

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today marks the 30th anniversary of medicare here in Saskatchewan. On October 13, 1961, in this Chamber, the late Premier T.C. Douglas concluded the debate on the introduction of The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act. In concluding his speech he said: I believe that if this medical care insurance program is successful it will prove to be the forerunner of a national medical care insurance plan.

I want to say that when the history of our time is written, it may well be recorded that the Saskatchewan legislature and the Saskatchewan people have pioneered in this field and took the first step towards ultimately establishing the system of medicare insurance for all people of Canada.

We believe that health care is too important to be left to chance that the average family will have the necessary money to buy health services. I am convinced that both the people and doctors will be so completely satisfied with the plan that no government will dare to take it away.

Tommy's own words are the plan's best memorial.

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

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, On July 1, as Canadians celebrate our 125th anniversary as a nation, here in Saskatchewan we celebrate the 30th anniversary of Saskatchewan's most beautiful gift to the people of Canada — medicare. For several years medicare in Saskatchewan was completely funded by the people of Saskatchewan, thus proving that sacrifice combined with great vision truly can produce great things.

Tommy Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd, and many, many others were people of vision and action — hospitalization in 1947, medicare in 1962, and the dream of an effective illness-prevention health system to which we find ourselves committed to today.

In their spirit we are again prepared to make sacrifices and changes in the interest of universally accessible, publicly funded and administered, quality health care for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker on this day, on behalf of my constituents and my family, to the pioneers of medicare for their vision, determination, compassion and action, I can say only a sincere and simple thanks.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of medicare, Mr. Speaker, it would be well to review the past decade to see how far we have come. Since 1982, Mr. Speaker, our health care system has been enhanced to provide better protection and better coverage for all

Saskatchewan people.

The previous government introduced the breast cancer screening program which is vital to Saskatchewan women, and I commend the government for the continuation and the furtherance of this program.

In those 10 years as well, entire new systems of health care were introduced for our people, including a province-wide chiropody program, community physiotherapy, community living programs, CAT (computerized axial tomography) scanners, new cancer clinics, vastly expanded drug and alcohol treatment, tuberculosis prevention, particularly in the North, and many others that cannot be fit into 90 seconds.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we in this province are proud of our medicare system and certainly want to give thanks to the many individuals over the years, such as the Hon. John George Diefenbaker, for their commitment to medicare across Canada.

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

**Ms. Murray:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In all the comments today and tomorrow about this very significant 30th anniversary of medicare, we would be remiss if we did not pay tribute to the brave and visionary men and women who brought medicare into the world. We have praised Tommy Douglas of course, as we should, because it was his life-long determination to bring about medical equality that lit the flame.

But there were others equally dedicated, equally unswerving, equally tenacious in their determination that the Liberals, Tories, and other naysayers of the day would not prevent the birth of this new program. I think, Mr. Speaker, of W.G. (Bill) Davies — minister of Health in 1962 who got an immediate baptism by fire — Eiling Kramer, Allan Blakeney and the other members of the government who stood their ground during those tense days before July 1, 1962.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, we should remember Premier Woodrow Lloyd who led the way. The phrase "grace under pressure" was created to define him and his actions during that time. Vilified, threatened, harassed, berated on all sides, he stood his ground because he knew his cause, the people's cause, was just. He stood his ground and he never raised his voice. He was a gentleman to the end, and the greatness of the program he ushered in is only matched by the profound integrity of the character he showed.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we will all be in our constituency tomorrow, and I think it's important for us to mark this very important birthday of our nation.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we are a nation 125 years young. And for a nation, 125 years, Mr. Speaker, indeed is very young.

And I'm so proud of this country and of our people, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes it overwhelms me. The great majesty of every corner of our land is inspiring — a gift from God that each of us cherish from moment to moment in our lives.

Mr. Speaker, this country, this Canada, is too precious to be characterized or properly honoured in 90 seconds. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to give every member time to discuss our country on this important day, I ask leave of the Assembly to move this following motion:

That this Assembly congratulate the Canadian people on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of Canada, and that the proceedings on this motion be bound and sent by Mr. Speaker to the Governor General of Canada on behalf of the people of Canada.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

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

**The Speaker:** — Members, just give me a minute to . . . I think the member should be aware that on . . . You can only move motions on orders of the day and not in routine proceedings.

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

**Mr. Pringle:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege to represent the Minister of Health at a provincial mental health conference. And the conference was attended by over 100 delegates, consisting of individuals who are mentally challenged, their families, and representatives from many government organizations and community services.

A primary focus was on how to ensure that individuals who are mentally challenged do not fall between the cracks of the mental health programs and into the criminal justice system. There was significant support in the minister's wellness approach and in the five initial steps undertaken by the government, including an overall increase of 3 per cent in the mental health budget.

There were many benefits from this conference, Mr. Speaker, which will be outlined in the next issue of the *Transition* magazine. Clearly we've got a long way to go in rebuilding a sound mental health service in the province, to once again assume our leadership role in this field.

I commend the important organizations that have joined together with the individuals and families to address these shared concerns and to work towards the well-being of all Saskatchewan residents. On this 30th anniversary of medicare we all recognize the importance of promoting good mental health and this must be a priority area, Mr. Speaker.

I wish this coalition well and know that all members will support their efforts and pledge our co-operation. Thank you.

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

**Ms. Stanger:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Canada has been a world leader in developing a universal, publicly funded health care system. Our medicare is the envy and model for countries around the globe.

Here in Saskatchewan we should especially be proud of it because it was here that the whole concept of medicare came into being. Many people have talked about the need for medicare, but it was our own people, right here in this province, that actually had the courage and determination to turn the dream into a reality in spite of harsh and unreasonable criticism.

It is appropriate now, 30 years later, the party that introduced health care to the world is also embarking on reform to our health care system. The principle of medicare does not say that everything will be done exactly in the same way for ever. The principle of medicare says that those who need health care shall receive it. There are many changes and improvements that can and should be made to our system. This government is not afraid of change.

With the principles of medicare as strongly entrenched in our party today as they were 30 years ago, I am confident that reformed health care will mean that working together in a community-based system, we will embark on the next generation of medicare.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Federal-Provincial Funding for GRIP

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, given the concern that all of us have with respect to drought and given the concern this legislature has had with respect to offering adequate crop insurance and protection to farmers, I have a question to the minister of Crop Insurance.

The federal Minister of Agriculture has offered to pick up the tab for 1991 crop insurance, the federal government's share of it which is pretty significant. And I wonder if the minister has given any thought and consideration to the fact that the federal offer was until June 30, and this is June 30.

And if that's the case, if the minister might want to tell the farmers and tell this Legislative Assembly if in fact that he'll take the offer or if he would allow the farmers to choose '91 or '92, particularly given the drought situation, given the offer, and given the considerable amount of money that's on the table. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, I just ask if he's been in negotiation with the minister to talk about this kind of money coming into the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear on one thing. In the first place, the federal Minister of Agriculture hasn't offered this government anything in writing. He's offered it to the press, and it's very difficult to tell from a press report exactly what has been offered.

I think the other confusion that I would like to clear up is that '91 GRIP (gross revenue insurance program), unless the members opposite have a time machine that they can take us back to '91, is not and never will be an option. The only option would be a program that complies with the '91 formula which, as you know, will be very different than the program that was in place last year.

And I think that's part of what farmers have been misled into believing: that we can go back and have exactly the same program that we had last year, with the bells and whistles that were added on to the program last year by the federal government and with the . . . without the adjustments to crop insurance rates and so on that were coming, whether we have the old program or the new program. So that, Mr. Speaker, is the answer.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — An additional question to the minister. Mr. Minister, are you saying that you have not discussed and that you have not had any negotiations with the federal Minister of Agriculture who's offered to pay obviously a great deal of money to the people of Saskatchewan and the farmers of Saskatchewan, and you haven't talked to him about that offer? And today is June 30 and he said he would pay it up until July 1. Are you admitting to the farmers of this province that you haven't even discussed that option of getting probably several hundred million dollars from the federal government?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, just for the information of the members opposite, a number of ministers have been in contact with the federal minister or his office. It is clear from those discussions that the federal government has never offered anything other than the regular cost-sharing arrangements that we have found to be inadequate in terms of offering the program in the old form and continue to find it inadequate for the future.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I will go back to the minister of Crop Insurance, and the Minister of Agriculture can perhaps answer if he likes. I asked the minister of Crop Insurance if he's been in negotiations with the federal minister on providing money to farmers and he refused to answer. Then the Minister of Agriculture comes out and says, well there's been lots of talk.

Can he table any specific negotiations on the kinds of program and the kinds of money that he has talked to the federal government about up until June 30, so that in fact the substantial increase in payments coming from the federal government could be available to the farmers of Saskatchewan? Could you table any of that information?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the discussions . . . On June 16 we received a letter from the federal minister saying that there was no additional money available from the federal government. On June 19 the press Donnybrook began with the members opposite participating, with all kinds of numbers flying around.

