

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

respect to Saskatchewan's bid?

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

The Petition of the undersigned farmers and citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

The Government of Saskatchewan entered into legally binding contracts with them to provide a Gross Revenue Insurance Program explicitly guaranteeing that the provisions of the contract would not be changed without notice before given to farmers by March 15, 1992 and that the Government has announced its intention before the Courts in Melville that it proposes to pass a law saying farmers received such notice when in actual fact they did not and concerned that the crisis on the farm is being made much worse by these actions.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to

- 1.) allow the 1991 GRIP program to stand for this year,
- 2.) start working with the federal government and farmers to design a program that will be a true "revenue insurance" program by the end of this calendar year, and
- 3.) ensure that the new revenue insurance program to be set up on an individual cost-of-production to return ratio instead of a risk area formula.

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

There are people here from the districts of Hearne, Briercrest, and Tilney. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Thursday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding the Saskatchewan bid to attract Piper Aircraft Corporation to this province: how much has this proposal cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to date; has the government position changed since bid was first announced? To date what are the costs and details of all travel including bureaucratic and ministerial, names of travellers, and dates of excursions? Which government department paid for the travel costs, and costs of travel broken down by trip? And now that the management has changed at the Piper Aircraft Corporation, what is Cyrus Eaton's role in

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Bradley:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, a group of 4-H exchange students who are visiting our province from New Brunswick, along with other guests that have come here today from Saskatchewan. They're visiting in my area of the province in agriculture district no. 14 and they have been hosted in the area and have visited many places, the Moose Jaw air show, and rodeo, a tour of the Big Muddy, I understand, and many other events.

Today they're visiting in Regina and will be visiting the IMAX, the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) sunset ceremonies, and of course our legislature here today. I would like the members here to help me welcome them to our legislature.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the members of this Assembly, sitting in the opposition gallery, my wife Jeanette who today is accompanied with relatives from Switzerland.

With her are Marlis Schneider, Heinz Nyffenegger and Marti Nyffenegger. Heinz is a production process engineer with the Holderbank Cement Manufacturing Company, the biggest manufacturer of cement in the world, who also have three plants in Canada. And I would like them to stand up and take a bow.

They're going to go out to the cement factory today, Mr. Speaker, to check things out over there. And perhaps considering that all of our cement factories are no longer in operation in Saskatchewan, they might convince Holderbank to come over and show us how to get it rolling again. So please help me to welcome them.

And I would like to also welcome Warren Martenson who is sitting up behind them today. And we're glad to have him back with us as well.

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

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The results of a survey were released today indicating that 64 per cent of Saskatchewan residents favour expanding the province's nuclear industry. Saskatoon's support is at 70 per cent. I find it encouraging that the majority of people of this province support searching out alternate energy options including nuclear energy. However, the government continues to turn a blind eye to a perfect avenue for such development — an agreement with Atomic Energy of Canada.

We in Saskatchewan could take a leadership role in developing not only alternate forms of energy but exporting the technology to other nations. It makes little sense that the NDP (New Democratic Party) on the one

hand encourages uranium mining in Saskatchewan, but on the other refuses to take advantage of millions of dollars in research and development funding. To suggest that it is okay to mine uranium but not ensure that it is processed and used safely is hypocritical at best and profoundly irresponsible.

Saskatchewan has an important role to play in providing technological expertise to countries using nuclear reactors as well as setting safety standards, or refusing to sell our uranium to anyone who will not meet our guidelines. For this very reason I once again encourage the NDP government to not let this opportunity slip through our fingers.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Health announced the expansion of the renal dialysis satellite program at Prince Albert's Victoria Union Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the minimal care dialysis program currently provides treatment to nine chronic, medically stable patients in the Prince Albert area. We expect that the expansion will accommodate an eight additional patients.

Mr. Speaker, previously a number of patients were required to travel to Saskatoon two or three times a week for treatment. I think today of one individual who contacted me during the election campaign and asked if this program could be expanded because her parents, who were elderly, were forced to move to Saskatoon. They had the inability to travel back and forth two to three times a week.

And so I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government is moving ahead with positive moves with respect to health care, education, and other areas. And I want to congratulate the minister on her announcement today.

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

**Mr. Renaud:** — Mr. Speaker, on July 9 the hon. member from Nipawin, the hon. member from Pelly, department officials, and myself had the opportunity to tour the alfalfa dehy industry in north-east Saskatchewan thanks to the Saskatchewan Dehydrators Association. The Minister of Rural Development, the Hon. Darrel Cunningham, met with the association in the morning. The tour included the Tisdale plant, the Arborfield plant, both sun-cured and green-alfalfa field operations, and the laboratory.

Many significant points were noted on that tour, Mr. Speaker. The strong support for the existing method of payment under the Western Grains Transportation Act is very important to the survival of this very important industry.

The announcement by the Saskatchewan Dehydrators Association to take a leadership role in phase one of a plan to research the development of an alfalfa dehydrated cube — this is very significant as the export demand for good quality, long fibre product is growing.

This is also good news for the farming community that utilizes alfalfa as part of their farm management practices.

Thanks to Dale Pulkinen and Dale Davidson and Ian Meyer for a very informative tour.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**The Speaker:** — Before I recognize the member from Kindersley, I want to remind members again that they do not refer to members by their proper names, or ministers by their proper names, but ministers by their portfolios.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted today to talk a little bit about the importance of the regional park system throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and of one of the parks in specific — the Eston Riverside Regional Park.

I attended a number of functions there over this past weekend. The park is located 15 miles south of Eston on the South Saskatchewan River. It's just part of a network of excellent regional parks throughout this province.

Some of the concerns people were telling me about while I was at the functions on the weekend were the concern about the highway leading to the park and the possible ripping up of that highway.

Some 700 people attended various events on the weekend at that park. It has an excellent nine-hole golf course, Mr. Speaker. They are working towards fund raising with the goal of construction of a new swimming pool in the park. It's just, as I said, a part of the regional park system throughout the province. And I would ask all members to support and continue supporting the regional park system throughout the province.

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

**Ms. Bradley:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Over the weekend I attended Ogema's 80th birthday. At the official opening I was proud to be called upon for a few remarks before the unveiling of their second edition of their local history book, *Prairie Grass to Golden Grain*.

I applaud the history book committee for having the foresight to update their local history. It is crucial that we preserve our heritage and the spirit of our past, for without our past we have nothing to learn from or to build from for our future.

I also want to commend the community of Ogema and surrounding areas for an event well planned. An event such as this takes a tremendous amount of organization, co-operation, and community effort. One of the fair organizers with the agriculture society told me when the grant money wasn't available this year, of course they were disappointed, but they realized that there were other priorities for taxpayers' money. And they dug in, worked together, and held a bigger and better fair than ever.

I was amazed at their three-day agenda, which included pancake breakfast, ball games, team roping events, children's rides, two parades, museum days, a thrashing

demonstration. And the list goes on.

The theme, "Ogema 80" — "Proud of the Past", well exemplifies the community spirit and determination which will be a key to Ogema's success in the future. Please join me in congratulating Ogema on an event well done.

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

**Mr. Calvert:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today in the city of Moose Jaw, at 20 different venues, seniors from across Saskatchewan are participating in this year's 55-plus seniors' games. Last evening I was pleased to join the Minister of Community Services as she opened the seniors' 55-plus games in Guthridge field in Moose Jaw.

Sponsored by the Saskatchewan Seniors' Fitness Association, with support from Sask Lotto, these games are bringing together seniors from all eight zones in the province. And I venture to guess there is hardly a seat in this House not represented at the seniors' games in Moose Jaw.

There are in total 550 participants in the games. And the seniors are competing in events ranging from story-telling to track, from golf to playing bridge. The winners in Moose Jaw will go on to the national games in Prince Albert next year.

Mr. Speaker, in the view of this private member, the seniors who are today gathered in Moose Jaw, many of them the sons and daughters of the original pioneers, are pioneering once again. They are pioneering a wellness model for the whole of life, a model based on the wellness of body, mind, and spirit. Mr. Speaker, I extend my best wishes to all the participants, all the local organizers of the event, and may the best zone win as long as it's zone 3.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Negotiations with AECL

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question . . . I have a couple of questions to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, in a poll to be released today, two-thirds of Saskatchewan people say you should be considering the nuclear option. Far, far more people than voted NDP are telling you to get on with creating jobs and building the future. And they are specifically endorsing moving toward the nuclear option.

Mr. Premier, 18,000 jobs lost in Saskatchewan and one out of ten people on welfare. I ask you, Mr. Premier, do you believe that the limit of your responsibility as a government is to simply blame the previous government and just to ignore this crisis?

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

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member refers to a poll . . . a newspaper article in which a

poll was just released. It's pretty difficult for us on this side of the House to comment on a newspaper article when we haven't seen the questions that were asked on the poll nor have we seen the results of that poll.

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

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Therefore it is pretty difficult for us to make any comment on that at all at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, yesterday we heard the Minister of Finance say your government is not responsible for job creation and that the 18,000 jobs lost in this province are not your problem. In the Premier's own city of Saskatoon, Mr. Minister, there are thousands of people out of jobs. And a week ago we learned that there was one in ten of the people of Saskatoon are on welfare.

Given that dramatic, hurtful numbers, can you give the Assembly an update on the status of the negotiations that you are doing to restore the nuclear energy deal and to replace some of those jobs that you and your government have destroyed?

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If all the jobs that were declared by AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) when they signed the MOU (memorandum of understanding) came to Saskatchewan, it would be a very, very small percentage of the replacement of the jobs that you're talking about, the 18,000 that you're talking about.

An update on what we've been doing — we have, as I've indicated in this House before and I've indicated publicly, that we are currently and have been negotiating to have AECL come to Saskatchewan with their research department.

As I indicated to the former premier several weeks ago, we indicated that we were not interested at this time to commit to any kind of a nuclear reactor, nor are we interested in committing to a waste disposal site in Saskatchewan. But if AECL is interested and if the federal government is willing to co-operate to bring the research department to Saskatchewan, we are very interested in talking to them.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the member opposite that this government better realize that they ran an election and told the people that they wanted to govern. You wanted the responsibility of government and now you must accept that responsibility. A deal with AECL promises hundreds of jobs immediately and thousands of jobs in the future. Saskatoon and all the people of Saskatchewan need those jobs, Mr. Minister.

And I want to put it to you quite simply: have you been negotiating with AECL, as your ministers claim, or have you simply abandoned the people of Saskatoon and the city of Saskatoon?

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

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I can say unequivocally we have not abandoned the people of Saskatoon if that's what the member is asking about. We're very interested in every person that lives in Saskatoon and also in every person that lives in Saskatchewan.

The member is quite right that we wanted to govern. So did 53 per cent of the people think that we should be governing in this province. And there are still a lot of people in this province who are saying that we should be governing and we would like to govern. If the opposition wasn't so obstructionist, we could continue on with the governing.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the strategy of the NDP government is quite clear to everyone — keep people on welfare, keep them unemployed, and keep them desperate, then you can do anything you like.

Mr. Minister, I say to you, the fact is, sir, you have plenty of options to create jobs that would cost you very little or nothing. Instead, what you do you go on a spending spree foolishly marketing savings bonds at cost to the taxpayer and frittering away any chance we had of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask you. I would like to ask the Premier. Mr. Premier, before the end of this week will you commit to making a full report to this Assembly on the status of any work at all that you are doing in pursuing the nuclear option. Mr. Premier, will you do that for us please?

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member opposite is that the minister has given the full status report just a few moments ago, and the question that he's advocated and has been giving full status reports not only to the legislature but the public of Saskatchewan. The public of Saskatchewan is very fully informed.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Speaker, I have been told that the minister has had a copy of the poll sent to him, so maybe he would like to get up . . . Mr. Premier, I would like to direct the question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, we have lost 18,000 jobs, down the tube. We have the highest number of people on welfare in our history, and despite your hatred for the capitalist media, the only thing that saved your skin has been the kid-glove treatment that the capitalist media has given to you on these horrible, absolutely terrible numbers.

Mr. Premier, I put it to you this way . . .

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Premier, I put it to you that you are not seriously pursuing the nuclear option and that your own cabinet ministers cannot agree what it is or what it is not that you are doing.

We know for a fact that many of your own Saskatoon caucus members have now come over to this side and they support this option. Mr. Premier, I ask you therefore: as an hon. member, would you put on record your own personal position on the future of the nuclear option in Saskatchewan? Will you do that, sir?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not here to answer my own personal views; I am here to answer the policy of the government which is what question period is all about. And I will continue to answer the policy of the government. I will tell the hon. member opposite that the employment in the province in Saskatchewan rose by approximately 1,000 people from May to June, 1992, something which the hon. member neglected to raise in his questions of yesterday or in his questions of today.

The reality also is that 18,000 loss over the last year really is the result of 10 years of devastation and mayhem and havoc, which was wreaked by the former administration.

There are some encouraging signs. It's not to say that the job will be done overnight or easily, but we are embarking upon a program which will try to get sensible, steady growth going in the province of Saskatchewan.

If the hon. member is saying that we should return to the days, the 1980s days of billions of dollars of taxpayers' subsidies spent for the big business corporation friends of the people opposite, I can tell the hon. member: forget it. You lost the election. The people of Saskatchewan want a new direction to support the small-business people of this province. That's our policy for the 1990s.

