

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have another of the many petitions which have come to this Assembly. This one pertains to the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) issue and the preamble is the same as in the rest of them, Mr. Speaker. I'll only read the meat and potatoes, if you will, of this particular petition:

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 be set up on an individual cost-of-production to return ratio instead of a risk area formula.

The people signing these petitions today, Mr. Speaker, are from Moose Jaw, Craik, Keeler, Brownlee, Marquis, Caron, Central Butte. The whole entire Moose Jaw trading area, Mr. Speaker, is represented on these petitions that I present this morning.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to lay on the Table some petitions, and a different topic than from my colleague. To read part of the prayer, Mr. Speaker, that is included in this petition, states that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And, Mr. Speaker, these petitioners come from a variety of areas within the province, from Lampman, from Estevan, from Oxbow, Midale, Gainsborough, Regina, Carnduff, areas such as Air Ronge, Leoville, Meath Park, Shellbrook, Prince Albert, and in Melfort. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also want to present several names on a petition today, with respect to chiropractic services, and just the last couple of sentences in the same light as my colleague from Saskatoon:

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

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

And the names on here, Mr. Speaker, are people like Mr. Ken Funk from Kingsmere Boulevard, Saskatoon; Mr. Dale Fehr from Assiniboine Drive, Saskatoon. We have Mr. Erdman from Perreault Crescent in Saskatoon; Mr. Cole from Shea Crescent in Saskatoon. We have Mr. Wiebe from Hardisty. We have Leo LaClaire from Saskatoon; and several others from Saskatoon.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions to present. And I'll just . . . one of the most important paragraphs of the petition, I will read. I feel this should be repeated and repeated, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal

to discriminate against chiropractic (treatments of) patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions that I'm petitioning, I have two here with pages full. The first page is from Prince Albert, Shellbrook — looks like pretty well all that page is all Shellbrook and Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker.

The next one is from Swift Current and some surrounding towns — Gladstone, around Swift Current. And some from Saskatoon and some from Regina, and as of course there's always some on here from Churchill Downs.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have some petitions here, pretty much the same. I'll just read the final chapter.

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

And as in duty bound, your petitioners humbly pray.

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners come from the south-west: Swift Current, and Central Butte, Elrose, Gull Lake — quite a few from Swift Current, quite a few from Gull Lake — Herbert, Vanguard, Ponteix, Mankota, Webb, various addresses in Swift Current, Mr. Speaker, a couple of colonies, Kyle, Pennant, and several other towns down in that area, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too want to present a petition on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and it has to do with chiropractic care. And these petitioners are from Stoughton, Heward, Weyburn, Swift Current, Ponteix, Waldeck, Cabri, Rush Lake, and throughout the south-west. I just present them to the Assembly here today.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions with respect to chiropractic care and the treatment that the government is providing them with. Mr. Speaker, this first petition is primarily from Saskatoon and region — Verbeke Crescent, Confederation Drive, Frobisher drive. Some here from Biggar; Stone Crescent; Colonsay; a number of signatures from Rosetown, Mr. Speaker. And on this petition, the second one here is primarily from Prince Albert and area.

I present those now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to present a petition to the Assembly dealing with chiropractic care. I think the last paragraph of the prayer is the most important part:

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

This petition, Mr. Speaker, comes from the people of Saskatoon — all over the city, I'm guessing, because I'm not totally familiar with the city — but Edinburgh Place, subdivision 32, Ottawa Avenue, Stewart Avenue; from the town of Hafford. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this petition to the Assembly.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my honour today as well to present petitions on behalf of the people out in our province who are very much concerned about the perception that they have that this government is discriminating against them.

The Speaker: — Order, order. The member knows he may not comment. You can read the last paragraph of it, but you may not comment on the petition.

Mr. Goohsen: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to read the last paragraph so that the people will understand what the problem is.

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

These petitions come from people in various towns, beginning with Herbert, Hodgeville, Hazenmore, Stewart Valley, Swift Current, Gull Lake, Bracken, Shaunavon, Cree Lake, and many others, Mr. Speaker.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, I'm fortunate that I've been joined here today by two constituents who are seated in the east gallery. And I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members, Linda Walsh and her son Darren, and ask all members to join with me to welcome them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you and other members of the House, a person by the name of Phillipe Bavière. Phillipe is from Noisz-le-Roi just east of Paris in France. He's here as an exchange student with other 13 students right across Saskatchewan, and he'll be with us for a whole month. I'll be asking the member from Kinistino to say a few welcome words in French.