And in checking with the federal minister's office, it was very clear that the letter of June 16 continued to be true, that no provision other than the regular funding arrangements for GRIP as it had always been constructed were available for Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, either one of the ministers could answer, and I will perhaps even encourage the Minister of Finance to participate as a result of the information that perhaps he failed to provide last night.

To the Minister of Agriculture, you have said that the federal government would participate in this '91 program, it could cost Saskatchewan an extra 40 to \$60 million. Last night the Minister of Finance said that the Crop Insurance minister told him that it would cost Saskatchewan up to \$300 million more.

Now would you help clear this up? If in fact it's going to cost 30 or 40 or \$50 million more to get more money coming from Ottawa, that's one amount of money. But if in fact it might cost up to \$300 million, you can imagine what that would lever from Ottawa. Would you be able to clear up the accurate figure on what 1991 would mean to farmers, and what . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Let the minister answer.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that one of those who had participated in the designing this awful piece of policy might understand the answer without asking it. The cost sharing on the GRIP program as it's been designed seriously debilitates provinces who are being devastated by the circumstances that the program is supposed to address. The Prime Minister of Canada recognizes that, and I wish the members opposite would.

There is the one issue of the up-front costs, that Saskatchewan simply does not have the additional 40 or \$50 million in premiums that are required to participate in the program at the level under which it was created because of the state of our economy here. On the other hand, the arrangement which was negotiated by the member opposite in constructing this program was that the province would be responsible for 35 per cent of the shortfall in the event of a deficit in the pool.

My information from the department is that Saskatchewan's share of last year's shortfall, when we had a bumper crop, was about \$76 million, and that the real risk the province is under in the way the program is designed is that if we should have a short crop, we could be looking at between 2 and \$300 million in unanticipated liability to the province to cover that.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — I want to thank the minister. Now he's thrown out three different numbers this morning. And I wonder if he could check those numbers with the minister of Crop Insurance and then provide the right set of numbers to the Minister of Finance because in the budget, or in the estimates last night for interim supply,

the number's \$108 million. Now you said, if we did 1991 GRIP it would cost 50 to 60 million more, then you said it would cost 73, and then you said . . . Crop Insurance people said, well it could be up to \$300 million more.

Now the Minister of Finance said he got that number from the Crop Insurance people. Are you telling this Assembly that the \$108 million is not accurate? Are you telling the Assembly that you can't lever extra money from the federal government because it would cost \$300 million more to the taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan? Is that to the Crop Insurance Corporation? Is that to the taxpayers here? Could you please clear that up for the public in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, it's becoming clearer and clearer why Saskatchewan is in such an awful economic state after 10 years of the number mangling the member opposite has done.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — If we want to get into the detailed discussion that the member opposite is suggesting, we can do that in estimates at a time when we can fully explain each of the little pieces to his satisfaction. The fact is that the cost of the income insurance programs have been created that put the Saskatchewan economy at risk, that were approved of by the member opposite, have two significant pieces of cost. One is the up-front cost of premiums and the other is the cost of covering the deficit which goes into a pool and which has to eventually be paid off by the province and the producers. And that deficit, potential deficit in the event of a short crop, is an amount of money that simply is unfathomable for an economy already devastated by the mismanagement of the previous administration.

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask the minister of Crop Insurance if he would help the Minister of Agriculture who is trying to help the Minister of Finance with these numbers.

Isn't it true, Mr. Minister of Crop Insurance, that when you look at an insurance company, that you can have a deficit from year to year if you have crop failures? On the other hand you can have surpluses if you have a good crop, and that 15 or 20 year ongoing operation, which is actuarially sound, is completely separate from the current taxpayers' responsibility on this year or any particular year?

Would you care to comment on the fact that you have said, and provided information to the Minister of Finance, that it would cost \$300 million more to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan if, in fact, you had to participate in 1991 GRIP? Would you explain that, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — It's interesting that an animal scientist should have to try to explain to an economist his own program — maybe because there's enough of something floating around in the air that it doesn't have much to do with fact.

The member opposite presided over a government that,

first of all, voluntarily took on a responsibility for a \$100 million for a drought assistance program in 1988. In exchange for which privilege, he then also said, well why don't we while we're at it take on half of the federal cost of crop insurance. You poor brothers in Ottawa, we'll take it for you.

Now let's look at the crop insurance program for a minute. As a result of the way that program is set up there's about a half a billion dollar liability to the province and the producers of the province with respect to crop insurance, accumulated also through your years of administration. You can say that will be paid off in premiums; it certainly will.

It will be paid off in premiums that are increased which is one of the reasons why farmers are suffering increased premiums this year, is because that deficit is accumulated and you have taken on an additional responsibility for the province. And you are equally familiar with the amount of off-loading that you have voluntarily accepted on behalf of the province. For what purpose, I do not know. But would you accept . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Next question.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Clearly, Mr. Speaker, you and the media and the Legislative Assembly knows that the minister of Crop Insurance is not allowed to address these questions. And the last so-called answer didn't address the question at all. I'm trying to clear it up so that . . . You just don't have to get partisan about it. Just please talk about it. Please talk about it in a specific sense.

There is a serious concern that there may be drought this year. Mr. Minister, there's a serious concern about drought in parts of Saskatchewan this year. Farmers are coming into the legislature saying that they're worried about drought in Kelsey-Tisdale, Meadow Lake, south-east, south-west, various parts of the province.

Do you have any contingency plans, Mr. Minister, or the minister of Crop Insurance, or the Minister or Finance, to help farmers in the event that there would be a 25 per cent below normal crop? Do you have any plans at all that would help those farmers through what they already know is a crisis? And they've had higher premiums and they're worried about their income. Do you have any plans at all for them?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the caution of the member opposite that we should not become partisan. I think that's a delightful caution and one we should all observe. The reality is that farmers are worried about drought. Rain would be very welcome in all parts of the province right now.

The fact is as well that the Saskatchewan government is committed to the extent that it can possibly be committed with respect to these kinds of program payments. And we have designed a program that is both a sound program from a policies perspective for farmers and also does

provide reasonable coverage in an ordinary situation considering that there is inadequate federal money now in farm support. With the amount of federal money available we are doing all that we can.

Now we have engaged in two debates in this legislature, one of which you chose to oppose — the resolution on federal assistance and the one on drought assistance, which you chose to speak to the end of and I think you never voted on in the end — in order to try to get the federal government on side, recognizing that they did draw Saskatchewan farmers into a crop stabilization program based on third line of defence coverage in an emergency situation.

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

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Minister, you're getting to the point that all the provinces signed a crop insurance and a GRIP program, and to participate they would get a third line of defence and federal co-operation. The federal minister has said to other provinces, as you know, in Alberta, Manitoba, and other jurisdictions, we have the money there to help you. He said to you, Mr. Minister, and to Saskatchewan people, the money is there and I will even provide 1991 equivalent money if I can get the co-operation from the province of Saskatchewan.

Now to a lot of people that means not only crop insurance and the GRIP payments but an active participation in the possibility of third line of defence. And you have broken the spirit of that. You said no, I don't want to participate. It would cost us too much. The farmers don't . . .

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

**Mr. Devine:** — I ask the minister, if there's an offer today, June 30, to come up with the kind of money that was there in the 1991 program, won't you negotiate with the federal government? Won't you do something on behalf of farmers so that they can look forward to added protection? Because you know under 1992 the protection just isn't there.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is aware that farmers participated in 1991 GRIP because they expected a third line of defence support. We have asked for a definition and a triggering of that support, and we have run into a brick wall and we . . . If you are really concerned about this, I would ask that . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order. There wasn't very much interference when the Leader of the Opposition asked his question. I wish to give the same to the minister. And while I'm on my feet I would like to ask the Associate Minister of Finance to maybe just tone down his comments a bit.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Farmers believed they were going to get federal assistance in third line of defence. We have suggested a number of

alternatives. At the outset we said the federal government should spend the \$150 million that it would be spending in Saskatchewan, and should we have a different program designed on that third line of defence triggered to our disaster areas. We have asked for that and we asked for your support in asking the federal government that commitment.

We have asked the federal government to look at their third line committee's recommendations on delivering third line of defence which says that when the incomes fall . . . Saskatchewan's incomes have just plummeted relative to the previous averages. And yet the federal government does not respond to their own committee which has suggested that in order to bring those incomes up to a reasonable level to compensate for about a billion dollar shortfall over the last two years, there needs to be more money.

We ask for your support in dealing with the federal government on attracting that money which is a commitment they've already made.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I've got to go back to the ministers, all three ministers, and ask them, if we're sitting . . . situation in Saskatchewan where we have a farm crisis, and you know that and it's serious, and then you have no grain and you have no income, and you have a minister . . . ministers of Agriculture, ministers of Crop Insurance, or ministers of Finance who say, but we can't help you because we don't have enough funds to do that and the Crop Insurance Corporation might be vulnerable if we had to help you.