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

#### **Status of Swift Current Pasta Plant**

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Mr. Speaker, in this government's never-ending desire to destroy everything positive ever done by the previous government, they've done more to contribute to the 18,000 more jobless situation in our province than to solve it.

Unemployment continues to grow, and the government continues to end economic projects that would provide people with jobs and income.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is, will the Acting Minister of Economic Development please update this House on the status of the Saska Pasta plant in Swift Current.

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Economic Development in the next few days may be in a position to give a full update report with respect to Saska Pasta or other matters which the hon. members may have directly advanced to them.

I would say to the hon. members and the people of the province of Saskatchewan that what we have to realize, that this province's financial situation, the government's

financial situation, as a result of the last 10 years is very precarious to put it mildly. And as precarious, it does not allow, nor should it by way of responsible economic development, a policy which — I'm saying as a general statement — involves a holus-bolus approach of cheque-writing of taxpayers' money in order to support economic progress.

Where they are justifiable and they can be justified by the studies in the appropriate economic returns and where money is available, we'll consider it. That is a general approach. The report with respect to Saska Pasta, you can get in the next few days.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well that's scary. That is really scary. I say there goes another project down the tubes just from that statement.

But, Mr. Speaker, this government obviously doesn't care if this project falls through the government's ever-widening cracks which means that you must also not care if people in the region of Swift Current, in that area, go without jobs and are jobless.

The minister knows that the private sector is ready to move into this pasta plant and is waiting for the NDP government to go on with its commitment. They're ready.

My question: will the minister give this House his assurance that he will do his . . . colleagues and associate ministers of Finance, and not do what they did with Promavia and bad-mouth the project in public, as is sort of shaping up here today, and that they will give serious, immediate consideration so that we can get on with the creation of hundreds of jobs in that area and provide farmers with a much-needed new market for durum wheat.

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to give the hon. member my assurance — as I do the House and the people of Saskatchewan — that we will do all that is reasonably possible to encourage business, not only in the province of Saskatchewan, but to maintain business in the province of Saskatchewan.

We will do this in the light of the economic circumstances which we have been faced with and the cards, the hands that we were dealt with by the opposition opposite, the member from Rosthern, who virtually bankrupted the province when he was on the treasury benches, virtually bankrupted. This is the record and the legacy that this new government has to face with.

And I find it rather ironical, putting it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, from a so-called free enterprise party advocating the merits of the magic of the market-place, to see those gentlemen getting up, arguing that business in the province of Saskatchewan can only be conducted if we hand out large bucks of taxpayers' support for them. I have more confidence in the small-business community than you do, sir.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Mr. Speaker, everything this government touches, it destroys — the GRIP program, the fine hospital system we have, rural highways, the Piper project, the AECL deals, just to name a few. Eighteen thousand more jobless people in our province this year than last, and this government now plans to let literally thousands more jobs go down the tube, all for \$6 million. Now that's not a lot of money for this whole province. And that's all your commitment is, according to these articles that we read here.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: will the minister commit to Swift Current and the private sector involved that he will ensure that the project gets an unbiased review, and that if the government's analysis results in not proceeding with the pasta plant that the analysis will be made public so that we can know what you're doing.

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect to the hon. member opposite, I don't think I'd want to have him or his caucus colleagues decide whether a person knows what he or she is doing or not. Because judging by the last 10 years of record, these are the gentlemen opposite who virtually bankrupted the province and obviously don't know what they're doing.

I say to the hon. member opposite as I did a few moments ago, we need business activity in this province. We encourage business activity. We want business activity to come here. We think, however, that in the 1990s, dictated by the circumstances in which we find ourselves, that the best business is the business which operates on its own, gets the capital going on its own, gets government helping out where it can from a regulatory and other point of view in order to provide jobs and economic options.

Saska Pasta, any of these operations which are on the table for consideration, will receive our very careful consideration, but I repeat again to the hon. member, thanks to the legacy of the last 10 years the idea that only business can profit and be attracted to the province is if there's large scales of taxpayers' dollars is an idea, sir, whose time is gone; long gone.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the role of king of exaggerations has switched back from this side to that side. The fact of the matter is that the province is not so bankrupt that it can't afford to spend a few million dollars to create a lot of jobs in a city like Swift Current, and especially with the spin-off you would get from not only processing durum wheat into pasta and selling it around the world, and especially into a U.S. market that's knocking on the door and begging for the product, but especially with all the spin-off effect of having a market for all that durum. Mr. Speaker, will the Premier assure us that vengeance against the past administration will not enter into his decision to destroy that plant.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I frankly find the member's question, and as I'm sure most members in this

House do, to be at least confusing if not absolutely contradictory. I don't know what more I can tell the hon. member with respect to Saska Pasta or any other business option; if it's there and it makes economic sense we'll be there to help it out where we can. Full stop, period.

But we're not going to be helping it out concurrent to the Tory style of helping things out. The spin-off from Supercart, and from Joytec, and from GigaText, and Nardei industries, High R Doors, and Dad's Cookies, as a partial list, is the kind of spin-off where there were absolutely zero jobs and millions of dollars of loss. I say to you, sir, that if you're asking me to go back to the 1980s I'm saying no, because the people of Saskatchewan rejected you and the way you bungled the economy. This is a new government and a new era of economic development in the 1990s.

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

### Cancellation of FeedGAP Program

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, would you please tell this House what effect your removal of the FeedGAP program will have on jobs in the Saskatchewan livestock industry.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the discussions are going on with the feeding industry and with the department. Clearly any government intervention in the economy has an impact and changes, and that also has an impact. The fact is that we are in a situation where we don't have a lot of excess dollars to spend, and the challenge I've put to the feeding industry is to demonstrate that the next dollar that ought to be spent for economic development in Saskatchewan ought to be spent for those purposes. We also need to then determine from what other sources we would take those funds, because we are in a situation in Saskatchewan where we simply do not have the resources, and you all know why, to spend money that we simply don't have.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Minister, you've been scrambling for eight and a half months to develop a strategy for Saskatchewan agriculture. And apparently in the course of developing this strategy, it's you who didn't realize that by removing FeedGAP — at a saving you say of \$8.5 million — you would threaten 4,200 jobs, two packing plants, many farms, feedlots, and rural communities.

Mr. Minister, what value, what value does your department place on jobs in the agriculture industry?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite would ... if she would have more information than she discloses, possibly contribute to the discussion.

The fact is that there are many impacts on the livestock industry in Saskatchewan, and which part of that impact this kind of intervention involves is a good question. The industry, if you talk to the industry, if you've taken time to talk to the industry, comments that the piece that really concerns them is that the Alberta government is injecting

millions of dollars into their feedlot industry, and in fact buying the industry.

So for us to participate in that kind of activity, in a bidding war against a province that is now undertaking the kind of folly that the previous government in Saskatchewan undertook here, which has virtually put us without any financial flexibility, for us to compete in that kind of a game does not make any sense.

So I've asked and I've engaged in some very positive discussions with the feedlot industry. They recognize, they recognize the dilemma the province is in, and they recognize the misleading kinds of activities the previous government engaged in with respect to their rhetoric around agriculture, and they are going to be working with us in examining the issue and seeing that we do get the best kind of economic development that we can afford in Saskatchewan.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, I have talked to the cattle feeders association, the Saskatchewan stock growers. I've spoken to the hog producers. I too have talked to exactly the same kinds of people you're trying to let this House believe have been telling you what you want to believe.

Now by scrapping the FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) program, you've placed our feedlot industry in a position of disappearing overnight, just as Manitoba's had, by truck and rail car to Alberta. How do you intend on replacing the jobs lost, and what is the dollar value of creating one job in this industry?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The member opposite seems to forget that a month or two ago, or three or four, she had a very different stance throughout the Saskatchewan budget, that we in fact had not dealt severely enough with the financial dilemmas in the province. Which stance is it you would take? The fact is that the province has very little financial flexibility, that businesses, including farmers, are willing to do what they have to do in order to make a profit because they are more efficient.

I've said it in the House before, if you were here to listen, that the hog industry in Saskatchewan is the lowest-cost hog production industry in Canada. We have ... within the hog industry we have a great deal of energy willing to invest in the future and to look at the prospects here because they can do business without government intervention. The feedlot industry is unique and that discussion is going on.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Minister, you are the Minister of Agriculture. You're the one that's supposed to be making the decisions. And how in the world can you justify placing a \$240 million industry at risk, 4,200 jobs at risk, at a cost, I remind you, to government of less than \$3,000 per job, while Crown Life jobs, on the other hand, will be subsidized by some \$300,000? That's the cost value. Okay?

For goodness sake, when are you going to have the courage to admit your mistakes and stop making the

opposition, who were inept in government, look good?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The member opposite draws attention to the number of bad deals that have been engaged in in this province. The fact is — and the member opposite knows it — that if the economy is going to function effectively under these circumstances in the '90s, if one is conscious of what's going on in the '90s, is that business will do well because they do well on their own, not because government subsidizes their input costs.

The fact that we have a neighbouring province that is going between 2 and \$3 billion in the hole this year, and 2 and \$3 billion in the hole next year, is not cause for us to try and compete in a bidding war in order to bankrupt ourselves even further than we are now.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Minister, will you commit yourself to introducing an internal committee to look at the way that you've been handling FeedGAP and the Saskatchewan livestock industry and come up with suitable alternatives in order to preserve the livelihoods of the livestock industry workers in this province?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite may be aware that there have been ongoing discussions looking at that question. I thought I had said that in my first answer, that in fact several days after the budget announcement I met with the Saskatchewan stock growers. I answered questions at that time and encouraged them to engage in the discussion I referred to earlier. There has been discussion with a number of representatives of the industry. There's been ongoing analysis within the department.

The fact is the issue is much more complex than the superficial analysis of one little piece of money. What is the impact on the feedlot industry in Saskatchewan? What is happening in the packing industry? What impact do grading systems have on where Saskatchewan cattle are slaughtered? What impact do exchange rates have? What impact do interest rates have? The fact is that Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan business people want to do business on their own, and they do not want to rely on government support on the input costs side. And we will work with them to do what we have to do to keep the industry healthy.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, you have an example to the east that can show you exactly what can happen to a livestock industry, and it is Manitoba. And the kind of unilateral decisions you've made by not consulting people in this field who do want government left out of their affairs has resulted in the kind of blunder that you have created.

Now I want you to stand in this House today and say that you indeed did not make an error by cancelling the FeedGAP program out and out because there's not one person in the industry that agrees with you. You stand up and tell this House that in fact you have had support from

people in the industry for doing away of the FeedGAP program and making us completely uncompetitive.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, in collaboration with the Leader of the Liberal Party, have . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Under the leadership of the Liberal Party. Finally you've got a leader over there.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Under the leadership possibly, yes . . . have an interesting perspective of the world because they believe on one hand that somehow we should come to grips with the financial crisis here, that we should promote a business environment where people want to do business. But, but we should continue spending money in a way that we cannot afford to spend it. The fact is that the feedlot industry in Saskatchewan, their only enemy is the Alberta government, and the Alberta government is engaging in financial strategies that hopefully the member opposite would condemn because she certainly was not supportive of the degree of reductions we did here. So I . . .

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

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

## MOTIONS

### *Referral of Estimates and Supplementary Estimates to the Standing Committee on Estimates*

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I have a couple of items of business. The first one is one for which I do not have leave, but of which I gave the members informal notice yesterday. I'll be asking for leave, Mr. Speaker, to move a motion that the estimates and supplementary estimates for the Legislative Assembly be referred to the Standing Committee on Estimates. I gave to members opposite a copy of this yesterday and asked for their comments. I'll now formally ask for leave to introduce this motion.

Leave granted.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the estimates and supplementary estimates for the Legislative Assembly, being votes 1 to 3, 5 to 7, 20 to 23, and 26 of vote 21, and for the Provincial Auditor, being vote 28, be withdrawn from Committee of Finance and referred to the Standing Committee on Estimates.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have but two short questions of the minister. The first is: when will the Provincial Auditor's proposed changes to The Provincial Auditor Act be examined by the office of the Minister of Finance in light of the 1992-93 budget?

And secondly, when will these proposals be brought forward to the legislature, and what will their impact be?

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Although the member may ask questions, the minister has had his turn at introducing

the motion, and there is no mechanism for the minister to get up and answer the member. Certainly I assume that the minister will make the information available to the member in another mechanism.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'm going to rise and ask leave for a motion which the members opposite have had no notice of, but of which there's been some discussion. I'm asking for leave to move a motion that we go directly to government orders on orders of the day.

Leave not granted.

## NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CLOSURE

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice pursuant to rule 34 that at the next sitting of the Assembly, immediately before the order of the day is called for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for concurrence in the second report of the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures and any amendments or subamendments proposed thereto, I will move that the said debate be not further adjourned.

(1415)

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

#### Return No. 17

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In motions for return, pleasure to move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 17 showing:

Regarding the Minister of Social Services: (1) the names of all persons currently employed by, or accountable to this office directly or indirectly, who were employed on or after 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; (f) the actual date that the person started work; and (g) if employed on contract, a true copy of their contract the existence of which is required by law as set out in The Crown Employment Contracts Act.