So, Mr. Speaker, please welcome Phillipe Bavière.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roy: — Merci, M. le Président. Je voudrais prendre cette opportunité pour dire du part de mes collègues dans le gouvernement et aussi les collègues de l'opposition, c'est un plaisir d'avoir Phillipe ici dans la Saskatchewan et parmi nous dans la législature. Je voudrais lui souhaiter une bonnes vacances et voudrais demander à tous mes collègues de l'accueillir chaleureusement. Merci.

(Translation: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my colleagues on both the government and opposition sides, I would like to take this opportunity to say that it is a pleasure to have Phillipe here in Saskatchewan and with us in the legislature. I would like to wish him a good holiday. I ask all my colleagues to give him a warm welcome. Thank you.)

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Potential Merger of Canada's Airlines

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for converting highways to cart paths. The minister will know that discussions about the potential merger of Canada's two national airlines have now commenced. Because of Saskatchewan's location, our province has always had to fight to maintain adequate service and our share of the air traffic employment, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the minister: would the minister outline his government's position on this possible merger, and will he table the communications he has had with the federal government, outlining his government's concerns?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier and I have both met with senior representatives of both airlines in the earlier stages of discussing the merger of Canadian Airlines with the American firm and have remained in communications. And our department is actively engaging in discussions with the federal government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation seems to be treating this issue with about

as much candour as he has used in his dealings with 60,000 farmers over the GRIP contracts. Surely the minister has to acknowledge that the merger would cost thousands of people their jobs in our province and would have the potential of driving prices of travelling by air through the roof in Saskatchewan.

My question to the minister: will the minister not acknowledge these inevitable results and what he is prepared to do to help save these people their jobs and help make airline travel affordable for ordinary persons? Will you do something, Mr. Minister, to save the jobs for the people in Saskatchewan and to keep the costs of air travel at somewhat of a reasonable rate?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the airline industry across the world has been suffering extremely under the conditions of the last number of years with the deregulation that's been going on, and it has left both Canadian companies at some risk. And we continue to be involved in the discussions with the federal government with respect to both the service to Saskatchewan and the security of Canadian carriers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Speaker, it's not good enough to blame somebody else all of the time for everything that goes wrong. Deregulation is not the culprit, Mr. Minister. The world economy has made air travel a luxury instead of the norm. Unionized workers are worried that they will lose their jobs, and all you can do is blame everyone else far and wide and take no responsibility for yourself.

Mr. Speaker, my question: what are you prepared to do, Mr. Speaker, to help ensure that Saskatchewan continues to receive the same level of service we currently receive and that the good people that work for those two airlines continue to have employment? Will you do anything other than blame somebody else to try to help these people to maintain their livelihoods, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I suspect other listeners are having as much difficulty as I am putting together my answers with the subsequent questions, supposedly based on my answers. The answer I gave continues to be the answer — that we have met with senior representatives of both airlines and heard their concerns. And our department continues to be in dialogue with the federal ministry with respect to service to Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the same minister. Mr. Minister, are these the same kind of negotiations that you've had with the farm people of this province over the last months, the non-existent types of conferences?

Mr. Speaker, the minister's colleague, the federal member for Regina-Lumsden, is already on record as favouring a merger of Canada's two airlines, thus

favouring higher rates, less service for Saskatchewan, and the potential loss of hundreds of jobs for people in our province.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is this: has the provincial government already consulted with their federal NDP (New Democratic Party) counterparts, and is the minister's view the same as the MP (Member of Parliament) from Regina Lumsden? Or does the minister have some other position which he is prepared to share with us by tabling his communications with the federal government here in this Assembly? Or have you talked to anybody at all about this at any time?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, clearly our — as I've already said twice — our department continues to be in contact with the federal minister on this question. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, what the members opposite are doing with respect to directing their federal government with respect to what's happening on this matter?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — We, Mr. Speaker, will support absolutely any proposition that saves jobs for our people in this province and maintains some credible standard of air flights to and from our province to other places in the world.

I have here in my hand the member from Regina's statement. Mr. Minister, he states quite clearly . . . And I quote from Pat Grandy. She says here that "layoffs appear inevitable."

Mr. Minister, in view of the fact that union people are so worried, in view of the fact that the federal critic from your party has said that he favours that we merge these two airlines, how do you square this in the province where you are the Minister of Transportation and responsible to try to save jobs and save transportation?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the government of the same party of the members opposite is in Ottawa directing these kinds of events and facilitating these kinds of actions that the member opposite is expressing concern about. I would suggest that the member opposite might in fact straighten out the policies of his own government if he's concerned about the impact on jobs, of this move.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Thank you. My question is just a follow-up to the Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Minister, could you just tell us . . . in your last response you said, well we should talk to the feds and find out what the outcome may be. Would you tell us how you feel about the potential of a merger of these two national airlines? Or in other words, would you tell the public in Saskatchewan the message that you want to give to the federal government, or you want to give to these airlines before you just blame everybody else. Wow do you feel about this merger?

