I realize that the government has an absolute majority and they shall have their way in amending any orders of the Assembly that are issued here, or any motions. And I realize unless something unusual happens in the next few moments, the people of Saskatchewan will not be able to find out who the passengers are that ride on chartered aircraft which is paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

They will know the number of people. And I don't know if government cabinet ministers are riding on there with split personalities, whether they'll count two rather than one, or not. But that's something we can sort out later.

And it's unfortunate that the Deputy Premier has chosen

to shield the public from this information which is theirs by right, because they pay the money that pays for the chartered aircraft, and they're entitled to know who rides on that chartered aircraft.

And therefore I would oppose the amendment and ask the members to vote for the motion in its original form.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 216

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Hagel, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 216 showing:

For the period April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, a detailed list of the aircraft chartered by each department, Crown corporation or agency of the Government of Saskatchewan, including in each instance: (1) the purpose of the charter and the minister who authorized it; (2) the name of the individual or company who provided the charter; (3) the total cost of the charter and the name of the government department, Crown corporation or agency to which that cost was charged; (4) a list of all passengers; (5) all destination points on the flight; (6) the date of the flight.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — It's with extreme regret this is the last motion I'll be able to put forward for seeking information, Mr. Speaker, but I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 216 showing.

And this deals with the use of chartered aircraft by the Government of Saskatchewan from the period April 1, 1986 to the present, and requests the usual information which I have requested on previous motions, some of which has been denied by the Deputy Premier, such as a list of all passengers that were flying on these chartered aircrafts. And it's with a great deal of pleasure that I move this motion, seconded by the member from Moose Jaw North.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 216 be amended by deleting the words “a list of all passengers” and substituting:

the number of passengers on the flight.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 352

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Last private members day we had a fairly, I think, good arrangement worked out in dealing with particular categories of returns all in one lump, as it were. And we're into a category here where up to, I think from 352 to 394 inclusive, are of the same except they

call for information from different departments, agencies, and so on.

What we propose to do is drop all of them up to 393 inclusive, and amend no. 394 to give all of the information that is being asked for in the previous numbers so that we can do it all in one return.

The amendment that I would propose on no. 394, assuming that the previous numbers would be dropped, is:

That no. 394 be amended by deleting the words “the Sask Expo ’86 Corporation” and substituting therefor the words:

all government departments and Crown corporations

And by deleting all the words after the word “instance” and substituting:

the date on which the contract was entered; (2) the amount of the individual’s salary; (3) a brief description of the service to be provided under the contract.

Copies of the contracts have not in the past been disclosed, and these are confidential at the option of the individual. And they are also arguments relative to . . . and I don’t claim authorship for the argument; this is credited to the member for Riversdale. These are internal departmental documents subject to non-disclosure in accordance with past practices of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I’m suggesting is that we drop up to 393 inclusive and move that amendment on 394.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What the Deputy Premier states about the agreement we had the previous day is correct. So just to go over it briefly so the mover of the motion understands, it was agreed previously that the mover of the motions for returns would agree to drop all of the motions as indicated by the Deputy Premier, except for the final motion which she would move, or he would move, and then the amendment would be moved to that final motion.

So I ask now the member for Saskatoon Centre if she is agreeable to that with her motions, which would mean that all motions up to 393 would be dropped and she would move no. 394.

**Ms. Smart:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will agree to the amendment if it reads:

By each government department and Crown corporation.

**An Hon. Member:** — No.

**Ms. Smart:** — No? Dropping the motions, but not . . . okay, then I’m not approving any of those amendments. Okay, now I agree to dropping them.

**Ms. Smart** moved, seconded by Mr. Van Mulligen, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 394 showing:

For the 1985-86 fiscal year, the name of each person whose services were retained under a personal services contract by the SaskExpo ’86 Corporation, which entitled the individual to be paid an amount of \$5,000 per month or more, including in each instance: (1) the date on which the contract was entered into and, where applicable, the date on which it was terminated; (2) the experience and qualifications of the individual retained under contract; (3) the terms and conditions of employment, including salary, fringe benefits and perquisites; (4) the duties and responsibilities of the individual retained under contract; (5) signed copies of the contract documents.

**Ms. Smart:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to move an order of the Assembly issuing return no. 394 but before I do, I want to speak briefly to it. And I want to make sure that people understand that this return, and the 42 returns that have preceded it, is asking for information regarding the personal services contracts that have been paid out by the various government departments and Crown corporations to individual people.

We want to know specifically about all the contracts for services which entitle people to be paid an amount of \$5,000 per month or more, including their salary, their fringe benefits, and their perquisites. And for people who don’t know the meaning of the word “perquisites”, it means profits or payments received in addition to a regular wage or salary, especially a benefit expected as one’s due.

That’s a lot of money — \$5,000 minimum per month — from the taxpayers’ point of view, for people to be receiving. And it’s particularly, I know, important from the point of view of many of the constituents in Saskatoon Centre, which I represent here in the House, who have a very great concern about the amount of money that’s being spent for people’s personal services on salaries that are very high compared to what people in my constituency have.

The money that’s being spent by these personal service contracts is money that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. It’s taxpayers’ money. They deserve to know how the money’s been spent and who it’s been spent on.

And it seems particularly ironic to me that this government opposite, which has been tooting and hooting its horns about entering the information age and the knowledge-based industries, has just completed a number of amendments on these motions for return which cut out the opportunity for people to get the kind of information that they need in order to know just what the government is going with its money in many different ways.

And I think if they’re going to talk about the information

#### Return No. 394

age, they're going to have to justify to their constituents why they're denying them this information, why they're not letting them how their money's being spent.

A minimum of \$5,000 per month is a \$60,000 a year salary – as I say, a hefty amount of money, especially from the perspective of the people I represent, many of whom are receiving only \$123 a month for their food, their clothing, and their personal services and personal needs.

We want to know who got the contracts, what their qualifications and experiences are for the jobs they got, given the record that this government has for blatant patronage appointments. We are concerned that people may be getting contracts who don't have the qualifications for the job – just because of who they know and what membership they have in the PC Party. We want to know what kind of work was done and what sort of projects were funded.

As critics of a government which consistently funds its friends and gives money to those who are already wealthy, we need to know how many of these projects were legitimate and how many of them were make-work projects for those already well heeled.

I can't help but wonder if maybe the money would have been better spent providing a decent wage for those who are doing the hard physical labour of cleaning up the Meewasin Valley, for example, and other essential tasks that are being done by people who are working on minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that this province is becoming more and more divided between those who make large amounts of money, including on government contracts such as the ones we want the information for, and those who are being forced to live on minimum wage or lower. And I say this is not acceptable, and it's not acceptable not to get the information that we require so that people can know how the government's money's being spent.