Mr. Speaker, just a remark or two before we hear from the Acting House Leader or whoever is looking after this today. I believe, Mr. Minister, that people have the right to know who the NDP is hiring. The information is all published in the *Public Accounts*. It is already public. We are all asking is which of those were hired since November 1, 1991.

The minister knows what we're asking for in these type of questions. We want to know who are the individuals and who was hired since November 1, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I'm warning the government that if they

refuse to provide this information now, then when the complete list of names for this year's . . . in fact, published in the *Public Accounts*, we will be tabling written questions for each and every name in the *Public Accounts* asking for the date they were hired, who hired them, and their qualifications.

And there is nothing in freedom of information or any other law that denies that information to this Assembly or the public. And if we are refused now, we will ask for every one, once the lists are published in the *Public Accounts*. Refusal, Mr. Speaker, now, is buying a big problem later. Why is the government hiding this information?

I have faith today, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is going to get up and say, we're going to honour this here motion that I'm putting in today. But as of now, they've been refusing the information we've been wanting.

The associate Finance minister says he is hiding it because the people he is hiring may have spent time in prison. That is ludicrous, Mr. Speaker. If he says, as he did two Tuesdays ago — that's two weeks ago today — that he cannot tell us about who he is hiring is because they may have been in prison, maybe that reflects on their qualifications.

But the point is we do not want to know which NDP appointees were in prison. We want to know the names and positions of all the people the NDP have hired since November 1, 1991. It is not a big request, Mr. Speaker. And I think if the minister isn't going to give this here motion that I've asked for . . . just go ahead and say that they'll answer all these questions, I'll be very surprised.

So I'm hoping that the minister since two weeks ago has thought over a lot of the no's and amendments he's put in and will answer this one. This is very important about the Public Service Commission, who's been hired and who hasn't been. He's also the minister for this department, and I'm hoping when he gets to his feet that they'll be no amendments to this one. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to speak extensively on this. This is similar to a number of motions which were moved by members opposite on June 30th. I gave, at some length at that point in time, Mr. Speaker, the reasons why these motions could not be answered in the form in which they were then put.

I said at that time as well that we want to give the members as much information as we can. This is a government which is both accountable and accessible in a way which the former was not.

And at that point in time, at that time I explained what we could provide and amended the motion accordingly.

Accordingly, I move that this motion be amended as follows:

That the words "by, or accountable to the minister directly or indirectly who are 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. Speaker, I made reference to some comments. They’re on page 1140 of *Hansard*. I so move.

**The Speaker:** — I recognize the member from . . . I forgot where he’s from . . . Thunder Creek. Sorry.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It happens to all of us as the summer goes on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we’re right back where we left off on motions for return. Members of the opposition ask very reasonable questions. We’re dealing with a very small number of individuals, at least according to the rhetoric that the government gives us on this issue, that they aren’t hardly hiring anyone and that everyone that they hire is absolutely lily white. And yet we ask very legitimate questions about the individuals.

And this minister that is now the minister of cover-up for the Government of Saskatchewan, last time in this debate throws out the idea that some of these people might have criminal records, so we gave him an out. We said well, if they’ve got criminal records we don’t expect you to release those because we wouldn’t want to infringe upon the constitutional rights of anybody. And we said, once you’ve dispensed with the criminals, then give us the rest.

But this minister continues, in the face of public opinion, overwhelming public opinion, to hide. And it all comes down to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this government, this government must be engaged in some type of patronage operation that they’re ashamed of. They must be ashamed of it, otherwise there would be no reason for a minister of the Crown, one who stood in opposition time after time, berated the former government for exactly the same thing, promised he’d never do it that way when he was in government, and yet does it.

And he always . . . you know it’s just wearing a little bit thin, Mr. Speaker, that this minister on record so many times would stand in this legislature and attempt to hide what he’s doing, with these silly amendments.

I don’t think that member would stand on a public platform anywhere in this province and try and justify that practice. Matter of fact, I would challenge the member from Churchill Downs, come out to my riding, come out to Moose Jaw, stand on a public platform and do exactly what he’s done in this House and justify it.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? I don’t believe that member’s got the courage to do that. I don’t think any member of the front bench would have the courage to do that. Not one of them would dare stand up in front of a crowd — even a crowd of New Democrats these days — and do what the minister is doing in this House. Because face to face, he simply couldn’t pull it off.

It’s why we have the Minister of Agriculture hiding from

the pork producers in Swift Current today — the same kind of mentality. It’s why we have the Minister of Rural Development hiding from the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) meetings.

The bunker mentality of this government has just set in totally. These people do not want to face the folks that they serve. And that’s why the minister will stand in the House on motions for return and hide behind flimsy excuses, hide behind his majority, and not give the public the information that for five long years they sat in this legislature and demanded of the previous government.

This is the new accountable . . . as was quoted to the member . . . as was the member from Riversdale’s statements in 1989 in the bell-ringing debate. Who are these new-found democrats? Well as I said in that particular debate, Mr. Speaker, these new-found democrats are the NDP. And that’s a pretty sad commentary for a group that a short eight and a half months ago went out and solicited the votes of Saskatchewan voters, promising never, never to be like that.

And I say to the minister, before he stands on his feet with the next one, how about giving this Assembly a commitment that he will go into some public venue on these questions and attempt to do the same thing and take on the crowd. Just go out there and give a commitment that he’s willing to face the public in this province in a public way and say, I won’t answer these questions for these reasons.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## Return No. 26

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that it’s important that the folks who have been following the Assembly out through the province know exactly what we’re doing. So I’ll just read through the motion so that they have an idea what we’re talking about:

Regarding the decision to cancel the agreement with the federal government and the AECL: (1) whether the minister responsible consulted with any groups or persons prior to the decision being taken; (2) if so (a) the name of the individuals involved in the consultation; (b) the dates and locations where the consultations occurred; (c) the content of representations made to the minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don’t think that there’s anything in here that the government couldn’t comply with in terms of giving us information.

The question whether or not there was consultation with anybody shouldn’t certainly be any kind of a secret for the government members to pass on to us and to the general public.

And it’s important I think, in view, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that there’s been considerable question as to whether or

not this administration in fact does consult with the people out in the public, and the reality being that an awful lot of people are accusing the government of not revealing whether they consult and in fact saying that they don't believe that they do consult.

Therefore I think it's probably a good chance for the government to sort of show the public that they have consulted. It gives them an opportunity to be able to sort of clear the air, I guess might be a term that we could use. They could make themselves look responsible.

Once again where a lot of people are seemingly losing confidence in the administration of our province, I think that this motion gives the government the opportunity to save a lot of face and to re-correct, if it is correct that they have consulted, re-correct the thinking out there in the public that perhaps they haven't consulted and that they aren't doing the job in the way that the public perceives that they should be doing it.

(1430)

I know myself that I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a government, before it takes an action as big as this particular action is, they should consult with a lot of people. They may not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, have to take a long time to do that. But they certainly should consult with people and get the varying opinions and ideas from all of those involved in the process.

You see for example in this situation that when you don't go through with the deal, if you've made a mistake, you've cost so many people so very, very much.

Now I will refer back to question period where the Premier suggested, or I guess it was the Minister of Energy and Mines suggested, that not many jobs were actually lost when this deal wasn't struck. It is true that there were only jobs in terms of hundreds at the outset involved with this direct deal. But what he doesn't explain and should explain to the people, is that there are thousands upon thousands of jobs that can be obtained through the spin-off when you take on a project of this kind of magnitude.

It's not the immediate people that are going to be involved in the executive positions, it's the spin-off to the whole province that counts for all of the real, true benefits. And certainly in a project like this, there would be a lot of spin-offs.

Even if you didn't do a nuclear power plant, there's got to be just tremendous amounts of spin-off of not only job, but economic activity, because when you have all of these jobs, naturally you've got the wages, you've got those wages spent throughout the community. If you have more money working and circulating, you perhaps keep some of the people that are now leaving the province. That in itself helps us to build a tax base. It helps us to keep an awful lot of our municipal administrations financed. You have simple things like a grocery store selling more groceries to the people that didn't then leave the province. So all of that . . . And I know that the people of this province are aware of studies that have been done over the years.

I know that when I went to school, it was suggested that for every real, new job that you created, you would have a spin-off of between 7 and 10 other jobs throughout the community.

Now if you have that within a community and then take that and magnify it throughout the whole province, it can be a tremendous boost when you bring in, say even 150 management jobs that might in fact spin off to say 2 or 3,000 other types of jobs. Then you spin that off again 7 or 10 times for all of the related service industries that are required to keep those real, new jobs there and functioning. Then you have a tremendous economic growth potential. And our province needs that kind of a stimulus.

We are always known in this province, for some reason, to go into recession first, then come out of it last. Why, Mr. Speaker, should that be? Why should we always be the first into trouble and the last ones out? Why do we accept that in this province? There's no need to accept this kind of an approach to business and to life-style. Sure, we're land-locked in the middle of the Prairies. But knowing that and understanding it should make us equipped and ready and able to go out and do the things necessary to change our lot in life.

And certainly it doesn't seem to me that it's proper that we should accept that our lot in life is to be second cousins or second-rate economic people in our country. Because I believe that we have the intelligence, the ability, and the wherewithal to put ourselves in the mainstream of economic development in this country, right along with Alberta, right along with Ontario, or anybody else. It's just a question of rethinking where our position is going to be and how we can change our position.

And one of the ways, Mr. Speaker, of changing that position has got to be by going out and getting these projects that will start economic stimulation in our province, starting economic stimulation that in turn then leads to the development of a stronger tax base, leads to the development of more jobs that pay better.

And then we won't have to accept the role of being the first ones always into economic trouble, the first ones into a recession, and then the last ones out while we wait for the rest of the country to bail themselves out and drag us along on their shirt-tails. We can be the shirt dragging them. There's no need to be second or last always. We can change this direction. I know we can.

Alberta is not very much closer to an ocean than we are. They got to go over the Rocky Mountains to find their way out of central Canada, just as we do. But they took the option, Mr. Speaker, many years ago of pioneering something that was new. And that, of course, was the petroleum industry. If we'd have had that kind of pioneering done in Saskatchewan, I seriously doubt that there ever would have been a Leduc No. 1, or a Leduc anything. I doubt if there ever would have been an exploration in oil at all. Because this province has never had a history of growing or developing.

We sit around and whine and complain and grumble

about how everybody else has got things, and we do nothing. We follow the administrations of the old school of philosophy of socialism which is to beg for somebody who's got more to share with us. Well let's not be sharing any more, Mr. Speaker. Let's set a new direction, a direction of leadership, a direction of building tax base, a direction of creating jobs. And nuclear development and nuclear energy can be that exact tool.

The member opposite takes offence to my remarks, and no wonder, because he's been a part of it for so many years of dragging this province backwards, down the tubes, out of the race of economic development, just sits there and rips this province apart. Everything's down; everything's negative; we never do anything positive. They just sit there. Day after day they sit there even in government, whining and grumbling and backbiting. It's all they're good for.

They don't know how to develop a good industry like the nuclear energy industry that could have been started with this deal. This deal didn't say it was the whole ball of wax by any means. But it was the start, the nucleus, and we could have had the beginnings, Mr. Speaker, of an industry as big for this province as the oil and gas petroleum industry was in Alberta. This could have been the nucleus, the start of Saskatchewan becoming one of the richest provinces in this country, an economic leader, a leader of an economic base that could have put us in the forefront for many years to come, with a strong tax base, with many, many good-paying jobs, Mr. Speaker.

Just doing it without building a nuclear plant would have helped so very, very much. But consider just for a moment that we would have went that one step further and built a nuclear power plant. The members opposite would say, well what would you do with the power, because they don't have the vision, the understanding, or the foresight to understand that there are people in this world that need and will pay for energy.

Alberta recognized that many years ago when they started investing in developing their oil and petroleum industry. They knew that energy was the key to success, because you can trade energy for economic wealth.

All over the world in order for anything to happen these days you need energy, because we know that the power of working from a man's backbone and his sweat is not nearly as fast as burning gasoline through an internal combustion engine. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that nuclear energy of course can produce many thousands of times more energy output with smaller amounts of the material than petroleum does.

There is risk, an enormous risk, and I'm the last one that would ever want to walk through a nuclear fall-out area or anything like that. But the reality that has to be remembered here, Mr. Speaker, is that nuclear energy is around us all through the world. And the reality is that if a nuclear power plant blows up in Alberta, we're probably going to die three seconds later than they are. There's no getting away from the fact that it's all around us, and by being afraid of it and keeping it out of here isn't going to save us if it blows up.

So recognizing that fact, then we must deal with the real issues of making it safe, making it absolutely safe so that there is no errors, no chance of errors, and accepting the fact that if we have it, it's no more dangerous than if they have it across the border. Knowing that it's going to be there somewhere then means that we must take that step forward and do all we can to make it safe, make it reasonable, and then use the product and find customers for that electricity.

Who are the customers that these gentlemen across the way seem to think are not there, seem to think that we don't need any more energy, any more electricity? Well there are two areas that you can look at, Mr. Speaker, for economic development in selling energy. You can look internally and you can look externally.

