

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

Of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited and Saskatchewan Co-operative Financial Services Limited, both of the City of Regina, praying for an Act to amend and consolidate An Act respecting Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society Limited and Saskatchewan Co-operative Financial Services Limited.

And the petition:

Of Briercrest Bible College of Caronport, in the Province of Saskatchewan praying for an Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Briercrest Bible College.

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

#### Special Nominating Committee

**Clerk:** — Mr. Lingenfelter, from the special committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the standing committees of the Assembly, presents the second report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee recommends that the size and composition of the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs established by the Legislative Assembly May 21, 1992 under rule 89, be as follows:

Members Goulet, Cline, Crofford, Flavel, Goohsen, Haverstock, Lorje, Roy, Stanger and Toth, with a membership of 10.

Your committee further recommends that membership on the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs be transferable by written notice signed by the original member and filed with the chair of the committee.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Dewdney:

That the second report of the special committee appointed to prepare lists of members to compose the standing committees of the Assembly, be now concurred in.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just a few comments regarding the committee, as it has been proposed and in light of the debate that took place some . . . I believe, it's about a month ago now or a few weeks

ago in this Assembly, regarding the committee and regarding the make-up of the committee.

We all, certainly in this House and in this province and across Canada, are quite well aware of the ongoing debate we are facing regarding the constitution and regarding the make-up of our great nation. And I believe the Premier in his comments, when we were in debate, talked about the fact that we must certainly work together and put aside political differences to deal with matters before us that are very serious and very important to each and every one of us.

And I believe the Justice minister has been involved quite, I guess, very forthrightly in discussions that have been taking place over the last two weeks. And I believe, beginning June 9, the committees that the Premier . . . or Prime Minister has called — or Mr. Clark, I believe — has called members again to come and sit down and address the constitution.

We did have a couple of concerns with regards to the make-up. And certainly maybe there is, at times, disagreements arise and maybe everyone will admit that we may not have understood what each individuals were saying, but it was our understanding — at least the impression that our House Leader had been left with — that our caucus would allowed three members on the constitution. We certainly are quite well in favour of being involved in this debate although we, as has been indicated, maybe question some of the reasonings behind the special standing committee at the time.

But as I have indicated earlier, we are quite well aware of the ongoing discussion and we . . . In light of the fact of the openness the Premier had even talked about and putting aside differences, I guess we all want to hear what the public are saying regarding the constitution. There's no doubt in my mind that as this committee speaks to people across this province, that they're going to find that there are many differences, even in our own province, regarding Canada, regarding the constitution, regarding the debate that is taking place right now. And so we will go along.

We accept the fact that this committee has been put in place. We have raised our differences and our major concern was, at this time, was we felt that it would be appropriate to have had at least three members from our caucus involved on the committee. And no doubt it would have put an extra load but we were prepared, Mr. Speaker, to give ourselves to the discussion of the matters regarding the constitution so that indeed when the committee reports to this House later this year or at whatever time it reports, Mr. Speaker, we will all have had a fair opportunity to hear and to listen to people and to be part of the process. And so I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

### MOTIONS

#### Amendment to Rule 89(4) of the Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Saskatoon River Heights, that rule 89(4) of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan* be amended by adding the Standing Committee on the Constitutional Affairs to the list of those committees with transferable memberships so that the said rule is as follows:

89(4) The membership on the Standing Committees on Non-controversial Bills, on Crown Corporations and on Constitutional Affairs, other than that of the Chair, shall be transferable by written notice signed by the original member and filed with the Chair of the committee; and

That the said rule, as amended, shall come into effect this day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this change is being put forward by the committee on the recommendation of the members of the official opposition. They felt it would be better for them to be able to transfer membership, being a smaller caucus. And in the spirit of co-operation that recommendation was accepted by the committee.

Motion agreed to.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Bradley:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, a group of grade 5 and 6 students from Pangman who are sitting in your gallery today. They're accompanied by their teacher, Judy Schwindt, and chaperons, Faye Heath and Laurie Claffey.

I look forward to meeting with this group after question period for pictures, refreshments, and questions. And I ask all members here today to join with me in a warm welcome to the students here visiting us.

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

### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to at this time make a short report on a meeting that I had with the energy and mines people yesterday.

They kicked off Energy and Mines Week in Saskatoon yesterday, and I was able to talk to people in the industry. Mr. Speaker, they were very concerned about Bills 9 and 10 that the House is now considering. The industry had no chance to have any input at all on these Bills, and they were . . . before they were presented to the House. And that definitely sends the wrong signal, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, apparently the Bill has been pulled. And one meeting with the minister has been had already, and another is planned for I think Wednesday — being tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, energy and mines is the second largest industry in Saskatchewan after agriculture, and the dollar numbers and job numbers are very impressive, Mr. Speaker. But the fact remains that the government should

be consulting with the people, no matter how big or how small.

The opposition takes as his major victory that the government has delayed this Bill to consult with the industry, and we commend the minister for admitting his mistakes and acting to correct the flaws. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that he will bring forward some of the amendments to this Bill that address the most serious mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, I . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this week is also Tourism Awareness Week in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, for this tourism season our government cancelled the Maxwell Smart ad campaign of a year ago, Mr. Speaker, and replaced it with a locally designed and produced ad campaign at a fraction of the cost, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I am very happy to announce that as a result of this year's promotional campaign, during the month of April the number of inquiries to the Department of Tourism as compared to April a year ago from Canadians outside of Saskatchewan, the number has doubled.

Inquiries, Mr. Speaker, from the United States have tripled, and inquiries from local Saskatchewan residents have quadrupled, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, that is the result of a truly smart campaign.

Mr. Speaker, communities and constituencies across the province are recognizing the potential of the hospitality industry, and nowhere is this more true than in Moose Jaw. In addition to our existing parks and museums, we in Moose Jaw are now the home of the largest selection of outdoor murals on the Prairies.

We are proud as well to be the home of the renowned Canadian Armed Forces-based Snowbirds, and on July 10 we look forward to opening a gallery in Moose Jaw in the Western Development Museum to celebrate and to display the Snowbirds. And, Mr. Speaker, we are . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order.

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

**Mr. Keeping:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise in this place today to comment on the importance of tourism in the northern part of Saskatchewan. I farm in the north-east part of the agriculture part, at least, of the province. And the towns and the villages up there have been very adversely affected by the downturn in agriculture over the past

years.

But there have been a few positive things happening and probably the brightest one of them is the tourism industry. We have two hydroelectric dams on the Saskatchewan in my constituency that have really enhanced the natural beauty of the area and have become the focal point of an industry that's very important and growing in my area. With very good catches of record-size pike and walleye are being caught every day and fishing has been very good so far this year.

The tourism industry has been growing every year in my area and the economic spin-off that it had is very good for that part of the province. But the money that it brings into the area isn't the only benefit, Mr. Speaker; it's the people we meet, the new people from other parts of Canada and the United States that return year and year.

And also, Mr. Speaker, it has made many of us that are local people there realize what we have and how much we appreciate where we live and the area that we grew up in.

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the government for some more good news. The Minister of Education has just announced about \$8.8 million in emergency funding for school repairs in this province. I'm particularly pleased to see that some of these repairs are going to be done in the city of Saskatoon, the city of Regina, Prince Albert, North Battleford, as well as other areas across Saskatchewan.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this is National Access Awareness Week and many of the projects that we've become aware of that are required had to do with accessibility for disabled students. As we all know, more and more disabled students are attending our schools. And in order to do that, in order to be part of an integrated setting, they must have access to those schools. I want to congratulate the Minister of Education and the Government of Saskatchewan for forwarding about \$6.6 million to various school divisions across Saskatchewan. It certainly will enhance accessibility for disabled students in our province.

(1345)

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to bring forward to the attention of the Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that the Zone 1 55-plus senior games will be taking place in Carlyle on June 8 and 9. Zone 1 represents the area from Ogema to the Manitoba border, from the Qu'Appelle River to the U.S. (United States) border. Since we're all politicians in here, it encompasses the constituencies of Souris-Cannington, Estevan, Bengough-Milestone, Weyburn, Indian Head-Wolseley, and Moosomin.

Participants in these senior games are involved in not only physical activities but also in mental and spiritually beneficial programs. Some of the programs that they're

involved in, Mr. Speaker, include tennis, performing arts, old-time dancing, golf, bridge, horseshoes, poetry, and track and field.

The participation in these type of games helps the participants in their physical well-being and in their mental well-being, which in one sense is a wellness model for the Minister of Health in that any of these activities will help us live longer, Mr. Speaker.

I encourage those that are qualified in age and are able to, to participate in the senior games in their areas. Mr. Speaker, the winners will go on to Moose Jaw to the provincial games on July 13, 14, and 15. I would like to congratulate the Carlyle committee for the work they have done in putting these games on, and I encourage everybody to participate.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also want to congratulate the Minister of Education today for her announcement of approximately \$8.8 million for emergency repairs to schools in Saskatchewan.

Many of those schools are in rural Saskatchewan, and the Last Mountain school division in my constituency is receiving repair funding for three schools at Semans and at Quinton and at Strasbourg for a total government cost of \$182,895. And that, Mr. Speaker, is just a part of our commitment not only to education, but also to rural Saskatchewan in general.

One of the main objectives is providing safe, modern learning environment for our students and for their teachers. Repairs become very important, Mr. Speaker, because of the dismal financial state that we find this province in. There will not be much money for new schools.

We will meet the objective of providing a safe, modern learning environment in 1992-93 and in years to come, despite the constraints that we face in terms of controlling the government's spending.

I want to thank the minister again for her commitment to rural Saskatchewan and to the education system.

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Minister of Health and the Government of Saskatchewan for their initiatives in the health field in northern Saskatchewan — the special \$700,000 placed in northern Saskatchewan. We'll be looking at not only the school-based dental plan in northern Saskatchewan, but also the home care program in the north.

We're also looking at the issue of dealing with suicides and are planning to look at the whole area of substance abuse, family violence, and mental health. We are trying to concentrate on the issue of disease prevention and health education.

So, Mr. Speaker, with this holistic approach which

combines not only the personal level of development but the social and cultural development of the Dene and Cree people in northern Saskatchewan . . . will be a great plus in the history of northern Saskatchewan. And with this community-based approach combined with the wellness model, I think we're looking for a better future for health in northern Saskatchewan.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Government Publication Costs

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the minister responsible for patronage and political rhetoric, which I realize each and every . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I have a form here. There's no minister by that portfolio, and I wish the member would — order, order — I wish the member would direct his question to anybody on the other side in the government benches.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, yesterday your news release and media conference on the credit rating was a cowardly partisan act, yet another example of your government's inability to govern without spewing liberal amounts of political mud at anybody who gets in the way.

Mr. Minister all of your documents are highly partisan. In fact your budget address is so full of NDP (New Democratic Party) political dirt that one has to read seven full pages to get any detail on what you're going to do to the people of this province — seven pages. Mr. Minister, how much did it cost the taxpayers of this province for this unprecedented political attack in the budget speech. How much did it cost?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I can . . . I don't know what the cost of the budget documents are. That information is available. I'll undertake to provide it to the member opposite. But I want to remind the member opposite that the budget speech reflected the direction of the government in this time that we are governing. And the direction is a result of the kind of waste and mismanagement that his colleagues perpetrated on Saskatchewan in the last 10 years which has brought us to the situation which we face a huge deficit, a huge accumulated debt which requires that now we begin to get that under control so we can stop getting the kind of downgrades that Standard and Poor's brought down for Saskatchewan yesterday, and indicated clearly that it was a result of the last 10 years of government by the Progressive Conservatives.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, in fact the budget paid tribute to the past NDP governments. In fact your budget says, and I quote:

Working together with the Saskatchewan community,  
previous (NDP) . . . governments

succeeded in establishing and enhancing the Province's financial integrity and building for the future.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Proof positive, Mr. Speaker. There we have it. Proof positive by the level of rhetoric in here right now, that that's exactly what they're engaging in, political rhetoric in these types of addresses.

Mr. Minister, I ask you again, how much did the NDP Party pay for . . . or indeed did the taxpayers of Saskatchewan pay for those seven full pages in the budget address?

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, the member is very correct that that statement is made in the budget speech because the statement is correct. NDP governments have had to clean up a mess after Conservative and Liberal governments in 1944, in 1971, and again in 1992. We're elected with a mandate to do that.

There is costs associated with printing budget documents, informing the public what the budget is about. I do not have it at hand with me, Mr. Speaker, but I will undertake to provide, take it as notice and provide to the member the next time I'm in the House.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your taking the time to give us that information. I was wondering also if you can tell the Assembly if any other government departments are using tax dollars to spread NDP propaganda.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — None are. The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I have another document prepared by the Department of Finance with the Associate Minister of Finance's name on the front. It is dated April 14, 1992 and it is called: the accounting initiatives briefing package. The very first paragraph says, and I quote: the New Democratic Party came to office committed to opening the books and restoring open, honest, accountable government.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Once again, Mr. Speaker, proof positive of the political nature of it. The only thing missing from this is in fact, is a disclaimer saying that the NDP Party ad was paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, can you tell us how much this thing cost the Saskatchewan taxpayers?

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, this sounds like

estimates in the Committee of Finance, with very detailed questions. I will undertake and take notice and provide the answer . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I think the minister knows that you don't make a statement and take notice. You either take notice or you answer the question. That's the rule.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, not only are you using government documents to propagate your political agenda, you are using government distribution systems to distribute your New Democratic Party caucus office news releases to the media. I have a news release dated April 22 put out by the member from The Battlefords which bitterly criticizes the former administration. Even you cannot deny that this is propaganda, Mr. Minister. Yet what's interesting to note is that the release has been sent by the cabinet press office, not your NDP caucus office, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, clearly you've been using government money, taxpayers' money, to distribute your political message. Mr. Minister, how much did this one cost the taxpayers of the province? And is this just another example of your political waste and mismanagement?