Therefore I'm moving, seconded by the member from Regina Victoria, that an order of the Assembly do issue a return no. 394 showing:

For the 1985-86 fiscal year, the name of each person whose services were retained under a personal services contract by each government department and Crown corporation, which entitled the individual to be paid an amount of \$5,000 per month or more, including in each instance: the date on which the contract was entered into and, where applicable, the date on which it was terminated; the experience and qualifications of the individual retained under contract; the terms and conditions of employment, including salary, fringe benefits, and perquisites; the duties and responsibilities of the individual retained under that contract; and (5) the signed copies of the contract documents.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 394 be amended by deleting the words "the SaskExpo '86 Corporation" and substituting therefor the words "all government departments and Crown corporations" and by deleting all the words after "instance" and substituting:

(1) the date on which the contract was entered; (2) the amount of the individual's salary; (3) a brief description of the service to be provided under the contract.

(1530)

I move, seconded by the Minister of Health.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first of all want to indicate that we have agreed to an omnibus or an all-encompassing motion to replace the large number of motions that are before us because we wish to expedite the workings of the House.

I am somewhat concerned about the amendment which the minister, the hon. House Leader on the government side, has proposed in that in those amendments a very substantial amount of information is being withheld – information that I really do not understand why it needs to be withheld. There are no conceivable reasons for the purpose of confidentiality, or name it whatever you will, why some of that information can't be provided.

I think – and I will give the minister the benefit of the doubt – I think that he inadvertently missed out in his first part of the amendment, when he said: 'services contracted by the departments of government . . . all departments of government and Crown corporations, the word "agencies, because essentially without that being including there are a number of agencies who would then not have to be required.

I'm sure the member will when I'm . . . let me finish and then you can . . . sir. I'm sure the minister will concede that and make that change. I'm sure it's just a simple oversight, so I bring that to your attention, Mr. Speaker.

And secondly, the amendment which talks about the date on which the contract was entered into . . . and then the minister deletes "where applicable the date on which it was terminated." I don't know why that should be not included in this because it is of some importance to know that if a contract was given on day one and terminated on day 15, and that the payment was \$100,000 – and I may be exaggerating a bit – that there is something peculiar about that arrangement. So I would hope that the minister will reconsider and continue to include in his amendment "where applicable the date on which the contract was terminated" so we know in fact if it has now been ended or if it still exists.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, when the minister proposes that his amendment only include the salary, he then does not provide to the House other payments that the individual or individuals involved may have received. They may very well have received \$60,000 in salary, but without the fringe benefits and perquisites being provided to us,

we might not know if that individual may have been paid another \$100,000 for something else, not called salaries. And so I would hope that the minister would consider changing the word "salary" to at least "total remuneration" because then that would provide the full payment that was made under these contracts.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I would have to have leave to get back into this, or I'd be out of order, but I recognize that agencies should be included, and it was an oversight. It should read: departments, agencies and Crown corporations. And with leave of the Assembly I would add to the amendment: where applicable: the date of termination of the contract. And if the motion can be returned to me I'll add that.

Leave granted.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 395

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, once again we have another group that is virtually identical to the previous group, except that it's asking for a different time period. This is to the date of the return being ordered. And this group takes us from 395, up to and including 439. So to follow the pattern that's already been established, I would suggest that we agree to drop up to 438 inclusive, and then I would offer the identical amendment that was offered to the last ones. So it would require the member for Prince Albert and the member for Regina Victoria's consent to do that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, I would consent to that.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — I consent as well.

### Return No. 439

**Mr. Van Mulligen** moved, seconded by Ms. Smart, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 439 showing:

For the period from April 1, 1986 to the date this return was ordered, the name of each person whose services were retained under a personal service contract by the Saskatchewan Expo '86 Corporation which entitled the individual to be paid an amount of \$5,000 per month or more, including in each instance: (1) the date on which the contract was entered into and, where applicable, the date on which it was terminated; (2) the experience and qualifications of the individual retained under contract; (3) the terms and conditions of employment, including salary, fringe benefits and perquisites; (4) the duties and responsibilities of the individual retained under contract; (5) signed copies of the contract documents.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — I will be moving an order of the Assembly to issue a return. But before I do that I just want

to say that with respect to this order, it's recognized that the government has a well-qualified civil service to administer the work of the government. It's also recognized that from time to time a government may deem it feasible and advisable to engage certain individuals to do specific work for the government which the civil service may not be qualified to do because it does not have the qualified people to do specific types of work; or it may not be in a position to undertake the work because of commitments in which they are engaged.

Having said that, certain questions arise for the public and for members of the House, and that is the reason for asking the questions that we do — questions such as: are there too many people performing certain functions that are being engaged by the government on this type of contractual basis? If that is the case should we as a government, as an Assembly, be encouraging the development of that type of expertise within the civil service, recognizing that if we're to pay for that kind of work to be done, then it makes sense to have that kind of expertise in-house?

Other questions also arise. It's recognized that in the government engaging individuals in this matter on a contractual basis, the potential for abuse of the system exists in so far as the government may be tempted, from time to time, to engage people to do work for which perhaps they are not qualified; but the reason for engaging those people to do that work, or perhaps not to do any work, is simply to reward them for political favours which those people have shown the government.

And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that potential for abuse does exist; that as members of the Assembly, and I think the public, want to make sure that that kind of abuse, that potential, is simply not there. And that is the reason for asking these questions: one, is the civil service being bypassed, and should perhaps the civil service be more involved in doing the kind of work that the government is now having done on a contractual basis? Secondly, we want to make sure that any potential abuse is curbed so that we can have a better, more effective government in Saskatchewan.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by my colleague from Saskatoon Centre, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 439 showing.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 439 be amended by deleting the words "the Sask Expo '86 Corporation" and by substituting therefor:

all government departments, agencies, and Crown corporations.

And by deleting all words after the word, "instance" and substituting:

(1) the date on which the contract was entered; (2) the amount of the individual's salary; (3) a brief description of the service to be provided under the contract; and (4) where applicable, the date of



termination.

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — On a point of order. It seems to me that what we really have are two amendments, one which is a friendly amendment, that is, replace all the various departments, agencies and Crowns and to provide for an omnibus motion. And I think that's something that can be agreed to and was agreed to.

But the second part of the amendment seeks to restrict the amount of information which will be forthcoming from the government, information which I have indicated that the public needs and that the members of the House need so as to ensure that the government is doing its work properly and that there is no potential for abuse. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that what we have, in effect, are two amendments.

And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if it's possible, for us to vote on the separate parts; that is the first part to delete "Sask Expo '86 Corporation" with the words "all government departments, agencies, and Crown corporations", to make that as one amendment. And then to discuss the . . . or to vote on the other part of the amendment as a separate entity, Mr. Speaker. And I'm wondering if that's possible.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Okay. According to the rules, that is in fact possible. So the first amendment will end with the word, "Crown corporations" — that's two words — "Crown corporations".

(1545)

According to *Beauchesne's* rule 415, a motion which contains . . . I will just read the ruling; that will be the simplest. Citation 415(1):

A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the House may be taken on each separately. The Speaker has a discretionary power to decide whether he should divide a motion.