First of all, internally, who can use power? Anyone that runs a factory or a production plant needs energy. Tremendous amounts of cheap energy gives an economic advantage for people in industry to locate close to the sources of energy. That's a number one consideration. I understand, for example, that in Saskatchewan we have no cement plants producing cement at the present time.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I just want to draw to the member's attention that his order of the Assembly is very specific in its questions that it asks, and nowhere does he ask the question of the merit or the merits of nuclear energy. And I think he must address himself to the question that he put in the order for return, so I would ask him to come back to the order for return.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the member opposite already heard all of these good arguments and they're going to take them into consideration. Because it does provide them with the opportunity to get back to this idea of letting the people know who they communicated with when they decided to scrap this deal.

It's important, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province know that this government is in fact going out and talking to someone. It's important for the people of this province to know who that someone was.

If you're going to scrap as big a deal as this, it is absolutely incumbent upon you as a government to show the folks how you got your idea that you should scrap the deal. If it was just out of vengeance against the last administration, the people won't buy that. It has to be, in our society today — a well educated society — a reasonable approach to consultation, development of ideas, development of notions of what's good weighed against what's bad on the scales, those invisible scales again of justice that we weigh things on in our society when we make our decisions.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that public hearings were held to the effect of providing that kind of consultation that we have somehow seemed to learn to accept in our society these days. Just going out and talking to your buddies in a political meeting isn't what we're talking about when we're talking about consultation. We're talking about going out and talking to the folks that would have responded to a survey such as we heard about

earlier today where 75 per cent of the people indicated that they thought the government should have gotten into this kind of deal.

Now did those people that are represented in that poll have a chance to consult with this government? I don't believe they did. I quite honestly can't see that the government would go against the wishes of 75 per cent of the people. It would seem, even with three years to go to an election, foolhardy for the government to go against 75 per cent of the population.

So I don't believe they held those consultations.

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't underestimate their stupidity.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, my member says we shouldn't underestimate stupidity, but in all fairness to the government, I think they acted in haste rather than in malice. And here's a chance for them to take a step back and to correct that haste and to correct the direction that they took.

They can show the people of this province, if they did consult with anybody, any groups prior to the decision being taken, they can show that by putting it on the record. They can name the people; they can enter all of the documents. And if they want to give not only the names of the individuals, it would lend even more credibility to their case if they in fact would show where they consulted with these people. And if they had any documentation related to . . . suppose they had a *Hansard* type of record keeping, or perhaps they were done in a meeting forum with minutes. If there are minutes of meetings where they met with folks, those would be good evidence to the people that there was at least some attempt to discuss these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's extremely important that if we do get that process, that we know the dates and the locations where these consultations took place. Because if we don't know where these things happened, there will always be some people who will doubt that it ever happened.

We want to give the government the chance to remove all doubt. They have been very, very adamant in telling us that they did everything right. The public is starting to doubt that. This is the opportunity for the government to take that step that is now necessary to regain the confidence of the people of this province.

(1445)

I personally, politically, don't think that they can do it. I don't think that they did the right things. I don't think they had consultations. I don't think they ever talked to anybody except their own political people in their own political circle.

I'm giving them the chance to prove me wrong. Prove me wrong. Show that you've consulted with people. Show that you threw this massive deal away with some reason.

Mr. Speaker, I think I've shown that the government not only needs an opportunity to demonstrate to the people of this province that they are above board and legitimate, I

believe that I've made the case that they should support this motion. And I don't know, but I think maybe some of my colleagues would want to speak on this matter for a while.

So with that I hope the government will seriously consider the things that we've said and vote in favour of this. Thank you.

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

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you. Again I do not intend to repeat the comments I made on June 30. They were fairly extensive. I explained that in almost all these meetings there were no formal minutes kept, thus we do not have accurate records of dates or what was said, or so on. We are therefore going to move, for the reasons stated previously, going to move that the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "consultations" be deleted.

**An Hon. Member:** — What's the amendment?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — That all the words after consultations be deleted, about the second- or third-last line.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister in his remarks outlined the government's position and said that they didn't have the opportunity to take minutes or they didn't do that sort of thing. It seems strange, to say the least, when you're dealing with something of the importance that that is, the AECL agreement, that you wouldn't be taking minutes on it. And I would suspect the people of Saskatchewan would hold the same view that I hold, Mr. Speaker, and they do not believe that kind of stuff. No one in their right mind wouldn't be taking minutes at a meeting as important as the AECL agreement.

What we are asking for in our motion simply is some indication from the government that indeed there was some consultation, because we don't believe for a moment what the minister is saying, that there was consultation. And I think it only confirms it when the minister stands up and says there was no minutes taken. No one believes that kind of stuff, and the minister should be ashamed of himself for even standing and saying that. If there wasn't any consultations why doesn't he have the forthrightness to just stand up and tell us there wasn't any consultation.

We have seen time and time and time again with this government, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't consulted and yet they try their best to tell everybody that they did. They haven't consulted in agriculture; they haven't consulted in health care; they haven't consulted in this or anything else for that matter, Mr. Speaker. That's why the people of Saskatchewan don't believe them about this.

This AECL agreement had the potential for thousands of jobs in this province, Mr. Speaker. At a time when we're losing jobs — 18,000 was recorded here just recently; 18,000 jobs lost in this province — you'd think this government would be jumping at a chance to go for an agreement like this, Mr. Speaker. Not only the jobs, but

the investment in the province of Saskatchewan.

There would have been millions and millions of dollars worth of investment brought forward into this province by an agreement like this, Mr. Speaker, and it seems absolutely incredible — incredible — if you want to believe their story about how poor a shape Saskatchewan is, that they wouldn't be looking at this thing a lot more seriously.

The AECL agreement, Mr. Speaker, called for a penalty clause if they backed out. I think they have conveniently forgot about it, just like the contracts for farmers. They forgot about this contract as well. Two million dollar penalty — we haven't heard a word about that. Has that penalty been paid? It would be interesting to know. I think the people of Saskatchewan would be interested to know, Mr. Speaker. This agreement had the support of people right across this province, SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), SARM, the chambers of commerce.

Today's poll indicates again overwhelming support for it. This cannot be overlooked, Mr. Speaker. The members of the flat earth society that sit over on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, cannot deny the people of Saskatchewan this opportunity. We need development in this province; we need investment in this province. That's exactly what this agreement would give us, Mr. Speaker. I can't believe for one moment that these people would want to turn down that opportunity for Saskatchewan.

Hopefully . . . there's only one ray of hope that I see in all of this, was the appointment of Mr. Blakeney to the Cameco board. Hopefully — and I say hopefully again — it signals the turnaround that this government is having with respect to nuclear energy. Maybe if Mr. Blakeney is on the board at Cameco he will have the opportunity to drive some sense into some of these members in the next little while. We only can hope that, Mr. Speaker.

The sale alone of the electricity generated by a nuclear plant would have put this province on the map, Mr. Speaker.

We have the opportunity to generate nuclear energy in this province. We have the feedstock for a nuclear generator, Mr. Speaker. And that's exactly what the people of Saskatchewan feel should be done with it — just like they feel in other areas of diversification, just like they feel in . . .

It's a natural progression. We've got the nuclear energy feedstock. We've got uranium. Turn it into nuclear energy. Sell the energy. Sell the technology. It's wanted and needed all over the world, Mr. Speaker. They're crying in California for electricity right now — absolutely crying for electricity. And these people opposite want to turn it down, turn down the opportunity.

The only thing that they seem to have any respect for is changes, unilateral changes, to whatever they feel is necessary in this province. But the people of Saskatchewan will not support that kind of an attitude, Mr. Speaker. We don't want a huge fence being put up around this province like they want, Mr. Speaker . . .

(inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Quill Lakes, he talks about fence . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I want to remind the member from Kindersley again that he is on the amendment. And the amendment simply says that all the words after consultations be deleted. So I draw his attention that he's speaking on the amendment.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important to note the kinds of things that would be possible in this province if we had an agreement like this. I think it's important that the people of Saskatchewan recognize and know that they had no consultation with anyone on this, that they unilaterally cancelled the contract. They did not want to proceed with this type of agreement, Mr. Speaker. They don't want this kind of development in this province in spite of the fact that an overwhelming number of people do want the agreement, Mr. Speaker.

The potential in nuclear energy, nuclear medicine . . . Just a few days ago the Minister of Health officially opened a new component at a hospital that had a nuclear component to it, Mr. Speaker — nuclear physics, nuclear radiation of foods, Mr. Speaker. There is absolutely huge potential for this. It should not be overlooked. The government should at least consult with the people . . . with AECL to see what kind of potential this has in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think it's only important that the government recognize the potential that this has and recognize that the people of Saskatchewan want this agreement, and recognize that it's a step forward, not a step backward as they seem to think. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** — Before I recognize the member from Moosomin, I do want to draw the attention to members that when an amendment is made which only deletes words from the main motion and does not change the motion itself, then you must, you must keep your words to the amendment. The debate is not concurrent, it is on the amendment, and the merits or demerits of deleting those words from the main motion. And that's what the debate is on.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just a few comments and directed to the amendment in light of the question that has been put before the Assembly, brought to the attention of the government. I find it very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that we . . . I think our question brought forward and that the amendment is addressing and changing, takes away a fair bit of the effect of the question and what the opposition is looking for — the consultation process and the involvement.

When the minister brings an amendment that subtracts dates, locations, and content, it would appear to me, as has been brought forward by my colleague already, that any time a government or a minister or anyone in business or any organization would meet and meet with a group of people, that there would be a time set aside for that meeting. There would be a location that would be set aside, there would be a place to meet. And indeed, Mr.

Speaker, you no doubt would have someone on hand to take notes and to keep a record of the proceedings of that meeting.

And I find it very hard to believe that if indeed the minister is telling us that these consultations took place but they didn't have the time to indeed work and set up meetings, set up dates, set up times, and have a recording secretary on hand, it would beg the question, we actually wonder if at all, if any of these consultations took place at all.

I would also like to think that any minister or any member involved at a meeting at any time, may not be able to remember the particular date but would have a pretty good idea of the location, the place, maybe the time — whether it was afternoon or evening — and the format of the meeting. What took place? What was discussed? The information that was laid forward . . . brought forward in that meeting.

And as we are quite well aware, Mr. Speaker, many interest groups across this province have been asking for and will continue to ask for meetings with the government, with ministers, with members not only on the government side of the House, but certainly with members like myself. All members of this Assembly will be requested to meet at some time or other. And I think most of us take the time to jot down and set a date, set the time and jot it down on our calendars so we know when a meeting is coming up because we don't want to miss that opportunity to meet with groups.

And I would think that if what the minister is telling us today, that indeed meetings and consultations took place, that there should be some record or there should be something available for the minister or for the government to bring to this House to indicate that the consultations took place, to indicate that they had — whether it was two or three or four or five — meetings.

And roughly saying that around the middle of May there was a meeting, I believe it was around May 20, there was a meeting that took place between one of the ministers and a group. In this case, we would have hoped that the Minister of Economic Development would have met with representatives from Atomic Energy. But they would recall some of the times and locations when they met to discuss the Atomic Energy agreement.

And so I think it is very appropriate that the opposition be asking the question, because the public want to know if indeed the consultations took place. And one of the easiest ways to know if indeed consultations took place is to know that there are dates, there are times, there are locations, and that minutes were taken. And whether minutes were taken or not, ministers or anyone involved would be very well aware of some of the discussion took place.

That's the only way that we as an opposition are going to know indeed that the consultation process was followed. And so I think it is very fitting that we ask that question. And I find it very difficult to accept the fact that the minister would say no, we don't have that information available and so we're going to amend the motion. I would hope that on the next proceeding motions coming

forward that the minister would indeed give us the information. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the member from Churchill Downs takes a great deal of delight evidently, today, in what he is proposing for the Assembly. The fact that that member would bring in a closure motion and then decide . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. As an experienced member, the member knows well that is out of order.

(1500)

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the member from Moosomin just said to the Assembly, it's absolutely hypocritical of this minister to delete those sections from this particular motion for return.

Today in question period the minister responsible for Energy was asked questions. He told this Assembly that there were ongoing discussions, there was want by the government to enter into an agreement with certain provisos. Everyone in this province understands the MOU that was signed last year. It has been well publicized what the contents of that MOU were in regards to the AECL deal.

Now the government has chosen for their own narrow, political purposes, to represent that MOU to people in a way that I think is unfair, untruthful, and simply wrong-headed. And what we have been asking, after repeatedly asking the minister in question period, asking the Minister of Energy and Mines, asking the Minister of Economic Development, where are you with those discussions with AECL and the federal government in regards to the MOU? What portions of it are on the table? What portions aren't? When did those discussions take place?

Because as was brought forward today by the member from Saskatoon Greystone in this legislature, there are an overwhelming number of Saskatchewan people that believe that Saskatchewan needs to explore the nuclear option. And yet this government is so afraid, so afraid of elements within its own party, so afraid, that they would put at jeopardy this province and the potential for us to develop ourselves and our people.