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, for 10 years, for 10 years the people of Saskatchewan were denied information of the activities of their government when the former members were on this side of the House. I want to say to the member for Kindersley so that he clearly understands — that has changed. The public of Saskatchewan will know about the activities of the government and the public of Saskatchewan will know about the misguided activities of the members opposite because they are the voters and they have a right to know.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well we have more examples, if you like. On May 29, just last Friday, another NDP news release was sent by the government's cabinet press secretary office. This NDP news release politically attacks the federal government — another NDP campaign which is being paid for by the Saskatchewan taxpayers. Mr. Minister, this appears to be common practice for your government. You won the election on the promise that you were going to be honest and non-partisan. You failed miserably on both accounts.

Mr. Minister, will you now admit that you've been dishonest with the public and most certainly have been partisan at the expense of the Saskatchewan taxpayers? Will you admit that dishonesty?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the member from Kindersley that although for the last 10 years under the PC (Progressive Conservative) government, the premier who was then the premier, the member from Thunder Creek, and all of their colleagues were in the hip pocket of the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Brian Mulroney . . . And because they kowtowed to the federal government and agreed to everything the federal government demanded, it has cost

this province \$550 million of off-loading, which would have balanced the budget had we had that money which was rightfully in the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to say to the members opposite, this government will not act in that way. This government will provide a voice for Saskatchewan and we will stand up for this province when we feel there's a need to stand up for this province, and tell the federal government where they're going wrong and where they ought to be doing something. And we ask the members opposite to speak up on behalf of Saskatchewan and join us in doing that on behalf of this province.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Mr. Minister, the point is, when you're sending out political rhetoric the NDP Party should be paying for it, not the taxpayers of this province.

Mr. Minister, we have one more that I would like to present here today. And it's dated April 27 and it comes from your department, the Minister of Finance himself's department.

The Deputy Premier wrote a letter with respect to the budget — a letter, I presume, which was widely distributed. In this letter he says, and I hesitate, I hesitate to quote from it because of its exaggeration and inaccuracy, but it says: When our government assumed power six months ago we knew that 10 years of Devine's PC government had seriously undermined the provincial . . . the province's financial position.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Once again, sir, once again, Mr. Speaker, proof positive by the level of noise from the government exactly what it is — political rhetoric.

Mr. Minister, it's shameful to note that even the Deputy Premier . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Does the member have a question? Order. Does the member have a question?

**Mr. Boyd:** — Do you believe that this kind of pure political garbage should be paid for by the NDP Party? Or do you believe that you should continue to force the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to pay, as you've been doing ever since you became in power?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, on October 21, in the election in this province, the people of Saskatchewan said they wanted the new government to open the books. That's what we have done. We have opened the books. The people of Saskatchewan know where we stand financially, as bad as that news is.

And I want to tell the members opposite that I intend to continue to tell the people of Saskatchewan how that situation was created. They know it. They will continue to hear it. And each and every day, Mr. Member from Kindersley, they will think of the damage and the harm that your members, when they were on this side of the House, did to the present generation in Saskatchewan

and to our children and our grandchildren — something which we are going to turn around so that they can have the future that they deserve.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Saskatchewan taxpayer deserves from this government is for their NDP ads to be paid for by the NDP Party, and not the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, your government has shown that it's prepared to take and use personal MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) files and documents. Your government has no problem engaging in massive political patronage. You cancel energy deals because of party pressure. You close parks down because they're not in NDP ridings. You cancel pension plans for single women because it was a Tory idea.

Mr. Minister, at the very least, when you launch one of your own political inquiries . . . will you launch one of your own political inquiries into this dishonest, immoral, and costly conduct of your own government? Will you take this initiative, Mr. Minister?

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, this is getting to be an old, worn-out record verging on the verge of being silly. For days now the members opposite have spent all of their time defending the record of the former Conservative government.

Well I want to tell the member for Kindersley, who is new to this House, get off of that and start looking to the future. Because the record that you're defending, which you had no part of, is a very dismal one. And you don't do yourself any favours by making yourself a part of it.

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

### Impact of Budget on Livestock Industry

**Mr. Martens:** — I want to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, because your budget takes out the feed grain assistance and livestock cash advance program, what do you anticipate the reduction of the cattle numbers on feed will be for this year?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the member opposite yesterday, we've engaged in discussions with the livestock industry. And the livestock industry continues to be committed to this province and we will continue to work with them to make sure that the opportunities continue to be strong here in Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, we understand that your ag caucus met today with the livestock feeder association and they told you that they estimate that each animal will lose \$42 in the market-place because of your program. Are you prepared to change this disastrous part of your

budget and will you tell us what impact it has on the cattle industry?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I have invited the livestock industry to meet with us in a broad consultation to examine the kinds of questions the member opposite is raising. The numbers are highly variable; clearly the numbers the member opposite picks are not average at any rate. And the fact is that the livestock industry has committed themselves to sitting down with us and looking at the programs we have that continue to support the industry in Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Dr. Hartley Furtan, a chief economist at the University of Saskatchewan, has estimated that this will cause a reduction in an already struggling feeding sector in the livestock side of 117,000 livestock reduced in the feeding industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Will you confirm that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, no I won't confirm that. I don't know where the member opposite gets his numbers but both of the numbers he's been quoting this afternoon are highly inaccurate.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to inform him that that is what he thinks of the livestock feeders association comments that they made to his ag caucus, because that's what they told him this morning, because we have exactly the same information that you got. Will you disclose to this House that that is a 50 per cent reduction in the livestock feeding industry on the cattle side alone in the province of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry is a complex group of industries in Saskatchewan. They include farmers who are mixed farmers in their cow-calf operations. They include ranchers, they include feeders and backgrounders. And every change in government program impacts each piece of the industry differently.

As I said yesterday, Saskatchewan is not in a position to engage in a bidding war with Alberta for our feeder cattle; however, I've invited the livestock industries to sit down with us and to look at the impact of the feeder industry as an economic development initiative in Saskatchewan compared to other industries here.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, they also told you that this loss would be a \$500 million loss in direct contributions in the industry. They told you that it was going to be \$160 million loss in labour and \$220 million gross domestic product loss. Which of these statistics are wrong? From your analysis in your Department of Agriculture, which of these statistics are wrong?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, all of them.

**Mr. Martens:** — Then, Mr. Minister, that is exactly the content that was given to you by the livestock feeders association. Mr. Brian Perkins and Mr. Alexander were to see your ag caucus. They told you all about it and yet you say it's absolutely wrong. Will you table from your Department of Agriculture, the exact estimates of what they were?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, we have met with the cattle feeding industry on more than one occasion. We've had good discussions about impact. The numbers they give us are believable when we have those discussions. I don't know where the member opposite is . . . how he's interpreting the numbers they give us.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Well, Mr. Minister, when Mr. Furtan believes that you are right, you quote him and do everything you can so that he substantiates your point of view. When you disagree with it, then he has no value, and that's where they come from, Mr. Minister.

Has the minister done an analysis to in fact ensure that there isn't going to be 117,000 head loss in the province of Saskatchewan to the feeding industry?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, there are a number of different documents from different sources that talk about different impacts of investment in the feeding industry. The invitation I've given to the industry is to sit down with us and examine those impacts and to demonstrate that the best place for us to spend our marginal economic development dollars in Saskatchewan is in the feeding industry, and they're prepared to do that with us.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Will the minister confirm that they also told him this morning that they're going to lose 1,500 jobs in the province of Saskatchewan with this reduction?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the delegation met with ag caucus. I don't know if that's part of their analysis, but clearly that's an overestimate of impact in the industry.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, I would like to have you do some analysis from your department, put it on the Table here, to show that the accuracy of Mr. Hartley Furtan is being questioned in this case. And I want to point out that . . . ask you the question: on 1,500 people, how many people in the livestock packing industry are we going to lose in the job market?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that when I spoke with the stock growers association yesterday at their meeting, one of the last comments at the meeting as I was leaving was from their president who committed

himself to an open discussion, free of bias, relative to the issues that the member opposite is raising and that discussion is going to be held and those issues will be reflected back to government.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, the study that the livestock feeders association from Dr. Hartley Furtan also said that you are going to lose one packing plant in the province of Saskatchewan because of that. Which one is it going to be? The one in Moose Jaw or the one in Saskatoon?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite continues to make judgements about things that have been cursorily examined by him. And I want to say that the broad discussion that we intend to have with the livestock industry will reflect the real facts about the questions the member opposite is raising.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you how could you justify putting money into the Moose Jaw packers if you knew in your budget that you were going to cut the program to devastate the livestock industry, feeding industry?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker the livestock industry in Saskatchewan continues to be a resilient and aggressive industry and I know that the people in Saskatchewan will continue to engage in it and they will engage in it because they are good producers, they are efficient producers, and they can compete with producers anywhere in the world and they will continue to be a healthy industry in Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, that is exactly what you understand about the livestock feeding industry. That's exactly what you understand about the packing industry. One packer in Alberta will pack 100,000-plus cattle a year. You're going to take and leave in the province of Saskatchewan, for two packing plants you're going to leave two packing plants to kill 100,000 head of cattle? And that is what you're saying to this Assembly. Tell me which one is going to shut down? Intercon or Moose Jaw?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the pretend concern by the member opposite for the packing industry and the livestock industry needs to be put into perspective. Under the previous administration the number of cattle on feed in this province reduced from 400,000 head to just around 200,000 head. I challenge the member opposite to start being a little bit honest about his real concern other than politics.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, I want to talk about the aspect of giving an opportunity for the livestock industry to recover. Most of those cattle went to the United States because they took a whole lot of land off of their programs and so that is why that went south rather than staying here. In fact the livestock industry will tell you that too. Why weren't you with the meeting with the people here in your ag caucus this morning discussing this with your livestock feeders association?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has a poor memory about what happened to the feeder industry. Certainly more of it went to Alberta because of the policies of the neighbouring province, and went to the States in this period of time. And I was involved in a cabinet meeting this morning while the caucus was meeting with the cattle industry.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, how much money did you give to Intercon to buy the Moose Jaw packing plant through SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation)?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the arrangement between the packing plant and the government was not made by my department. But the reality is that the health of the industry here in Saskatchewan continues to be based on the willingness of the livestock industry to deal with reality. And the member opposite ought to be ashamed of trying to point fingers at this point, when he was in government during the time when the livestock industry was cut in half from 400,000 to 200,000 head.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Now let's talk about the pork industry. How much are you going to slice out of the packing plants in the province of Saskatchewan with your reduction in your feed grain assistance program on the pork industry?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the questions of the member opposite leave me at a loss with respect to what they really want an industry to do. I know that farmers and cattle feeders and hog producers and business people in Saskatchewan believe in doing business because they do it better than other people across the country and in the rest of the world. I know that the hog industry operates the lowest cost production system in Canada here because we're good producers and we have access to feed grains and we have space and we have good people and we have equipment.

The member opposite seems to be quite unfamiliar with the energy in the agricultural sector and their willingness to attack the issues where they really lie, which is doing business because you're willing to work hard and because you're willing to do it at the least possible cost.

The interest of the member opposite in this issue beyond politics simply does not exist. The fact is that we have a healthy agricultural industry and they will continue to work. And it will be based on a policy that says we will pay our bills here in Saskatchewan, we'll get our debt under control, and we will not follow the folly of the government of the province nearby who's . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order.

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Could I ask the member from Arm River to please come to order.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, will you table the analysis from your Department of Agriculture that shows the benefits that have accrued since you cut the FeedGAP

(feed grain adjustment program) program and the livestock cash advance?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I will table with people who really care about the industry all of the discussions that we can have . . . all the papers that we can have a good discussion about the impact and a good discussion about the future of the industry in Saskatchewan, based on real facts and not the pretend kind of economics practised by the members opposite and their friends in Alberta.

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Mining Week in Saskatchewan

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to announce that in co-operation with the Saskatchewan Mining Association, I proclaim the week of June 1 as Mining Week in Saskatchewan.

Mining is Saskatchewan's second largest industry and is a very important contributor to the economy. It accounts for \$1.3 billion of the gross domestic product each year. The mining industry spends more than \$1.5 billion annually in the province on goods, services, and wages.

In addition to the mainstays of potash and uranium, the province's mining industry also produces coal, copper, zinc, gold, silver, cadmium, sodium sulphate, and clay products.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Could I ask the member from Saskatoon Broadway, please come to order. We have a ministerial statement and I can't even hear the minister from here. When I call "order" I expect members to come to order.

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As well, there have been recent activities evaluating the potential of diamond mining in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the mining industry in Saskatchewan was one of the first to adopt an environmental protection policy. It now spends more than \$20 million each year to protect and work in harmony with the environment.

Mining is one of the safest industries in Saskatchewan, with an enviable lost-time record and more than 500 trained emergency response personnel on alert at various mining operations throughout the province at all times. These people will be demonstrating their safety skills at the annual mine rescue competitions in Yorkton this weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in recognizing this week as Mining Week.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that we on this side will join with the minister in proclaiming the



week as mining and energy week.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think most of the public realize the impact of the mining and energy industry on Saskatchewan's economy. I had the privilege of being in the industry in a small way for about 32 years. And a lot of the numbers are high, a lot of the numbers are big, but in a lot of times the return on investment is quite low.

And the people in the mining have persevered, Mr. Speaker, and I think have done a great job in our province. They are indeed, as the minister mentioned I believe yesterday — I was there when he made his address . . . it is the second largest industry in Saskatchewan. The dollar numbers are very impressive and the numbers of jobs are very impressive.

And we on this side of the House recognize that, Mr. Speaker, and we're looking forward to any amendments or adjustments the minister will make to Bill 10 which has the industry quite concerned.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

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

#### **Reassessment — SAMA**

**Hon. Ms. Carson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise in the House to clarify the status of the Saskatchewan Assessment Management Agency's reassessment proposals and the supporting legislative amendments.

The Saskatchewan Assessment Management Agency, SAMA, has proposed several changes to the property assessment system in Saskatchewan. The changes include the elimination of the business assessment with the introduction of a separate mill rate to be set by municipal governments. SAMA has recommended that this change, along with a number of others designed to modernize the assessment system by moving to a market evaluation, enhance its fairness and equality. They expect that those proposals should be implemented by legislation this year.