Your federal counterpart says he likes the merger. Do you

like the concept of these two national airlines merging in Canada?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is aware that the crisis in international air travel is very much . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I will ask the member from Arm River to please, if he has a question, to simply get up and the Speaker will recognize him; otherwise, not to interrupt. Order.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are aware that the crisis in international air travel has not left Canadian carriers unaffected. They are also aware that the policies of the federal government have not left Canadian carriers unaffected, both in terms of privatization and deregulation. And we are as a ministry in contact with the federal government with respect to the ongoing negotiations in these matters which are under the authority of the federal government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the question to the same minister. I just asked his opinion. Are you too . . . Why are you so reluctant or why are you afraid to give us your opinion? Do you like the merger concept or not? Can't you tell us? It's not a difficult question. Do you think the merger is a good idea or not for Canada and for Saskatchewan people and the general public? Your federal counterpart . . .

The Speaker: — Order. order. The noise level is much, much too high. And now it's coming from this side. Before when the minister was answering, it was coming from the other side. Now will the members please just cut down the noise level so we can hear the questions and hear the answers.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well it's very simple. Mr. Benjamin says he supports the merger. He's a federal NDP Member of Parliament. We're asking the Saskatchewan Minister of Transportation: do you support the merger of the two national airlines or not? Could you just simply address that question?

The Speaker: — Order. Is the member from Quill Lakes going to be answering the question? If he is, then he should rise and I'll recognize him. Order.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I understand the member opposite's frustration, whether to follow his Prime Minister or his member from Regina on this matter, who also disagree on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the question of airline transport in Canada is a question of some complexity and some difficulty and the member opposite knows that. And possibly he has an interest in telling the people what his opinion is on this matter.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Liquor Consumption Regulations

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the Premier or whoever might like to answer. Mr. Premier, your government's actions continue to amaze people in this province. You've clearly demonstrated once again that one arm of government doesn't know what the other's doing.

Why is it that the government feels it is right to impose its morals on Saskatchewan people through the NDP-appointed vice squad at the Liquor Board, when your Minister of Agriculture, when your Minister of Agriculture has no problem morally in breaking the contracts of 60,000 farm families?

Which is it? Which part of the double standard, Mr. Premier, which part of the double standard does your government subscribe to? Please tell Saskatchewan people.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the members opposite that the rule which is giving us a little bit of difficulty enforcing, was a rule that was made by the commission that was appointed by the previous government and not by the new commission which we appointed.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think if it's a question of leading in moral values, I think the members opposite should be more concerned about the free booze that was given away by the previous administration, and the people who are working for the Liquor Board and being paid by the Liquor Board and not working for them. I think if there is a concern . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. I want to warn the members if the interruptions don't cease, I'll cut off question period and go to the orders of the day.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well it's very evident today, Mr. Speaker, that double standards do exist in this government. We have very lame excuses from the minister today, Mr. Speaker.

I notice that they felt no compulsion about using the former government's GRIP program, or using the former government's budget. But now we can use the former government's liquor standard to the defence for what the minister and his vice squad are doing over at the Liquor Board.

You can be sanctimonious, Mr. Minister, when it comes down to Big Brothers raising money or people going to the Regina Exhibition and enjoying themselves, but when it comes down to money, the morals stop. Because this government has no problem in breaking the contracts of thousands of Saskatchewan people.

Now which is it, Mr. Minister? If you can live by the Liquor Board requirements of the previous administration, maybe your government should live by the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance requirements also. Which is it going to be, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I have a little bit of problem making the connection between these two issues. I think maybe the members opposite should try to get a grip on the spandex issue here.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not a case of breaking contracts. This is a case of attempting to enforce regulations in an even-handed manner and creating some . . . realizing that there are some problems possibly with the rules. And we will be looking at changing the rules, if that's necessary. If we have a problem with enforcement, we'll be looking at changing that.

But I think they were the rules that were there from the old commission and we are trying to enforce them in an even-handed manner. And if that's creating a problem, we're going to look at it. But I fail to see where the connection comes to crop insurance. It's a far leap for me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the same minister. Well the connection comes, Mr. Minister, because of all the hypocrisy that we see coming out of your government. You always have someone to hide behind. It's either the federal government, or the former provincial government, or in this case you'll blame third parties like Big Brothers or the Regina Exhibition company. You've always got somebody to hide behind, Mr. Minister, for your incompetence and the incompetence of the people underneath you.