And by deleting the dates and locations where these consultations are supposedly ongoing, if you believe the ministers, and the content of the representations . . . I mean, Mr. Speaker, we've recently had the Minister of Energy stand in this . . . announce to the public that Saskatchewan's power requirements don't even need another coal-fired plant. The Minister of Economic Development the next day directly contradicts the Minister of Energy and said yes we do, that Saskatchewan's going to run out of power if we don't have another coal-fired plant. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, the public is totally, totally up in the air with this government as to what their intentions are and where they're going. One member of the treasury benches says we need it, and one member says we don't.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, this question is totally

legitimate. Because if there is nothing meaningful going on with AECL or nothing meaningful going on with the federal government vis-a-vis the development of our uranium resources, then we have to take the words of the member from Regina Elphinstone, the Minister of Economic Development, and concur from that that it's absolutely necessary for Saskatchewan to have another coal-fired plant. And that along with that coal-fired plant will come certain environmental restrictions that the taxpayers of this province are going to have to live with. Those restrictions mean that we're going to have to spend several hundreds of millions of dollars to achieve those energy requirements.

If we don't believe him, then we have to believe the Minister of Energy and Mines, who says we don't need it, period. And that's why it's very important for the public, Mr. Speaker, on this question, to know what the content is, which portions of that MOU are on the table, which portions aren't, what ministers are meeting, what officials are meeting, so that we can know that come 2003 — or whatever date that the energy options panel named in their report — that this province isn't going to have the lights go out.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue to believe the government, then there is something going on. And it is right and proper that people that are planning development, that people that are planning our cities, people that are planning industry know that our power requirements in the future are going to be met.

And, Mr. Speaker, the opportunities that are present are something that no one in this province should be uninformed about. And that is why we've brought forward this motion, this motion for return that simply asks the government to lay out some kind of an agenda that doesn't have ministers contradicting each other, that says to the public, this is the progression of events. This is the portion of the AECL MOU that we're working on. This is where you can have hope. This is where there is no hope. This is where the University of Saskatchewan can do some planning. This is where they can't do some planning . . . all of these questions that would have 70 per cent of the people in Saskatoon say that they are in favour of nuclear development. And those questions have to be answered.

And, Mr. Speaker, this amendment by the member from Churchill Downs is just another example after dozens of examples that we've seen in this legislature of a government that is closed, that doesn't consult, that has no intention of informing Saskatchewan people in the direction at which they're taking them. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I find this amendment totally unreasonable.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 27

**The Speaker:** — All right, the question before the Assembly is the order of the Assembly do issue for no. 27 showing. Is the Assembly ready for the question?

It should be formally moved. It is only on the order paper that . . . The member from Thunder Creek, if you wish to have it, it should be moved. I could move it for him, but the procedure usually is that the member moves it.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Point of order. Earlier in the day the member from Arm River moved the motion and then was prohibited from re-entering the debate on the amendment. And I think on the practices I have noticed in this Assembly, on these motions that the government wishes to amend, that the minister has stood and made the amendment, allowing all members the freedom to speak on the motion.

And I don't wish to have myself removed from the debate anticipating what the amendment will be by the member. I mean the motion was read into the record by myself at an earlier date.

**The Speaker:** — Will the member just give me a moment to consult, please.

Order. There has been some confusion about what may happen. Maybe some bad advice had been given.

If the member moves the order for return, he certainly can get into the discussion on the amendment. And that has always been what we've done in this House, so the member should move it. And if an amendment is moved, the member certainly can get into discussion on the amendment. Okay?

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the advice. I just noticed the previous member and it had me somewhat worried that I would lose my place. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 27 showing:

Regarding the changes to the prescription drug plan as they affect diabetics: (1) whether the Minister of Health consulted with the Saskatchewan Diabetic Association prior to the imposition of these changes; (a) if so, the dates and where the consultations took place; (b) the content of the representations made to the minister; (c) the names of the individuals consulted; (2) whether the Minister of Health consulted with any other organization or persons regarding the changes: (a) if so, the dates and where the consultations took place; (b) the content of the representations made to the minister; and (c) the names of the individuals consulted.

I so move.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to move an amendment to this motion. I'm not going to elaborate at length. The reasons have been made very clear by the Acting House Leader on a number of occasions, as they apply to a large number of these amendments.

But I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is well-known

that the minister has indeed done extensive consultations on this matter, as the minister has and other ministers have on a lot of other matters. That's an important process that the government is pursuing and will be developing into the months ahead to refine and improve this consultation process.

It is well-known by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and by the Saskatchewan public that the period of time that this new government had in preparing for this legislative session and the budget and the short legislative session in December which passed an Appropriation Bill to finish off that fiscal year was a limited period of time.

I can assure you and the House, and I can assure the public through this House and through you, Mr. Speaker, that this consultation will be a lot more extensive in the future as we have more time to prepare for another session of the legislature and prepare the legislative agenda of the government.

In order to be able to respond to the member opposite and his question, I want to move an amendment which I believe will help to make the response adequate and sufficient and provide the information that the House needs and that the members asks for. And so I move that the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "as they affect diabetics" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) whether the minister consulted with any groups or individuals prior to the decision being taken; (2) if so, the names of the groups or individuals involved in the consultations.

Mr. Speaker, I move this, seconded by the member from Churchill Downs.

**An Hon. Member:** — You don't need a seconder.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — You don't need a seconder? Then I won't second it.

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Speaker:** — Yes, what's your point of order?

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, subsequent to the ruling that you just made, the member from Arm River was intending to make the motion on item no. 1. He made the motion. The minister made an amendment to the motion. And when the member from Arm River wanted to speak and make his points on the amendment, I understand he was not allowed to do so.

Subsequent to that you made the ruling that members do indeed have that right. And my point of contention here, Mr. Speaker, is that because the member was deprived of his legitimate right to make his comments at that time, that he now be given the right to make his comments pursuant to that amendment that he feels so strongly on.

(1515)

**The Speaker:** — We have admitted that some bad advice

was given to the member from Arm River on that. If, however, the member from Arm River feels that strongly on the issue . . . Order . . . we will give him that opportunity once we have completed this return.

But I do want to make it very clear that that will not set a precedent for the future, but that the member should not be denied his right to speak on that issue if he so feels. So we will return to that issue after the decision is made on this order for return. Okay.

We are on the motion as amended.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that the government would want to delete everything after the words "as they affect diabetics" and replace it with two clauses that are totally innocuous.

As I understand what the minister is proposing in the way of amendments, is just that the Minister of Health consulted with someone. And I find this strange because the whole question of diabetics and their insulin supply is one of life and death. And obviously we would want the Minister of Health to be consulting with diabetics and people associated with diabetics, not just anyone at all. And as I read the amendment as proposed by the minister, that's basically what the government is saying.

I mean we have on record in this province, in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, that Minister of Health, when she was in opposition, raising questions in this House with the former minister of Health in the previous government, questions as to whether people were actually going to die because of the health care system in this province.

So I think it's totally legitimate, Mr. Speaker, that we had placed this particular question on the order paper because, as you know, diabetes is a very, very wide-ranging disease in our society today. I mean it is almost astronomical when one hears about the numbers of people that are affected either in a minor or in a major way by this particular disease.

And the minister's excuse, in saying that we're a new government, that we don't have time, I would just remind the minister that this is the same party, the same government that talked about bringing budgets in on time and was going to be open and consultative with just about everyone. So we have diabetics going from a dollar a vial with insulin to \$380 a year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the diabetics that I know went without their insulin for one reason or another, they'd get in very serious trouble very quickly. I had a girl just down the road from me on the farm that developed diabetes when she was 12 years old. And her parents didn't realize that the disease was coming on. There was indicators that I think most parents probably wouldn't recognize. But anyway, she went into a diabetic coma and just about died. And I've followed this girl's growing up. She's now married and has a child. I had the honour of being the master of ceremonies at her wedding. So she's someone that is fairly special to me.

And when the previous government implemented



changes to the drug plan back in I believe it was 1988-89, somewhere in there, by raising the deductible, this . . . At one time we contemplated having diabetics pay more. And I remember the reaction from this girl and her family and sitting down and talking with them. And they introduced me to a lot of other people that are involved with the diabetes association in Moose Jaw, and had the opportunity to sit down and talk with a lot of these people on the problems faced by families that have this as yet incurable disease in their family. And we have to remember that diabetes has a large hereditary component to it.

So any time, Mr. Speaker, that we who are charged with the public trust would take it upon ourselves to arbitrarily change factors in the lives of people with diabetes, you must be very careful. It's not something you can take lightly.

People will rationalize lots of things. And if one young person says that because of cost or changing circumstances in their lives that I'm not going to take my insulin properly, we jeopardize that person's future. We jeopardize their ability to get married and have normal children. We jeopardize whole aspects of families' lives.

And I think it would have been only appropriate, Mr. Minister, as we've pointed out, in the motion for return that isn't covered by the government's amendment at all, that before the government undertook such a major step, that there would have been some type of consultative process with these people.

And we're simply asking, we were simply asking, I think, some fairly wide-ranging questions about what that consultation was about, what type of information the minister received back, what type of information her officials received back so that diabetics in this province would have a sense of security; that their families would feel secure in knowing that the health care system was going to continue to provide for them in a way that was reasonable, that was logical.

And I think the government's all out attempt at budget reduction, holus-bolus, without any thought to people in our society that don't have any choice, is a wrong-headed approach.

Mr. Speaker, after those consultations occurred, there would have been no problem with the Minister of Health, as other governments have done previously, with bringing in changes to the prescription drug plan that would implement higher fees for diabetics; higher user fees, if you will, for the folks that use insulin. And at least the people that are involved in diabetes would have had a clear understanding and had been able to make representations to the minister, and the fact that there had to be special provisions in place.

And we were simply asking, Mr. Speaker, that we get some detailed analysis from a very large department, a department of government that probably is as big or bigger than any else in government. I mean we have hundreds, indeed thousands of people in the health bureaucracy. And we would think that with a department that size expending this much of the taxpayers' money

that there would have been ample opportunity for consultation.

And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, a lot of the questions that went along with changing the fees on insulin and the test strips and the other things — the needles the diabetics have as a necessity of life — have been talked about by our health care system. So it wouldn't have been that difficult for the minister to piggyback onto some of those prior consultations and come up with a reasonable plan to present to diabetics in this province. And at any time thereafter — at any time thereafter — make changes to the prescription drug plan. It can be done with an order in council of the cabinet. And I think people in the diabetic world would have at least felt some comfort.

That obviously wasn't the case, Mr. Speaker, because the government now has seen fit to come in and once again hide behind an amendment — an amendment that is so innocuous and wide-ranging that it doesn't give any comfort to the people associated with diabetes at all. It doesn't give any comfort to that little girl who's now grown into a woman — who is a diabetic, is raising a family — that her concerns and her needs in our society are being listened to.

And I think it's high time that the Minister of Health, as she goes through this next step of the wellness model, learn from some of the mistakes made prior to the budget process — learn from some of the mistakes in relation to people like diabetics in our province in that there be some honest-to-goodness consultation, that there be some well-thought-out game plans that will take people, who depend on a particular thing like insulin for their life, some comfort into the future.

Diabetics aren't unreasonable people, Mr. Speaker. Many diabetics have the ability to pay, as you and I do, for their drugs, for their test strips, for their needles. But there has to be provisions, and the only way there can be provisions is if the minister takes the time to do her homework and consult with people.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we thought that the motion was reasonable. Because if nothing else — if nothing else — if the minister didn't do these things, it would then give a further impetus to people involved in diabetes. And it would give a further impetus to the minister if this motion had been left unchanged and this Assembly had adopted it and the information, as provided for the minister, was coming up short in the estimation of most people involved in diabetes, then that should be an impetus for the minister to make sure that the next time she doesn't come up short; that the proper consultation, the proper questions, the proper answers are provided.

Because isn't that the whole reason for being a minister? Isn't that the whole reason for being in government? It's not simply, Mr. Speaker, to be answerable to the deputy minister of Finance. That's not why one takes the oath to become a cabinet minister and to serve the public. You don't do it simply to satisfy the deputy minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, you and I have both been in that position. And I can tell you that when I swore my oath to serve in

the Executive Council of the government, it was there to try and achieve certain things for people. And I would think that this Minister of Health, this Minister of Health which talks so much about wellness, which means keeping people out of institutions, keeping people out of the heavy cost side of our health care system, would want to do everything in her power to talk to people like diabetics to make sure that they never, ever end up in that situation of being in a coma, of being on life-support systems, of having to heavily utilize our health care system.

And there's only one way to achieve that, and that is for both the government and the people needing the service to have a very clear understanding of where each other's going. And I think these questions would have provided the public with an indication of where that process is going. And if it's found wanting, then the minister has the obligation to clean up her act.

And that is why the question was posed. And if the minister feels uncomfortable about cleaning up her act, then I would suggest that the Premier swears someone else in the cabinet with the responsibilities for the Department of Health who does feel concerned enough about people like diabetics that they will talk to them before they move in such threatening ways.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(1530)

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to bring a few comments and add a few comments regarding the amendment and again the fact that the minister has made the decision to limit the amount of information that will be available to the opposition and to the people of Saskatchewan.

When we talk of opposition, Mr. Speaker, we're not just talking of the 10 members on this . . . or 11 members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about all the people in Saskatchewan, residents of Saskatchewan, because we're elected to serve the people of this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one has to ask themselves: what are the government attempting to hide? And when you look at a recent editorial and the headline that says, not so loyal NDPers need not attend, then one begins to wonder, well maybe that information isn't available. Maybe they don't have the information available because there's a limit to the number of people who can attend certain meetings. And certainly that's the question that is being raised, the question we must raise.

And we've also heard over the last period of some nine months or so, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions where indeed cabinet ministers have met with groups or individuals. But as we've done some research into who was involved, we find that most of the meetings were limited in who was invited. They were meetings with specific people invited to them.