Today I want to make it clear that legislative amendments necessary to authorize property reassessment and assessment reform, will be introduced when consultations on the proposed changes are complete and support for the change is clear.

SAMA is meeting extensively with communities to review the foreseeable impacts of reassessment. These meetings are not complete and the reaction to SAMA's modified proposals is not yet in. I am hesitant to introduce legislation when full public reaction is not clear.

The provincial government supports SAMA's work. We all have an interest in being sure that the reassessment proposals are endorsed by municipal governments. To this end, and so the government can more accurately gauge local government and public support, I have asked municipalities to pass a resolution in their community stating either their support or rejection of these assessment proposals.

If a majority of local government support these changes, I ask that they communicate this to me and to the SAMA Board.

I have made this situation known to SAMA board of directors, and I have stressed the importance of clear local government support for reassessment changes before implementation through new legislation proceeds. Because of the time needed to complete the consultation process, legislation will not be passed in this legislative session.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think any time that there are plans to change the property taxation system within the province of Saskatchewan, there's always a great deal of concern. And we have seen with the SAMA report that kind of concern throughout the province. And we've heard from people in various sectors of the economy that are concerned about the SAMA recommendations, and we have a number of questions and concerns about it as well, Mr. Speaker.

We would certainly appreciate a copy of the . . . a courtesy that we would appreciate, and I thank the minister for sending over the statement.

I think it's important that the consultation does indeed take place with the municipalities and affected groups, and we would whole-heartedly hope that the minister does move forward with that consultation process.

We understand that you're not planning on proceeding with the Bill for this sitting, and so I think that will give adequate time for all parties to be consulted, and we appreciate that.

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

#### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

##### **Bill No. 41 — An Act to declare a Day of Appreciation for Scottish Clans in Canada**

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move first reading of a Bill to declare a Day of Appreciation for the Scottish Clans in Canada.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill ordered to be read a second time later this day.

##### **Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Consumer Products Warranties Act**

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Consumer Products Warranties Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

##### **Bill No. 43 — An Act to repeal The Hospitals Tax Act and respecting certain consequential amendments resulting from the repeal of that Act**

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to repeal The Hospitals Tax Act and respecting certain consequential amendments resulting from the repeal of that Act.

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

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Table Officer

**The Speaker:** — Before orders of the day, I wish to introduce to the hon. members of the Assembly, Mr. Charles Robert, a committee Clerk who is on attachment from the Senate in Ottawa. He will be assisting our Clerks at the Table for the remainder of the session. I think as most of you . . . Charles Robert is certainly no stranger to this Assembly, and I ask all members to welcome Mr. Robert to our Assembly. Will you do so now.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

#### SECOND READINGS

#### Bill No. 41 — An Act to declare a Day of Appreciation for Scottish Clans in Canada

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to move second reading of this Bill to declare a day of appreciation for the Scottish clans in Canada. As you are aware this is the first private members' Bill to be introduced under the new rules of this Assembly. Those rules are hoped to represent a spirit of co-operation among all members of the Assembly, and so you will understand how I see this Bill as a bit of a test of that spirit, Mr. Speaker.

The Bill itself is not controversial. It simply acts on a request of our citizens of Scottish decent to acknowledge their heritage and the role it played in building our province and our country. I, along with the member from Wilkie, have Scottish blood in our veins and we are proud of that part of our heritage. And I'm proud of my heritage.

We believe that all people of Saskatchewan recognize the contribution of the Scottish clans from the great explorer Mackenzie to the first prime minister of our nation John A. Macdonald.

And so this Bill proposes a day of appreciation of the Scottish clans in Canada. It does not, Mr. Speaker, entail any days off or statutory holidays, but simply confers recognition. And it is appropriate that this Bill is being introduced just before Mosaic takes place in Regina. I am sure that many of you will take in this event and enjoy many of the pavilions.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to passage of this Bill and anticipate all members' support. Thank you.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order.

**Mr. McPherson:** — . . . in this debate and others may want to speak on it. I'm going to move to adjourn the debate on this.

Debate adjourned.

(1430)

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### Resolution No. 5 — Health Care Fees

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Mr. Neudorf and the amendment thereto by Mr. Draper.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise to address the motion which is before us. And for the information of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and those who are following the proceedings, I remind the . . . regarding the amendment that was brought forth by the good doctor, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, Mr. Speaker, which would be worded as follows:

That this Assembly commend the government for standing firm in its commitment to universal health care by keeping Saskatchewan one of the few provinces not to charge annual health premiums, and for showing leadership by expanding medicare into a wellness model, in spite of the staggering financial obstacles now facing this administration.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is with pride in the history of my province and pride in the history of my political party, Mr. Speaker, and the close relationship between those two, that I stand in support of this resolution before us today.

And, Mr. Speaker, in 28 days, a week . . . sorry, 4 weeks from tomorrow, on July 1, we will be celebrating a very significant anniversary in our province because, Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1992 we will be marking the 30th anniversary of the introduction of medicare in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can first of all begin by expressing my support for the actions of the government in defence of universal health care and in defence of, and in support of, the government's promotion of wellness. Mr. Speaker, to do that I'd like to first of all begin with a very brief review of the history of medicare in our province.

The people of the province will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1944 when the first CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), the first social democratic government in North America came to power, it came to power with, as part of its pledge, to improve the quality of health care with the principles of universality and accessibility, Mr. Speaker, as part of its commitment to the people of Saskatchewan. People will remember as well, Mr. Speaker, that in about 1947, I believe, that hospitalization was introduced in this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I can speak in a little more detail around the series of events that occurred since April 25, 1959, to put our circumstances today into an historical perspective.

On April 25 of 1959 premier Tommy Douglas made a by-election promise in Birch Hills to proceed with a universal medical care insurance plan. And, Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1959, in a very formal kind of way, a commitment was made, a pact was made, a political pact was made between the government of the day, the CCF government of Tommy Douglas, and the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, on June 8 of 1960, Tommy Douglas won his fifth consecutive mandate as premier of our province, campaigning on a medical care plan funded in part through premiums. On November 17 of 1961, Saskatchewan, now under the premiership of the hon. Woodrow Lloyd, passed The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act with an implementation date of April 1 which later was delayed to July 1 of 1962.

On May 3 of 1962 bitter negotiations took place between doctors and the government, and they came to a head when premier Lloyd addressed a special emergency meeting of Saskatchewan doctors in Regina. Doctors voted to oppose the plan, setting the stage for withdrawal of services.

Well, Mr. Speaker, is there anything — anything — that supports the wisdom of the people of Saskatchewan, through their CCF government at that day, to introduce the medicare plan here in our province than reflecting back at that particular meeting on May 3 of 1962 when doctors bitterly opposed — bitterly opposed — assisted by the organization of the Conservative Party of the day, Mr. Speaker, and also fully supported by the premier, the former . . . later premier — he was at that time the leader of the opposition, Ross Thatcher, leader of the Liberal Party — Mr. Speaker, bitterly opposed the Tories and the Libs and the doctors; bitterly opposed the introduction of medicare.

Well isn't it interesting, Mr. Speaker, now this day in 1992 when because of the financial circumstances of the day facing the New Democrat government, having come to office and inherited a deficit with interest payments, Mr. Speaker, of approximately \$760 million a year, \$2 million a day . . . Two million dollars a day just to pay interest on the debt.

As changes are made to the health care provided to the people of Saskatchewan in order to try to preserve the future of health care, some of the strongest opponents of changes, Mr. Speaker, become practitioners in the health care system, those very same people who 30 years ago opposed the introduction of medicare. So I think that the point is cryptically made, Mr. Speaker, that medicare has become not only for the people of Saskatchewan but also for the health care professionals of Saskatchewan, a program which is implicit to the quality of health care for the province in its most universal terms.

Well, Mr. Speaker, July 1, 1962, a day that goes down in the history of Saskatchewan and of Canada, born on July

1, 1962, what I think has become Saskatchewan's greatest gift to the people of Canada, on July 1, 1962, introduced, completely paid for by the taxes and the premiums of the people of Saskatchewan, North America's first medicare program here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as history would have it, the CCF government of the day was removed from office in 1964, and Ross Thatcher leading the Liberals came to office. And in March 1968, premier Ross Thatcher introduced utilization fees; utilization fees he called them, Mr. Speaker. The rest of the province called them deterrent fees. Well, Mr. Speaker, as history would have it, the government changed again. The government changed again, Mr. Speaker, and in 1971, Allan Blakeney led the New Democratic Party back into office and in 1971 the New Democratic Party government abolished deterrent fees from medicare in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Hagel:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as a result of prudent management of the resources of our province and as a result of a social conscience, by 1975 the New Democratic Party government was able to take another step. Thirteen years after the introduction of medicare, Mr. Speaker, on November 1975, the NDP government abolished medical and hospital premiums and therefore providing health care to all people of Saskatchewan without direct fee, Mr. Speaker, a program paid as history has evolved, partially funded by provincial as well as federal revenues.

That begins to become a growing issue, the federal share of funding for medicare these days, Mr. Speaker. But it was at that time . . . the decision was made that it will be publicly funded health care for the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as history would have it, governments change, and the history had it again. Another change took place. And then in June 1987, Mr. Speaker, another significant event in the history of health care in the province of Saskatchewan, one that many of us in this province will long remember. In fact I would go so far as to say, Mr. Speaker, that for a good number of the people of Saskatchewan, one that people will never forget.

The premier at that time, the minister from Estevan, the member from Estevan and the PC government, ended the school-based dental program, firing 294 dental therapists and turning dental care for elementary school children over to dentists, thus beginning, Mr. Speaker, in a very cryptic and a very significant kind of way the move towards the privatization of health care in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I stand in this Assembly today, as I said, proud of the history of our province and proud of the history of my party's association with the people of Saskatchewan in regards to health care in our province.

And, Mr. Speaker, we find that is a system which is under attack these days in a number of ways — some ways directly and by conscious decision by the Conservative

government in Ottawa, with the conscious decision to be continuing a practice of cutting back the funding for health care from the . . . in terms of the federal share for the province of Saskatchewan and other provinces.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as we go through this new consciousness of health care, leading I think to what many would describe as dramatic new steps being taken — some would say with controversy; others would say at long last, Mr. Speaker — that does not to say that everyone among us is progressive. And that is not to say that everyone among us supports those sacred principles of medicare, of universality and accessibility, Mr. Speaker.

I have before me an article from the April 7 Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* with the title, Mr. Speaker, “Universal health care impossible: Manning.” It’s clearly, Mr. Speaker, the view of the Leader of the Reform Party of Canada that universal health care does not have a future for the people of Saskatchewan or the people of Canada. In fact he attempted to make the point when he was visiting here in our province at that time, that here in the home of medicare would be the place to begin to reduce the universal accessibility to health care.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say as I stand in my place that Preston Manning’s proposal for health care is not acceptable to the New Democratic Party Government of Saskatchewan. It is a proposal which this government has considered, has rejected, and has, Mr. Speaker, made a firm decision this year that we will continue with universal accessibility to health care as it has been the tradition since the Allan Blakeney government removed the premiums in 1975.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not to say that we’re out of the woods by no stretch of the imagination. In fact as I look through the clippings, Mr. Speaker, of the news of the day, I see that there is a group which continues to be concerned, and a number of groups across the nation which continue to be concerned about the accessibility to quality health care in our nation. In fact there has been some advertising which many of us have seen and many have supported, for a television program which will be aired on June 18, Mr. Speaker, in defence of the universally accessible health care system.

And so, as Tommy Douglas was prone to tell us, Mr. Speaker, when he walked through Saskatchewan in his days as premier and then after going on to the federal level and coming back to our province, I remember hearing Tommy Douglas say many times that the fight for medicare will never end as long as there are right-wing parties that are roaming our province and our society — and so the fight does go on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the future of health care, I’m not suggesting for a moment that nothing can or should change. In fact I think as we go through the review of health care these days, there is a very valid debate about the best way of providing universally accessible health care.

Now I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a *Leader-Post* article by political columnist Dale Eisler — entitled: Doctors abuse

medicare — which suggests, Mr. Speaker, that there may have to be some changes to the system.

Now I’m not saying that every physician in the province of Saskatchewan is prone to abuse the medicare system. But, Mr. Speaker, I think there is not one of us, not a single one of us in this Assembly, who has not had several conversations with several health care professionals, Mr. Speaker, who have suggested that among their colleagues there are those who have taken to abuse the fee-for-service system that exists primarily in this province, and have put their well-being, their financial well-being, ahead of the personal well-being or the health well-being of their patients and the financial well-being of our health care system in the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is clearly the view of the government of the day — and I share that view, Mr. Speaker — that the time for using our health care system for building empires, for bloating egos, and for bloating bank accounts is over. It is time that the health care system of Saskatchewan must — crystal clear — see it as priority, the provision of health care services universally accessible — quality health care services for the people of Saskatchewan. And that’s where the priority must lie.

(1445)

Well, Mr. Speaker, the notion that Mr. Eisler indicates in his article is one that the system has to change, that we have to look at different kinds of structures in the delivery of the health care system which will make it a little more difficult, or perhaps if there are deterrents, Mr. Speaker, in the system, the deterrents must be applied to abuse and not to use.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that’s a notion that must be endorsed. When I pick up a copy of the *Star-Phoenix* of March 19 of this year, in a letter in the editorial section, an article entitled “Letting doctors keep gates not best idea.” A personal opinion expressed by a resident of that city, Mr. Speaker. I think it simply indicates that that is a notion that the people in the province are beginning to see a little more clearly and more commonly.

In fact it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, that a poll taken about two years in this province had indicated that over 50 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan were in support of the notion of having structures where physicians, health care professionals, are being paid salary as opposed to fee for service. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a notion that has to be given very, very serious consideration in these times when we find ourselves being concerned about the very future of quality, universally accessible health care.

And, Mr. Speaker, again as I look through the clippings in the recent fixation — appropriately so by the media — on our health system here in Saskatchewan, I find another article dated April 21 of 1992 in the *Star-Phoenix* entitled “Health system’s efficiency must improve: consultant.” And if I can read just in part, Mr. Speaker, from that article, I think it summarizes the directions that health care must be taking, and in fact is taking in the province of Saskatchewan these very days.