Mr. Minister, are you going to tell the Assembly today whether you have given direction to the people at the Saskatchewan Liquor Board to back off people like Big Brothers, and to back off associations like the Regina Exhibition Association, who are doing things to provide support to their community in various ways?

Mr. Minister, everyone in this province believes that you need to show some leadership instead of hypocrisy. Will you do that today, Mr. Minister, and inform this Assembly that you have given those orders to the Saskatchewan Liquor Board?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will give that confirmation to the House. I've been . . . The new Liquor Commission is meeting his week and I've instructed them to look at the regulation and see if there needs to be changes to it. I've instructed my officials to look at the way we're enforcing regulations to see if there's a problem in that. If there's over-zealous enforcement and a lack of common sense, we'll correct it.

And, Mr. Speaker, this government is hiding behind nothing. We will write new policy and we will enforce it as best we can, and we will take responsibility for it. But we do not like to take responsibility for rules and regulations that were made by the past government, or GRIP contracts that were made in a very unprofessional manner and without proper documentation and all the

rest of it. And I can assure you that there is no connection between the crop insurance program and the Liquor Board regulations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Minister, I'm sure that your new people on the Liquor Board will do as you say. I mean, they bought and paid for the positions, so I expect that they will.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Minister, you made the statement on Friday that Saskatchewan's moral standards were higher than those of our neighbours in Manitoba and Alberta, therefore we had to be different.

I would say to you, Mr. Minister, before you make those kind of comments about our neighbours on either side, I'm sure as they read their newspapers and see the various things that your government has done with breaking contracts with farmers, diabetics, ranchers, all sorts of people in our society, Mr. Minister, they must be wondering about who has the moral standards in western Canada.

Mr. Minister, I think that you should apologize today to the people of Manitoba and Alberta for making those kind of remarks, unless you are prepared to clean up your own act, Mr. Minister. Are you prepared to do that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the members opposite should be giving me a lecture in morality. I think somebody that would attack individuals who are appointed to a board who are, in my opinion, very competent individuals and very worthy of the position, and to be attacked by the members opposite because of their alleged political leanings, I think that's immoral. And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Return of Leased Land

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister in charge of the land bank. As a follow-up to last week's conversations, minister, I think everyone in the south-west perceives that a Mr. Oster got much more than his improvements are worth as a pay-off for running for an NDP candidacy in Maple Creek.

In an attempt to help my former constituent to clear up this matter, I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is there anything that you can tell this House that would prove proper procedure was followed and that Mr. Oster was not paid much more or much less than market value for his improvements?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I think the members opposite should know that there's no longer a land bank. It was done away with by the previous

administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — As to Mr. Oster, I think this is again, the member opposite, as Mr. Oster being a constituent of his, he should be in this House defending his constituents and being sure that they get a fair deal, not in here slandering their name.

And I have given assurances to this House that it was done in a perfectly normal, standard manner and there was nothing untoward in that contract that he would . . . done in a standard procedure. And Mr. Oster got paid no more and no less than any other lessee in the same position.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure this Assembly that there's no slander involved here. These are simply an attempt to achieve the role of finding out facts.

Mr. Minister, the law firm that handled the original owner's transactions in the early 1970s was Walker Romanow and Stevenson. I also know, Mr. Minister, that the house Mr. Oster lives in was built brand-new by the previous owners in the early '70s and so was the Quonset you mentioned last week.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister: Mr. Minister, can you confirm today that the original owner was offered about 700 per cent less for their new house and Quonset than Mr. Oster was for the same piece of property? And do you still claim this isn't a sweetheart deal?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I think . . . Mr. Speaker, this is . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, this definitely is a case of sloppy arithmetic and slander, and I think there is no question about that. The improvements were purchased from the former owner by a standard policy. The improvements that Mr. Oster made were valued, and the total package was valued according to standard procedure and was not paid too much for it.

And I think the member opposite, in attempting to slander his own constituent, is in breach of his job and his trust as an MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Minister, my constituency does not run to Medicine Hat. Secondly, I do have a calculator that you can borrow, if you'd care to have it.

Mr. Minister, the previous owner doesn't want to be put in the middle of this whole mess, and I can respect that. In fact the retired school teacher believes that you are, as she put it, just taking care of one of your own — just taking care of one of your own. That's her words.

That is in fact what you are doing, isn't it, Mr. Minister, taking care of one of your NDP faithful members? How else can you explain this, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I've explained this about six times. I don't know why the member opposite doesn't seem to catch on to it. Mr. Speaker, this was land that . . . improvements that were sold, bought, purchased back from a lessee who is . . . standard procedure. Any lessee in Saskatchewan has that right to sell back when they give up their lease, to be paid for their improvements on it. And this was done in a standard procedure, and it was no pay-off to anybody. I did not even know that Mr. Oster was turning his lease back.