And I believe that we will divide this one.

So the first question ends with Crown corporations and then the second amendment will begin right after that. So the question before the Assembly then is — the amendment, the following amendment:

That return 439 be amended by deleting the words "the Sask Expo '86 Corporation" and by substituting therefor the words:

all government departments, agencies and Crown corporations.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Okay, the second amendment then will read as follows:

By deleting all the words after the word, "instance" and substituting:

(1) the date on which the contract was entered; (2) the amount of the individual's salary; (3) a brief description of the service to be provided under the contract; and (4) where applicable, the date of termination.

Is the Assembly ready for the question on that amendment?

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into the details of the amendment *per se* but I do want to convey my sense of concern, and I'm sure that of the public, that what the government is attempting to do with this amendment is to restrict the amount of information which will be made available to the public, through this Assembly, about individuals who are hired by the government on a contractual basis, outside of the civil service, to do certain kinds of work.

We had asked about the experience and qualifications of these individuals, the terms and conditions of their employment, the duties and responsibilities of those individuals. The government proposes to provide what is called a "brief description."

We can get into a semantical argument by what's meant by a "a brief description", but I have no great faith in this government showing their predilection in the past year to obfuscate, to hide information from the public that they will be anything but brief, and very brief at that. So therefore I would express my very real concerns and those of my colleagues that the government, again, is attempting to hide information from the public view.

The government may take the position that somehow they are helping their own cause by hiding information, and therefore by somehow limiting the amount of accountability that they have. By I would suggest to them that every attempt that they made to somehow limit, in their view, accountability, does nothing to enhance their credibility.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would assure you that this side of the House will not support that amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

**Ms. Smart:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amended motion is similar to the one that was done under my name, and I just want to make very brief comments about my dissatisfaction in the amendment. And I feel it's a very bad motion now because we can't find out exactly the total remuneration paid to individual people from the government for contract work; nor can we find out the experience and qualifications of the individuals retained under this contract. That is vital information in determining how valuable this work is, and the people who've been doing it.

And therefore the motion has lost a lot of its power, a lot of its ability to provide the information to the people of Saskatchewan — information that they need in judging the difference between \$5,000 a month salaries to people, plus, plus, plus, versus the kind of assistance and amount of money that other people have to live on. So I really am opposed to this.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 440

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — We have here another category, if you like, dealing with two time periods: one the previous fiscal year, and the second deals with to the date the order was returned — or the return was ordered, I should say. And so in keeping with the practice of the day, as it were, if we were to drop no. 440 to 524 inclusive and amend 525, it would give you the information that is required. The return no. 525 would be amended as follows:

That the names, titles, and remuneration of all non-clerical staff employed in, or assigned to, ministers of the Government of Saskatchewan for the period April 1, 1985 (which goes back to the beginning date of the previous fiscal year) up to the date that this return is ordered.

And that covers the full time period, and all ministers' offices, and all those assigned to ministers.

So what I'm suggesting is that we drop 440 to 524 inclusive and amend 525 to effectively cover all of those previous.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake agrees? Then they're dropped.

#### Return No. 525

**Mr. Lautermilch** moved, seconded by Mr. Goulet, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 525 showing:

The names, titles, duties, salaries, fringe benefits and perquisites of all non-clerical staff employed in, or assigned to the office of the minister responsible for the Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan during the fiscal year 1985-86.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 525 showing:

The names, titles, duties, salaries, fringe benefits and perquisites of all non-clerical staff employed in, or assigned to the minister responsible for the Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan during the fiscal year 1985-86.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 525 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "showing" and substituting:

The names, titles, and remuneration of all non-clerical staff employed in or assigned to the minister's offices of the Government of Saskatchewan for the period of April 1, 1985 to the date this return is ordered.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, once again the amendment is not what we would call a friendly

amendment, because the amendment, the way it has been placed, omits some information that would be very valuable for the people of Saskatchewan to know; specifically, the duties that the people . . . or the information that is required, and also the perks, any fringe benefits that the people hired under this condition may be. So we would oppose the amendment under that basis.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Address No. 1

**Mr. Romanow** moved, seconded by Mr. Brockelbank, that an humble Address no. 1 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before this Assembly:

All correspondence during the period January 1, 1984 and December 15, 1986 between the Minister of Health and the federal Minister of Health and Welfare, dealing with proposed changes to Canadian patent legislation and their impact on the price of prescription drugs.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Westmount, that an humble Address no. 1 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before the Assembly:

All correspondence during the period January 1, 1984 and December 15, 1986 between the Minister of Health and the federal Minister of Health and Welfare, dealing with proposed changes to Canadian patent legislation and their impact on the price of prescription drugs.

And before I take my place, if I could find a member, on the other side preferably, but even on this side, to make a small amendment so that the correspondence be from the period January 1, 1984 to the date of the humble Address, up to date to the passage of this order, then it would be more current.

This has been on the order paper for quite some time and thus the need for an amendment, if I can persuade any of my colleagues to so prepare. Thank you.

**Mr. Mitchell:** — I would like to follow up on the invitation of the member from . . . my colleague, the member from Riversdale, by moving an amendment to item 194:

Deleting the words in the first line "December 15, 1986," and substituting therefor the words:

and the present date

so that it will read: all correspondence during the period January 1, 1984 and the present date.

Seconded by my colleague from Saskatoon South.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I have no strong feeling one way or another on the amendment. I do however have a strong feeling as it relates to the motion for any time period, whether it's in the amended form or in the original form. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is not proper to be tabling correspondence in this House as has been suggested.

And once again, maybe it's because from time to time I'm a little lacking in original thought, and so I go back to the history and tradition of this House and look for arguments that have already been presented. And I found one, Mr. Speaker, and it came once again from my very good friend, the hon. member for Riversdale, when he said, Mr. Speaker, that it is simply wrong, simply a wrong principle to do this, to tabling. We never have done this before. These are internal documents which are used by the government and the department in the formulation of policy, etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, the amendment, I think, is not the issue here at all. Whatever time period we're talking about isn't important; it's the principle of tabling this kind of correspondence. And it will be essentially the same argument for item no. 195 and item no. 196, Mr. Speaker.

So while I have no strong feeling, as I say, on the amendment, I will be urging all members to vote against the main motion, or the motion as amended, whatever it may be.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to listen to the Deputy Premier's comments on this particular issue. He takes a very high and principled stand, but really what is the issue here, Mr. Speaker?

The issue is patent legislation and a correspondence which may have flowed between this government and the Government of Canada. This government has been telling us that this is good for Saskatchewan. It's good for Saskatchewan people that if this legislation is passed, there will be all kinds of money flowing around Canada for research, the price of prescription drugs will drop, and other benefits will flow to the people of Saskatchewan.