Now I think it would be very imperative that the people of Saskatchewan and the members of this Legislative

Assembly have the ability to ask for information regarding particular meetings, regarding the individuals who attended those meetings, regarding the consultation that took place. And in fact we might be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find that if we had a chance to really peruse the minutes or peruse any information that's available, that it might indicate that the government certainly has not listened or not acted on the best wishes . . . or the ideas that were put forward.

When I look at the motion that is being presented by my colleague, certainly it's a motion that raises a lot of concern across the province of Saskatchewan. And I think of a chance meeting the other day at an anniversary with a senior couple who have been long-time supporters of this government, who have worked very diligently over the last number of years to support the NDP Party, support their local candidate in my constituency.

And the question was asked, if I had a moment to, while I was attending this anniversary, just to sit down and talk for a minute. And knowing the couple very well, I knew that they would be willing to . . . and interested in discussing politics. And I said, yes, I would have. I have lots of moments, but at the time I was fairly busy. However, I would take a moment because I could see that they were interested in bringing up a few concerns they had.

And so as I sat down I said, okay, what would you like to discuss? And the comment was this, Mr. Speaker. The couple . . . the individual said, I would like to discuss some of the things that this government is doing, this government of ours is doing that I'm not happy with. And everyone in that room knew where that couple came from.

And the first item of concern that they raised was the fact that diabetics would now have to pay for all their insulin, would have to pay for all the services that they require. And they felt very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that it wasn't fair to put that added health burden on the backs of a few individuals. And as my colleague from Thunder Creek has indicated, there are many people across this province who suffer with diabetes, many people across this province who are facing an added cost. There are many people who are on low or fixed incomes, that it is going to become a major problem for them to continue to have a decent amount . . . or a decent living and be able to supply for themselves the food and the clothing and the shelter when indeed it's going to cost some more money.

And it begs us to wonder, Mr. Speaker, how much consultation really did take place, and therefore the question that was posed. We would ask, for the consultation process, what consultation process took place? And the fact that we need dates and times, and they are a strong indication of the fact that the ministers or the cabinet or any of the government members took the time to sit down with individuals across this province and talk to them about health care issues, talk to them about chiropractic services, talk to them about optometric services, talk to them about the prescription drug plan and the changes.

And we're finding every day, Mr. Speaker, that more and

more people are becoming very keenly aware of the changes in the drug plan and the fact that the deductible has gone from 125 to \$380 a year for a couple, a substantial increase for many people, Mr. Speaker.

And so I think, in light of the fact that the government has suggested in their throne speech, and in this House on many occasions ministers have stood in this Assembly during question period and said that they are going to consult, that they will continue to consult, that they have consulted, they have talked to different groups, I think it is very imperative that they show the opposition, show the people of Saskatchewan, that they indeed have taken the time to sit down with groups, that they have set dates, that they have responded to requests to meet with groups and individuals — not just sending out departmental staff but they themselves, as elected officials, would take the time to sit down with people and consult with them and ask for their views, ask for their input.

Yes, we're all aware of the difficult financial situation our province finds it in, but there isn't a jurisdiction around the world that isn't facing major financial difficulty, and we're all going to have to work together on it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to reconsider on further motions about deleting the dates, times, and places of consultation and indeed make that information available to the Assembly. What has the minister, what has the government to hide? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

**The Speaker:** — We will now, as previously agreed, return to return no. 17, and allow the member from Arm River to make his statements which he was not able to do before. Order.

### Return No. 17

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We just had an error this afternoon. And before question period, or before the House went in today, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't real sure myself because it's been 10 years since I was whip and was up on all these here things. I thank you and the Clerks for allowing me to rule that I could speak again because, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, what I did was to give you a chance when I was reading out my motion. I just made a . . . I just thought that if I didn't make all my comments that maybe that . . . why should I? Because maybe you're going to come through like I thought you would and give us all the information in my motion, no. 17.

I thought maybe you would . . . Because pretty well all I said, Mr. Speaker, to you, Mr. Minister, was I was warning the government if they refused to provide the information that that complete list of names for the year in fact would be published in the *Public Accounts*. And it could be, you know, you might as well answer the question now and answer exactly what we're wanting because in a later time by next spring when the House comes back in, in *Public Accounts* we're going to get it anyway, or

whatever. Refusing now is buying a big problem for you later.

And we don't understand why, Mr. Speaker, that the member from Churchill Downs is so stubborn on giving us this information. They were the ones . . . he's part of the government that made election promises throughout this province of Saskatchewan that there would be open and honest government, that there would be no information held back.

Now why, Mr. Minister, do you sit there so arrogant and just say we will give you nothing, absolutely nothing. Because that's exactly what you're doing, because the information, Mr. Speaker, that we've asked you to give, that we've asked the minister to give, there's nothing wrong with it.

All we want to know is who was hired and all the descriptions and information about them since November 1, 1991. If you're not ashamed of it, why wouldn't you do it? Why would you not give us that information? Because you know that we know that it's political patronage. We know, and we've talked about it in our estimates, which has got to be weeks ago now, Mr. Speaker. It's the same minister, when we asked these same questions about the hirings and the firings and the individuals, we wanted to know all this information and you were reluctant.

I know why you're reluctant, and we'll be back in for . . . as your promise, we'll have another hour or two in your estimates, and it'll relate back right to this very same question here, is who was fired after you formed government and then came back into work again, that had a job?

There are several departments. Rural Development is one that we know the individuals and we're not going to stop until you give us those names. Somehow we're going to get the names. Because I know some of them, but there has to be hundreds more throughout government where they were given their pink slips. Mr. Speaker, they were given their pink slips on a certain day and still . . . that they're gone, fired, but working the next afternoon — never missed a day's work — in the same department under a different job description.

Now that is wrong, Mr. Speaker, that this government is so ashamed of that. If they wanted to do that, do it out front like you promised.

We've said here we want to know who you've hired and fired and especially who you've hired since November 1. And that would have to include all the information we wanted here. And there's not a reason in the world why you couldn't do it. But why wouldn't you do it? Because it's showing that you're an underhanded government, that you don't really care about keeping your election promise. And I thought you would.

Mr. Speaker, I definitely thought that this minister . . . I've known him since 1978, '77, and I thought that he's a man who would stand to his feet and see that his people — because he's an elite member of the caucus; he's been there for longer than any of them pretty well — that he

would say look, we have promised, we have promised this information. We have set an election time. We have said in this House, there's nothing that we'll keep back; there's no information that isn't public. Anything this government does, no matter what it be, that it will be public information.

So why, why are we only in here in six to seven months of government and a new government and says, no we're going to be arrogant and we're not going to give you information.

It's the only possible reason that you wouldn't give us the names is because some of those names you would have to give us would be people that, individuals that were fired and rehired.

We know, as I said, Mr. Speaker, that this government has made a promise that they're going to cut back and they're going to be careful and save money and cut back on department after department. But we're finding that's not right. We have many departments. And that's why this motion's here about Social Services because we think, Mr. Minister, that you've hired more people back than what you laid off; that you want to make sure that your elite people that are out and work for you at election time, that they get favoured with a job.

Now that's what we're after. We want to know whether you're going to keep your promise on political patronage or not. And it looks like you're not. But if you are and you've nothing to hide, why wouldn't all this information and all these motions for returns . . . Why are you doing this on all the motions for returns, putting amendments in and saying, we'll tell you this, we'll tell you that. And you even got a quote here. And I'd like to read some of your quotes.

Mr. Speaker, the deputy Finance, the minister . . . the member from Churchill Downs has got to be one of the worst . . . It's a member that I like as an individual, but he got to be one of the chirpiest members that I know. And this is a stock answer that he has. And I'm sure he made it up before he ever seen any of the blues.

And I want to just put this few parts of this . . . I'm not going to go because I'm not going to take much time, Mr. Speaker, because you were kind enough to give me a chance to say a few words here. But I do want to say this here, that after we brought this . . . The member from Kindersley brought in a motion for return along the same lines as mine. And here's the stock answer. And each one after this is along the same lines, because there's several motions for returns, and they're all the same.

(1545)

And he just arrogantly would not give any more reason to the next motion for return than he did for this one. And he said:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is our desire in these matters to answer these questions as fully as we can.

Well now why, Mr. Speaker, would a minister stand to his

feet and say, as fully as we can, and then turn around and put amendments in to cut out what we were really asking?

The main thing we're asking . . . You might as well just say we refuse to give you any information at all. Why don't you just stand up, Mr. Minister, and say, well this order here from the member . . . order for return . . . motion for return for the member from Kindersley, why don't you just stand up and says, zero. We're not even going to amendment. We're going to give you nothing. Because you know what we wanted. You know what I wanted in this one here, in my motion for return. You know exactly what we wanted. We want to know one thing, and that is to get at your political patronage, whether you're doing it or not. Because you promised there'd be no political patronage.

So he goes on to say here:

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 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 . . .

Mr. Speaker, who is the minister to say what we wanted? He tries to put it in his words. Well I think this is what the members wanted. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, when we put these orders for return in, we know what we wanted. We knew exactly what we wanted and you're telling us, well I think I know what they wanted. Well that's not correct.

You're going on to say:

. . . 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 . . .

And he goes on and talks for a while, for about two pages in here, and there are two columns, and then makes his amendment.

He did the same thing all that day, two weeks ago today. So naturally we're going to be a little upset, Mr. Speaker, when he knows that these particular motions . . . I'm not going to . . . I can't because I would be off what I'm talking about. We're talking about the one Agriculture day; we're talking about one in Health. They don't want to seem to come through with them. But I'm not talking about it. I'm talking about Social Services and what we wanted. You just used your amendment to say, forget it.

Why didn't you, Mr. Minister, as I said earlier, why didn't

you just stand up here and say, we're going to give you no information at all because you said also in here, Mr. Speaker, the member from Churchill Downs said in here that the information we're asking for, this would be a book that would rival the New York telephone book.

Well that's got to be just straight, pure arrogance because there's a lot of names in the telephone book in New York. There happens to be 14 million people there and we're only talking about a total of a million people in Saskatchewan. If the whole million had a job in Social Services it wouldn't be nothing like New York.

So you know that shows you the arrogance of our minister, that he's just trying to make fun of our questions. He's trying to make fun. But anyway, let's just say he's having his fun. And we thought today that this minister, seeing that he's been around a long time, that this minister would come in here today and have a little different attitude than just walk over top of us and say, we're going to give you nothing and here's my amendment — take it or leave it.

Well it's not fair, Mr. Speaker. It's not fair, never mind to us 10 people in opposition here, never mind us. It's not fair to the people in the province of Saskatchewan. It is not fair because they have absolutely misled and misrepresented the voters in the province of Saskatchewan when they said, we will have open, honest government. Everything we do will be open to the public.

So the first motions for returns, no, we're not going to tell you. Why can't you, Mr. Minister, why can't you list all the individuals. Why can't you list . . . Mr. Speaker, why can't the minister list every individual in Social Services where I'm asking, why can't you have that answer for us as an opposition, so we can take out to the individuals in the province of Saskatchewan, the individuals that you've fired and the individuals you hired, and the ones you fired to make it look like you were just getting rid of anybody because of qualifications and then hire back your NDP.

That's exactly, Mr. Speaker, what they're doing because it's happening right over here, as I said, in Rural Affairs. They've done it, and they're doing it. And if they do it in one department, they'll do it at all. And there's no sense any member saying I'm on a witch-hunt. I'm not.

I'm absolutely dismayed that this government would break promises this quickly. If you're not ashamed of the people you hired, the people you fired, then for goodness' sakes, answer the questions that we want. Answer them. Because somehow or other, as I said in my earlier remarks . . . and I'm going to close, Mr. Speaker, because it's just wasting our time and everybody's time when the minister just stands up here arrogantly and just says, we'll give you what you want and that's all.

Now I've been here for quite a few years, and I've seen both sides do this and I don't like it. I've seen our government do the same thing. Some of the people would get up and say, well we'll give you this and we give you that. And I earnestly and honestly don't like that. If we're doing things right, then when we're in government and you're doing things right, whatever you're asking for should be public information, and so it should be

answered as public information.

And if you say that we did it and we say you did in the 1970s, two and three wrongs don't make a right. It doesn't make it right. Campaigns were ran on this here type of promises — that whatever we do, it'll be different than we did before. We apologize, they said. Right in these kind of departments right here that I'm talking about in my motion, that we apologize that we got arrogant in the '70s and that we didn't keep in touch with people; we apologize. They said that election time. They said it for eight years. But we're going to be different. But they're no different. They're still arrogant.

Now if I could see that we were asking all these here 16 or 17 motions here, Mr. Speaker, or 16 motions, and maybe we're getting all of them — maybe two or three that they were amending. But when you amend them all, every one, that is a sign of an arrogant government not wanting the people to know what we're doing. They don't want people to know, because we can only make the accusations out there that we know that people in the departments have been fired, rehired, replaced into other departments, then you do . . . when why we have to have the names. We got the names of some. And you do the blood test, and what are they? They're a high profile worker for the NDP. That's who's keeping their job.

But to make it look for the public that we're a nice, clean government, and we're just cutting back. We're just cutting back. And we're going to go just by qualifications. So they fire them. They clean out so many in a department. They let them go and then hand-pick the ones that come back in. And those are the . . . That's why we're suspicious.