It begins out, it begins, Mr. Speaker:

The health system has to make better use of its people and money to ensure its survival, says a health care consultant.

Speaking at a forum entitled Trends in Health Care Delivery at the Royal University Hospital on Wednesday, Susan Hyatt of Toronto said medicare has reached a pivotal point in history.

And that is has, Mr. Speaker. In the article it points out in her address that Ms. Hyatt refers to three things that she thinks need to be done. One:

Evaluating the health care needs of the community;

In other words the health care system should be there to respond to the needs of the people not to respond to the desires of the professionals to the needs of the people.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, she suggests:

Developing a strategic plan that would substitute health care workers at different positions to provide the best care at the least cost;

Now, Mr. Speaker, this becomes a significant factor for us.

I was alarmed when I heard a speaker, on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, about a month ago, who was addressing the Saskatchewan home and school association, and was talking about the change in demographics going on in our province today. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it tells us something about the responsibility that we have to exercise in this Assembly on behalf of our constituents, when we take a look at what is happening in the demographics.

Fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1921, the average life expectancy for people in Saskatchewan was 60 years — 60 years. Here we are in 1992 — the study was done in 1991, Mr. Speaker. By 1991 the life expectancy for the average Saskatchewan resident had risen to 77 years, an increase of 17 years to life expectancy, Mr. Speaker, in just a little over three generations.

And so it's not surprising when we look at the use of health care that we find an increasing amount — well over half — of our health care system is dedicated to health care targeted for people who are the age 65 and older, the seniors of our province. Mr. Speaker, there's nothing inappropriate about that at all. In fact, I suppose one could say in a twisted kind of way, I suppose, that one of the problems with our health care system is that it's working so doggone good.

You see, Mr. Speaker, as a result of our health care system serving the needs of people, they're living longer. And as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, the exposure to requiring health care in different forms, Mr. Speaker, has increased.

So it is as a result of a health care system which has served

us well that we find ourselves struggling with a new challenge, a new challenge to our health care system and the ability to continue to afford to provide what we have come to expect in the past as worthy of being taken for granted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the third point that Ms. Hyatt makes is that she suggests:

Shifting to community-based health services from acute care facilities.

And I'll comment on that a little more just briefly, Mr. Speaker.

She goes on to say, and I'll just quote another couple paragraphs, Mr. Speaker:

Governments are spending enough money on health care, she said. "What we need now is a reallocation of resources so there can be more effectiveness and (more) efficiency."

Citing the recent creation of the Saskatoon Health Board, she said linking organizations under a single authority provides better services, and more importantly for governments, means greater fiscal responsibility.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to now refer to an article in the *Leader-Post* written April 30. This is nine days after the article in which Ms. Hyatt's comments are reported. And this one is entitled: "Health model explained." And, Mr. Speaker, what it covers is the remarks of the Minister of Health — the Minister of Health for the province of Saskatchewan on April 30 of this year, just a month ago.

And if I can read . . . It's a brief article, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to read it in its entirety into the record because I think, Mr. Speaker, in its coverage it touches on a number of points specifically and extremely succinctly and ties them together:

Saskatchewan's wellness model of health care will incorporate preventive health care, accident prevention and safety programs, changes to the Public Health Act, and integrated health facilities, says Health Minister Louise Simard.

Mr. Speaker, can I just repeat that, because what we're saying here is that preventive health care wellness is an approach to health care which involves movements on a number of fronts. Preventive health care, accident prevention, safety programs, public health, integrated health facilities — Mr. Speaker, all of those.

He goes on to say:

One of the cornerstones of the wellness model of health care is disease and accident prevention, she said, noting increased public awareness is the key to making the "wellness concept" work.

"For every dollar spent on treating sickness less than a nickel is spent on prevention," Simard told the Saskatchewan Safety Council annual meeting

on Wednesday.

Communities must work together to establish district health boards, which will oversee the delivery of health-care services to geographic areas encompassing one or two home-care districts, she said.

Simard also talked about communities establishing public health centres where a variety of health education and preventive services could be provided by a multi-disciplinary team that would include nurses, therapists, nutritionists and other health professionals.

And I think we see, Mr. Speaker, as the Government of Saskatchewan is looking to the future in health care, more of an emphasis on holistic health care, bringing services, Mr. Speaker, together and finding professions working in co-operation as opposed in isolation from one another.

And the article concludes, Mr. Speaker:

But, she warned, if communities aren't prepared to work together to integrate health-care facilities and do away with any duplication of services, the province may have to arbitrarily implement the necessary changes and set the boundaries for district health boards.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the province of Saskatchewan is saying very clearly, the days of empire building are over. It's the quality of services to people which must reign supreme in terms of criteria to judge where we go and how we get there.

And I just go back, Mr. Speaker, for a reminder. As the Minister of Health said, for every dollar spent on treating sickness less than a nickel is spent on prevention. And I think in that, Mr. Speaker, is forecast the need for a new priority here in the province of Saskatchewan in the long-term interest of the people of our province, an increasing, a growing emphasis, on the prevention of sickness as part of the wellness model for health care.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I look at what the Minister of Finance said when he presented his budget in this Assembly on May 7, what do I find? Mr. Speaker, I think what I find is a tangible, concrete commitment to the wellness model of health care, Mr. Speaker.

I find the same thing when I look in the Speech from the Throne. And let me just review that, Mr. Speaker, because this government is interested not in rhetoric, as we've heard over the past number of years, but is interested in making the necessary changes and making the necessary commitments to ensure the future well-being, future wellness of health care in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance stood in his place on May 7, he told us that home care funding is increased in this budget by 20 per cent — 20 per cent, Mr. Speaker — in a budget in which the total spending of government is cut back by 3 per cent, Mr. Speaker, the total spending cut back by 3 per cent, and in which, Mr. Speaker, the payment on interest, because of that rising

mammoth debt inflicted on the people of Saskatchewan by the Tory government prior, rising to \$760 million; still, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party Government of Saskatchewan has committed itself to a 20 per cent increase in funding for home care for the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not only sensitive, it is also prudent, Mr. Speaker. Because the fact of the matter is this, is that home care is not only the most desirable form of support for many of our senior citizens, it is also the least expensive. And it is not often, Mr. Speaker, in the world of government that the best quality, most desired service is also the least expensive. But compared to nursing home services, Mr. Speaker, or even more expensively, health care beds, Mr. Speaker, which are now costing in the neighbourhood of about \$500 per bed per day, Mr. Speaker, money dedicated to home care is money well spent, both in terms of quality of services to our seniors as well as in terms of fiscal prudence and service to the taxpayer of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the budget as well the Minister of Finance stood in his place and he said that there would be increased funding for northern water and sewage projects, Mr. Speaker, which again is a commitment, a tangible commitment to reduce the negative impacts of these matters on health for Northerners — increased funding for child hunger, Mr. Speaker, by 35 per cent.

And let me just stop for a moment and comment on that. Because it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when a government commits itself to wellness that it's committing itself, Mr. Speaker, realistically to several things. As I said before and as the Minister of Health has said: to incorporate preventive health care and accident prevention and safety programs and public health on integrated health facilities. But also with that, Mr. Speaker, is the responsibility to attack the root causes of poor health for many in our society, which is poverty.

And, Mr. Speaker, one of the commitments, the ways, the tangible expressions of commitment to wellness in Saskatchewan, is through a 35 per cent funding increase for child food programs, Mr. Speaker, as a positive step to well-being and the long-term health of a high risk group.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as well, when I took a look at the Speech from the Throne, I noted as well that there we are expecting in this legislative session changes and improvements to The Occupational Health and Safety Act — Health and Safety Act, I underline.

Mr. Speaker, again as part of a recognition that if you're interested in the wellness of people you have to look at the delivery of your health care programs directly. But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, work to reduce poverty in high risk groups and also work to reduce accidents on the job for people who are working.

Mr. Speaker, as well, we have been advised that this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, will be considering an environmental bill of rights as a part of this legislative session. Mr. Speaker, again a tangible expression for wellness for the people of Saskatchewan by their New Democratic Party government as part of their health care

commitment to the people of Saskatchewan.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I note in the budget, in which there were not many items that were capable of finding an increase in spending, an increase for mental health services, Mr. Speaker, and increased family support services to address areas of teen pregnancy, family planning, and family violence. And, Mr. Speaker, throughout the Speech from the Throne and the budget, increased emphasis all along towards more community-based services.

(1500)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I've outlined in some detail the commitment to wellness by the province of Saskatchewan. And I'd like to just very briefly take a look at the other side of the coin before I take my place.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, here we are on July 1 about to celebrate the 30th anniversary of medicare in Saskatchewan. Our neighbours to the south, the Americans, at long last, Mr. Speaker, have finally discovered that maybe Canadians have got something going for them and that the people of Saskatchewan knew back in 1962 what they were doing when they introduced Canada's first medicare program.

For you see, Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the same way that we're finding here in Saskatchewan pressures related to the mechanisms of delivery of health care for financial reasons, they're finding for similar reasons that they need to move to a medicare system in the United States.

When I look at an article back . . . this is 1990, so it's May 7, 1990, two years old, entitled: "Call for radical surgery" — this is an article in *Time* magazine, certainly not a magazine which has any political axe to grind — it does a very quick and dirty comparison of the quality of health care services in the United States and Canada. Mr. Speaker, if we ever need any convincing that we've been on to a good thing and that we need to preserve those principles that we instituted and have made as part of our commitment to preserve, we need only look to our neighbours to the south.

In 1990, Mr. Speaker, the annual health cost per capita in the United States was \$1,926, just about \$2,000. In fact I'm sure by 1992, by now, it would be in excess of that.

Here in Canada, the annual health cost per capita is \$1,370. And in this budget of this year, Mr. Speaker, that figure would be approximately \$1,500 per Saskatchewan resident being dedicated in Department of Health budget for the health of Saskatchewan people.

As a percentage of gross national product in the United States, they were paying 11.1 per cent for health care; in Canada, only 8.5 per cent of gross national product being dedicated to health care.

But what about life expectancy? Which one is better? Obviously it's more expensive in the United States than Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, in fact here in Canada people are living longer, life expectancy of 77 years as opposed to 75 in the United States.

And infant mortality, Mr. Speaker. I've commented on the senior end of the age spectrum, let me refer to the baby end of the age spectrum. What about that end of the health care system? In the United States they average a loss of 11 babies per 1,000 births in their health care system; in Canada, that number is 7.

And, Mr. Speaker, if we need any convincing at all, one final figure. In Canada . . . well first of all let's start in the United States. In the United States the percentage of the population not covered by any form of health care insurance — 14 per cent, Mr. Speaker. In the United States one out of seven people is not covered by health care insurance. In Canada, Mr. Speaker, the percentage of people not covered by health care insurance is zero — zero.

Mr. Speaker, in Canada, at less cost and higher effectiveness, Mr. Speaker, we also have ensured that every Canadian will have access to quality health services. And that's a commitment that was born in the province of Saskatchewan and continues today in this province and across the nation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, just finally I make brief reference to a couple of articles, one from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of April 25, entitled: "Creative approach to health sought," which I think spells out the challenge that faces all of us concerned about health care in Saskatchewan today. And if I can just read the introductory paragraphs to this article, Mr. Speaker, it says this:

Health care professionals care more about promoting a holistic approach to health than current funding shortages.

Mental and public health professionals sat down to discuss strengths, problems, and possible actions in their world during the Caring Community conference Friday.

The gathering energized a valuable partnership between the co-sponsors — the Saskatchewan division of the Canadian Mental Health Association and the Saskatchewan Public Health Association.

Health workers are finding creative ways to work together instead of concentrating on the dollar crisis, says Judith Martin, administrator of the Saskatoon Community Clinic.

And, Mr. Speaker, therein lies the solution; therein lies the future. In spite of the fact that our health care system is working so well that it increases the demands because people are living longer, it is possible, I believe, to maintain and to preserve for the people of Saskatchewan access, universal access, to quality health care.

The key, Mr. Speaker, is co-operation. It's the health care professionals working together. It's people in communities working together, and it's communities working together, Mr. Speaker, which shall be the key — which shall be the key to ensuring that this great accomplishment in the history of our province shall

continue to be something about which we feel proud for generations to come in the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can conclude by making reference to an editorial, April 16, in the *Leader-Post* which comments on some of the tough decisions being faced by the province of Saskatchewan, by the Government of Saskatchewan today, and I quote in conclusion this editorial, Mr. Speaker:

Whether action is taken through premiums or a combination of changes, it can only be one aspect of a package that would require federal co-operation by amending the Canada Health Act.

Good point, Mr. Speaker, that the co-operation must also involve the federal government with the Government of Saskatchewan.

Until the trial balloon turns out to have more helium than hot air, judgment must be suspended.

Mr. Speaker, it concludes with this sentence:

The NDP is showing considerable courage and vision (considerable courage and vision) in tackling a sacred, but quite ill, cow.

Well, Mr. Speaker, health care may be a tad on the ill side now, but it is with the commitment to curing the system that exists to serve people, and a system which begins to emphasize more and more the importance of staying healthy while at the same time ensuring that the sick will be cured, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue with that dream — those dreams of those pioneers who came before us, some of them 50 years ago, as part of that original dream that was there in 1944 with the first CCF government and premier Tommy Douglas, hospitalization, medicare in 1962, that beats so strongly, Mr. Speaker, in the breasts of so many Saskatchewan people.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is with that in mind that I take my place, saying that I firmly support this resolution moved by the good doctor, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg:

That this Assembly commend the government for standing firm in its commitment to universal health care by keeping Saskatchewan one of the few provinces not to charge annual health premiums, and for showing leadership by expanding medicare into a wellness model, in spite of the staggering financial obstacles now facing this administration.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to join my colleague from Moose Jaw Palliser in commending the Government of Saskatchewan for not having premiums in this province. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take much time in addressing this resolution, but

I did want to talk about 1992 as being the 30th year of medicare, universal medicare, in Saskatchewan.