And I think that again the member opposite is trying to use this to slander one of his own constituents, and I think it's shameful.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not particularly concerned with your opinion of me, Mr. Minister, but I will remind you of the figures that you yourself have put into the public's knowledge bin last week: \$10,000 was paid approximately, you said last week, at the original purchasing of these buildings by land bank. You now paid 71,000-plus for that same set of buildings. You figure it out.

Can you please explain to this Assembly how a house and a Quonset can appreciate by a whopping 700 per cent over about a 20-year period of time, especially at a time when we were in a recession, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Minister, the member opposite is using his privileges in the House to give false information; I wish he'd make those charges outside the House and see where they come with that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Martens: — Will the Minister of Rural Development confirm that he said outside of this House that there was \$10,000 paid by land bank to the original owner and that 70,000 was paid by lands branch to the now resident of Medicine Hat, Mr. Bryan Oster.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, again there were improvements to the buildings; they're not the same set of buildings. There's a difference in time frame of some 20 years. And, Mr. Speaker, they were valued according to the standard procedure for value, and I think that we had an independent appraiser again who valued them at a higher level than what our department valued them at. They were standard, fair value for what he got for his improvements, and that is the facts, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Will the minister confirm that the

appraiser that they used as an independent appraiser is not a qualified appraiser as requirements under lands branch.

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, on lease improvement values, he was a qualified appraiser.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, is it true that he would not have qualified if the land would have been purchased or sold to another individual? Would he have been qualified to provide that appraisal?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — He would be qualified to appraise the improvements of buildings, not land, which is a different situation. But under our regulations he was qualified as an appraiser.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, the appraisal was done by a non-approved appraiser as a requirement under lands branch. Will you confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — No it wasn't, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, will you tell this Assembly whether the appraisal done by the lands branch in 1973 was \$10,000 and that the appraisal done by your lands branch now was \$71,000?

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, in approximate numbers those are correct. But considering they were different set of buildings and different . . . had improvements on them, I don't know what the relevance of that is. And considering the 20-year difference in time frame, it certainly is not relevant.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR CLOSURE

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that pursuant to rule 34, that at the next sitting of the Assembly, immediately before orders of the day is called for resuming debate on the motion to proceed with the vote on first reading of a Bill respecting amendments to Certain Farm Income Insurance Legislation, I will move that the said debate be not further adjourned.

The Speaker: — Order, order. If some of the members want to have an early recess, I will accommodate them under rule 28. I said order.

(1445)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, before orders of the

day is called for resuming consideration of the resolution for interim supply, I move:

That consideration of the resolutions in Committee of Finance required for interim supply be not further postponed.

The division bells rang from 2:46 p.m. until 2:56 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 32

Wiens	Hagel
Simard	Calvert
Tchorzewski	Murray
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Teichrob	Trew
Shillington	Serby
Koskie	Roy
Anguish	Scott
Goulet	Kujawa
Atkinson	Crofford
Kowalsky	Stanger
Carson	Harper
MacKinnon	Kluz
Penner	Carlson
Cunningham	Renaud
Upshall	Jess

Nays — Nil

Motions for Interim Supply

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since we are beginning a new day I thought it might be appropriate to introduce my officials. On my right is the associate deputy minister of Finance, Mr. Craig Dotson; and immediately behind him is Roy Hynd, the manager of the treasury board branch.

(1500)

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know why the minister was introducing his officials because he can't answer any questions anyway with the rules of the Assembly. There'll be no questions answered. This has got to be the most ridiculous day I've ever heard of in the Assembly of Saskatchewan. Closures. Closures. We had an interim supply Bill. We talked about it, didn't even get one day finished, and we go to closure.

Well I never seen . . . Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance says it shouldn't take more than 20 minutes. Well I'll tell you, that's got to be the most insulting, arrogant man I've ever heard of in my life, coming from what I thought was a decent individual — 20 minutes, shouldn't take more than 20 minutes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, and also the House Leader, we didn't even speak one day on GRIP, on the GRIP motion. Closure. Talk about a heavy-handed bunch of people. I never seen such individuals in my life.

Fifty-five days they said this House should be ended. I've never seen anything like it. We have sat here . . . I came in here under the NDP once, when they were in opposition we sat 129 days. We sat 129 days.

And they say that we're not getting any work done. We've passed many, many Bills. We would get work done in this House, Mr. Chairman. We would get work done if the people across there would answer their questions, without bringing ridiculous . . .

The Chair: — Order, order. Order, order. Order. Why is the Government House Leader on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — A point of order on a sitting during the time we were in opposition when we sat 129 days. I'm sure if the member checks, there's no such . . .