What do you tell those people when you look at the federal government coming along and say, we gave you \$800 million third line of defence last year; we'd look at more this year if we could get co-operation from the provincial government? What do you tell those people? That they should go to Ottawa or they should go to the United States? You are the ministers of Agriculture, Finance, and Crop Insurance. They look to you for some guidance. Do you have any contingency plans to help them get through this serious, serious crisis?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the provincial government has been left in a financial situation where even if we wanted to do the kinds of things because . . . Let's leave the mismanagement issues aside for a minute, Mr. Speaker. Let's just look at the off-loading question where the members opposite, in response to these kinds of crises in the past, said to the federal government, we will put the provincial taxpayer at risk and the provincial farmers at risk — because it hurts us all when we're broke — in order to attract these kinds of monies.

The fact is Saskatchewan . . . The federal government now has a \$150 million that they are saving because we have designed a program that is more appropriate. What we need is the disaster relief part. What we need is the disaster relief that addresses the income shortfall when people have a crop shortage through no fault of their own.

And we need you to start fighting with us against the federal government to get that money, and not sitting there sniping against Saskatchewan farmers.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Minister, you say you've designed a better program. Now the people that were involved in designing it gave you many, many cautions. And SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) people gave you cautions. Professor Furtan gave you cautions. Professor Furtan said to you and he said to me and he said to members of the Legislative Assembly, if in fact there's a drought, there is a serious deficiency in the Saskatchewan program. All right now, let's call him non-partisan. Let's call the SARM non-partisan. Other people are non-partisan.

There's a serious deficiency in the coverage for Saskatchewan people. That's why there's a court case. That's why farmers are frightened, on top of the fact that there's a crisis in income.

Don't you have any additional contingency plans? When you've got a federal offer to come out with hundreds of millions of dollars, don't you have any other plans that could help farmers through a serious situation, given the fact that the chairman of the advisory committee who designed your program says, in case of a drought, there is a serious lack of coverage in the province of Saskatchewan?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, just for the information of the member opposite, all of the discussions that took place in the design of the program were discussions that were held before the committee report was submitted to the minister. They were in the end . . . when the discussions were all complete, everybody signed the report, and the report was submitted as a recommendation to the government.

The fact is that everyone, other than the member opposite, recognizes that Saskatchewan does not have, under our present circumstances, the fiscal capacity to deal with the crisis when so much of our economy is grain dependent. The Prime Minister of Canada recognizes it. The Prime Minister of Canada, in two communiqués with first ministers, has said that provinces in this situation . . . we need to re-examine the cost of funding these kinds of programs.

Saskatchewan simply cannot subject itself to the prospect of a surprise 200 or \$250 million deficit that it has to cover after the fact. The fact is we have to design programs that have stability for provinces across Canada. When we're doing well, we'll help the rest of Canada. And when the rest of Canada's doing well, they ought to help us. And that's the way programs ought to be designed. The Prime Minister said that.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Minister, only Saskatchewan is left out of this protection, only the Saskatchewan farmers.

We've got about half the farm land in Canada. We're the major producers of grains and oilseeds. We've got a multibillion dollar insurance company in Crop Insurance, and you're worried about Crop Insurance liability in a crisis at the farm level. And you keep talking about, as your Minister of Finance says, we'd have to raise taxes to back up Crop Insurance.

Crop Insurance Corporation is an independent financial insurance company, and farmers know that. And it will have good years and bad years as SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) does, or the Co-operators, and others. It's an insurance company that can afford to defend . . .

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Would you tell . . . would you please give the farmers an accurate estimate of how much more money they could get in their pockets if they had 1991 GRIP over 1992. Could you do that so we'd know exactly the kind of money that they're being denied by your potential legislation and by the fact that you changed the program. Could you tell us that.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan produces about 50 or 50-plus per cent of Canada's export grains. Saskatchewan's economy is ravaged by the international grain situation as well as by other circumstances that are here locally.

In every country with whom we compete, that is dealt with by the national governments. But under your administration you took enough of that responsibility onto the province that it's crippling the province and it disables us from participating.

But even through the agreements that we have with the federal government, it was their agreement to provide disaster relief as third line of defence. And when we've asked them for it, you've denied the support that we need to put more pressure on them to pay the funds they've committed to help. You know that there is \$150 million sitting there that the federal government has that belongs to Saskatchewan farmers, and because of the state of our economy we cannot afford to cost share in order to get. That's bad national policy and we need to fix it.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly I would like to make a statement of condolence in memory of William Smith, commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, who recently passed away in the People's Republic of China.

Leave granted.

## CONDOLENCES

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I

announce to this Assembly the passing of Bill Smith who died unexpectedly on Tuesday, June 9 in a remote region of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Smith was in China on Wheat Board business at the time of his death.

Mr. Smith was the commissioner responsible for the Chinese market and had been so for a number of years.

Bill Smith's work on behalf of the farmers of western Canada spanned three decades. He proudly fought for a strong, co-operative marketing system that was responsive to our changing times and the changing needs of our farmers.

He was born and raised on a farm at Inland, Alberta, just east of Edmonton. He graduated from the Vermilion School of Agriculture in 1955. In 1957 he was hired by the Alberta Wheat Pool and worked as an elevator manager at Azure, Irricana, and Trochu before his appointment in 1971 as pool representative at Medicine Hat. He was transferred to the Pool's Winnipeg office on special assignment in 1974, returning to the Calgary head office later that same year to become assistant grain sales manager.

Mr. Smith was named Winnipeg manager in 1976. He returned to Calgary in 1979 upon being promoted to the position of grain sales manager for the Alberta Wheat Pool. In May 1983, Mr. Smith was appointed a commissioner of the Wheat Board following a distinguished career with the Alberta Wheat Pool.

Besides his many friends and colleagues in the Canadian and international grain industry which he loved so well, Bill Smith leaves his wife, Kathy, five grown children and one grandchild.

On behalf of this Assembly, I wish to extend my sincere condolences to Mr. Smith's family and thank him for his contribution and devotion to prairie farmers and the grain industry.

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join with the Minister of Agriculture in extending our condolences to the Smith family. Bill Smith, who died in a very freak accident in China, was a distinguished agricultural representative, not only for the Canadian Wheat Board, but for agriculture people across Alberta, across western Canada, and indeed across Canada. The 55-year-old commissioner suffered these injuries while working in China.

And he had represented the Canadian Wheat Board over and over again as a very astute marketing agent for the Canadian Wheat Board. Smith, who was responsible for the board's sales efforts in China, was accompanied by other members of the Canadian Wheat Board and members of the Chinese delegation at this particular time.

I'd like to say that the board's chief commissioner, Lorne Hehn, said that Smith's death represented a huge loss, not only to the family and to the board, but to the grain industry. And I quote: this is a sad day for prairie farmers and the entire grain industry. We've lost a good friend and

a strong ally in Bill Smith.

And Mr. Charlie Mayer, who is the minister of the Wheat Board that appointed Bill Smith, described Bill as an outstanding individual who leaves behind him a distinguished and extensive career.

I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, when individuals rise to public service and work hours and hours and years and years in international markets to stick up and defend and to market Canadian products, then we certainly respect them. We on this side of the House and I'm sure all members of the legislature join the minister in extending our condolences to the Smith family.

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

## SPECIAL ORDER

### APPROPRIATION BILL

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move:

That Bill No. 58, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending on March 31, 1993, be read a second and third time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill read a second and third time.

## PRIVATE BILLS

### SECOND READINGS

**Bill No. 04 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Briercrest Bible College**

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 04, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Briercrest Bible College be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

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

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to say a few words about a private member's motion which I would be moving after my remarks.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The member, I think, recognizes that he must have leave in order to proceed with his motion.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask the Assembly for leave to proceed with my motion.

**The Speaker:** — Order. The opposition wish to know what the motion is. I think that is a fairly good request.

(1045)

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, it refers to the notices of private members' motions, June 11 to June 29. I would move after my remarks, if I get leave to do so, that this Assembly recognize the Saskatchewan government's early initiatives in re-establishing a stable provincial financial climate which is strengthening our economy and is encouraging economic development, especially in the areas of tourism and housing.

This was moved, Mr. Speaker . . . or I laid the motion on the table with the Clerk prior to the Friday sitting last.

Leave not granted.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### Resolution No. 20 — Sunset Clause on Government Programs

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by Ms. Haverstock and the amendment thereto moved by Ms. Lorje.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

### Bill No. 41

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Boyd that **Bill No. 41 — An Act to declare a Day of Appreciation for Scottish Clans in Canada** be now read a second time.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of the motion put forward by the member from Kindersley.

Mr. Speaker, I note in *Hansard* that the member from Kindersley recognized a few of the Scots, one being the great explorer Mackenzie, and the other the first prime minister of our great nation, John A. Macdonald.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are two other Scots that the member from Kindersley forgot to mention. One, Robbie Burns of course, the poet — a man who experienced a great deal of poverty and injustice as a youth. And I'm sure that this was what made strong his beliefs in the equality of his fellow man.