(1600)

Now the Premier and the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Health and others in this Assembly, other members of the Executive Council, have been saying far and wide in Saskatchewan and elsewhere that this is good legislation; we should support it — when in fact this is a sell-out to the big drug companies who have exclusive rights on patents.

We want to find out what the exact argument of this government is with regard to patent legislation. We want to be able to determine if this is in the best interests of Canadian people.

We have learned through bitter experience in this Chamber that you can't trust what this government says. And I suggest to you, taking an issue very similar to this, the question of free trade, there was no greater exponent of that than the Premier of Saskatchewan. And he's gradually backing off. Yesterday in New York, it was

50-50; today the headline in the *Leader-Post* says, "... doubts (if) free trade legislation will ever fly."

We want to know what's good for the people of Saskatchewan and why this government is taking this stand on prescription patents. We want to see the information. If we do not get it, Mr. Speaker, we have been again denied information which is rightfully the property of the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan keep this government in office; they pay the bills. They should have the right to decide whether the legislation, whether the money that this government is spending to defend the federal government's patent legislation is well-spent money.

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the amendments are not the kind of amendments that should be passed by this particular Chamber. We should have the information that this government has within its hands that shows the exchange of information between this Executive Council and the federal government.

Amendment negatived.

Motion negatived.

## Address No. 2

**Mr. Romanow** moved, seconded by Mr. Brockelbank, that an humble Address no. 2 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before this Assembly:

All correspondence during the period January 1, 1984 and December 15, 1986 between the Minister of Health and the federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, dealing with proposed changes to Canadian patent legislation and their impact on the price of prescription drugs.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Westmount, that an humble Address no. 2 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before the Assembly:

All correspondence during the period January 1, 1984 and December 15, 1986 between the Minister of Health and the federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, dealing with proposed changes to Canadian patent legislation and their impact on the price of prescription drugs.

Motion negatived.

## Address No. 3

**Mr. Romanow** moved, seconded by Mr. Brockelbank, that an humble Address no. 3 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before this Assembly:

All correspondence during the period January 1, 1984 and December 15, 1986 between the Premier and the Prime Minister, dealing with proposed changes to Canadian patent legislation

and their impact on the price of prescription drugs.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move in a moment, at the conclusion of just a few brief remarks, that an humble Address no. 3 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before the Assembly:

All correspondence during the period January 1, 1984 and December 15, 1986 between the Premier and the Prime Minister dealing with proposed changes to Canadian patent legislation and their impact on the price of prescription drugs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I take my place for the members to debate the motion or to dispose of it as they will, I wish to make a couple of very quick points.

First of all, the Deputy Premier's precedent of a government not tabling documents requested is a precedent based on, as I heard him read it, internal communications between departments to other departments within the provincial government, or if you will, flowing up from the officials to the ministers. Those, I candidly admit, are of a privileged nature. I think that a government must have the opportunity and the freedom to be able to get the best advice from its advisers that is possible. And that means the good and the bad of policy considerations. And those ought not to be made — as a general rule; there may be exceptions — to be made public.

That's not what is being asked for here however, Mr. Speaker. What's being asked for here is communication by the Government of Saskatchewan, presumably reflecting a policy decision had and taken with the Government of Canada, an external agency, presumably also on a decision had and taken. That is to say, it's a question of a decision already being debated; having been debated internally; the memoranda having been considered internally; and the Government of Saskatchewan adopting a position either for or against the matter which is being debated. In this particular case the issue is whether or not the Government of Saskatchewan adopts a position for Mr. Mulroney's drug patent legislation or whether it adopts a position in opposition to it.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the genus of these motions is very simple, that back in December when this session first began formally, a number of questions were asked by various members of the Legislative Assembly, especially on this side of the House, asking what the government of the day in Saskatchewan's position was on the prescription patent plan, the drug patent plan of Mr. Mulroney's.

We were told a certain series of answers to those questions. But when we asked them to back that up with the documentation, that was not forthcoming. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm sad to say that this motion is important to lay before the Legislative Assembly because the government, with the greatest of respect, has fallen into, I think, a very tardy habit of simply blandly giving us an assurance that a representation has been made — presumably a verbal representation, maybe on occasion a written

representation — but never backing that up with the kind of proof that I think an Assembly is justifiably correct in seeking. And if you will, never backing it up with the kind of evidence that those of us who are concerned about the federal drug patent legislation, the kind of evidence that we'd like to have to know that our government is in our corner to make sure that drug costs don't balloon up even higher.

And this is an important matter in Saskatchewan as we know, because we have now fundamental changes to the drug prescription plan of Saskatchewan which has resulted in very fat increases to everybody paying for drugs. It would be a double injustice and a double hardship, Mr. Speaker, if as a result of the federal drug patent legislation, there were yet even additional substantive increases for drugs and payments of drugs to patients, and to those who require prescriptions.

We argue on this side that that's exactly what the result of that federal legislation is going to do. And we argue that the federal government's action is wrong. And we argue that the provincial government's seeming silence, in this case refusal, outright refusal, to back up those concerned Saskatchewan people about our health care and medicare system, by refusing to table these documents, is yet further evidence that the administration in Saskatchewan is singing the Hallelujah Chorus behind the administration in Ottawa as they systematically attack what I think has been heretofore a very progressive, comprehensive, prescription program in Saskatchewan, and if you will, a very comprehensive and very excellent program for the manufacturing and the invention and the dispensation of drugs under the drug patent legislation.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, before I take my place, I'd be the happiest member in this House or at least as happy as anybody else in this House, if the Deputy Premier would get up and say that I'm wrong. Or the Minister of Health — here is the correspondence showing our opposition; we weren't successful in persuading Mr. Mulroney to our point of view. If that takes place we understand you can't win every argument with the federal government. I'd be the happiest person if that took place.

But the purpose of this address is, let there be no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this address is to say that we have a major initiative federally before us; the government will have now fought out its position. It now communicates its position in the public domain to the federal government and the people of Saskatchewan.

I say to the Deputy Premier, tell us that you're behind the ordinary people of Saskatchewan and Canada and that you're opposed to this drug patent legislation. It will be some small relief to the horrendous changes with the terrible consequences that you've wrought as a result of your own fundamental program changes to the prescription plan. So, Mr. Speaker, I see absolutely no reason whatsoever to deny this request for those reasons.