It was Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan citizens along with their government, that introduced the first medicare system in Canada, let alone North America, and our province has been looked to by citizens all across North America as a model for health care delivery in Canada and in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I was an eight-year-old child, I think, in 1962 when the CCF government, under the leadership of premier Woodrow Lloyd, introduced medicare. Mr. Speaker, Woodrow Lloyd was the MLA for the constituency of Biggar, an area that I grew up in. My family was very supportive of Woodrow Lloyd and his government. Woodrow Lloyd had been my mother's high school principal, and in fact that's how my family got involved in the political process in the 1940s and 1950s because of Woodrow Lloyd's leadership in our community.

Mr. Speaker, when the CCF government decided in 1962 to introduce medicare, obviously the province of Saskatchewan underwent a great deal of turmoil. In my community there were people who were called the KODs; they were the people that were the Keep Our Doctors. And there was another group of people, Mr. Speaker, that were called the SOBs, and I won't tell you what that happened to mean. My family happened to be in the SOB category because they were defending Woodrow Lloyd and his government's right to introduce medicare in this province.

And I want to remind the people of Saskatchewan who opposed medicare in those days, the people who opposed the introduction of a universal health care system in this province where people did not have to have money to go to a doctor or go to a hospital were the people like Ross Thatcher, like some of the medical people in this province — people like Staff Barootes who is now a Conservative senator from the province of Saskatchewan. Conservatives and Liberals opposed the CCF government.

And in fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the John Birch Society which painted a red picture of the province of Saskatchewan, saying that the people of this province were communists. Well the people of this province were not communists. They simply wanted their citizens to have access to a health care system, not on how much money they had in their pocket, but on whether or not they had the genuine need to see a doctor or go to the hospital.

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Now as my colleague has described in his previous remarks, slowly over time CCF and NDP governments moved to expand our health care system to include more and more services that people didn't have to have money in order to access those services.

Over time, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has obviously become a model for other parts of the world. And I was the Health critic for the NDP opposition in 1987, which



was the 25th anniversary of medicare, when the members opposite chose to do in the finest dental health program in all of North America and in fact all of the world — the school-based children's dental program.

It was a very inexpensive way of delivering primary health care to citizens and children living in rural Saskatchewan and urban Saskatchewan. There was absolutely no consultation with the dental therapists and the dental health nurses. There was absolutely no consultation with the parents, with school boards. They simply did in the program, Mr. Speaker.

Now obviously the province of Saskatchewan since 1982 has undergone a major fiscal transition. The members opposite spent money like it was going out of style. They had money for their business friends; they had money for out of province corporations; they sold off many public assets at fire-sale prices. In fact, many of those public assets we received no money for.

And so that leads us to the 30th year of medicare in this province: 1992, where this province faces a BBB rating, where this province faces a \$15 billion deficit — the largest deficit per capita of any province in Canada. Ten years ago we had no deficit. We had the finest credit rating in the country. But here we are 10 years later and medicare — not because of what's happened in the medicare system, Mr. Speaker, but what's happened with this province's fiscal situation — is under a great deal of consternation.

Now there are many citizens in this province that are concerned about what our government has done to deal with the deficit crisis we face. We have implemented user fees for optometric services. We have increased the deductible for the prescription drug plan. We are probably going to go to a co-payment for chiropractic services.

These are measures, Mr. Speaker, that not one person on this side of the House enjoys. And I know, Mr. Speaker, from speaking to the Minister of Health, she does not enjoy this process at all; in fact she finds it gut-wrenching.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of trying to transform the health care system and move on to the second level of medicare in this province — the wellness model. And there are citizens who aren't quite clear what the wellness model means.

(1515)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to use the creativity that we had in 1962 when we decided to have a universal medicare system in the province of Saskatchewan. When the doctors of Saskatchewan went on strike in 1962, the citizens where I come from — Biggar, Saskatchewan — rallied together and built their own community health centre where they put doctors on salaries. That's how they dealt with the health crisis in 1962.

We have another health crisis in this province in 1992 in that we have a horrendous deficit. And the citizens of this province are going to have to be creative and devise their own community-based solutions to deal with that crisis.

And I see in the city of Saskatoon and the city of Regina and Prince Albert, various health people coming together to have an integrated approach to health care delivery.

For the first time in the history of Saskatchewan we have the hospitals in Saskatoon, we have two nursing homes in Saskatoon, along with the home care board and mental health people, community health services, coming together under one super-board to try and devise a way of delivering health in the city of Saskatoon in such a way that it's integrated. We don't have duplication of services and we're not spending money needlessly.

I think those are the kinds of creative solutions that each community across Saskatchewan is going to have to partake in if we are going to deal with the fiscal crisis Saskatchewan faces.

Wellness, Mr. Speaker, can mean all kinds of things. It can mean whatever the community decides that it's going to mean. Wellness can mean a needle exchange program for drug-addicted street people who are engaged in something that I certainly am not supportive of, but there are drug-addicted people who use needles.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, once AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) gets in that population it's a very expensive process for the citizens of a province or a country to have to support an AIDS victim. A needle exchange program could cost \$10,000 in the city of Saskatoon or Regina, and it could prevent the spending of hundreds of thousands of dollars in medical treatment and it could also save lives, Mr. Speaker.

Wellness can mean whatever communities want it to mean. And I would urge the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to come together to devise their own solutions so we can go on to the second stage of medicare, Mr. Speaker.

I want to allow other colleagues to speak and so I will take my place.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Langford:** — I'd like to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Langford:** — Mr. Speaker, in your gallery I have 19 grade 8 students from Canwood. Canwood is originated on the west side of my constituency. I will be meeting with them for pictures at 3:30. The teachers are Edith Larsen and Dennis Lehmann. Chaperons are Barb Danberg and Glen Person, and the bus driver is Wayne Person.

I wish you students an enjoyable trip and safe journey home. And I will be taking pictures and drinks with you later.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Mr. Speaker, I too am happy to greet the folks that are in to visit and it's nice to see them here this afternoon. I hope they enjoy their stay.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### Resolution No. 5 — Health Care Fees (continued)

**Mr. Goohsen:** — I want to talk for a minute or two about the adjourned debate on this health motion.

I want to warn the members, Mr. Speaker, that when I complete my remarks I will be moving to adjourn the debate, unless someone hands me a note firmly requesting for some good reason that I do otherwise. Some of the government members as well as some of my own colleagues have indicated that they might like to debate this issue a bit more on another day. So unless I see that, I will proceed. So you can be forewarned.

Now I took some interest in the comments of a couple of the folks that were discussing this Bill. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in all sincerity wish that we could pass a motion and an amendment sometimes because truly this motion has got some good points, and the amendment also has some good points. And it's too bad that we can't sort of melt the two together and use them both.

But I think we've served the purpose by seeing both of them here, of having the folks know that there are some good things in both of them. And as we debate this, they will see that in general I think our two parties — and I expect all three political parties in our province — have got a goal in mind that would be very much similar. And that goal I should hope would be to provide good health care to the people of our province.

We can debate sometimes the methods that we go about it, the methods that we would pay for it, but I think the ultimate goal of having good health is truly one that everyone wants. And if you don't believe in that, get sick for a while and see what you think about doctors then. They're probably the first fellow you're going to run to. And I know that there's at least one member in this House that probably would be willing to help us out.

I noted that there was some discussion about the health care issue in dental care that had happened in the past as we discussed some of the things that happened in the past. And I couldn't help but think at that point that yes, there were some good things about having a dental program in schools. Obviously every program has some good points.

And also though, there are some bad points. And I guess the reality is that in those days they had to weigh the good against the bad and see which could be the one that you could afford to do. It was an extremely costly program. And I have children myself, Mr. Speaker, that were involved in that program. And it was certainly convenient for them to just go to school and come home with their teeth fixed. But on the other hand, we found that the program was discouraging the growth of the dental industry for the rest of the population.

The way it was explained to me is that an awful lot of dentists require the child work in order to supplement their incomes so that they can justify staying in a community. And so when the plan was cancelled, it was difficult for a lot of people to readjust back to the old ideas of going to a dentist somewhere in place besides the school.

But what did happen was a good spin-off. And there were some good points to this program when it was cancelled. We found that places . . . like my colleague from Souris-Cannington pointed out a minute ago here, they had one dentist in 1981 in Carlyle, and shortly after the dental program was cancelled three located there. And they moved their activities into the Redvers and Oxbow communities as well.

That same process happened in my community, and for that I think we can be grateful to the dental association and to the people who are dentists in this province. It was a little more inconvenient for parents to have to take their children, but at the same time we were providing that service then for the adult community that had to travel sometimes 50 to 100 miles to find a dentist and make appointments three to six months ahead of time.

And so the good and the bad have to be weighed. And I'm not going to debate that issue any more except to point out that choices had to be made. They weren't easy choices in those days either, I'm sure. And a lot of people though can see that with those choices there has been some good.

The health area is under attack, one of the members across the way said, by certain people in certain areas, politically. And I would say that I have to, to some degree, agree with that statement. Obviously, at the national front, which was mentioned, the Reform Party has attacked the way that we do our health care system, the way that we fund it. And certainly they are making their point known throughout all of the country. And their ideas, I guess, will have to be judged at the next election.

But we also have, at the present time, an attack in our own province against the health care system by this very government. The NDP have been the ones that brought in the elimination of assistance to people that need optometric services. They're the ones that brought in a cancellation of assistance for people who need chiropractic services.

And so who has really started to put fees onto health care? It's this government, this government of today.

The member opposite made the comment, and I won't say that I can repeat it exactly word for word the way he said it, but he said the health care system was working so doggone good, and that's the trouble. Well maybe it is the trouble. But if it's working so doggone good, how could it have been working so doggone good unless it was the PC administration over the last nine years that made it possible for that to happen. It's a pure fact of life that this health care system didn't just grow out of the ground all of a sudden, it started back in 1962 by the member opposite's very comments of today.

And I'll have you know, just in passing, that I happen to live in the area where health region no. 1 originated. And health region no. 1, of course, was the model example that was used to test the way that this type of a program could work. And we were, in fact, the living guinea pigs of the original program and if we hadn't been able to, as a people, show that it would work, the rest of the province never would have had it. And so we take a lot of credit for that co-operation, and we believe that the people of our area did a good job of showing that it could work and assisting the government of the day.

So if the program is so doggone good . . . It has to have been, that what it costs, the kinds of billions of dollars that it costs for health costs, it has to have been a program that all of the governments that have come and gone have contributed to and done some good for. And I think probably the reality is that health care is getting very expensive and we are going to have to look at some ways to support it.

But we have to be careful in which direction we go. We have in our province at the moment a super-centralization kind of a direction of future seeming to be developed. And that frightens me, because we've got some big areas in this province where you can travel and all you see, as they say, is miles and miles of miles and miles.

But out in those areas there are some people. And they have the need to have medical care and medical attention. And the super-centralization of bringing all of your medical care into a concentration into the two or three big cities in the province simply does not lend to a wellness formula for the people who live 200 and 300 miles away from those centres.

We have to have a rural network of hospitals and of special care homes in this province if we are going to fairly provide for all of the people. And I think this government has gone on record as saying that they want to treat people equally and treat people well. And I believe that they mean that, and I'm going to take them at their word and demand that they stick to that policy and provide health care equally for all of the people of our province and not just for those that can stagger into one of the big cities.

I believe quite honestly that hospitals in places like Eastend should be completed. I don't believe that they were built as monuments for anybody. I never saw anybody ever try to put their name on a plaque and stick it on the front door of that hospital, saying, I caused this to happen. I don't think it happened in Shaunavon. I don't think it happened in Maple Creek. Those people built those institutions and those facilities in order to help people provide the kind of medical services that are needed there, the kind of medical services that were proven to be needed by research and study that went into those programs.

This was not political decisions made in health care. The political ball games were played out on the other fields. They weren't played with the lives of people who were sick. There's nobody can convince me that that could

happen in the province of Saskatchewan with any political party. We just don't play politics with people's lives when they're sick.

I've got to say, Mr. Speaker, that in a way I sort of like some of the amendment because it does say that we should go for a wellness program, and why not? What fool would say that we're against wellness in our province. It is a good idea to have wellness programs if we can afford them and put them into place. And why not have them? But let's not destroy rural hospitals and rural area health care for rural people.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think that I've pointed out those issues for today that I want to let the folks know about and to have our government think about, and basically that is to give some consideration to rural Saskatchewan in health care and don't just tear the whole system down by starting with them.

And with that, I haven't received any notes to the contrary, so I move that we adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### MOTIONS

#### Amendment to Television Guidelines in Rules Committee

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Van Mulligen.

Motion agreed to.

(1530)

#### Federal Opposition to Leaseback Program

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. McPherson and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Martens.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to take a few moments today to add to some of the remarks that I made previously regarding the motion as presented by the member from Shaunavon.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we're quite well aware of the difficulties and the crisis that has been facing agricultural producers across the province of Saskatchewan for the past number of years, not only in Saskatchewan but as well the prairie provinces and indeed across Canada.

As we've acknowledged earlier, Mr. Speaker, we brought to the attention of the Assembly that it is our feeling that as individual governments — provincial governments, federal governments — we must work together. And it's not always appropriate to always look at putting the blame on someone else — laying the blame at somebody else's feet and asking them to continually be divvying up or providing the funding that it is needed to maintain not just agriculture but many of the sectors of our province that we have come to appreciate and enjoy such as the health and educational fields, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that federal assistance is needed and continues to be needed in the agricultural field. We are quite well aware of the fact that last summer was . . . and last year we had an exceptional growing season in the agricultural field. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite well aware, even in my own area, of the number of producers who still have sufficient quantities of grain in their bins.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, despite the abundance of grain and the availability of it, the facts are that the prices are still too low to support the industry. And in light of that, we are supportive of the fact that the federal government certainly put some funds in to support and strengthen the agricultural sector here in Saskatchewan.

We do have a problem as well, Mr. Speaker, with the fact that the federal government has decided to collect overpayments under the Western Grain Stabilization Act. And as I indicated earlier in the House, Mr. Speaker, I've conferred with my federal MP (Member of Parliament) and related the concerns that have been coming into my office regarding repayment of the overpayment to the western grain stabilization payment.