The other Scot, Mr. Speaker, is Tommy Douglas. And, Mr. Speaker, this being the 30th anniversary of health care in this province, I'd be remiss if we were not to mention the battle that Tommy had fought to bring medicare into this province, and how he touched the hearts and minds of so many throughout this country.

As my colleague stated earlier today, Tommy had quite a battle on his hands, and did not have the support of the parties that were opposite side of the House of that day. But it was a health system of fairness and one which has been adopted in Canada and one which has proven to be fair and affordable, Mr. Speaker.

These two men touched the hearts of many and they'll be remembered for generations to come.

This Bill recognizing April 6 as Tartan Day is very appropriate in this year for another reason, Mr. Speaker. This being the 125th birthday of Canada, we recognize the important input of the Scottish clans.

Many came here to seek a new life, Mr. Speaker. They came as farmers and professionals and business people. Their vision, and the vision of the two men I spoke of a moment ago, was to have a desire to build this nation, this great Canada, a united Canada. And we recognize them for that. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must rise in support of the motion from the member from Kindersley. Although my last name is not a Scottish name, some would say the better part of me is Scottish because the McLeay side is very prevalent in my past, being my mother's maiden name.

I just want to say a few words because I think it's really important that we have seen so many people of Scottish origin come to this country in the very, very early days into Ontario. I know my grandfather's family came to Ontario I think three generations ago and many of those families that came over to Canada were part of the builders of this country and they moved out to western Canada and were part of the foundation on which Saskatchewan was built on.

We have seen, as my colleagues on both sides of the House have said, many people of Scottish origin become very prominent and, as my colleague said, Mr. Tommy Douglas was one of those very prominent people.

Now the Scottish people, the people of Scottish origin, are noted for being very tight-fisted, Mr. Speaker. And I'm not sure that that's true, although if you look at the history of the Douglas government when he took over this province in very dire straits, I think it was. Maybe that is a little bit true that some of the desire to create and distribute wealth in this country, maybe it was a little bit of the Scottish blood in there that helped control some of the monies so that it could be distributed equally among the people of the province.

So I want to just join with my colleagues in saying that I'm pleased that we have a day now recognizing the contributions of the people of Scottish origin and I think they will all be pleased as others will be that we have finally recognized them.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to very briefly address this question in support of my colleague. The folks from the Scottish clans no doubt have done a lot to develop our great province in Saskatchewan as well as to develop different countries throughout the world. I don't have a Scottish ounce of blood in my body any place that I'm aware of, but of course anything could happen in the past that you might



not know about.

But I do want to say that in spite of that we recognize the fact that these are great people and certainly that is exemplified by the people from that origin who are represented in this Assembly. And I want to support this most whole-heartedly.

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

**Ms. Stanger:** — I want to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and support this motion. Even though I am of Ukrainian descent, my husband was Scottish and we were fortunate enough to make a trip to Scotland and trace back some of the roots of the Scottish people that came to this country.

I'm proud to say that the men and women from the Orkney Islands worked with the Hudson Bay Company in this country and they did a lot of the exploring, the mapping, the settling of this country. They came from northern Scotland and they settled in Ontario, they settled in Saskatchewan, they settled all over the country.

Scottish people, I believe, made a big contribution and I concur with the member from Humboldt. I believe that their natural bent for good management is exemplified in the . . . one of our dear premiers, Tommy Douglas, and I'm proud as a person who has some connection to Scottish people to stand and support this Bill.

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

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure this morning to rise in this Assembly to support my colleague, the member from Kindersley and his proposed Bill No. 41, the Act to declare a Day of Appreciation for Scottish Clans in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, although I'm not Scottish, I have very many friends who are of Scottish backgrounds and I want to stand in this Assembly this morning to acknowledge their contributions and their forefathers' and mothers' contributions to the province of Saskatchewan and to Canada.

I recall receiving a letter from a very diligent, hard-working person from Ontario who asked all MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) to consider supporting such a Bill in their province, to acknowledge the work and the contributions and the sacrifices that the Scottish people have provided in building this country and this province. And I at that time spoke with a number of people who I know to have very deep roots in the country of Scotland and they thought it would be a very good idea.

So I was in the process actually of considering such a Bill myself, member from Kindersley and colleagues, but I had already made a commitment to move a private Bill with respect to assisting the Credit Union Central and its amendments to the Bill which affects their operation of incorporation. So I want to thank the member from Kindersley to taking the initiative.

I am very pleased to see that that is being done today and

on behalf of the constituency of Regina North West and our caucus, I wish to say that I will be supporting this Bill when it comes to final reading. Thank you.

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

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

#### **Resolution No. 5 — Health Care Fees**

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

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

(1100)

#### **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.

Amendment negated on division.

Motion agreed to.

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

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

Motion agreed to.

#### **Return No. 10**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Boyd and the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. Shillington.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

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

#### **Return No. 11**

**Mr. Boyd:** — I would move the motion:

Regarding the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation: (1) the names of all persons currently employed by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly who were employed on or after November 1, 1991; (2) for each person listed in (1), the details of employment including compensation, job description, qualifications including employment history, the name of his or her immediate superior, the authority under which the person was hired, and the actual date

that the person started work.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is our desire in these matters to answer these questions as fully as we can. Notwithstanding that, the motion as it was written by the member is too indefinite to be answered. There is really, I think, no way of defining the comment indirectly.

In a sense the minister is the . . . when a minister is minister of a department, all of the employees of a department are in a sense employed indirectly by him. What we think the member's . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the intent was — right, thank you. What we think the intent was, you want to know the details of those who were working in the ministers' offices — not necessarily paid by Executive Council but employed in the ministers' offices — and therefore we are moving an amendment. And I say to . . . at the end of my comments I'll move the following amendment, Mr. Speaker, that the motion be amended:

That the words "by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, who were employed on or after November 1, 1991" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"in the minister's office."

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in the department is accountable to the minister indirectly. That includes everybody in the department. I don't think that's what they wanted. I think what they wanted to know was the details of people who are . . . of the minister's personal staff.

We think this amendment covers it. If it doesn't, the session is a long way from being over. It will be open to the members of the opposition to rephrase the questions and get whatever it was they think our amendment does not include. We think this amendment, Mr. Speaker, adequately covers the information which they want and which they are reasonably entitled to.

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, will cover one other item as well. We'll be deleting the words "including employment history." The guide we have used in answering these questions is, if it's reasonably answerable and if it is allowed under the freedom of information Act, we'd try to answer it. If it's excluded under the freedom of information Act, we think that's a useful guide and therefore we won't give it, as a general rule.

Now an employee's employment history is information that is excluded under the freedom of information Act. And I mentioned the other day, in my comments, reasons why that might be the case. There may well be such things as a period of incarceration, there may be unemployment, there may be large gaps, so we are excluding that. I frankly don't see how . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — We just want the ones from November 1.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The member from Rosthern is

actively engaged in the debate. Presumably he'll be on his feet in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how giving the employees' employment history tells you anything about patronage. Patronage goes to the motives behind which a person was appointed and is almost always proved by circumstantial evidence. I just fail to see what employment history would add to their keen desire to avert any kind of patronage now that they're in the opposition — a desire which was noticeably absent prior to October 21, '91.

I will at any rate, Mr. Speaker, therefore move a motion that the motion be amended as follows:

That the words "by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly who were employed on or after 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. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Assembly that the reasons that we were asking for these items to be brought forward is to identify as a process the work of the government in eliminating positions and re-establishing positions that they're identifying in the Crown corporations that would be accountable to them, and also that it would be the political patronage issue in many of these cases is being identified.

We had the Minister of Justice stand in the House and indicate to this Assembly that positions would not be cut and back-filled by partisan people. And, Mr. Speaker, the role of the opposition in this is that we want to know who those people are.

It is not difficult for you to identify them. All you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is take the public accounts component of your departments and identify that same opportunity in the development of a Crown corporation.

All we have to do is put the public accounts names in format that you have in the public accounts for the departments. And that would provide for us a description of the time lines that these people have been hired and it would also describe for us an opportunity to know how many of them that you have back-filled.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is why we're asking for these questions in returns for you to understand and the public to understand that you are in fact hiring partisan people to back-fill those people that you are laying off in the Crown corporations. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we're asking the question. We want you to identify your patronage.

Now you've identified through the years the patronages that we've made, and you said in the election campaign that you weren't going to do this. You said it over and over again. We're not going to be partisan. Far be it from me to be a partisan politician. And now what you're doing is you're preventing us from seeing those people being

identified.

And, Mr. Speaker, if you're ashamed, if you're ashamed of the employment history of the individuals and their record, they shouldn't be working for you. You'd think that you'd go around this province lifting these people up as being honourable citizens in the province of Saskatchewan or this country. And what you're doing, in fact saying, oh, I . . . and you have identified well, if he's been incarcerated before, we don't want to make that public.