(1611)

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 20

Blakeney	Prebble
Brockelbank	Romanow
Tchorzewski	Rolfes
Mitchell	Solomon
Kowalsky	Atkinson
Anguish	Goulet
Hagel	Lyons
Lautermilch	Trew
Smart	Van Mulligen
Koenker	Goodale

#### Nays — 26

Muller	Duncan
McLeod	Andrew
Berntson	Lane
Taylor	Maxwell
Schmidt	Hodgins
Gerich	Klein
Meiklejohn	Martin
Toth	Sauder
Johnson	McLaren
Hopfner	Swenson
Martens	Baker
Gleim	Neudorf
Kopelchuk	Britton

#### Return No. 526

**Mr. Brockelbank** moved, seconded by Mr. Prebble, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 526 showing:

Regarding rooms 131 through 141 in the Legislative Building of Saskatchewan, a list of all renovations, furnishings, and fittings contracted for or purchased between April 1, 1986 and the date this return was ordered, in each instance detailing: (1) the work or purchase undertaken, including the reason why each expenditure was required; (2) the cost of each renovation or purchase; (3) the date each renovation project began and ended, and the date each purchase was made; (4) the name of the government department which paid for each renovation or purchase; (5) whether or not the renovation or purchase in question was tendered, and if not, the reasons why not; and in all cases where the renovations and or purchases were tendered, whether or not the lowest tender was awarded the work or contract, and if not, why not; (6) the name of the company or individuals who undertook the renovation work or from whom the furniture or fixtures were purchased.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move this order, I may reconsider my entry into the leadership race.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — You'll notice it got a lot of applause.

Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do

issue for return no. 526 showing, and this is seconded by my seat-mate, the member for Saskatoon University. And I'm sure the amount of applause that I received was due solely to the fact that this is the last one on the order paper.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move an amendment that will just clean up the motion for return up a little bit. The kind of detail that the hon. member is asking for is to ask for every nail and pail of paint and two-by-four, etc. Now we're going to clean it up, to make it easier to provide for the information that he's asking for, and I therefore move, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That return no. 526 be amended by deleting all the words after "showing" and substituting therefor:

Regarding rooms 131 and 131A through 141 in the Legislative Building of Saskatchewan, the purpose of the renovations; (2) the nature and extent of the renovations which took place between October 20, 1986 and the date that this return was ordered (and I don't know what's magic about October 20); (3) the cost of the renovations; and (4) who paid for these renovations; and if any of the renovations were tendered, were they awarded to the lowest bidder?

I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move the adjournment of this particular item so that I can have an opportunity to look at the amendment which the Deputy Premier has offered.

So I therefore move the amendment to this particular item . . . or adjournment.

Debate adjourned.

**Mr. Hopfner:** — With leave of the Assembly, I'd like to welcome some guests.

Leave granted.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Hopfner:** — Mr. Speaker, you'll notice in your gallery, the Speaker's gallery, there's a tour group here from the United States, and I would wish that this Assembly would take note. They're from Iowa and, I believe, from Minnesota, and I would ask all members to give a good, hearty Saskatchewan welcome.

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

#### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

#### Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Science and Technology Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 15

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I, just before the minister . . . I realize this is slightly out of order. I notice our American visitors have some perplexed looks

on their faces, and they're wondering what we're doing right now. And just by way of brief explanation, we're entering into the study of estimates on a particular department of government. And each member in the Assembly has the opportunity to question the minister and his officials that are before the Assembly now, and ask them any detailed questions they wish about the estimates of that particular department. So this may guide you in understanding what's going on today.

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to introduce to you, and to the members opposite, the officials from my department that are here today. Beside me I have Richard Letilley who is the acting deputy minister; and directly behind me, Roman Visvanathan from administrative services; and Mr. Bob Mills who is with industrial development; and Leanne Gerrard from the communications division.

#### Item 1

**Mr. Koenker:** — I want to begin this afternoon by saying a few words about the priority that I and my colleagues on this side of the House place on science and technology — not just that it's the key to the future, which it certainly is, but the sense in which it's already determining present developments here in Saskatchewan society and across the world.

I think, for example, of the information age that we live in, the micro-electronics developments. I think, for example, of technological change and how that affects working people in the work place, of industrial and economic strength that is so important across the world and so dependent on science and high technology, and also of the important social and ethical issues that flow from technological development — biotech, medical technology, the application of agricultural technology here in this province to strengthen rural life.

All of these are examples of why we as New Democrats believe that no one in society today can afford to isolate themselves from discussions of public policy which involve science and technology. We're learning that these questions affect all of life. And so we welcome on this side of the House the opportunity to review the department's work this afternoon.

We're also aware that along with some of the promise that science and technology holds for the world community, there are also some problems — problems which concern the very future of the world as we learned from the Chernobyl accident last year where we saw technology go astray. We saw last year also the Challenger accident, another example of how we can invest large amounts of money in science and technology and have them proceed apace, suddenly to find out that things aren't quite what we thought they are.

I think also the aspects of medical research, when we consider the AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) epidemic across the world today, point to the important dimensions of proper applications of science and technology.

And so when it comes to estimates of science and

technology today, I think the big questions are not, should we have technology, but rather what kind of science development do we want? What kind of technology do we want for the future of Saskatchewan, for the future of the world? What sort of society are we heading to?

And these aren't just academic questions for us here in Saskatchewan. I myself stood at the campus of the University of Saskatchewan about two or three years ago and heard the Premier of the province stand before a group of students and faculty and advocate the participation of Saskatchewan firms in the high-tech community, particularly in the U.S. star wars program. And that certainly is one option, and one that the Premier advocated on that occasion in the fall on the university campus.

But there is another option for Saskatchewan firms. I think for example of the federal government's initiatives in terms of verification satellites, the PAC-SAT project that Joe Clark has been working with. And I think those are the kinds of projects that Saskatchewan companies could well be involved with, and make a real contribution to the global peace and security, rather than escalating the arms race by developments of U.S. space stations funded by the Pentagon with Canadian complicity in military projects.

So I say: will Saskatchewan engage in science and technology work that meets real needs, the real needs of the world community, of Saskatchewan farmers and small-business people, of the resource industry, that will protect Saskatchewan people from the cycles in the agricultural economy or in the research economy? Or will we become subject to the plays of the larger market-place, the investment community, and multinational companies offshore, such that the profit picture becomes the only motive for science and technological development, which places us at the prey of larger corporations who can shut down Saskatchewan aspects of their business at the snap of a finger?

(1630)

We have the opportunity here in Saskatchewan to have a constructive technological development, a technological and scientific advancement which facilitates dealing with environmental waste; which increases and enhances human well-being; which provides meaningful long-term employment. And correspondingly, we have the other choice of engaging in scientific work which wastes the environment, which displaces workers and endangers health, which doesn't protect human well-being.

And so those are some of the general comments that I would like to make this afternoon before we get into particular questions. And as my first particular question, I'd like to ask the minister if he can supply the information that I requested by letter on August 4, 1987.

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would say at the outset how I appreciate the remarks that the hon. member has made with regard to the support on that side of the House in so far as advanced technology is concerned, and the recognition, of course that we do, in

fact, live in that global society today. And we know that there is a tremendous need for advancing many areas in our society, whether we're talking about medical research or better ways of doing things within manufacturing or whatever the case may be.

And I would indicate that during the last few months in some of the debate that has gone on within this House, we know the economic situation as it exists in Saskatchewan today – that we are in a situation where we can no longer rely solely on the revenues from our traditional products of potash or uranium or wheat, whatever the case might be. And at the same time, we still have that increased need for services.