The Chair: — Order. That's not a point of order, that's a question of debate.

Before I recognize the member from Arm River, I want to point out to the member that each member has 20 minutes to be able to speak to the motion. The Chair will not look kindly upon interruptions while the member is speaking.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I hope that the House Leader's interference is deducted from my time.

I had some questions that I wanted to ask the other day when interim supply was here. So I'm still going to ask these questions, Mr. Chairman. And maybe in his 20-minute response, maybe he can answer some of them.

We've had quite a discussion the other night here about this one-twelfth. And they asked . . . and several departments asked for more than one-twelfth. And I was going to ask questions about how many departments of these have a surplus. And we know that some of them did have a surplus. And how many departments are there all together — departments and agencies? And how many . . . We've only had three interim supply Bills that's come forth in this session, so that means that there's some departments that have money in their funds. And questions I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman, where's this money gone? Where's this money at? Is it sitting in the Consolidated Fund?

Is it . . . you're going to never . . . going to get this man to agree with you that you spent . . . that Crop Insurance has spent one-twelfth of its funds. There's just no way because they don't spend money out now. So are you taking that money and spending it some place else?

How many have a surplus? And I want that question answered in this 20 minutes, but I have no way . . . if he doesn't answer it, I have no way under the new rules here, there's no way to come back.

Any time . . . did you ever get a house foreclosed upon . . . have closure, and we've only been speaking one day, or part of a day on an interim supply Bill, has to be the most arrogant thing I've ever heard happen in this province and this government's going to suffer for that, Mr. Chairman.

We'll never, on this side of this House, we will never, ever let the people of Saskatchewan forget this day and these days.

We are blamed by you people, Mr. Chairman, we're blamed by them for stalling and filibuster in this House. What I call the words filibustering, is the people that don't answer questions. If you don't answer questions, and you bring in stupid Bills like this here retroactive GRIP Bill — there's the people that's filibustering and causing all this problem.

An Hon. Member: — Order, order.

Mr. Muirhead: — Oh, order nothing.

When the minister, Mr. Chairman, gets on his feet, he can just maybe answer some of those questions. But one of the things that I sure want to remind him of, that every time you get up to speak, almost every time when you're speaking, the other night on interim supply Bill, you kept going after the member from Estevan. Oh, this problem we're in is always because of the prior government and the debt they left.

Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, when we sat in this same building in the end of May, the first day of June — in fact, I got a *Hansard* here from June 1, an interim supply Bill — it took me two and a half hours to finally get you to agree what the deficit was in 1982 when we took over government. You finally admitted it. You got backed into a corner, and under oath I asked you to give what the exact figures what the deficit was, and you finally did it after two and a half hours.

And I think it's very important that everybody viewing television here today and anybody that's going to read *Hansard*, that hear this again, because I must read this into the record. This is a question, just the latter part of my question after questioning you for a long time, Mr. Minister. I'm asking you direct questions, and you as Minister of Finance shouldn't have to ask anybody, because if you were the minister of Finance back in 1982 and the government falls on it, I would have dreamt those figures for at least four years. I would never have forgotten them. You'd remember them till you die. And you should know right to the penny.

So you'd get up . . . And this is what I quote. I quote from you, Mr. Minister:

I can give it to you right now. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the member opposite: 1982, the total Crown corporations' debt, self-liquidating, not in any way a burden on the Saskatchewan taxpayer because the Crown corporations' earned income . . . They charge power rates and telephone rates and they paid the loans that were provided for them. But the Crown corporation debt was \$3.397 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the Consolidated Fund, which is the government side, taxpayer supported debt, do you know what it was, Mr. Chairman? A hundred and ninety million dollars — \$190

million. Do you know what it is today, Mr. Chairman? It's almost \$9 billion after 10 years of the good and wise management of the member from Arm River.

All told, when you consider the sinking funds which are provided . . .

Now this is what I quote. This is important for the viewers of Saskatchewan to hear.

All told, when you consider the sinking funds which are provided, and the member will know what that's all about, the gross debt for the province of Saskatchewan in 1982 was \$3.5 billion.

Now how come that he, Mr. Chairman, can get up here for . . . well for nine years you stand in this House and blame the government for the debt we were creating because they left a balanced budget. How can he do these things? It's absolutely misleading the people in the province of Saskatchewan. Three point five billion dollars in 1982 dollars and put into 1992 dollars is very, very serious, for accusations to be left out there for people to be able to actually believe that. People believe that, Mr. Chairman.

But we've got this statement from you, Mr. Finance Minister, and I've said it all over my riding and I intend to make sure that every reader, that everybody that can read in the province of Saskatchewan gets this submission from you, that it was \$3.5 billion.