Now I want to point out to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that we want to know the partisan patronage policy of the government and that's why we're asking the question. And you're ducking it every time.

You said you would be free and open in your hiring. And what are you doing? You're hiding behind your own ability to control the agenda in this House when we ask the questions on who was hired after November 1 and what positions did they fill in relation to those that you terminated people on. And we want to know that.

It's just a very simple point, but it's very fundamental to the discussion. And that's why we asked the question in that way. We want to know who's in the department and we'll ask who's in the department. But we also want to know who's in the Crown corporation that has been hired by you and you're afraid to admit, you're afraid to identify, and you're afraid to say what his work history has been. Because what you will have to do is identify probably that he did work for the NDP (New Democratic Party) Party at one point in time.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we had raised these questions and the reasons why we're objecting to the amendments that are being brought forward by the minister from Churchill Downs — or the minister . . . Associate Minister of Finance and the member from Churchill Downs.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

(1115)

### Return No. 12

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is similar to the one we just discussed — Return No. 11. It deals again with the employment and employment histories, back-filling of political appointments by the government. We're interested in the same ideas.

We went through this whole debate on June 9 with another one of these motions. We had the same amendments by the government and the same refusal to provide that information, and it's hard to understand why they will not provide that information.

This time I'd like to read the motion.

Regarding the Minister responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: (1) The

names of all persons currently employed by or accountable to the Minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Communication Workers Coalition 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. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I won't repeat my comments another time. Suffice it to say if the members wanted to know the positions which were back-filled, you could have asked that. You did ask it on my estimates in the Public Service Commission and my estimates in the SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) and we undertook to provide it.

Now I recognize that does not cover the Crown corporations, but if you wanted to know the positions which were back-filled, that really is a different matter. You've asked a much, much broader question here.

If I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, the member from Rosthern says they expect an answer. I say to the member from Rosthern if we were to answer this it would be a book that would rival the New York telephone book.

**An Hon. Member:** — It's all right. We'll take time. We'll read it.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well, the member says it's all right. There are other priorities in government, and I think the taxpayers have other priorities besides preparing useless information which no one's going to read. I doubt very much that any one opposite would read the answer to your question which would be the job descriptions, salaries, and all that other information with respect to every employee in the department.

What we thought you wanted, doing the best we could with imperfect language, what we thought you wanted was the details of people who work in the minister's office. If you want to know the positions which were back-filled, you could ask that and there's plenty of time left in the session to ask that. I point out to members opposite that unlike the practice in past years we are answering these at an early date, which gives you time to ask any supplementary questions which you want, and they will be dealt with in due course.

**An Hon. Member:** — Aren't you just wonderful?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well I thought so. I therefore am going . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — He is actually.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — These people all agree with you for once. I'm therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, going to move that the motion be amended as follows:

That the words “by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Communication Workers Coalition 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. Neudorf:** — I can’t help thinking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can’t help but respond to the Associate Minister of Finance’s comments and the arrogance that he shows which is basically only paralleled by the arrogance of the House Leader and how this whole situation with the bell-ringing is being dealt with.

Mr. Minister, how dare you get up and lecture us as to what kind of questions are appropriate for us to answer and perhaps the length of the answers that you would have to provide for us. Mr. Minister, I’m going to tell you that we will be asking the questions and we expect you to give us the answers.

Now, Mr. Minister, the basic premise of our questions are, as my colleague from Morse has already outlined, you, sir, are riddled with patronage. Your government is riddled with patronage. And I suggest the reason why you are ducking, why you are ducking, is to preserve the position of the Minister of Justice. I think this is a cover-up for the Minister of Justice. That’s where you’re heading. Because he has made the allegation in this House and the commitment in this House that there has not been one patronage appointment made by this government. That is what he told this legislature, not one patronage appointment.

Now, Mr. Minister, all we are doing is giving you an avenue to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that the Minister of Justice is correct, that he is accurate. Now, Mr. Minister, you are going to give us those answers. We are asking specifically from November 1, we want a response from you, employment history — who was hired, who was fired — since November 1. That is what we are really after. And I’ll tell you quite bluntly, that’s what we are after.

Because I think what we will find is a whole series, a whole series of political appointments. And then the Minister of Justice is going to have to retract and explain to this House why the House was misled. And that is what we suspect.

Now if the member, the toy minister, is reassuring this House, I want him to put it on record and I want him to answer these questions that we have legitimately put forth, and not give us a lecture what we may and may not ask because it may be too long in answering. And we will read your report, Mr. Minister, I assure you. We will read it. And I also assure you that we will use that information that is in there because beyond a shadow of a doubt, beyond a shadow of a doubt, it is riddled with patronage appointments, exactly what you said during the election you would never do.

And so therefore, Mr. Minister, for you to get up and sequentially here make these amendments to every one of our questions, is the height of arrogance, and refusal of an open and honest government to really come clean with how much appointments that you have made based on patronage. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is just no way that the opposition could go with such an amendment.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended negatived.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if I could address the subject? We are amending the motion. If the opposition are telling us they don’t want the motions as amended, that’s their choice. We’re not going to force upon them information they don’t want. We have amended the motion. We are thereafter somewhat ambivalent as to whether or not it passes. If you don’t want it in its amended fashion, we’ll simply defeat it and save the government the time of providing it.

So when the members voted against it, our side was solid — you heard what you heard. But the government is not going to force this information upon an unwilling opposition.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I’m trying to follow, Mr. Speaker, why you had that member getting up to make a statement as he did. I don’t see the rules. He had just spoken to the motion once already and now he had the opportunity to speak without raising a point of order. And I’m raising a point of order on that particular issue. And I would want a clarification as to why he was on his feet.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The member appreciates the assistance of both members in this matter. I thought I heard some yeas from that side. Let me just check this again. The question before the Assembly is Return No. 12 as amended. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion as amended?

Motion as amended negatived.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I would request the same courtesy from the Chair as was given the Associate Minister of Finance to make a statement as well. And my statement, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is this: I know that the microphones pick up the holler and the abuse from members of opposite. They have heard the ridicule and the laughing about the parliamentary procedure . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There will be no order called on this; I’m making my statement just as the associate deputy minister did. And my statement is this. We will not be party to making a ridicule of the legislative process. This side has brought forth a motion that asks for information. You guys, by that amendment, are gutting the intent of the motion whereby we are trying to find . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. The next item of business before us is item no. 3.

## Return No. 13

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe we're engaging in an exercise of futility here. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to read into the record motion no. 13. The Fisher-Price minister made the statement that we probably wouldn't read the answers anyway.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not his choice to make, that's our choice. And it's our choice if we want these answers, and it's our choice if we read them. The length of the answers has no bearing on what we're asking for, Mr. Speaker. If we didn't want the answers, we wouldn't be asking for them.

And when that minister gets on his feet and decides for us whether we get the information and then tells us that we're not going to read it, Mr. Speaker, it speaks an awful lot for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to read this motion. And the motion reads, Mr. Speaker:

Regarding the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Power Corporation: (1) The names of all persons currently employed by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and Energy and Chemical Workers unions . . .

(1130)

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. I'd ask the back-benchers on the government side to come to order or take their . . . conduct their business somewhere else and let the member for Wilkie have his say.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I was at:

. . . Chemical Workers unions 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.

Mr. Speaker, I move that motion.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Without making any extensive comments, I will endeavour to avoid inflaming the opposition again with my comments. I just simply say that this session is a long way from over. If this is not the information you want, then you can re-ask the questions. I wasn't suggesting that we decide for you what you get. I was just simply saying it wouldn't be very useful.

What you're going to get with these questions is the names, occupations, compensation, etc., of everybody in the Crown corporation. That's a very large amount of information and very costly to prepare. If you want . . . It's everybody who's employed.

The member from Morse suggests . . . you didn't ask for

everyone who was hired from November 1. That would have been a different question. You asked for the names, etc., addresses, the names, occupations, job descriptions of everybody who was accountable directly or indirectly to the minister. That includes everybody in the Crown corporation. The question . . . it isn't very useful. This won't tell you.

Because you're going to get the name of everybody in the Crown corporation, you're going to have no way of knowing which were back-filled and which weren't. This is not going to give you the information which was requested by the member from Morse. This is not sophistry. I'm just simply saying, if we answer the question, you're not going to get the information you wanted. If that's what you want, it may be a legitimate request. You should put it in writing, and we will consider it another day.

I am however, Mr. Speaker, with those comments, going to move that the motion be amended:

That the words "by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and Energy and Chemical Workers unions 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.

. . . for the reasons I've already given.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, the concerns that we have are that the members opposite and the Crown corporations that they're dealing with will terminate positions, re-establish those positions in patronage appointments. And, Mr. Speaker, that has happened over and over and over again. Patronage in this Assembly has been there for ever.

And I don't disagree with patronage. But these people across the way, Mr. Speaker, in the last election said that they were not going to do it. The Minister of Justice stood in this House and said, we will not do it. We don't do it. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what we're questioning here. And we want to know how extensive your patronage employment process is.