And it's through advanced technology that we're going to be able to meet the competitive problems that we're faced with today and generate new revenues through diversification. What we have to consider, of course, is what the situation was here not that long ago in the province in so far as the advanced technology industry was concerned, and a plan that was put forward back in 1982 to address this problem.

The hon. member has indicated the fact that we do have a lot of people within this province that have good ideas. We've got companies that are very actively involved in many areas of research, and it was a recognition of this potential that we have in the province, made by the government on this side of the House, that this was the way, in fact, in which we were going to be able to expand our economic activity.

And following that plan in 1982, the strategy was developed to put this into practice. And in 1984 the department came into being – the first province, of course, in Canada that developed a Department of Science and Technology.

And I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to be able to reach our goal of a diversified economy, that we must develop our advanced technology and be able to transfer it to various industries. And we will be addressing such areas – as the member has indicated, opposite – whether we're talking about medical research, but probably even more importantly the whole area of agriculture.

We have a tremendous opportunity in this province right now to show leadership in such areas as biotechnology. We know that we're showing and providing leadership in the area of space technology and telecommunications, ranking third in the country behind Ontario and Quebec. And this of course not only means increased revenues for the province, but it also means more jobs – more jobs for our young people.

There's no doubt about it that the department has a very major role to play today in ensuring that we do build a very strong, advanced technology industry in this province. And I think if we look back over the record of the past few years, we can see that in fact our industry has grown tremendously. You consider the fact that back in 1982 there were only about 39 companies involved in advanced technology in the province of Saskatchewan, and that has grown today to over 170 different companies

that are very active.

There are specific areas that still have to be dealt with, and yet we recognize the fact that we're talking about an industry that has a great deal of risk with it. We know certainly that not all of the industries or the ideas that are put forth are going to be successful. And when one considers the fact that probably only 3 or 4 per cent of all the ideas put forth by inventors are going to be at some time successful, we can see indeed that it is a very high-risk industry.

Sometimes I know that people get a little bit impatient with the fact that some of the companies that are coming onstream are not always successful, or maybe it takes a long time before they're in a position where they can sell their products, and we have to recognize that. Even though times are changing very rapidly, it still may take two to four years for an idea from the time it's conceived until a company is ready to put products on the market. So I think we have to recognize that too.

And I think the member opposite will understand that when we consider some of the companies that we have in this province right now where maybe they haven't moved along as quickly as some might have liked.

We have to keep working along with the industry in developing what we've got here and also promoting new businesses. We're very fortunate of course with the facilities that we have within the province as far as doing advanced research, whether we look at our universities and our research councils and the industry that's out there in itself.

So there's a lot of potential here, and it's something that's been recognized by this government, and we are going to do the best that we can in these difficult times to promote as much as we can, as much economic activities, so we will have added benefits that we can pass on to the residents of Saskatchewan.

With regard to the request that you had, some of that information has been provided to you. And as we go through the estimates, we can provide more of that to you, and we'll ensure that you'll get all of it.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Mr. Minister, I haven't received anything yet from any of your officials or the department. I'm wondering if there isn't a problem on that end or whether it was in fact sent to me, and if so, when?

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the information has been sent to the member. Possibly he has not received it. I'll be willing to send it over to him right now. He will be getting another copy as well in the mail.

**Mr. Koenker:** — I'd like to continue in these estimates then by saying, Mr. Minister, I think you work under a very distinct disadvantage, and this is no reflection on you personally. The disadvantage I speak of is the disadvantage of working under a Premier who does not practise what he preaches.

I think we have in the Department of Science and Technology a classic case of Progressive Conservative

hyperbole. And I'll say that I haven't heard that from you yourself, but I certainly have heard it from the Premier. I want to say that I think you are working under a disadvantage and that the Premier pays lip-service to high technology but he doesn't put his words into action. And he has consistently failed to do so.

And so what we have, and what you have to contend with and what your departmental officials have to contend with, is a departmental legacy of a whole lot of hype about high tech but very little real help compared to the hype. Certainly there is help there; I don't question that at all. But relative to the hype and the hyperbole coming from the Premier himself, there's really very little help, and I dare say that that puts you at a disadvantage.

I think, for example, and I'd like to ask you about the mythical \$50 million over the next five years for assistance for Saskatchewan high-tech firms that was announced during the October election campaign on Friday, October 10 in Saskatoon. The minister announced what he called a new high-tech strategy, committing \$50 million to help struggling high-tech firms in Saskatchewan, develop new products and find markets. And we haven't heard anything about this high-tech strategy. And I'm wondering if you can give us some information. It's been almost a year now since he made that announcement on October 10.

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member opposite can indicate all he wants that the Premier doesn't practise what he preaches. But let me simply point out to him that the fact that we have a minister in charge of a separate Department of Science and Technology, and probably the only province in Canada where this in fact exists, I think says something as to the importance that the Premier puts on science and technology.

I think as well if we look at the moneys and the commitment that have been put forward over the last five years, we look at the development as far as the number of companies, the assistance that has been given to them, whether it's with the initial research or whether it's helping them at the end of the line selling that first product, that there has been indeed a commitment made by this government and it has been kept.

As well, if you consider the last budget — and you're indicating that it is nearly a year ago since this particular promise was made — I think if you consider the budget and the moneys that have been put forth there in so far as development of economic activity, a lot of which can be attributed to advanced technology.

We've got other areas, of course, other than science and technology, where moneys are being expended on research and development. If you consider the fact that this year we have the economic diversification and investment fund with \$22 million in, there is no doubt about it that is . . . a good portion of that is going to go towards the advanced tech area. But I think also you have to consider the fact that in the agricultural development fund, that you're got \$30 million, part of which is being spend on research and development and diversification.

I think also you have to consider the fact, Mr. Chairman, that in the neighbourhood of \$100 million is being spent on research and development by the various government departments. So I don't think that we always want to simply isolate the Department of Science and Technology and try to promote the idea that that's the only department that is expending money on research and development.

So if you look at the total picture, we do have a good amount of the budget that is being spent on science, and research and development, and on advance . . . some of it certainly on advanced technology. We are still committed to spending more money on advanced technology and as it applies to the technological transfer to other businesses. And I might point out that this was a promise of \$50 million over the term of this government, which we still have up to another four years to go.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Well, Mr. Minister, all I can say is, I still say you're working under a disadvantage. You say that the minister is in charge of a separate Department of Science and Technology, and this indicates the Premier's priority. You, of all people, have to be aware that it's a shrinking department.

You talk about the amount of money that the department spends or that the government spends, and the budgetary program — those funds are shrinking as well, and I'm going to be getting into that later. You talk about the economic development fund as basically a false juggling of figures there, and it amounts to less money being spent by the provincial government in that regard. The agricultural development fund — we'll talk about these things later.