The motion that was presented did ask that the government take this overpayment out of the \$500 million that the province is demanding of the federal government at this time, Mr. Speaker. And I'll give way to allow the member to . . .

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

**Mr. Sonntag:** — I ask leave of the Assembly to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Sonntag:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you — and seated in your gallery — and to the rest of the members of the Assembly here today, 12 grade 7 and 8 students from the Waterhen Reserve, and their teacher, Phyllis Longobardi.

I think that there are no other students in the province that would have travelled as far to get to the Assembly here today. I travel six and a half to seven hours to get here, and they are an additional hour beyond that. So I would ask the rest of the members here to join with me in welcoming them, and I will be meeting them shortly for pictures and refreshments.

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

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

**Mr. Goulet:** — I'm just replying to the introduction of the guests, welcoming the guests.

**The Speaker:** — Does the member have leave to introduce guests?

Leave granted.

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to stand to welcome the guests from Waterhen. Waterhen of course is on the other side of the province from my constituency in Cumberland. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very important to introduce the guests in their own language which is Cree. So I would like to say a couple of words of welcome.

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.)

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

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### MOTIONS

#### Federal Opposition to Leaseback Program (continued)

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would welcome the students who have come down from northern Saskatchewan to visit the Assembly and visit the provincial capital today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, certainly there are many other comments that could be raised regarding the motion that is set before us and the amendment that was introduced in this Assembly, basically bringing to the forefront the fact that this government must accept some of the responsibility for the province. And certainly it's time for the government to indeed exercise the responsibility as a government to support industry in this province and especially the agricultural sector as we all realize the important role it plays in this province in job creation and economic development and certainly the economic spin-off.

In question period today a number of the economic spin-offs were raised in the fact of the problems that removing the FeedGAP program has brought to many producers across this province. And I have a letter that was sent to me, a letter that was sent as well to the Finance minister. And many of us on this side of the House have had many concerns raised especially in the elimination of the FeedGAP program and the fact that the increases in the tax on farm fuels and the fact that the amount that will be refunded has been capped and the livestock cash advance program.

Mr. Speaker, there are many areas that we certainly could stand in this House and address and bring to the attention of the House reasons why we feel the government as well must exercise its responsibility to agricultural producers in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, without continuing the debate, I will allow time for other members to address questions that have been raised through the motion and the amendment.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I see before us we have an amendment on the main motion introduced by the member for Shaunavon which demands that the federal government deduct any overpayment from the outstanding \$500 million that is due and owing, we believe, to the farmers of western Canada. But instead of joining with us in this

motion, members opposite chose again, as they have in the past, not to support a straightforward motion calling upon the federal government to deliver a commitment, but to divert it by putting in an amendment.

And I just want to talk for a minute, Mr. Speaker, about a couple of the points put forward in the amendment. They talk about the changes to GRIP (gross revenue insurance program). And we all know that the 10 opposition members opposite have been voicing their opinion about the changes to GRIP, but I want to make a few comments now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on those changes.

You will recall last year under the old GRIP program there was no incentive for farmers to produce. I'd like the members opposite to listen very carefully to this: there was no incentives for farmers to produce. The best pay-out they could have received is if they produced no crop.

In difficult economic times some chose to do that, others chose not to, and yet others chose to reduce their inputs dramatically because — and I experienced it as a farmer, and I'm sure members opposite must have experienced it too, when you're riding around in the tractor pumping fertilizer and chemical into producing a crop, realizing that every dollar that you put into it is just a dollar you're throwing away — because if you didn't produce any crop, you're economically much better off. A terrible position to put farmers in.

And so what happened last year? Fertilizer sales dropped dramatically. Fertilizer sales in this province were very, very low. I'm not sure exactly the numbers, but they were very low compared to other years.

Now let's compare that to this year, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Any of the members opposite who actively farm as I do will know that there is quite a change this year. In fact when I went to purchase my fertilizer this year . . . Normally I drive down to the . . . I use the Wheat Pool Farm Service Centre and I drive my truck down and get fertilizer that I want any time.

Not so this year. When asked why we can't get fertilizer, the response from the people working there was they just can't keep up. There isn't enough around. When you ask about sales, they say we can't believe it. There's tremendous sales of fertilizer this year. And you can go from the northern forest belt . . . I talked to people up the Shellbrook way right down around Regina. And I'm sure it's that way for every part of the province. They're looking for fertilizer in every nook and cranny that they can find it.

And that is because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the changes to GRIP are positive. Farmers can now farm like they want to farm, like they know how to farm. They didn't have to farm the system.

And the members opposite can chirp, but the fact remains. The changes to the GRIP program were received by farmers who thought, well now I can farm again. It's not a Tory program where I have to rip off the program. I can farm, and I can produce. I have some incentive to produce, and that's the job of every farmer in this

province: to produce food for a hungry world. The Tories took that incentive away.

So, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the 10 tiny members opposite are griping about GRIP, the farmers of this province understand, and there is a new optimism. There is a new optimism out there, and the changes to the GRIP program are a part of it.

And we are the first ones on this side of the House to understand that it's not a perfect program and that the bottom end is weak. But I'll tell you for the most part when you look around this province and see what's happening, farmers are producing again. I talked to a seed grower the other day. He told me he could have sold twice as much barley as he had cleaned and offered seed for sale, and in a normal year that would have been sufficient. There is a new optimism, and the changes to the program are part of it.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have seen this government now . . . In the second part of the amendment it says that this government fails to accept any responsibility to agriculture. Well let me remind the members opposite of the programs that we've put forward. And the member from Moosomin listed off two or three topics that he was concerned about and said that there were many more. Well I know if there were many more, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he would have stood in his place and listed them off. But there are only a few areas of concern, and those areas are being addressed, and the members opposite know that.

But let me put forward what we have done. Immediately upon coming into office we negotiated a short-term moratorium — the members opposite will remember that — a short-term moratorium to give farmers some breathing space to stop any foreclosures.

As I mentioned, there were the changes to the GRIP program, very positive changes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And now we're bringing forward debt legislation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from — I'm not sure where he's from over there — said something about that's why the farmers and I couldn't pick up the rest.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite had, in their 10 years, done any of the . . . made any of the changes that we're putting forward, they may have still been in government. But the problem is they spoke out of one side of their mouth and their actions were totally different.

The debt legislation that's coming forward, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again I'm sure will be opposed by the members opposite, instead of co-operating. In fact we've heard in this House . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — How do you know?

**Mr. Upshall:** — How do I know, the member from Kindersley says. I know because we've already heard their statements condemning the debt legislation, and they haven't even seen the legislation yet. This is why the people of this province de-elected the Tory government and put in a good government — the one we have today.

Besides the debt legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, legislation that will provide security of tenure. The previous government not once in their mandate provided security of tenure for farmers, not once. They oppose it.

Another idea that came out of the debt legislation committee was the idea of a land trust, a community land trust, where farmers could transfer some of their land into a trust in return for cash to pay off some of their debts, and still have security of tenure on that land.

Those are the kinds of positive ideas that this government and these members on this side of the House have put forward in order to help farmers in the farming industry, Mr. Speaker — a land trust, debt legislation, short-term moratoriums, positive changes to GRIP. And I recall one of the programs the members opposite put forward, that was equity financing — a sorry, sorry tale of equity financing that was completely rejected by the members and by the farmers of the province. And we will see in the future how the programs put forward by our government are going to be received. And to date they have been well received.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the life of me I cannot understand why the members opposite do not want to support a motion today, as they have in the past not supported motions, in order that farmers may . . . that this legislature can come together in one voice and ask the federal government to come forward with a \$500 million payment that's owing to the farmers of the province. For the life of me, I cannot understand why they do that. The only conclusion I can draw, the only conclusion I can draw, is that they are supporting Brian Mulroney, their federal cousin in Ottawa, and ignoring the wishes of farmers.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, if you recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you recall on April 28 there was an amendment to a motion put forward by our Minister of Agriculture. And I just want to take a minute, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to read that amendment. It's in three parts:

(1) to call on the federal government to meet its outstanding commitment to provide farmers with the \$500 million deficiency payment for the 1990-91 crop year as soon as possible and to deliver on its commitment for a third line of defence program this year as agreed to at the recent first ministers' conference;

(2) to extend with the federal government's consent the deadline to a date which is mutually agreeable for farmers, the provincial government, and the federal government; and

(3) to accept the request of the farmers to establish a review commission to design a long-term farm income stability program based on the needs of the farm families and the actual cost of production.

That was the amendment to the motion as put forward by

our Minister of Agriculture. The main component here was the \$500 million deficiency payment, the third line of defence that the Tories' federal cousins in Ottawa had been mouthing but not delivering on.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to give you the result from *Hansard*. The Speaker called for the vote, and I quote:

The division bells rang from 4:30 p.m. until 4:32 p.m.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

The yeas, there are two long lists of yeas, being members from our side of the House for the most part. Nays to the \$500 million deficiency payment as put forward in the resolution, nays, and I quote from *Hansard*:

Muirhead, Neudorf, Swenson, Boyd, Martens, Britton, Toth, Goochsen, D'Autremont.

Nays to \$500 million, nay to . . . Let me read it again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, nays:

to call on the federal government to meet its outstanding commitment to provide farmers with the \$500 million deficiency payment for the 1990-91 crop year as soon as possible . . .

And it goes on. Nays, those nine names, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were nine Tories in opposition. Their leader, I think, at that time was off in China somewhere, so wasn't around to vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't understand why the members opposite are opposed to this. And again today, again today in this motion, where we're calling on the federal government to deduct anything outstanding in western grain stabilization from the \$500 million, the same \$500 million that we talked about on April 28, instead of standing up and agreeing with the motion, they put an amendment to try to change the focus.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Tory opposition had no credibility when they lost the election. And a thinking person would wonder why they continue to act as though they were in government trying to run the show, trying to do whatever they want to do without any responsibility.

In order for the members opposite, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to become credible, they have to come forward with some co-operative voting to resolutions that will help the farmers of this province.

We have seen time and time again when they were in government, we have seen them work hand in hand with the federal Tories. Every time the former premier went down to Ottawa, he came back with a bill in his hand and the Saskatchewan taxpayer had to pay it. And we're still paying for it, and we'll be paying for it for 15 or 20 years in the future, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And you would think after the severe thrashing, the severe beating that the Tory government took at the polls last

October, that they might mend their ways. But do they? Obviously not, because on two different occasions now they've had the opportunity to stand in their places, vote with the government and with the farmers of this province, to put pressure on the federal government to put \$500 million into the pockets of western Canadian farmers. And they refuse to do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

You would think, one would think that, as I said, a party that's taken such a defeat would have to ask themselves why. And obviously they haven't asked themselves why because they haven't changed their ways. And I ask the three new members from the Tory caucus why they would jump on a bandwagon or jump on a ship that has sunk to the bottom of the ocean. They have the opportunity to lead a destroyed party back on their feet again by using their heads and voting with their minds instead of sitting in their chairs and being muzzled by Brian Mulroney in Ottawa, who is planning his election ploys, saying, you better do this and you better do that because I'm the boss.

Now these new members over there ought to know better. But obviously they've been brainwashed by the other members who have been around this institution, elected for a few years, but haven't learned their lesson.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the western grain stabilization program was a program that helped many farmers in cash-strapped situations. But now when the Government of Canada has not delivered on a third line of defence, has not delivered on a third line of defence and has actually sent bills to farmers who they claim they've overpaid through western grain stabilization, what's the response from the federal government? What's the response from the members opposite?

In time of severe crisis they don't stand up and say yes, this is wrong; we shouldn't be asking for that money back; we should be delivering on the commitment to deliver \$500 million to western Canadian farmers. They stick by their guns.

Why do the Tories in Ottawa and the Tories in Saskatchewan ignore the needs and the wishes and the rights of survival for Saskatchewan farmers in particular and western Canada farmers in general, deny them the right to survival by worrying more about their hides and their political strategy than worrying about the farm families of this province? That is a question, Mr. Speaker, that remains unanswered. It remains unanswered even though the provincial government got a severe thrashing in the polls. And I predict that the next . . . whenever the federal Prime Minister, whenever the Prime Minister gets up enough courage to call a federal election, he too will get a thrashing in the polls.

You'd think the 10 Tory members in opposition in Saskatchewan would take the message to Ottawa saying, whoa, we've done it wrong; we've done it wrong in the past. We have not been honest with the people and we've found out when you're not honest with the people, they throw you out of government; they throw you out of office. Have the members opposite taken that message? Obviously not. Have they taken the opportunity to vote with the farmers of this province and the government,

asking for delivery of \$500 million? No.

All they do is stand up in their places and complain about a debt program that we're coming forward with when they don't know what it is, complain about the changes to the GRIP program, complaints that fly in the face of the fact that there is a renewed optimism out in rural Saskatchewan. They sit idly in their places and don't vote in favour of monies that would compensate people in the drought areas, in the drought areas of this province who are . . . is an area in the south-west corner, who are very cash-strapped and again looking at no crop.

Do you think that a portion of that \$500 million would help those people out in the Morse constituency, in the west side where there is drought? Would help those people in the Shaunavons and Leader south over across to Assiniboia? Do you think \$500 million, a portion of that would help those farmers? Absolutely it would.

But listen, what do the members do? They vote against it. And listen to this logic. They say the GRIP program is no good. That's what they say, because it doesn't give enough support. The majority of the people in this province I believe now disagree with that.

At the first there was some concerns until the farmers figured out the program and what it did for them and what the potential was. But they're saying the GRIP program is no good. So you'd think if the GRIP program was no good, then they'd be voting to try to get some money in the hands of farmers. But what kind of logic is that when they say the GRIP is no good and then they vote against financial support?

I think it shows, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the confusion, the misguided logic, the inner turmoil over leadership, that they're again more concerned about themselves and who's going to lead the party than actually standing up and co-operating with the farmers of this province as we are doing in order to meet an end. And that is to get some financial stability.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I would ask the opposition members this: you have an opportunity. You have an opportunity to start rebuilding your credibility. You have an opportunity to help cash strapped financial farmers in Saskatchewan. You have the opportunity to show some conscience instead of political manipulateness. I ask: join with the government and the farmers of this province. Call upon the federal government to deliver the \$500 million that they had promised.