Over and over again we have seen patronage appointments in Crown corporations, in governments, in ministers' offices. We believe there has to be patronage. How are you going to take it any other way?

And that, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, is why we are asking the questions beyond the minister's office because we'll get that information when we ask you in your estimates. You told us that you would give it to us and we have received it.

But in the Crown corporations we also want to know . . . because, you know what? Prior to 1982 you and others in

government, in executive branch, seconded people from the Potash Corporation to work in your offices. And then you have the freedom now to say, oh we don't hire members of the Crown corporations to be employed in ministers' offices. We have never done that sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of thing that we want to identify. We want to identify it in a very precise way.

And if you're afraid to admit who your employees are that you've hired since November 1, then maybe you should say it so that the people of Saskatchewan can see what you're doing. If you believe that the records and the work of the people that you've hired are going to be detrimental to the employment of that individual, then why would you hire that person in the first place? Is he only a political partisan appointment? And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we want to identify these people.

Mr. Speaker, we've talked here about patronage. This government that we have here today said they weren't going to do it; they have never done it. And, Mr. Speaker, they have done it in bus loads. Mr. Speaker, they have done it prior to '82 and they have done it after 1991. And, Mr. Speaker, we want that identified.

We want that identified because the member from Quill Lakes had his whole family working for the government at one time. The member from Saskatoon Broadview, her father and herself worked for this government. The Minister of Health worked for the Government of Saskatchewan prior to 1982. I could go on and on.

What about the Bowerman family? Boyles? Bucks? Faris? Ferns? Funks? Glovers? And the member from Moose Jaw Palliser worked for the government for years. And he said, oh we don't have patronage, we don't have patronage. And what we're trying to do, Mr. Minister, is find out how really deep this goes.

A new one today . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — His name is John Gormley. It just came to light.

**Mr. Martens:** — Just came to light. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the member from Churchill Downs, he says Mr. Gormley was a recipient of patronage.

Well, Mr. Minister, what about the president and chief executive officer of SaskPower? And what about his assistant? Were they never, ever connected with the party of the NDP? Well I say, Mr. Speaker, they were.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we're asking this Assembly to provide to us, as the opposition, the names of these individuals. There's a whole bunch of them, all the way through — name after name after name of people who were employed as patronage appointments.

We never, ever said we were going to do it, that we were going to get rid of patronage. You did.

And what have you got? Over and over and over again you've got a list of patronage that is as long as five or six, eight or nine pages can give us. And that, Mr. Speaker, is

the reason why we're asking. We hear it in the news — patronage all over. And now we want to know from you exactly who they are.

Mr. Speaker, that's why we're asking the question and that's why we're against this kind of clipping the amendment so that it doesn't identify the kinds of things that we want to have in there. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, we'll be voting against that amendment.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be making an amendment to the amendment, seconded by the member from Kindersley. I will read the amendment and then wish to speak to the motion:

That only those persons hired after November 1, 1992 who have criminal records or personal medical disabilities on their resumé's be excluded from the motion for return.

I think the concerns that the Associate Minister of Finance raised in this House about the individual rights of people in this country are valid in certain circumstances. It has always been the practice of members of this Assembly to respect the personal files of people who have something in their past that may infringe upon their employability in the future. Because you happen to be a functionary in a political party does not fit that category, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Criminal records and certain medical disabilities which some people in our society for some reason frown upon are legitimate reasons to exclude that from the employment history of an individual, and I think all members of this Assembly would agree that those personal, private records, as are medical files of each and every one of us, are treated with respect and dignity.

But as the member from Morse pointed out, we have a newly elected government in this province who went out and sought the votes of the people of Saskatchewan a short time ago, spoke year after year in this Assembly on the patronage appointments of the former government. The hypocrisy of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is something that the members of the opposition simply cannot accept.

To have this government who comes in on promises of being open and accountable, who go into the Public Accounts Committee in this legislature and make a big thing out of every last employee of the former government, who allege all sorts of actions to those employees, do so in order, I say, to get media attention and not much else, and then stand in this Assembly order after order after order and say that those people that they hired since taking office should not be revealed to the Saskatchewan public.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only is it hypocritical, but I think it is downright shameful. If you have the power of your convictions that the people that you are hiring are the best possible person for that job, then you should stand on a stump somewhere and proclaim it to the world, not use the machinations of the Associate Minister of Finance to try and hide it.

New Democrats in this province seem to be the only people that say, I am holier than thou. The parties in the last election didn't run around saying that there would absolutely be no patronage. It wasn't their members who stood on stumps all over this province and decried that there was political patronage. It was the New Democratic Party and no other.

And now we see, as the member from Morse points out, pages and pages and pages. We have the budget document alone saying that we've made 560-some-odd appointments. Well fair ball. I'm sure some of those appointments are bright, reasonable people who will do a darn good job in their selected area.

But I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are others that may be hired for different reasons. And I would think it would be incumbent upon this government who went out and sought the votes, went out and sought the votes of Saskatchewan people such a short time ago, to put all of that on the record.

It's nothing more than a public accounts, if you will, expanded a little bit. It means that the Crown corporations will be treated the same as public accounts.

(1145)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are many more motions for return to be brought in this legislature. If the associate minister is true to his word in what he said in his previous statement where he said, opposition, you have worded your motion for return wrongly; that you are placing an unreasonable burden upon the taxpayer of this province, expenditures in time and money and paper with a job that is wasting the taxpayers' money, then I think it would be incumbent upon him to say that we the government will take the lead and we will change the motion to say, only those people since November 1, 1991. That we will be true to the words that we said in this province time after time over the last several years and definitely in the last election campaign, that we have nothing to hide; no person working for us had anything to hide. That we are very proud of the people that we will put into the public service of this province, and we will come forward with it.

And we will place those people in front and centre for every person in this society to look at and pass judgement upon, admire, decry, whatever they should be in our society, but not to hide behind a motion, an amended motion for return as we're seeing from the Associate Minister of Finance today.

The next motion for return, I hope that associate minister takes this opportunity to set it straight and do what is right in the province of Saskatchewan.

Once again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I propose to amend the amendment:

That only those employees with criminal records or personal medical disabilities be excluded from the motion for return.

Seconded by the member from Kindersley, I so move.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The Chair is having some difficulty understanding the intent of the amendment that's been proposed by the member for Thunder Creek. As the Chair reviews the proposed amendment to the amendment moved by the member, it's the Chair's understanding, if the subamendment were carried, that what the member's asking for, that when it comes to employees in the minister's office, that you don't wish to know those persons hired after November 1, 1992 who have criminal records or personal medical disabilities on their resumes. So that you're excluding from . . . that you don't want to know about people who are hired in the minister's office after November 1, 1992 who have criminal records.

If it's the intent of the amendment to amend the main motion to exclude those persons with criminal records or personal medical disabilities on their résumés, then the Chair can't accept that as an amendment to the amendment, but I could accept it as a distinct amendment after the first amendment that is now before us is dealt with. So I ask the member what his intent is and then we'll take it from there.

**Mr. Swenson:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for that difficulty. What I was intending was, given the comments of the Associate Minister of Finance previously, that this would be an amendment to the main motion rather than an amendment to the amendment.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I'll give this back to the member and ask him that at the appropriate time then that we deal with it.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. Swenson:** — I will move that the main motion be amended that only those persons . . . Point of clarification, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm now moving this amendment to the motion that's been amended. Right? And I think at that point it would negate what I was attempting to do, so I will desist from further conversation on this particular item.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 14

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, again I say this seems to be an exercise in futility — so much, I guess, for open and honest. They're using their majority to muzzle the opposition, Mr. Speaker.

But again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to read this into the record, even though the associate minister will probably gut the motion. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move an order to the Assembly for a return showing:

Regarding the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: (1) the names of all persons currently employed or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Sask Water Employees Association who were employed prior to November 1, 1991. (2) for each person listed in (1), 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 person started to work.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'll spare . . . I will not repeat the comments I made earlier. I will simply move that the motion be amended as follows:

That the words "by or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly, excluding only members of the Sask Water Employees Association 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.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 1

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to move the motion:

Regarding Don Ching: (1) that the details of employment, including compensation and job description; (2) who he reports to; (3) the authority under which he was hired; (4) a true copy of his contract, the existence of which is required by law as set out in The Crown Employment Contracts Act.

So moved.

Motion agreed to.

#### Return No. 15

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing:

Regarding the Ag Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan: (1) whether the government will provide a list of all legal action intended to realize security initiated either by notice of intent or actual court proceedings against farmers of Saskatchewan; (2) the costs incurred by the government in defence of these actions to the date this question is ordered; (3) whether the government will provide a list of lawyers representing the Government of Saskatchewan in each action and the individual fees being paid to these lawyers.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I will at the end of my comments move the following amendment:

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the "Agriculture Credit Corporation" and substituting the following therefor:

the number of legal actions intended to realize security initiated either by notice of intent or actual court proceedings between November 1, '91, and March 31, '92; the legal costs incurred by the corporation in these legal actions; the law firms to which these legal fees were paid.