I want to know, though, when are we going to hear the details of this \$50 million a year . . . \$50 million over the next five years. He said the next five; we've already lived one of those five years. When are we going to hear the details of the Premier's high-tech strategy? Has he shared that information with you? Have you discussed it with him?

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out the fact that the commitment is still there, and moneys are being expended on the advanced technology area for this current year. But I think we have to recognize the fact that because of the economic situation as it is, that we have to balance off the government's responsibility insofar as the fiscal situation is concerned as to the amount of money that can be put towards economic development, and in this particular case through advanced technology.

(1645)

There's no doubt about it that some of the plans may have to be deferred for the present time, but the commitment is still there, and as time goes on, we will still be looking at this. Plans are being of course developed by the department in consultation with the industry, and these announcements are going to be made as time goes on. Some of the development, of course, is already taking place, and I'm sure that over the next few months, as far as this current year is concerned, that more announcements



will be made as they're developed.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Given the spending that we have in the most recent budget, we have a long way to go to get to the \$10 million per year in seed money that the Premier said would be given or allocated for high technology firms in this province. We have a very long way to go, indeed. And what galls me particularly, Mr. Minister, is that your Premier, in his Speech from the Throne as recently as December 3, continues to play on this large accumulations of funds that are going to be handed over to assist Saskatchewan high-tech firms.

Aware that the health and growth of (the province's small-business) sector depends on the application of the most effective, efficient technology available, my ministers have already announced a commitment to provide \$50 million over the next five years to assist Saskatchewan small business to equip itself.

We have the hyperbole, the rhetoric, but we don't have any funds. A budget comes down six months later, a full six months later, and there's no plan, there's no indication of any plan to share these funds with Saskatchewan firms. And all I can say is they're waiting, and I think they're looking to you to provide some kind of pressure on the Premier to spring these funds loose.

I don't know whether we're going to get much further on that question. I guess, as you say, we'll have to wait and see. Maybe a year from now we won't be at the same juncture on this same question.

A related concern, Mr. Minister, related to the legacy of hype, is the legacy that your department has had ever since its inception, and that legacy is consistent fiscal restraint, consistent fiscal restraint on the Department of Science and Technology to the point where it's, in some sense, gutted in this most recent budget.

And the figures there tell the story. In spite of all the rhetoric, if we go to the record of public accounts, we find that ever since the Department of Science and Technology was first established back in 1983, it's consistently been the apparent victim of government deception, and what I would call a hidden agenda of overestimating the amount of money that's going to be spent on science and technology at budget time, and then consistently failing to spend it and to allocate it.

And I blame this, not on you, you weren't around during the first several years of the department. I blame it on the Premier and the former minister for overbudgeting, underexpending consistently, in a way that really makes a mockery of having a department that has a strong commitment to science and technology.

I think it says a lot about what this government preaches and what it practises, using science and technology for political advantage, and then trimming actual expenditures after the budget is revealed. The rest of the year, the name of the game is to hold the line on research and development work, to hold the line on government spending in this important area. You talk about the goal of economic diversification; that we must develop advance

technology. That's happening to some extent, certainly, but not the extent that the government indicates in its budget speeches, because it doesn't spend the funds allocated.

And I believe the Premier has no real intention of backing up these commitments for scientific research and technological development. I can only draw, and I think the public can only draw, one conclusion: that the Premier is fundamentally dishonest; that he deceives the public; and there's duplicity in his fiscal allocations as opposed to what he actually spends.

Now I want to say that throughout rural Saskatchewan for many years there is an old saying that goes something like this: "Figures don't lie, but liars sure know how to figure."

Well I can share with the people of this province that some of the figures in Science and Technology set out by the very Premier of this province . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. Order. The Minister of Human Resources.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — On a point of order. The member for Saskatoon Sutherland has indicated to this committee that the Premier is fundamentally dishonest. I submit that is unparliamentary, and he should be asked to withdraw that remark, and particularly in the absence of the Premier.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. I find the point of order well taken: "(4) to impute to any member or members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case" — page 104, paragraph 319(3); and page 23, rule 26: "nor shall he use offensive words against the Assembly or against a member thereof."

So I would ask the member from Saskatoon Sutherland to apologize for those remarks.

**Mr. Koenker:** — I beg your pardon, I didn't hear the last part of your remarks.

**Mr. Chairman:** — I would ask the member from Saskatoon Sutherland to withdraw those remarks and apologize to the House.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Chairman, I was listening very closely to what the member from Sutherland was saying, and he did not clearly, in my view, say that person X or Y was guilty of any particular action, and I would ask the chairman to please review the record before this is ruled upon.

**Mr. Chairman:** — The member from Saskatoon Sutherland used the words: "the Premier is fundamentally dishonest." I find that unparliamentary, and I would ask the member from Saskatoon Sutherland to apologize to the House and retract his statement.

**Mr. Koenker:** — I'm quite prepared to retract that statement, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Chairman:** — And I ask you to apologize to the Assembly.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm quite prepared to apologize to the Assembly as well.

I think that now we might as well turn to the facts, or the figures, which will not lie. And I start by looking at the public accounts departmental budgets for Science and Technology in these last few years, and we find that they've been consistently budgeted . . . consistently more has been budgeted for this department than has been spent. And that lo and behold! for two of the three years in public accounts there are huge gaps, impossible gaps in government spending.

In one year, for example, over a million dollars is estimated to be spent and the department is underexpended by some 800 million. The second year the department . . . there's a fairly close correspondence between what was budgeted and what was expended. But then when we get ready for an election in '85-86, we note that on a budget of \$1.5 million, almost a third of it, almost a half of a million dollars is not expended in the departmental budget itself. And I think that tells the story.

And I won't ask the minister to defend those kinds of actions, those of his predecessor or those of the Premier. I don't think that that would be fair. But I will go on to point out to the public that it's this kind of dishonesty that doesn't stop just with departmental figures. It gets worse when we look at related figures for Science and Technology funding through the Heritage Fund — far worse.

And what do we find here from the government's own figures supplied in *Public Accounts*? Well, in '83-84 the PC government estimated they would spend \$5 million for research and development. And how much did they actually spend? One-tenth of that — 552,000, and that's no lie. In 1984 and '85 the PC government estimated they would spend \$5 million again for research and development. And what did the PC government actually spend? — 1,469,000, not even a third of what was budgeted for research and development work in this province.

Three strikes and you're out, they say in baseball. Well let's look at the third pitch that they gave the public of Saskatchewan in '85-86. The PC government of Saskatchewan estimated that they would finally cut from previous estimates of the previous two years, \$5 million a year. They estimated that they would actually spend \$1 million less — \$4 million for research and development work in Saskatchewan. And that was subsequently revised downward even from that \$4 million figure to \$3.3 million.

But did that help close the gap between fact and fiction in terms of what was actually spent? No, I don't think it did. We have \$2,830,000 that was spent — almost a half a million dollars still out in terms of expenditures.