And we have a right to be very much so, because we're checking these people out. And the ones that they're hiring back are of their . . . They're people that we didn't let go. We kept them. And they blamed us for being such a arrogant government that we up and fired everybody. Well I'll tell you, what we did in 1982 in hiring and firing makes the . . . I don't know, makes us look mighty good today, Mr. Speaker. It makes our people, our ministers, very responsible. It makes them look real good.

I was the minister for the Crop Insurance Corporation and I let one man go — one man, one man go.

**An Hon. Member:** — Did you fire John Lautermilch, Gerry?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Somebody's squabbling from their seat over there, Mr. Speaker, and . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I wonder if the member from Prince Albert Northcote wants to get into the debate later on. Otherwise I would ask him to let the member from Arm River have his say. He's got the floor right now.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why he does that. But he's talking about a one Mr. Lautermilch. And I do remember that . . . or I believe that's his name. And they always blame me for firing him. Well I couldn't help that he become 65 years of age and he had

to just lay off on his own. I didn't never had a thing to do with him ever, and he knows that. And I'm not going to respond to his questions — his stupid questions from his seat.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I'd ask the member to please address his remarks through the Chair, not to individual members in this Chamber. Why is the member on his feet.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Would the member entertain a question?

**The Speaker:** — Will the member entertain a question?

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Yes I will.

**The Speaker:** — Yes he will. The member may proceed.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — My question to the member, Mr. Speaker, is if the one member that the member referred to as having fired while he was minister of the Crop Insurance would be John Lautermilch who was an area supervisor for Crop Insurance, and if he recalls firing him about a month before he was due to retire at the age of 65.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Mr. Speaker, I will say this statement and I'm saying it under oath, and it's an absolute fact. I fired one man in Crop Insurance and that was the chairman of the Crop Insurance, Mr. Campbell. And anybody else that was ever laid off when I was minister was fired completely by the board and nothing whatsoever to do with me entirely.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the member standing on his feet would like me to ask . . .

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

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I was wondering if the member would permit another question about whether or not he ever interfered in firing . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. The member is out of order.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can see why that the members when I am talking about the election promise that they broke that they would never hire and fire, and there wouldn't be political patronage to no end.

And that's exactly what they've done. It's been the biggest political patronage I've ever known in my political career. And the Minister of Justice stands to the feet and when he says that a person like Jack Messer is hired because of his qualification, and never thought of any political patronage whatsoever — well he was the minister of Agriculture when I come in here, for goodness' sakes. So no wonder when I start to rub them a little bit that they start to get antsy and want to . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I want to remind the member that he is referring to Social Services and not to the total government, and I wish he would direct his questions to the amendment and to the question before

us.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry we got off the subject, but I guess it's because they have started asking me questions. Let's sincerely get back onto the subject then, Mr. Speaker. I've said very sincerely to you, Mr. Minister, we've already voted on this your amendment, but they've allowed me to come back in and make my comments.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister will reconsider to answer yes to all the questions that I've asked in this here motion for return, no. 17. I wonder if he will do that. Because if he will answer all those questions, you'll find that things will go much smoother in this House, because your arrogance, Mr. Minister, is what's causing a lot of problems in this House.

Every place we move, whether it's department from department, from minister to minister, they sit there and snicker and they won't answer. Will you, Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister, as I take my place, will you consider giving us the full answers to this motion for return, no. 17? Will you do that, Mr. Minister?

If not, we're wasting our time, and we might as well just say absolutely no to them all and not even bother putting amendments in, because what you're giving us through the amendments is not what this opposition is after.

What we're after is what you're taking out, and now that's the sign of arrogance. But, Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister, will he or will he not comply with what I'm asking?

(1600)

**The Speaker:** — I know we have taken the vote already on this return. However, as all people know, the purpose of the member speaking in the House, number one, is to have it on the record; number two, to influence other members. It may be the member may have influenced some members on changing their minds, therefore I will put the question again on the return on the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## Return No. 28

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 28 showing:

Regarding the decision to pull the province out of the national standardized tests: (1) whether the Minister of Education 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 reasons given previously under other motions with precisely the same wording, I move that the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after “decision being taken” be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

If so, the names of the groups or persons involved in the consultations.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would certainly appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments regarding the motion that I presented to the Assembly — a motion I believe that is very pertinent to educators across this province, and not just educators, but certainly parents and the school-aged children in our province, and not only in our province but across our country.

We’ve heard a fair bit the last little while, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the national standardized testing program. And as we met with the Regina Chamber of Commerce recently, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were informed the chamber has taken a very strong position on the idea that there should be a standardized testing form across Canada.

And they have indicated to us, Mr. Speaker, that they feel it would be very appropriate in light of the fact that national standardized testing is done in a number of other provinces across Canada, and they feel that it would just show to the educators across this nation that to enter into a national standardized testing program would indicate that Saskatchewan certainly has the ability to compete with the best of them, if you will, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I think what I have found and what many people have indicated, the feeling was that when you talk about national standardized testing program, you’re talking about a whole program dealing with every subject that is available to the students across this province. And the indication we had from the chamber of commerce was that they feel that if we address the maths and the language arts, that we would show to the people, to parents . . .

And I certainly get a lot of complaints from parents about the fact that there seems to be fewer and fewer days that our children spend in the school system, fewer and fewer days that they’re actually spending at their desks and learning. And it’s a concern that has been raised with me. And I’m sure members in this Assembly, members on the government side of the House, have had the same concerns raised.

When we think of the fact that our school system is roughly 200 days, when you take off teacher days and when you take off the . . . in our division and I believe right across the province now there is an extra hour a month that is given for teachers’ in-house time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find that actually there are fewer and fewer hours and minutes that our students are actually in the class-room learning.

And it would appear to me that it would be very important, and it certainly wouldn’t hurt to look at a

standardized program and involve the province of Saskatchewan. And I think it would be appropriate . . . the motion we put forward is appropriate.

And the fact that we were asking whether the minister, whether the department, whether the government in fact sat down with individuals and groups such as home and school organizations or parents and even students or even teachers to discuss the standardized testing program, I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is fair for us to ask that question.

And it is certainly fair for us to ask the minister to disclose the times, the dates, the places, and the information that took place or the information that was made available and certainly the comments that were made to the department and to the minister and to the cabinet, they in government, and whether or not cabinet and government actually listened to the individuals as they made their presentations.

I think that in our discussion with the chamber of commerce, it appeared to me that their reasons for a standardized testing program weren’t unreasonable. I think they felt that the process of education in this province is one that can be competitive and that can compare, can compare right across this nation. And it might be a way also of letting people know across Canada, and indeed maybe in North America, that we have a top-notch educational system in this province.

So whether to say no to a standardized testing program, one begs the question and begins to wonder whether or not we indeed can compete if that’s what the government is saying, if that’s what the minister is saying, and if that is what the department is saying.

So I think it is imperative that we have all the information that we’re requesting. It is imperative that we indeed find out from the minister who they consulted with. And we would like to know who was involved and the individuals that were involved. I believe when we asked for the individuals or names of individuals, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason we do that is because we want to see if there was a broad section and a broad group of people that had some input into the decisions made by the department and by the cabinet and by the minister.

And the fact that we continue to ask for dates and locations indicates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if indeed the dates and locations as the minister indicates, the Deputy House Leader indicates are not available, then one begs and one has to ask the question if indeed this consultative process was followed through and if in fact the government did sit down and talk to interested groups across this province regarding education.

Because I believe education is very important. I believe people right across this province feel that the more we go and the closer we get to the 20th century, the 21st century, as we go proceeding to the ’90s, as we proceed into the year 2001 and on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, education is going to become more and more important.

And in fact we’ll find that a high school diploma may not take you very far. And we will find that our students are

going to be required to learn more, and they're going to require more and more students, but will probably be required to take further education by going to university or entering into technical institutes or other forms of education that are available to increase their knowledge so that they could enter the work-force that will be . . . the highly technical work-force that we will be seeing in our society in the next few years.

So I think, I believe it's important that the department, that the government, and that the minister take the time to talk with groups and to consult. And the questions we are raising today talk about the consultation process.

And we feel very strongly that for the minister to delete anything from our motions takes away from the motions and takes away our ability to gather information so that we can inform the public we are indeed addressing the concerns that they raise with us on a daily matter.

So I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I again ask the minister to reconsider his amendment and provide this information that we have asked for.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 30

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well this motion is relatively straightforward, the same as the ones that we've done earlier here today, Mr. Speaker. The motion is such:

Regarding the decision to retroactively apply regulations pursuant to The Saskatchewan Crown Minerals Act from January 1, 1974 as if those regulations had been in place ever since that date: (1) Whether the Minister of Energy and Mines 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.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fairly straightforward. The government opposite has told us since the session began prior to the budget that they consulted with groups throughout the province. We are simply asking the government where those consultations took place, who they were with, and to provide information to us.

The information that we've received from various groups around the province with respect to The Saskatchewan Crown Minerals Act have suggested to us that there's been very little if any consultation. And we'd like the government to provide us with the information so that we can judge for ourselves. Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. For reasons stated, **ad nauseam** actually, under previous motions, I'm going to skip the comments. I will move that the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "decision being taken" be

deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"if so, the names of the groups or persons involved in the consultations."

**The Speaker:** — I'll have to send this back to the . . .

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'm sorry . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You gave the wrong one.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — That's exactly what I did; I gave the amendment for the motion the previous motion which was stood. I assume the House will treat that as a **non sequitur** and I will move the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "regarding decision to" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

amend The Adoption Act and The Child and Family Services Act: (1) whether the minister . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Could I ask . . . I believe we are on no. 6, order for return no. 30?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes. Motion to be amended as follows:

That the words after "The Saskatchewan Crown Minerals Act" 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 the groups or individuals involved in the consultations.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

(1615)

### Return No. 31

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion that we have before the House is similar to the other motions that we have been presenting today. But I want to put some remarks on the record concerning this motion and the question that we're asking. And it's dealing with The Adoption Act and the child services Act as presented by the Minister of Social Services.

And the motion asks that various bits of information be provided to the House and to the public on whether or not the minister had done any consultations, on who she consulted with, what dates and times and locations, etc. And the previous motions that have come to the floor of the House, the government has changed these motions to delete some of that information.

But I would like to read from *Hansard* of July 2, Mr. Speaker, from the member who is the Social Services minister. And basically what we're asking about in this motion that I have presented is about the release of information that could be released through The Adoption



Act and Social Services Act.

And from *Hansard* of July 2, 1992:

Amendments 5 and 6 are strictly housekeeping amendments that were recommended by solicitors at the Department of Justice simply to clarify the relationship between section 18 of the Department of Social Services Act and confidentiality provisions in The Adoption Act and The Child and Family Services Act.

The member went on to say further:

The members also talked about the lack of consultation with agencies. Again the members opposite were mistaken. With respect to the two major amendments which make changes to the legislation, the following groups have been consulted: the Saskatchewan adoptive parents association, Royal University Hospital social services and legal department, Christian Counselling Services adoption program.

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister has indeed done some consulting with the general public. And we're asking in the motion that I will be reading later, to provide us with the names of all of those groups that she had consulted with. We're also asking that the names of the individuals that were involved in those consultations be provided us, that the dates and locations be provided, and that the contents of the representations made to the minister also be provided to the House.

Further on July 2, 1992 from *Hansard*, the minister read from a document, a letter from one of the groups that she had previously mentioned she had consulted with. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read to you a part of that letter that she read into *Hansard*:

... we sincerely thank you for consulting with our executive on several adoption issues. We support the Department's efforts in the Area of Intercountry adoptions and changes to The Adoption Act regarding independent adoptions as far as it goes. We appreciate your response in the area of permanency planning and the goals set out in search of permanent families. We continue to emphasize that children not be detained in the system either as foster children or permanent wards any longer than is absolutely necessary. We are aware of the Department's support of our proposal for funding, and look forward to input from your office . . .

Signed by the president of the association.

My colleague, the member from Arm River, then asked the member a question. To quote from the member from Arm River:

Madam Minister, would you give me a copy of that letter, please? I'll enlarge a little more while I'm getting that letter. I guess what I want to know is the date on that letter. Do you remember what the date on that was letter was, Madam Minister?

The Minister of Social Services' response: "It was May 13, 1992."

So that you see, Mr. Speaker, the minister herself has already provided us with some of that information. She has provided us with the names of three groups with which she had consulted. She has provided us with a copy of some correspondence that she has in dealing with this issue, these two Acts. She has also provided us with the date of that correspondence and that it came from the president of one of those organizations. We are asking for very similar information on all that consultative effort that she went through as to exactly who did she consult with, the individuals, times, dates, locations, and what those consultations were all about.

And part of what those consultations were about was about the changes that were being made in those Acts concerning confidentiality. But we want to know specifically whether or not that consultation did take place and what the representations were and what the minister's responses were.

The minister responded again on July 2, 1992, in *Hansard*, and I'll quote:

No, there will be no change at all with respect to adoption — the rules of adoption, the confidentiality of information with respect to adoption.

Later in response to another question by the member from Arm River, the minister responded:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. This Bill, Bill 13, will not affect in any way whatsoever adoptions that occurred prior to this Act.