(1200)

Mr. Speaker, in the amounts paid to individual firms, when finalized, will appear in due course in *Public Accounts*. It is not now finalized. And this is the . . . this at this point in time is the best we can do. We're providing the opposition with as much information as we can. The balance of the information they seek will be in . . . will be provided in due course.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is exactly what the opposition has been talking about. The Associate Minister of Finance knows full well that during the period of time of which he has changed this motion there was a voluntary moratorium in place amongst lenders of all sorts and the Government of Saskatchewan, so there was virtually no actions instituted during that period of time. Those actions all commenced after the date that the minister has talked about. There would be virtually no fees paid to any law firms. There would be virtually nothing done by the minister, gutting that motion in that regard.

I think what the members of the opposition are legitimately asking for is the record of the Government of Saskatchewan in dealing with its rural clientele. I think it's important for people out there, when they're assessing as taxpayers the needs of Saskatchewan residents, that they know the whole picture. They need to know how many people the government is foreclosing on, what the economic situation is in the province of Saskatchewan, who is benefitting from doing those foreclosures by the government. These are all very legitimate questions.

How can people in our society assess the impact that several thousand foreclosures would have on our province without having the data available to them? This is a very legitimate motion for return. We want to know, and I think it would be incumbent upon taxpayers to know — and they make these assessments as individuals — of how many of these actions are proceeding, how many dollars are being spent on it, and are there reasonable alternatives to those actions.

And what we have is a government that continually says one thing politically — that there is a crisis in agriculture, that they once again campaigned that there were thousands of farmers out to rallies, made promises on moratoriums, made promises on cost of production, made promises that they would come up with a better system — in government we see just the opposite.

We see secrecy, we see the GRIP program gutted, we see no moratorium, we see no cost of production. We see in



fact every last cost of production that rural people have going up — fuel, electricity, gas, taxes — across the piece. And what we're saying to the government today in this motion for return is that taxpayers need to make a rational assessment of how severe the problem is out there — how many people are going to be lost in our communities; how many people are fleeing this province.

And the only way we can get those numbers is to have the government answer them in this legislature in a legitimate way. If it's 100, 200, a thousand, and we're spending 100, 200, \$300,000 on legal fees to accomplish this task, then I think it's important for us to know so that people can make an assessment.

Question period was taken up today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a fundamental question. If you are going to expend taxpayers' dollars, is it better to do it through an insurance program that allows people to maintain self-sufficiency out there, or do you do it through some other avenue? Is that other avenue foreclosure and getting people out of rural Saskatchewan?

We have a drought on in a good part of this province. It is going to take a tremendous amount of rainfall to negate that. If we have had several hundred foreclosures since the end of March, just think of how many we're going to have in this province come the fall if we have a severe drought in this province and there is not enough back-up to keep those people on the land.

How many more legal firms are going to take the taxpayers' dollar in foreclosing on people? And I think those kind of questions are absolutely fundamental to this House and the people in this province to have answered. And it's absolutely shameful for the minister to put in these amendments that he knows full well will come up with almost a zero for an answer. Absolutely zero for an answer.

If you're ashamed of what you're doing out there, if you're ashamed of it, then why aren't you doing something in this House to fix it? Instead we hear political rhetoric and hiding behind the rules of this Assembly. And I just find it incomprehensible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why the Associate Minister of Finance would not want to tell the public how many of these actions are taking place, how much money they're spending, and who the legal people are that are doing the dirty work.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 18

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 18 showing:

Minister responsible for SaskEnergy. Regarding rate increases after November 1, 1991: (1) The total revenue generated to date and the total revenue projected to be generated by those increases this fiscal year; (2) the revenue that is derived from (a) customers within the cities of

Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Moose Jaw; (b) customers from outside those cities; (c) farm customers; and (d) business customers.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. At the conclusion of my comments I'm going to move an amendment deleting all the words after the words "this fiscal year." In other words, we will not be answering parts (2) (a), (b), or (c). The reason for that is that I am told that the SaskEnergy cannot break down the revenue in that fashion. The accounting system doesn't permit them to break it down in that fashion.

So I will therefore move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the words "this fiscal year."

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 19

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 19 showing:

Minister responsible for SaskPower. Regarding rate increases after November 1, 1991: (1) the total revenue generated to date, and the total revenue projected to be generated by these increases in this fiscal year; (2) the revenue that is derived from (a) customers within the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, and Moose Jaw; (b) customers from outside those cities; (c) farm customers; and (d) business customers.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — As given last time, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "this fiscal year".

Same comments apply. We are not able to break down the revenue figures in the fashion requested.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 20

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move:

Minister responsible for SGI. Regarding rate increases after November 1, 1991: (1) the total revenue generated to date, and the total revenue projected to be generated by those increases this fiscal year; the revenue that is derived from (a) customers within the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, and Moose Jaw; (b) customers from outside of those cities; (c) farm customers; and (d) business customers.

I so move, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — For reasons given previously, I move:

That this motion be amended by deleting the words after the words “this fiscal year.”

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

(1215)

### Return No. 21

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Might I ask the members to observe order.

**Mr. D’Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is similar to the last two motions. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with SaskTel the information is available. It’s on everyone’s bill. The minister, if he wished to, could find out what the billings were for Regina and supply us with the information. It’s available for businesses; they have a separate billing. If they wanted to, they could program the computer to pull that information out and supply it.

The same for the rural area, Mr. Speaker — that information is available for every exchange. If the government wished to provide that information, they could do so. We would encourage them to do so, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I will read the motion:

Minister responsible for SaskTel. Regarding rate increases after November 1, 1991: (1) the total revenue generated to date, the total revenue projected to be generated by those increases this fiscal year; (2) the revenue that is derived from (a) customers within the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, and Moose Jaw; (b) customers from outside of those cities; (c) farm customers; and (d) business customers.

I so move, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — For the reasons given previously, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the words “this fiscal year.”

I so move.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I just want to point out to the viewing and listening public again the decorum of the House, and the members applauding, the closed mouth, and the inability and the unwillingness of this open and forthright government to participate in the democratic process, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What we are seeing here is a complete and utter denial of members opposite to give the information that the opposition is requesting.

And yesterday, very sanctimoniously, for two and a half

hours in the evening, we heard the Minister of Finance saying, this is not my responsibility; this is not my responsibility. Ask that minister. Ask the minister of Crop Insurance; he will give you the answer. Ask the Minister of Agriculture; he will give you the answer. I don’t have the answer; I’m not going to give you the answer.

And that’s precisely what we’ve been hearing all this morning so far, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a complete denial by members opposite to give us the legitimate questions . . . answers to the questions that we are asking. And then you just heard what happened — a loud cheering by all members opposite. A cheering! A cheering by members opposite that they are refusing to give us the information that we are legitimately asking.

And I think that’s a downright shame. It’s just turning this whole legislative process into a zoo. And it’s just totally unacceptable to us. It’s disgusting.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, on the motion, with respect to the information that has been requested, I’ve been sitting here and listening to members opposite as they list complaint after complaint about the type of information that is given to them.

And I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there are members sitting in this House — 55 members to be exact — that are in full support of the minister and in the proceedings and the motions that are being passed. And that these motions are not somehow being passed at the whim of one or two members but is being supported by the entire government caucus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these questions, a lot of them pertain to employees that have been hired by government, and I personally have been endorsing the amendments because I think that the key criteria for any of the hirings or keeping of people in place is their qualifications and their competence. And those questions are being answered. Anything else dealing with a person’s history dating back to who knows when I think becomes material of a rather confidential and personal nature, and I do not support anybody in particular having a great big long list of a person’s history. I don’t think that’s a good way to attract a good civil service, Mr. Speaker.

So the reason for my standing is just to explain to those who may be listening to the proceedings that there are members all around in this House that are supportive in the action of the minister and that I commend the minister on his work and his diligence to answering these questions and to the proceedings in this particular case. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 22

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I stand here to move a motion that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 22 showing:

Regarding the decision to reduce heritage grant

coverage and to eliminate the grant outright for low income seniors living in subsidized housing: (1) whether the minister consulted with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken. (2) If so, (a) the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) the dates and locations where consultations occurred; (c) the content of representations made to the minister.

I so move.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to delete the reference . . . I'll be moving a motion which will in substantive terms delete the reference to dates and locations and the content of such representations. Doing that because in many cases no records were kept of dates or locations.

And with respect to the content of representations, in most cases these were oral, again no written records were kept of them. And in addition most of these groups who met with us assumed their comments . . . many of them assumed their comments would not be made public. And we really don't have a record of who indicated their comments could be made public and who couldn't.