Now when we come to research and development spending for this year, what do we find? Yet another million dollars less for research and development. We started with \$5 million in '83-84; another \$5 million in '84-85; we go down to 3.3 million in '85-86; and we're

down to \$3 million for '86-87. And your guess is as good as mine as to how much will actually be spent.

And I'm not going to ask you, Mr. Minister, to defend this record of deception and betrayal of research and development work that I've just outlined, but I do think it's fair to ask you, however, how did you as minister arrive at the figure of \$3 million for research and development work for this present fiscal year? How did you arrive at the \$3 million figure, and do you feel that that's accurate?

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should know full well that this was a new department that came into being on January 1, 1984, and when the budget for that particular year was established, there were 39 companies — or, sure, maybe slightly higher than that — that were in operation. And of course the moneys that are put forth in the budget are there for companies to request for whatever a case it might be, whether it's research and development or getting a prototype developed, right on up through the applied research and also to the sale of that first product.

The moneys are there then for request by the companies. The Department of Science and Technology is not going to be going out to the companies and saying, you must take this amount of money. We operate on the basis of companies putting forth their proposals, making application to the department, and then the officials examining them and taking it from there.

You have to consider the fact that the research and development was not introduced until November of 1984 so the programs really were only effective for a six-month period, and that can account for the small amount of money that was spent that first year.

If you go on through, then, the '84-85 year, the total amount of money — or the '85-86 year — was \$4 million, I believe, that was budgeted that year for research and development. And that was \$2.87 million were spent on research and development that first year which was up considerably over the year prior to that. And the main reason for that was the fact that the departmental programs became that much better known and also the number of companies there were in operation was increasing.

(1700)

The following year, of course, you had \$4 million in the budget, and out of that, 3.65 million were spent. So the amount that was being expended each year was increasing, but that simply, again, goes out to the request of the companies. It's not something that the government goes out and says, this is the amount of money you've got to take. You can have the money in the budget, but if it's not requested, then how do you blame the government for that?

Now you're talking about — the latter part here in this current year, there was a 25 per cent cut in the amount of money expended for the current year. So from \$4 million, a 25 per cent cut gives us 3 million for this current year as far as research and development.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Mr. Minister, you feel that there presently is no need to spend, or allocate any more than that \$3 million on research and development work in the province. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I point out to the hon. member that we would certainly be happy to have much more money than that. But I think that you have to consider the fact that with the economic situation as it is and the shortfall in our revenues, that it becomes necessary to balance off the amount of money that we can expend for research and development and economic development, against what we would term as fiscal responsibility.

While we might well want much more money, we have to balance off. And we were prepared to make our cuts in the same way as other departments had to. Certainly, we would like to have much more money. At the same time, we can't overlook the fact that there are other moneys that are being expended. There's money through the diversification as I indicated, and also now we have the western diversification fund, which we're also going to be triggering into, and I'd be prepared to discuss that more at a later time.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Well I think maybe it's time that we should get into the estimates for spending within the departmental budget itself. I note that the estimates forecast spending of \$1,954,200 by your department this year. But I wonder if this isn't just more eyewash as was the case in 1985-86 when you announced a budget of more than 1.5 million and you only spent \$1.1 million of it. Will you only be spending two-thirds of what you're bragging about spending for this year, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, the figure that the hon. member refers to, the \$1.954 million, is in reference to moneys that will be spent on the administration, and we certainly anticipate spending all of that money.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Well the proof will be in the pudding a year from now in terms of whether the department has another eyewash or a real substantive increase and commitment in funding to science and technology.

I notice that in the budget for 1985-86, the budget boldly set out the Devine government's intention to allocate 1.538 million to the Department of Science and Technology. But of course that was at a time when we were heading into a provincial election and the Premier was anxious to shore up some of his support, particularly for candidates in Saskatoon. But come to the end of the year and what do we find was actually spent? Not one and a half million, not even close to it, but actual spending was 1.135 million.

Do you anticipate coming closer than that, Mr. Minister, in this upcoming year with respect to the figure that we have, the \$1.9 million figure for Science and Technology? Do you really expect to come close to that figure? That that is a realistic that a year from now we will look at and say, yes, the minister has been far more accurate than his predecessors.

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Mr. Chairman, in answer to the member's question, I would simply point out again, as I did a few minutes ago, that we're talking about an administrative expense. We are also dealing with estimates, and one cannot always expect to be dead on.

But we would anticipate from this point that we will in fact be spending the \$1.954 million for the current year. But that's an administrative expense and that's really nothing to do as far as the research and development of the programs are concerned.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Mr. Minister, I note that in the *Public Accounts* for the fiscal year ending March 31, '85-86, there was substantial underspending under the administrative part of the budget. The figure budgeted was \$443,000; only \$402,000 was provided. When we look at the government research component of the departmental budget we note that 347,000 was budgeted; 313,000 was spent.

We look at industrial development, industrial development in this province — the very thing that you opened your remarks saying was so important to this province — \$420,000 was budgeted, and \$256,000 was actually spent. We look at the fourth and final aspect of the budget, research co-ordination — \$326,000 budgeted; an expenditure of \$163,000.

How is it possible to miscalculate so badly at the outset of a fiscal year? Or were the figures just purposely inflated because we were heading into an election? How do you explain that kind of consistent miscalculation in a relatively small budget that deals with a department that is relatively small, of only some 15 people? How can those kinds of errors be made?

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Mr. Chairman, the figures that the member opposite is quoting are strictly to do with administration, and in the year 1985-86 the department was still in the growing stages and those were moneys that had been estimated that would be spent on staffing. And they simply were not all spent. I suppose that not as many people were hired as they had originally intended might be needed to carry out the programs. But again, this is simply to do with administration. It has nothing to do with the programs.

**Mr. Koenker:** — Well obviously it has to do with the departmental administration. I look at the figures in the *Estimates* book for '87-88, Mr. Minister, and I look at the figures provided in previous *Estimates* from '84-85 up to the present, and I note that the number of staff in the administration component of your department has remained relatively constant, at 6.3 person-years, right basically from the beginning of the department.

Now this year the staff numbers in administration are almost doubled to 11.3. Can you explain this sudden jump in the civil servants required to administer what is really a relatively small department?

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Mr. Chairman, the reason for the increase in the administration area from 6.3 to 11.3 simply takes into consideration the fact that prior to this current year the departmental staff, in other words my

office, were not included within the budget of Science and Technology. So the increase of five in that particular area this year then is to do with the inclusion of my office, the minister's office, being put into the Science and Tech budget.

I would also want to point out, Mr. Chairman, I think when we reflect back on the previous question and the concern that the member opposite has with regard to the fact that the expenditures were actually considerably less than the estimates. I think that that speaks well of the efficiency of the department in the way that they were able to carry out their duties and get by possibly with fewer people than they had originally intended. So I think that that speaks well of the departmental staff.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order. It being near 5 o'clock this House is recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.