We would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not questions of that sort were part of the consultation process and the correspondence back and forth between the parties involved. We believe that the House should have access to that information.

I would like to read my motion now, Mr. Speaker:

Regarding the decision to give the Minister of Social Services the power to unilaterally decide whether or not to release personal family information in any form the minister chooses under The Adoption Act and The Child and Family Services Act: (1) Whether the Minister of Social Services 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 contents of representations made to the minister.

Thank you. I so move.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — For reasons mentioned under earlier motions, I move the motion be amended:

That all the words after "regarding the decision to"

be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

amend The Adoption Act and The Child and Family Services Act: (1) Whether the minister consulted with any groups or individuals prior to the decision being taken. (2) If so, the names of the groups or individuals involved in the consultations.

Thank you.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that the minister is prepared to provide us with the names of the groups and the individuals that were consulted with, but I'm surprised that he is not willing to give us the dates and the locations and some of the contents, when the minister herself was prepared to give us part of a letter, she was willing to give us the date in which that letter was sent.

It seems that one part of the government is prepared to be accommodating, to facilitate the business of the House, whereas the House leaders themselves, on the government side, are not prepared to do so. And I believe that's a shame, that one small clique within the government circle is prepared to dominate their ministers and not allow them to provide the information, that I'm sure in the cases of some ministers they are more than willing to provide to the House, because they have already done so.

On July 2, 1992 in *Hansard*, the minister did provide us with some of the information dealing with the consultation she was holding with some groups. And those groups being the Royal University Hospital social services and legal department, the Saskatchewan adoptive parents association, and the Christian Counselling Services adoption program. She named those three. The minister has said that he will provide us with the names of whatever consultations they took place.

But she also went on further, Mr. Speaker, and provided us with part of a letter that was part of that consultation, and with the date of that letter. And I'm surprised that the minister is unwilling to provide that kind of information for the other consultations that took place.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the minister to reconsider his amendment to allow us to have access to the information that we have requested in this motion and in the other similar motions. Thank you.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 32

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well once again we find ourselves rather concerned about the individual rights of people in our province. And just so that I won't be talking basically to myself, I will try to inform the people of the province as to what's going on by quickly reading the motion so that they can understand what I'm talking about:

Regarding the decision to give government employees power to forcibly enter premises without a warrant or other approval of the courts, under The Environmental Management and Protection Act: (1) Whether the Minister of 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.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that when a government is going to take this kind of absolute power, absolute power to infringe upon all of the rights of privacy through a Bill in this Assembly, making it law, it is absolutely then imperative that the government disclose all of the information about its process in coming to the conclusion that it has a need for this kind of all-encompassing power.

(1630)

The right to privacy in a democratic country is probably more highly valued than anything else. If we in a democratic country don't, for example, have the right to be in our businesses and our homes without harassment by a police force, then we have the very distinct possibility that we can be identified with countries like Russia, or the SS (Schutzstaffel) in Europe and those kinds of things. And I don't think the government wants to have itself tied to that kind of view of the approach it's taking.

So they must, in order, in order to show the people that they are not in fact trying to become a militaristic-style police state, they must come clean with the people and tell them exactly what consultations they had, who advised them, what they were advised on. That gives the people some idea of why the government is taking the action that it is taking.

I don't think personally that there's an argument strong enough for giving a government agency this much power. Surely the system that we have in the British parliamentary system, and through our evolved democratic process of justice, has provided us with the opportunity to get warrants to search anything through a court system, a system of rules that protects the individual and gives him rights.

Surely the government on the other hand is willing to show who they consulted with if they're going to take those rights away. And that's exactly what is happening here. And we have to know who told the government that it was necessary to take people's private rights away. Who would have given that kind of advice, and what would that kind of advice had been, and when would they have given that kind of advice?

If they can't supply that, then I'm saying to the people of this province and to this government that they probably never had any of such advice; they only decided that they would seize again by the force of legislation in this Assembly the right to take away the private rights of individuals. And the right to privacy in one's own business or one's own home in this country is almost a

corner-stone to our democracy. It has at least got to have a parallel of being one of the major corner-stones in our society that keeps our democratic right to freedom available to all citizens.

If a militaristic type of police force can be allowed to walk in and search your premises or take over your establishment without even going through the processes of the court system, the people of this province have a right to know where the government got that kind of advice, who they consulted with to get that kind of advice, and why they think they can justify it. And they have to supply us with the dates and the times and the communications they had.

Otherwise it's a sham. Nobody will believe that they did these things, that they consulted. Nobody will believe that there was any meetings if there are no minutes. Nobody is going to believe this government ever again if they don't start to show where they got their ideas from and who is supporting them because it is clear to me that in an issue where the fundamental rights of democracy are taken away from people, they have probably not got any support in the general public. No country in the free world has this kind of sweeping power without justifying it to the people and showing them exactly how they're going to use it so that it doesn't take away the democratic rights of freedoms, privileges, and the rights of individuals to some degree of privacy.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the ministers involved here ought to advise their colleagues to not only pass this, but to give the information, to support it fully, to give themselves the opportunity to save grace and face in the eyes of the public again. They have to do that, Mr. Speaker, very soon, or they'll never ever again have the confidence of the people of this province.

So I urge you members in the government, consider this seriously. Think about this. This is a very important decision that you're making today. I know that probably someone's going to stand up and move an amendment. And that amendment will strip the guts out of all of the meaning of this particular motion. And when that is done, they will then attempt to pass it to make the people think that they've done something to try to give a façade to their so-called fair play when in reality they won't be doing anything to clear themselves of the accusations that are being made out there that they are nothing but powermongers that are trying to set up within the province of Saskatchewan a socialist police state.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. We have all sorts of interesting visitors here.

This is with respect to item no. 8, return no. 30. For the reasons stated under earlier amendments, I am going to move the motion be amended:

That all the words after "regarding this decision to" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act: (1) whether the minister consulted

with any groups or individuals prior to the decision being taken; (2) if so, the names of the groups or individuals involved in the consultations.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well it's not hard to be a prophet in this Assembly any more because we just said a minute ago that someone in this government would stand up and amend this motion and tear the guts out of it and try to create a façade that they were then going to vote in favour of it to make the people think that they in fact had done something positive when in fact they are doing exactly the opposite.

They're taking away, with this government, the rights of individuals to privacy. They are circumventing the entire British parliamentary system and the parliamentary system that has evolved our justice system in this province. The court system and the court structure that we have developed over hundreds of years of evolution is being just kicked in the teeth and tossed aside, giving some government agency the power to literally walk in and take over individuals' lives. That will not wash in the province of Saskatchewan. It is tantamount, absolutely tantamount to a socialist, communist police-state action and it will be used as such. I absolutely believe that it will be abused.

This government has no sense of control in abuse. They have no sense of control within their own ranks. And they will use this as a power tool to seize control of people's lives and to force them to comply with socialist doctrine, and fear will be put upon this province that no one in their right minds will ever come here to do business again. It just absolutely is not going to be in the cards for anybody ever to locate in this province with this kind of socialistic, communistic philosophy.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Can I speak on the motion, Mr. Speaker . . . on the amendment, sorry.

**The Speaker:** — The member was a little bit late in rising to his feet, but I will recognize him.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought you were going to read the amendment out and so that's why I was waiting just to hear it to make sure I had the right one.

But I would like to read a comment by the Minister of the Environment that she made on May 27 in *Hansard* where she admitted, Mr. Speaker, that consultations had taken place and that meetings with the stakeholders had been part of the process leading up to the . . . bringing this Bill before the House.

And what we're asking, and what the minister has agreed to provide a part of, is the names of those groups and individuals with whom the minister had met. But he is changing the motion to eliminate where these people met and what was part of their discussions; what the dates were. And I'd like to read from the minister:

Public consultations and meetings with stakeholders have convinced us that Saskatchewan people have given this government

a mandate to improve environmental protection in the areas covered in all of the legislation examined here today: air quality, the control of ozone-depleting substances and environmental management and protection.

Well, all we're asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister provides us with where those meetings took place and the dates. Were these consultations actually before the Bill was introduced to the House or was it after the Bill was introduced to the House?

That's very important because if it was after the Bill had been introduced to the House, it just shows that the government had already had their mind made up on what the legislation was to be and then they went out and told those people — as the minister called them, the stakeholders — told them what they were going to do. Didn't ask them how this was going to affect them. Didn't ask them what concerns they might have about the issues.

So if the minister would provide us with those dates and the locations and what was being discussed, then the entire public, the entire province of Saskatchewan, would know that the government is indeed being open and honest; that they are consulting with the people that are affected, not just simply presenting their legislation and telling the people what they are going to do.

We have seen that happen in other areas. The consultation with the bottling industry took place as the Bill came to the floor of the House and the minister told them what they were going to do.

So that's why we're asking in all of these motions that the dates and the locations and the times be given so that the public can know that the consultations took place prior to the Bill coming to the floor, rather than coming . . . the consultations taking place after they came.

Consultations after are very important also, Mr. Speaker, because once it hits the floor of the House, it gives the general public the opportunity to see the Bill and to think on it and to present their concerns. But there are certain groups in the general public who are known to have an interest in certain items.

Did the minister consult with the construction industry? The construction industry is very concerned about this legislation.

Did the minister consult with manufacturers? Manufacturers are very, very concerned about the item, the issue of being able to enter premises without a warrant. Because if that is allowed to happen, then the minister can designate her department employees to enter into a premise. They can take out whatever they want, whether or not it is exactly related to the environment or an infringement on the environment Act.

That is a possibility that could happen. And that is one of the things that the general public is concerned about. Are the processes that I have in the manufacturing centre sacred, or can the Minister of the Environment take them and release them as public knowledge without my having any opportunity to have a say so?

So, Mr. Speaker, we would like that the minister does indeed present to us the names, the dates, the location, and the contents of those consultations. Thank you.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### Return No. 33

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 33 showing:

Regarding the decision to impose user fees on chiropractic patients: (1) Whether the Minister of Health 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:** — Thank you very much. For reasons stated under previous motions, I move the motion be amended as follows:

That all the words after "Regarding" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

changes to chiropractic health care: (1) Whether the Minister of Health consulted with any groups or persons with respect to these changes. (2) If so, the names of the groups or persons involved in the consultations.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Just a few brief comments, Mr. Speaker. The more it goes, the worse it gets. I mean, we can't even get to the 10th or 12th word in the motion now. The minister has to cut it off after the first one. I mean, is there anything in the English alphabet, Mr. Minister, that doesn't frighten you? Is it so bad that you are frightened of . . . Regarding the decisions to impose user fees. I mean, a fact of life is, Mr. Minister, that's what's happened. And that frightens you.

I think the comments, Mr. Speaker, that have been made by my colleagues all through this debate, my previous comments on the diabetics in this province . . . I mean it just goes on and on. How can people reasonably, reasonably accept the Minister of Health's wellness model for the future, if she will not provide the public information on what she has done since becoming minister in regarding the way our lives interact with the health community?

I mean, when the government is so frightened of providing information that they have to change every last word in a motion, we have a government that obviously is out of control. I have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, that if we shouldn't just dispense with this exercise altogether and forget about it. This obviously is something that matters nothing to the government. It's something that they

constantly harped on in opposition, went out and sought the votes of the Saskatchewan people to do it differently, and they're not doing a darn thing differently. If anything, Mr. Speaker, they're worse than the previous government. I mean the hypocrisy of these people goes beyond belief.

I guess it just goes to the statements that we've been bringing up in this legislature on another piece of business. We've read into the record how hypocritical these people are on different topics, and health now seems to be one that frightens them immeasurably. We expect the Saskatchewan public to accept a wellness model predicated on people having access to services to keep them out of heavy care institutions, and we have no indication from the government or the minister where we're going in consultation with people that fundamentally work at keeping people out of heavy care institutions.

Every question we ask is dispensed with. It's just absolutely hypocritical for this minister to stand in the House, bring forward these amendments, and not even attempt to let Saskatchewan taxpayers know what the health care system is doing.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've been listening very carefully to the proceedings this afternoon so far. And certainly the frustration that we, as members of the opposition are beginning to feel with the inability and the lack of desire on part of government members to come clean with the people of Saskatchewan and give us the answers that we're looking for . . . And we certainly witnessed this afternoon the attack on the democratic institution, as we know it, with the government using its heavy-handed techniques to force its way through, to uproot the democratic principles that this institution stands for.

And, Mr. Speaker, to be able to speak more adequately to the problem as we see it as far as the democracy within this system is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would now move that we move to private members' motions no. 2, Mr. Goulet, to move the following resolution:

That this Assembly support all efforts to strengthen parliamentary democracy in the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan and that it protect the right of all citizens to have their views debated in this Assembly by their democratically elected members.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

The division bells began to ring at 4:52 p.m.

**The Speaker:** — I have been informed by the official House Leader that they do not intend to return for the vote prior to the time of adjournment tonight. Therefore I will recess the House until tonight at 10:25. The House stands recessed until 10:25 tonight.

It has been drawn to my attention that it is the opposition House Leader who has informed me that they do not intend to return tonight for the vote. Therefore the House stands recessed until 10:25.

The division bells continued to ring until 10:30 p.m.

**The Speaker:** — It being 10:30 p.m. and the time of daily adjournment having been reached, the superseding motion now lapses. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:30 p.m.