With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **Resolution No. 21 — Established Programs Financing Freeze**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Ms. Bradley.

**Ms. Stanger:** — I am pleased to rise to speak to the motion that encourages the federal government to end its three-year freeze on established program financing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm really concerned about this issue because the off-loading of the federal government on the provincial Government of Saskatchewan has resulted in a loss of \$668.8 million since 1986. This puts a severe strain on Saskatchewan to meet the needs of a health care system and the educational system.

The most recent freezes combined with reductions means that the federal government has only paying 39 per cent of the province's expenditures on health and post-secondary education. And as early as 1976, it was paying 50 per cent. This decline is of significance.

So to secure proper training and education for our future needs, we must spend more on our educational system, not less. For obvious reasons, post-secondary education funding should be financed by both the provincial and federal governments. It makes me sad to see the province of Saskatchewan losing out due to the insensitive Tory federal government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have provided well-trained, educated people to many provinces in Canada. Saskatchewan people are recognized all over North America as excellent workers — versatile, well trained and tenacious. And we are sad to see our taxpayers loaded down with taxes to pay for something that the whole country benefits from. It is unfair for the federal government to off-load on Saskatchewan.

Health costs are increasing by leaps and bounds. The Conservatives, both provincially and federally, pretend to be guardians of the health care system, yet they don't put their money where their mouths are. The federal government continues to decrease funding and the provincial PCs put us in a such a financial mess that we must struggle to meet the health care needs of our people.

Folks in my constituency are trying to consolidate and make the health system more efficient and effective. The Lloydminster health care boards are working with both the Saskatchewan and Alberta governments to amalgamate under one board. The rural health care boards of my constituency are meeting to come up with plans that reflect their needs. Twin Rivers Home Care is innovative and it has been implementing wellness clinics that are unique in the health care field. Everyone is co-operating and doing their best to make ends meet in these hard economic times.

(1600)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe the federal government should get their priorities straight. There are ways of coping with the economic downturn. We can do better as a society. Too much real human damage is taking place in the short run and too much destruction of natural economic opportunities in the long run. The government must show strong leadership to renew our economy. The provinces must be treated more fairly, given the heavy financial crunch that they are facing. And these past rounds of the constitutional talks — I think really this is also a unity factor. With the federal government off-loading on the provincial governments, I think it is really causing them a lot of stress.

So I plead with our federal government to consider the impact of their decisions on a province like Saskatchewan. It is time for us to begin to rebuild and renew our economy. Let's work together to get Canada working again.

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

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Chairman, there may be other colleagues that may want to make a few remarks on this motion at a later date, so I therefore move that we adjourn debate on this motion.

Debate adjourned.

## MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

### Return No. 6

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Mr. Deputy Chairman, just a few remarks prior to moving the motion that's been presented — pardon me, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason for the motion as it's been presented to the House today is to — or has been presented to the House previously and we're raising today — is to ask of the . . . inquire of the government for information on government hiring policy and the number of people that the government is employing for their services; and indeed raising the question of the openness and honesty that was spoken about in the throne speech presented by the government earlier in this session.

The reason for the motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to bring the government to account and certainly give us, the opposition, the opportunity to follow up on the hirings and the jobs that have been opened up and who is filling the jobs — certainly keeping tabs on the government and the responses the way they are handling their job hirings, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The concern we do have and the reason we raise the motion is the fact . . . we wonder has the government indeed responded in a consultative way the way they indicated that they would be consulting with people? And we can remind the House and remind people around the province that one of the reasons that we are also bringing up the questions is because of the fact that we have seen in a number of occasions that the government hasn't indeed followed the consultative process that they've been speaking about so strenuously over the past month and a half.

We just have to look at the agricultural sector and the GRIP program '92 and we see the concern raised in the agricultural field by farmers, by lenders, by people all across the province regarding the lack of opportunity to speak and to voice their concerns and offer ideas and alternatives, rather than just having the government disband and bring in a new program without taking the time to really consult.

We have seen also in the Atomic Energy of Canada agreement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where the government has again failed to really consult with the industry and



consult with people of Saskatchewan, the fact that this was an industry and could have become a very important industry in this province in the area of economic development and job creation.

We have to ask ourselves what consultative process was taken by the government in addressing the Pension Plan, just destroying or taking away a pension plan that was addressing the needs of individuals around the province who didn't have the access to another form of a pension plan. And certainly it's been raised in the House the last few days — the fact that there has been various concerns regarding the process, Mr. Speaker, of the consultation, and many other examples that we could bring forward.

Mr. Speaker, we could certainly go into a number of other areas of concern. And as we continue to raise the questions that will be brought forward by the motions, we will certainly be bringing to the attention of the House that the motions that we are introducing, Mr. Speaker, are being brought forward to address the concerns of some of the election promises, the fact that the government of the day hasn't taken the time to maybe not only consult but has broken some of the promises they made to people prior to the election of October 23, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, another reason for raising these questions is to follow up on the question of patronage. And over the past few days we have been raising questions in the House regarding interim supply and appointments within the government sector.

And we have on occasion . . . certainly recently the minister, I believe, did set a precedent and we trust that the government will continue to be as forthright and open, when a question was posed and after much debate and continuously raising the question the minister did provide the information regarding employees within his department, not only of the job that they now hold but also the fact that he released information on their previous employment records, Mr. Speaker, previously the employment history. And we appreciated the forthrightness of the minister, and certainly the questions that we're raising through the motions are going to be addressing the same type of format and questions.

The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is to bring to our attention, the taxpayers of the province, were the type of people that are being hired, addressing the question of the fact that the government has spoken of eliminating jobs, of cutting back in the public service, to address the problems of debt and the financing and the waste and mismanagement.

And so under the new rules of the House and the freedom of information, we are going to be raising questions, not just as we will be today, Mr. Speaker, but in days to come, questions regarding hiring practice and the people who have been hired to fill positions.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, there have been times when we haven't received all the information that we would be requiring. And we'll be certainly watching with interest the government, regarding their response to the motions that we are presenting.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, when we were asking for employee information on . . . especially regarding previous employment, some would argue that, well, is it necessary for people to know where individuals have been previously employed? I believe when you apply for a job, regardless of where you apply, Mr. Speaker, one of the job requirements is that you give a list of previous employment you have had, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that is a strong indication of your qualifications, and that's taken into account. When you are asked or even hired for your position, your previous employment record certainly comes to bear. So we want to follow that up to see whether indeed the government has received the type of individuals to fill the roles that they are asking of them.

I can imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that certainly there are individuals would be concerned about the release of information on previously employment records. But I think, Mr. Speaker, most people would agree and would tend to feel that they have nothing to hide. And if indeed they have nothing to hide, there is no reason why this information shouldn't be available, not only to the opposition but to the taxpayers of this province. Unless, Mr. Speaker, employees may be ashamed of the fact that releasing previous information might tie them to the government and certainly would then discredit the government on the fact that they had indicated to the province, to the people of this province, that they would be doing away with political patronage.

And no doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we'll probably find that there are people employed by this government who were involved in different areas of political activity, working for the party. And we all acknowledge that it's politics and a number of these hirings do take place.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'm not necessarily running down all the hirings on the basis of political patronage but we want to bring the government to accountability on the fact that the people they did hire really do have the qualifications to meet the roles that they are asking of them, and not just the fact of whether they worked for the previous government, whether they were a campaign manager, or what capacity they worked in or whether they maybe worked for another government outside of this province, say the government of Ontario, whatever. And our purpose in presenting the motions is to bring this information forward.

Mr. Speaker, we are very well aware of a number of the appointments that have already taken place, and most people will acknowledge that, yes, they were political patronage like the Messers and like the Bryants and like the Chings. Mr. Speaker, but if they can do the job and do it well and do it effectively, then that's fine; we've got no problem with it.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, on the basis of leading up to this motion, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 6 showing:

Regarding the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Transportation Company: (1) The names of all persons currently employed by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Amalgamated

Transit Union, Local 1374 who were employed prior to November 1, 1991. (2) For each person listed in (1), the (a) details of employment including compensation (b) job description (c) qualifications, including employment history (d) the name of his or her immediate superior (e) the authority under which the person was hired and (f) the actual date that the person started work.

I so move.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words to the comments from the member from Moosomin. And I guess I find it interesting that the first motion moved by the members deal with STC (Saskatchewan Transportation Company). The public know that STC was one of the worst examples in a long litany of examples of waste and mismanagement of the previous government. People will know that in Crown Corporations and in the press there's been a story carried that two of the people that were hired by STC actually worked in the Legislative Building under the previous government and never worked for STC at all but yet were paid out of STC to do political work for those members opposite.

And yet today they stand here sanctimoniously and talk about giving out lists as if they had a corner on honesty and integrity when it came to hiring practices in their government. I find it almost laughable if it weren't so sad, for the fact that this corporation was an example right across Canada and North America: kickbacks, examples of their employees having to . . . in fact I believe one of them has now been in conflict with the law to the extent that the members opposite realize full well that they made a terrible mistake in their hiring practices in STC.

And so I wonder why it would be that they would choose this corporation as the first one to question the new government on their hiring practices. The company was in terrible condition when we took it over a few months ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the solution that the members had come up with to the problems in STC and the fact that it had a \$6 million debt was not to make the company leaner or make it more efficient, but they had planned to build a new head office for STC. And when we came to power, one of the first things we did is cancel that contract because the employees themselves said they didn't need a new head office, that what they needed was better management.

And also they had a contract signed for a new computer for \$1.6 million. Now the member from Arm River will know that in running a bus company with about 50 buses, spending \$1.6 million on a computer simply is irresponsible and a large amount of waste. So I want to say to the members opposite clearly, what the corporation needed was new management, new direction, and that is what we have set about to do.

And the members opposite should know and should appreciate the fact that the new management there have reduced the turnaround time for customer accounts from 110 days, which it was when we took over, to a mere 20

days; that is, from the time that a billing is received, the time that the expenses incurred, till the time that the billing is sent out has been reduced from 110 days down to 20. And what that will mean for the corporation, that the massive debts that we've seen over there in previous years, in recent previous years, will be reduced considerably.

(1615)

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I intend to give the information as required. I want to say, first of all, that we will be amending the motion slightly to exclude, for sure, section (c) which talks about including in the information employment history of the individuals. I don't understand why the members opposite would want or need that. But I want to say that we will be amending the motion as follows:

That the words "by or accountable to the minister, directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1374 who were employed prior to November 1, 1991" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"In the Minister's office."

And also that the words "including employment history" be deleted.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to react a little bit to what the Government House Leader has just said in response to the motion as my colleague has brought it forward.

In our attempt as an opposition to hold the government opposite responsible for their actions . . . and that is precisely what all of these motions for return debatable are going to be doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where we are attempting to get answers.

Now we have gone through a debacle here over the last three days with the just-adjourned Committee of Finance on the Appropriation Bill and interim supply, where we have spent that period of time asking the Minister of Finance a whole series of questions in order to get some answers. And we were stonewalled throughout the entire process.

Now when we come up for a motion for return debatable like this, we've just witnessed a discussion by the Government House Leader on issues that I would question very much the relevance of his comments to the debate in hand. But having said that, I will then branch off and piggyback on some of his comments in responding to them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we want answers — we want answers. That's precisely what these questions are doing. And by coming forth with the amendment as the Government House Leader has just done, it's going to effectively subterfuge our attempt to get those answers because it's basically another attempt at stonewalling by this open and honest government and preventing us from getting the answers to the questions that we are posing.

He makes the comment, why would we come up with STC? Well I think it's just a continuation of the process

that we've always had while we were in government of being open, honest, forthright, with the people of Saskatchewan. We have nothing to hide. He seemed kind of surprised that we would come forth with STC as if it was some kind of an albatross around our neck.

Now of course we were not perfect. There were mistakes. And some of the individuals and the people that were working for us — as in all governments, I would suggest to you — not all the employees were perfect. But we have nothing to hide. In fact we want to get more answers yet out of the current administration in terms of how they are addressing the problems and so on within STC.

Now the amendment as proposed by the Government House Leader says that he is going to exclude employment history. And he asked the question, he couldn't understand why members opposite would need, would want to know the answers to those questions. Well I would suggest to him, first of all, that it is our prerogative to ask the questions that we want answers to and we intend to get them. However if the motions here for returns debatable are going to be handled in this fashion, then obviously the taxpayers of this province are not going to get the answers to the questions that we are posing.

Now precisely the employment history, I don't understand. There was no reason given why the employment history would not be included. I don't understand that. I heard my colleague talking about patronage, for an example, and we just want to delve into that a little bit because the Minister of Justice has assured the people of this province that there is absolutely no patronage going on in the current government, that any and everybody that is hired by this government is bona fide, highly qualified, and in position to do good work for the people of Saskatchewan. And if that's the case, we commend you for it. But we want to find out.

We suspect, we just suspect that there may not be every individual there that's really qualified. We suspect, we just suspect that maybe a few blood tests were done. And simply by giving the employment history and the qualifications, then if there's nothing to hide, it can be done. It should not be that time-consuming. Anyone who has a job with anyone has already given forth a resume. The information is all there. It's easily accessible, and it could easily be brought into a format where the people of Saskatchewan could get that kind of information.

And I give you a case in point, Mr. Chairman. During the estimates . . . or during the Appropriation Bill and the interim supply, I asked the Minister of Finance to give me a run-down of his officials: who they were, how long they'd been employed, their qualifications, what the work history was, and what they were being paid. The next day, Mr. Chairman, I got that information. I appreciated that very much. It gave me an opportunity to assess the people that had been hired and why they had been hired and should they have been hired.

And this is what we're asking. Why would the government, in its openness, in its attempt to convince the people of Saskatchewan that they are forthright, that they are honest, that there is no patronage, why would

you not prove that by coming forth and giving us the information that we request?

This amendment does not allow us to do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is the opposition that we have to that amendment. And certainly we will be voting against it.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 7

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, a couple of concerns that I'd like to bring to the attention of the House, in light of comments made by the minister on the preceding motion.