But there's no sense . . . Those are just a few questions that I was going to ask the other day that I put down there. I could go on for a long time. I've only got 20 minutes. And it's just . . . So far as I can see, this whole thing's a farce. What's happening here today is a farce — that we have interim supply Bill and there was no doubt it was either going to end that night or the next day because we have never held up the interim supply Bill. We've only had the accusations.

Any government, Mr. Chairman, that brings in interim supply Bill in the last day or two and wondering why it doesn't get passed in an hour or two . . . Why didn't you bring it in 10 days earlier or 15 days earlier and we could debate it in a right and proper manner, instead of bringing it in the last day, the closing minutes, and then say, well you're talking too long, you're asking too many questions, and we'll have to bring in a Bill of closure. Talk about a dictatorship type of a government.

I've never known it. It has never happened. I'll bet you this has never happened, Mr. Chairman, in the whole Commonwealth. It's never happened — that two closures in one day. The House Leader made a statement a day or two ago — I believe it was last Friday morning — to the public that we were going to give the opposition . . . it'll take at least two weeks to get the GRIP Bill through; we're going to give them lots of time. And he didn't . . . We only get discussing it just on the motion. One man spoke. One man spoke.

And we could have got on with things today. We could

have got on with things today. We just had the critic for Crop Insurance, the only one that spoke and the only one that was going to speak — the only one that was going to speak. And you could have tabled your Bill and we could have got at it. But what are you going to do now?

You wonder why we're angry. Because you play this kind of tactics. Why wouldn't we be angry? Why wouldn't we as opposition be listening to the public out there?

I've been in politics a long, long time. I've got in over . . . it'll soon be 15 years as an MLA and it's 20 years since I was a campaign manager for Doug Neil in Moose Jaw. I've been involved all over this here province in politics, and I've never had such a sad day in my life as . . . or these days is the people coming at me, what you people are doing.

I have people daily, daily, no matter where I go . . . I was at the fair last night to see the musical ride, Mr. Chairman. And people that didn't even know . . . that recognized me: can you not stop this government? Can they do anything right? Is there one Bill they can bring in that's right?

Oh I said, we've passed probably 25 Bills — I'm not sure, 20, 25 Bills — and they've had Royal Assent. Well how could they ever have brought a Bill in that was right? They can't do anything right, these jerks. And that's what you people are called . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh, order nothing; I can call you jerks if I want.

Nothing wrong with me calling you people jerks, because that's exactly what you are. Well, and I stand here and I mean it. Because that's exactly what you are. It's the worst type of dictatorship . . . there's probably never happened — even in the socialist countries, it probably never even happened. It only happens here in Saskatchewan.

The Chair: — Order, order. Order. Why is the Associate Minister of Finance on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I'd ask for a ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not calling members "jerks" is in keeping with parliamentary language usually expected of members of this Assembly.

The Chair: — Order, order. In checking Beauchesne, the word itself has not been ruled as unparliamentary, but certainly it's not the kind of language that one would expect of members of the Legislative Assembly. And therefore I caution the member in the use of his language, and try to use language that befits members of the House and is a credit to the Assembly.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, you're absolutely right. We shouldn't have to stand here as members and use any type of those kind of slanderous words. But after what they've done to us, I don't think I can come up with parliamentary words that could be fitting for you people.

It's just unreal. It's unreal, Mr. Chairman, what you people here have done today. I'm absolutely ashamed of you. I'm ashamed that I'm a part of an NDP government in this legislature. I'm proud that I'm here as a legislator, but I'm not proud of this legislature today.

Because what you people are doing, you're going closure when we're only at 57 days? I never heard of such a thing. The House Leader well knows, and so does the member from Churchill Downs, and Quill Lakes, that this House in the 15 years we've all been here — and some of you longer — that we've been down to a week with less work than what we got to do now and this House finishes. They know that's right. All they've got to do is have co-operation. And we can't get co-operation from the government opposite. They don't know what co-operation is.

As long as . . . all you have to do, because why we're into this argument, it's not interim supply — you didn't do closure on us because what we're talking about pertaining to interim supply — it's because of the GRIP Bill. Because you know you've got to get it passed. GRIP has caused all the problem and it brings right to interim supply. And it isn't whether it's '91 or '92 GRIP, it's because the people of Saskatchewan are catching on, the media's catching on, everybody is catching on. I was in Bismarck for four days and they're even catching on there; for the province of Canada, they're catching on that what this government has done and that's why we're here in the closure position.

And we'll have closure on every Bill. Probably you'll start doing it in estimates. We'll have closure, closure, closure, because you know you've got to get your GRIP Bill passed. You have to have it as the House Leader said publicly to deem that the farmers got a letter on March 15, 1992.