So I'm therefore, Mr. Speaker, moving that the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "heritage grant coverage" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

whether the minister consulted with any groups or individuals prior to the decision being taken; if so, the names of groups or individuals involved in the consultations.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to draw some conclusions from the Associate Minister of Finance making some of the observations that he made. He made the observation that he didn't have the dates and locations because these were oral presentations that were made. If he has the names of the individuals, surely he should have the date associated with it, the communications that were made with the individuals.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this reminds me of a process that has gone on for a long, long time in governments where there's consultation directly involving people of the province of Saskatchewan in a very, very legitimate way. Last year I took it upon myself to visit with at least 20,000 farmers on a very, very direct way on a program that was going to impact on them. All together the ministers, there was seven ministers, went around the province and visited roughly 40 to 50,000 farmers in the province of Saskatchewan legitimately talking to them and asking them for their observations about what we were going to do with changes to the programs that we were involved with. It was a consultative process that was very, very extensively done. It cost the taxpayers some money but, Mr. Speaker, it was important that it be done.

The past two weeks are an example of how this government consults. And that's the reason why he doesn't want to be involved. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities had six

district meetings in Kipling, in Moose Jaw, in Swift Current, in North Battleford, Saskatoon, and Wadena.

And were any of the members who had time off to do it, were any of the members opposite at any one of those meetings? The answer is no. That's why they have no record of consultation, because there was none. There was none, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's the reason why they're not involved in it and that's the reason why they don't have any dates; they don't have any locations because they didn't do it.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the fundamental problem with this whole outfit on the other side. And as a matter of fact, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities cannot remember a time when the minister who is responsible for rural affairs hasn't been at that meeting and hasn't been at every one of those meetings.

Even when the House was sitting the member who was responsible for the municipalities in the province of Saskatchewan went to those meetings. Whether he was publicly in favour or not in favour of some of the recommendations made by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, he went. And what did this minister do? He copped out. He was not at one single one of them. In fact he made the deputy minister do his political work in every one of them. It was totally disgusting at every one of the meetings that I was at.

And that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is why they can't put the dates and the locations down because they never, ever did have. And that's exactly the reason why you got trouble with GRIP. That's exactly the reason why you had trouble with the pension plan. That's exactly the reason why you have trouble with health care, with the diabetics, the optometrists, the chiropody people, every one of them. That's why you have a problem. You don't take the time to ask. You don't take the time to visit with the people.

On July 3, there's going to be a meeting with all of the livestock people talking about one very fundamental thing: why are all the cattle leaving the province of Saskatchewan? Are you going to be there? Probably not. Probably not. News release issued today says that you should be there, but you're probably not going to be because you haven't got the jam to do it. You haven't got the courage to be there and you weren't there at any of these consultations about the hearings that . . . or the heritage grant with seniors. You know what you're going to be doing with level 2 and level 1 care. You're going to be kicking them out of those homes in the next two years. You're going to see people who are in level 3 and 4 in those level 2 homes walking out of those homes never to return.

(1230)

And, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what. You'd better start going around the province and listening to what the people are saying and what they're doing. Because you're far out of touch and you've only been here eight months. What are you going to be in another year?

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why these guys

haven't got a date and a location, because they never did. And that, Mr. Speaker, is totally disgusting. That's why they haven't got the courage to put it on paper. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why I'll be voting against the amendment.

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

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 23

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to make the point to repeat some of the points that I made earlier on exactly this thing, because I am anticipating that the Associate Minister of Finance is going to do the same thing on this one as he did on the other one. And I want to tell him that he never consulted with anybody.

In fact, if he would have taken the time on the same days that the Minister of Agriculture had Hartley Furtan in his office talking about GRIP and talking about leasebacks, if he'd taken the time to ask him about the study he did for the feeders association of the province of Saskatchewan, he'd have found out some more information that might have been helpful in relating to why cattle are moving out of this province at the rate that they are. And to top it all off they're moving out because of the drought besides that.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why this government is in trouble. They're in trouble because they haven't consulted with anyone. They don't know what's going on out there, and if they do, they're ignoring it totally.

Now he is going to put dates and locations down and he's going to take that out of there. And the reason he is, because he never did consult with anybody. That's the reason why he's in trouble. And that's the reason he's in trouble with the agriculture community. That's why the member from Shaunavon and other members who went down to Orkney almost ran them out of town when they were there the last time. And these are some of the reasons, is because they don't consult. They haven't got the jam to do it.

And the minister responsible for Rural Development should have been at the meeting in Swift Current when they took a strip off of his deputy because he wasn't prepared to answer some of the political questions that the minister of Rural Affairs should have been asking about crop insurance, about The Critical Wildlife Habitat (Protection) Act, about increase in cost to fees to the ranches, therefore their lease land.

He should have been there doing it and he wasn't, because he didn't have the courage to do it. He didn't even have the courage to go into his own constituency area and talk to the people there — never had the courage to do it. And the reason he's going . . . and the Associate Minister of Finance is going to take it out of here is because he never did contact anyone to find out what was going on. He didn't have the courage to do it. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, that's wrong.

Therefore I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing that:

Regarding the decision to eliminate the FeedGAP program: (1) whether the Minister of Agriculture consulted with any groups or persons prior to eliminating the program. (2) If so, (a) the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) the dates and locations where consultations occurred; (c) the content of representations made to the minister.

And if he puts down on the record that they were oral, I don't even believe that.

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

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — For the reasons given earlier, and so as to avoid inflaming the member from Morse, I will simply move the motion be amended:

That all the words after "consultation" be deleted.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I view this as being a shameful and despicable act of brushing off the cattle producers of this province, and most especially in the south-west corner of the province.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — I believe it is important to every producer in this province, but it is particularly of interest to me in the south-west because I know the cattle industry and I know the people that are involved.

And you are gutting the industry by the things that you have been doing and your disdain in not answering the question shows exactly what you think of primary producers in this province. You don't give a darn what happens to them. You'd just as soon see them all gone. Because all the cattle are going and the producers are going to have to follow them. And there is no other way out for this government but to say goodbye to everybody in this province. You start with the cattle producers, you'll end up with the grain producers, and then you're going to end up with nobody left to shut the lights out because everybody's going to be gone.

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

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 24

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This motion deals with the Saskatchewan Pension Plan and whether or not the government consults with any groups before making any decisions on the Pension Plan, the cancellation of it.

Even though the minister, the House Leader, is suggesting that they fixed the problem, indeed the problem is not fixed, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's far from fixed. And that's why I suspect they're still getting all kinds of calls the

same as we are getting all kinds of calls on the Saskatchewan Pension Plan and their so-called fix. It no more fixes the problem than it was fixed before.

The concern about the Pension Plan still is there and still is in the minds of the people out there in Saskatchewan. And that's why I think it's important that this question still be asked about the responsibility of the government to consult with people. They've said they're going to be open and consultative, and yet they haven't consulted with anyone on almost every issue.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would move the following motion:

Regarding the decision to eliminate the Saskatchewan Pension Plan: (1) whether the minister responsible consulted with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken. (2) If so, (a) the names of the individuals involved in those consultations; (b) the dates and locations where the consultations occurred; and (c) the content of representations made to the minister.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will rely upon the comments made previously and move that the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "consultations" be deleted.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### Return No. 25

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This motion is about the environmental deposits on pop bottles and other beverage containers. What we're asking is, what consultation had taken place and who was the consultation with and where?

We know that some consultation had taken place with the beverage industry, if you can use the term "consultation" when you have a meeting with the minister and the minister tells you what she's going to do — doesn't ask you what your concerns might be but tells you, this is what we're going to do.

**An Hon. Member:** — Well that's decisive.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — That's very decisive. It's also known as being dictatorial, Mr. Speaker.

We would like to know if the minister has discussed not only with the pop . . . the beverage industry but also with SARCAN and with those people who are interested in the costs for the environment, with the consumers. Did they discuss with any of the consumer groups this increase?

When the minister did hold a meeting with the beverage industry, did the discussion also include the impact on jobs that this new Bill would have? Reading in the paper a week or two after the minister introduced the Bill and

raised the price for the deposits, we see that the impact that it did have was a 20 per cent drop in the consumption rate. Now did the minister discuss that with the industry? Did you take into account that kind of an impact, and just what kind of an impact does that have on the environmental return on those deposits?

I'd like to read the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Regarding the decision to impose increases on the handling and deposit fees on soda pop and other beverages: (1) whether the Minister of the Environment consulted with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken. (2) If so, (a) the names of the individuals involved in the consultations; (b) the dates and locations where the consultations occurred; (c) the content of representations made to the minister.

I so move.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — For the reasons stated on earlier returns, I will move the motion be amended:

That all the words after "consultations" be deleted.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

#### ROYAL ASSENT

At 12:47 p.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Tobacco Tax Act

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

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

Bill No. 58 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending on March 31, 1993.

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

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 12:50 p.m.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

**The Speaker:** — Before I move adjournment of the House, I do want to wish everybody a happy Canada Day and I hope we celebrate it well tomorrow.

This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 on Thursday.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:51 p.m.