Certainly the government of the day have indicated to people right across this province that patronage would not be an issue any more, that they would be very open, that they would be honest, that there would be open public tenders, and that people regardless of politics would have the opportunity of applying for and indeed receiving employment within this government.

The problem I have regarding the amendment as it has been presented, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that the minister has indeed agreed that he is willing to release the names and employment information of individuals within the individual minister's office. But the other fact is that I believe it also indicates that the minister is not willing to release names of individuals that are employed within the department.

And I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what that does is goes totally against what the minister was just relating in this House — the fact that over the past number of years, if you will, and as the minister indicated in the corporation that was just raised, that many people were hired within the department that the government today is questioning and certainly when they were in opposition they would be questioning.

I guess the motion that we presented and the reason for bringing the motion forward to it was to address that concern. And it bothers me that the minister has now decided that at one moment he wanted to have, and suggested we should have, openness and that this information should be available to the House and to members of the House, now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find that this information indeed is not going to be available. So we are asking you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how are we going to hold the government accountable on their hiring practices in who is hired and who isn't hired?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is of major concern to us. That is a major concern not only to this opposition caucus but to people across the province of Saskatchewan regarding government hiring practices, not only because of the promises that were made prior to and up to the provincial election and indeed following the last election and over the past number of months, Mr. Deputy Speaker — the openness; but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason for the motions is to address that openness and address the ability of opposition members and the taxpayers of this

province to know who is hired in departments so that indeed we eliminate that process that the minister indicates took place over the past number of years. And certainly anyone across the province of Saskatchewan is aware that probably has been a practice for eons of time within the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move to return no. 7 and move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

Regarding the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation: (1) The names of all persons currently employed by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the International Woodworkers of America who were employed prior to November 1, 1991; (2) for each person listed in (1), (a) the details of employment including compensation, (b) job description, (c) qualifications including employment history, (d) the name of his or her immediate superior, (e) the authority under which the person was hired, and (f) the actual date that the person started work.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, for all the same reasons that I commented on in the previous motion, I would move that:

The words “by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly excluding only members of the International Woodworkers of America who were employed prior to November 1, 1991” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

in the minister’s office.

And that the words “including employment history” be deleted.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this simply isn’t good enough. We have a newly elected government here. They went around this province day after day in the last election campaign promising, promising the voters of Saskatchewan that they were going to be totally open and above-board in all things that they did in government.

And now we have the Government House Leader coming in, amending these motions for return, that simply ask some very simple questions.

I mean it must be, it must be evident to everyone in the province of Saskatchewan that a person’s employment history can’t be that onerous. That people should be proud of their employment history and that you would be proud to employ people because of their employment history.

(1630)

And now the minister says that the opposition and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan shouldn’t have access to the people that are unemployed.

I mean we have the member from Regina that is the resident expert on STC, standing up in private members’ statements, boasting about that particular Crown

corporation and what wonderful turnarounds it’s made for the Saskatchewan taxpayer.

Well if those wonderful turnarounds have been made and they commended the employees, then why wouldn’t they want the people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayer, to know all about those employees? It just doesn’t make any reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you wouldn’t want to advertise those things. If, as the member from Regina North — whatever now — claims that it’s doing such a wonderful job, then I would think you would want to let everyone know about the people you have there doing this wonderful job. And instead we have the minister in each and every situation saying no, we’re not going to give you that; we’re going to give you the folks in the minister’s office and that’s it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I’m wondering what they’re trying to hide, because obviously there must be some hidden agenda here. And my suspicion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that when we place questions to the Minister of Justice in question period about all the various lay-offs through the government services, he gave his personal commitment to this House that not one of those positions would be back-filled, back-filled with friends of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that particular question occurred on May 6, 1992. And my question to the minister at the time was:

Mr. Minister, will you give this House the assurance today that the hundreds of pink slips being issued by your Minister of Finance, not one single one will be back-filled with NDP partisans in the months to come. Will you give that assurance today?

And the member from Saskatoon Fairview stood up and said: “Yes, I give member that assurance.”

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only conclusion we can draw from the Government House Leader is that they have already put the Minister of Justice at jeopardy, that they have put the Minister of Justice in a position where he would have to tender his resignation in this House because of the commitment that he made.

Obviously if the minister is so frightened, is so frightened of these orders for return that he must amend them all to take away the right of Saskatchewan taxpayers to know who is employed, what their employment history is like, what their compensation is, their superior, and the person that they were hired by, then they are afraid that the Minister of Justice will have to tender his resignation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this from people who stood in this Assembly for month after month, year after year, condemning the practices of the past government. It is the absolute height of hypocrisy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the absolute height of hypocrisy that when they have the opportunity to practise what they preach, instead we have the Government House Leader come in here and subvert — subvert — the real questions of the official opposition and the taxpayers of this province. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can draw no other conclusion from this

debate if that is not so.

So I'm saying to the members opposite, if you're hiring folks that you're ashamed of, then don't hire them. If you're hiring folks that carry New Democratic Party cards but are doing a good job, then I would think you would want to boast about it to the Saskatchewan taxpayer, not hide behind amendments to motions for return.

If the folks that you hired can stand the test, can stand the test that they aren't patronage appointments, that they're doing good work, then I would think you would want to tell the world about it. But that's not the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It seems that the minister . . .

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

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Regina Hillsdale and the Minister of Health, I want to welcome to the legislature 15 senior citizens who are part of the Mackenzie Art Gallery seniors group. They have been visiting the legislature this afternoon looking at our various galleries and the art that has been assembled here in the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to be on their way to Moose Jaw. So the members from Moose Jaw will be delighted to learn that they're off to Moose Jaw next week to also see all of the various art sites in the city of Moose Jaw.

They are part of what's called, I believe, "gallery gazing," and they've spent the past several weeks visiting various sites in Regina where art is assembled. And they are a very interesting group of senior citizens who are interested in the cultural life of our province and the city of Regina.

So I want to welcome them here today and wish you good luck as you continue to see the various art that exists here in Saskatchewan. Thank you very much.

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

### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

#### Return No. 7 (continued)

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I've made the point that you've got to practise what you preach.

Sir, we have seen many examples where the members of the now government ask all sorts of questions about former employees of the past administration. They take great delight in talking about the employment records of people who were formerly employed by the Government of Saskatchewan.

If they in all honesty don't feel that these motions for return are simply legitimate questions that any interested

taxpayer would like to know about, then I guess there is no point at all in the official opposition or anyone else in this province asking those kind of questions, and there's no point at all in debating any of these motions for return. We might as well sit in our seat and let the government majority have its way.

And obviously that is the pattern that we've set upon this afternoon. And we might as well take our seats and simply let this House roll on. The government majority can do whatever it wishes, and so much for the taxpayer.

The division bells rang from 4:39 p.m. until 4:42 p.m.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 31

Thompson	Johnson
Wiens	Draper
Lingenfelter	Serby
Anguish	Whitmore
Goulet	Sonntag
Atkinson	Flavel
Kowalsky	Cline
Cunningham	Scott
Hagel	McPherson
Bradley	Crofford
Koenker	Keeping
Lorje	Kluz
Pringle	Renaud
Lautermilch	Langford
Calvert	Jess
Murray	

#### Nays — 8

Muirhead	Martens
Neudorf	Britton
Swenson	Toth
Boyd	D'Autremont

Motion as amended agreed to.

(1645)

#### Return No. 8

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This motion is similar to the last two that we have been looking at. And what we're debating in this motion is open and honest government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. During the election campaign and ever since that time the government opposite has been preaching how they are an open and honest government.

These questions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speak directly to that openness, to that honesty. We feel these questions are very pertinent to the operation of the government. The people of Saskatchewan have the right to know the qualifications of the people it is paying tax money to for their employment. They need to be able to judge the performance of their duties. And to judge their capabilities the people need to know what their employment history has been and how they have

performed in that employment, how successful they were in that employment.

There's only two reasons why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the government is not interested in giving us that information. Either the government opposite did not ask their employees what their previous employment history was, therefore do not have the answers to the question. But I would find that very surprising, but not totally impossible that they would not have asked. Either that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the employees are ashamed of where they were last employed. They don't want anyone to know what they were doing previous to being employed by the government opposite.

Perhaps it's because those employees are ashamed because they were campaign workers for the NDP Party. Perhaps they were even campaign managers, such as Jack Messer was. Maybe they were ashamed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they were employed as personal assistants to the NDP in some other province.

Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are ashamed because to provide a history of their employment would show the people of Saskatchewan that they have indeed broken their promise to eliminate patronage and that they have not followed the directive put out by the Minister of Justice that there would be no patronage appointment.

One of the reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we need to know who the people are, what they're being paid, and where they worked before is an example I'll give. In question period I asked the minister for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) about a \$22 million difference in an account. At the end of October, in the SGI auto fund stabilization account for the year of 1991 there was an increase in that account of over \$15 million. And yet, Mr. Speaker, at the end of December, there is a loss of almost \$7 million — \$22 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that has gone some place. And yet when we ask the minister what happened to the money, he would not give us an answer.

Perhaps the employees at SGI, those managers that have been put in place by the new government, are incapable of handling their portfolios that they have been given.

Another SGI example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the government has built a new office at 1818 Victoria Avenue East, a new SGI claim centre. This claim centre was almost finished, Mr. Speaker. All the walls were in place. The ceilings were in place, the lights, and yet new management came in and decided for some reason that the office was not appropriate. So the walls were tore out. Ceilings were tore down, and one of the things that were done was new windows put into this office.

The new windows that had been put in previously were 36 inches wide. It was changed to put in windows that are 39 inches or one meter wide, Mr. Speaker. This does not show competence. So what are these employees doing? What was their background? Did they know nothing about construction if they were in charge of new construction for SGI services for their claim centre? Why can we not find that out, Mr. Speaker?

That was just one example. There could be many more out there. And, Mr. Speaker, we need to be able to find out whether or not these people are actually qualified for the positions that they hold.

The government has talked of down-sizing, of the cuts that they have been forced to make with their last budget. And yet when you look at the budget, there is a hundred million dollar increase in the actual spending over the previous budget.

If we could find out, Mr. Speaker, what these employees' qualifications were, what their past history was, what they're being paid, the people of Saskatchewan could judge whether or not they're actually qualified and should be employed.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move the following:

Regarding the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Government Insurance: (1) The names of all persons currently employed by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Office and Professional Employees International Union 937 who were employed prior to November 1, 1991. (2) For each person listed in (1), the (a) details of employment including compensation (b) job description (c) qualifications, including employment history (d) the name of his or her immediate superior (e) the authority under which the person was hired, and (f) the actual date that the person started work.

I so move, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to see a copy of the amendment that the member opposite . . . I didn't quite understand what his closing comments . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon? Okay.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it's interesting the change in the members opposite. How after many years of being absolutely tight-fisted when it came to any information being given . . . And if you look back on day 26 and see whether any motions for returns debatable have ever been dealt with by the Assembly on day 26, what you'll find is this is the earliest that motions for return debatable have ever been dealt with in this Assembly. That's right — the earliest it's ever been dealt with because the government, the members opposite when they were in government, did everything to avoid ever getting to motions for return debatable. And they were amended out of existence. We didn't get any information from those members when they were in government, and everyone knows that.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, what we're seeing is a conversion on the road to Damascus here. These members opposite have no belief in freedom of information. They were in government 10 years and never got around to putting in and proclaiming any freedom of information.

We now have in place an agreement and a piece of legislation where all of the heads of Crown corporation have to file with the Legislative Assembly their contract

with their employer, the government and the taxpayers of the province. They have to make it public.

We asked day after day in the House what the salary of Mr. George Hill was when we were in government, and in Crown Corporations. And not once did we get an answer from those members opposite, the fact that George Hill, Mr. Hill, president of SaskPower, was making in excess of \$400,000. We didn't know it. We didn't know it until we came to government and opened the books. Well I'll tell you, every head of every Crown now has to file with the Legislative Assembly how much money they're earning. And it's public and everyone knows. So don't sit there and sanctimoniously say that this government doesn't give out information.

But if you're asking us to compile thousands of documents of every employee who this government will hire during its 4 or 8 or 12 years in government, it simply isn't acceptable. If you're asking for the political people in our offices — and I'll readily admit that the people who work for me in my office as a minister are political people. They have to understand what the New Democratic philosophy is about when they work in a minister's office — that's what we intend to give you.

We'll give you their salary; we'll give you their qualifications; we'll give you when they were appointed, and that's accurate and it's correct that we should do that. But if you're saying you want to go on a witch-hunt of every employee in this province, we're not going to allow that to happen because you did that for 10 years. And people are sick and tired of Conservatives doing witch-hunts in this province and it isn't going to happen.

So when you talk to us about open and free government and access to information, I'll tell you very clearly that we're doing 10 times more than you folks ever did in the 10 years that you were government.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — And I'll tell you one thing that the public dislikes more than the dishonest kind of government that you are running is the hypocrisy that they're seeing here today about how if you were in government you would now give out all this information. What a joke. What a joke.

We watched you for 10 years hide the salary of the president of SaskPower, not workers in the Crown corporation the you're asking for now. You wouldn't even give out the salary and the compensation for the president of the Crown corporation.

You're now saying you want everybody's compensation. When did you decide that? When did you decide that not only should the president's salary and all the EAs (executive assistants), which we're giving to you freely that information, that not only should that be made available but every employee that you asked for.

When did you decide that? It certainly wasn't when you were in government. You wouldn't give us anyone's salary not even the president's and you know that. Not one employee, not two employees. You would give us no

employees' salaries in the Crown corporation. And you made a virtue of that for 10 years.

Now suddenly a few months after you were defeated and turfed out unceremoniously by the taxpayers of the province you say that we should come to you with thousands of documents of all the employees who we hire, whether it's through Public Service Commission or wherever. And not only that, you want their work history.

Well I'll tell you what you're after is a witch-hunt, and it isn't going to happen. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that return no. 8 be amended as follows:

That the words "by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Office and Professional Employees International Union Local 397 who were employed prior to November 1, 1991" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

In the minister's office.

And that the words "including employment history" be deleted.

I so move.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, it being 5 o'clock I move the House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:00 p.m.