And you know that's why we're in this mess. You know that's why we're in this impasse in this House.

And so before I take my seat, I just want to say very clearly — and I won't use the word that I used before — that I'm ashamed of whoever is making the rules and regulations on that side of the House. I'm ashamed of each and every one of you. I'm ashamed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(1515)

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't bring me any pleasure at all to participate in this process that the Government House Leader has foisted upon this House. There's a few things I'd like to say, however, Mr. Chairman, before this business comes to its smelly conclusion. And I'd like to refer members of the legislature back to a couple of documents that were recently presented in this House.

One is from December 2, 1991, Monday, December 2, 1991, and I believe it was a document presented by the Minister of Finance to this Assembly. On page 3 it talks about democratic reform, and I can remember the statements: "My government is determined to restore the fundamental principles of democracy."

That's a strange statement coming from a government which has now used closure twice in the same day, that is very fearful of members of this House asking questions; is very fearful of members of this House expressing opinions that obviously impact on a lot of people in the province of

Saskatchewan.

The second document, Mr. Chairman, was presented to this House on Monday, April 27, 1992. And as part of it, it had a section, "A Mandate for Change," and I would quote from that document, Mr. Chairman:

A community that has lost faith in its elected representatives will not flourish. People want my government to be open, honest and fully accountable.

A community divided will not succeed. People want my government to re-kindle the Saskatchewan spirit of community and co-operation.

Well I'll suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, as my colleague from Arm River said, on the 57th day of a session to have closure motions brought forward one after the other, this early in the session, by a government that has shown over and over again in the last few weeks that it says one thing when it makes these public pronouncements and does another — it doesn't matter if it's the farm families of this province with their contracts. It doesn't matter if it's the people that have to do business with the secret service and the Liquor Board. It just goes on and on and on — these people firmly believe that they have the right to step on anyone that gets in their road.

And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that what we're seeing in this interim supply Bill is the epitome of the hypocrisy of the New Democrats.

We're on the third interim supply Bill of this session. Before that we had two special warrants. You know, Mr. Chairman, when the previous government even brought in one special warrant or one interim supply Bill, it was all the excuse New Democrats needed to go on a rampage around this province — stand on public platforms and talk about making the province ungovernable because an interim supply Bill had been brought forward.

The current Minister of Finance, amongst others, stood on his feet for days in this House with various interim supply Bills in the previous five years. And I've read all of the verbatim, Mr. Chairman. I've quoted some of it in this Assembly, and it went on and on and on. They felt quite at ease in asking the minister of Finance about revenue that he had garnered from various tax initiatives.

This Minister of Finance stands in this Assembly and hides, hides behind the narrow interpretation of interim supply. He can bring forward more than one-twelfth and nearly the sum of \$14 million in regards to the federal government, and yet when this opposition asks him questions about a federal offer that's on the table, contingency plans that the Finance department might have, we can't answer that; we won't answer that. We'll hide behind the narrow rules.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we haven't had a budget in this province for nearly two years. We have a Minister of Finance in his own words that said he was going to change the way the world operated. And we attempt to ask questions and what do we get? We get closure after a

few hours.

Mr. Chairman, on Friday the press released a document. It was budget analysis, done by survey. Done by survey, Bannatyne Research. Department of Finance paid over \$50,000 to come up with certain conclusions — certain conclusions. Part of the questions that we have been asking in interim supply are very relevant to this document and how the budget was drawn up in this province, the questions that were asked. There were lots of questions in here, Mr. Chairman, that would have been very pertinent to this interim supply Bill, the topics that the Minister of Finance outlined in it.

And now we're into this charade of 20 minutes, that if I ask a question and sit down, I lose my place. Well I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely ludicrous, absolutely ludicrous that members in this Assembly, given that the taxpayers shelled out 50,000 bucks for this thing — 50,000 bucks — that the press had to threaten to use freedom of information in order to obtain. And we're prohibited from asking questions about it for hours, I suggest would be the more appropriate, Mr. Chairman — hours and hours and hours on that document alone, because the minister refuses to answer any questions. He simply talks political rhetoric. And you wonder why there's frustration.

Well, Mr. Chairman, after a few hours in this Assembly, what we get from these people is closure upon closure upon closure. Fifty-five members, admittedly half of them never here, we get closure, Mr. Chairman, day after day after day.

Mr. Chairman, there was a movie recently released. As part of its closing it had a very powerful message delivered by Kevin Costner, playing the role of an attorney. The movie was **JFK**. And as part of that dissertation to the jury in that particular trial, Mr. Costner was talking about the U.S. (United States) government and its attempts to hide truth and fact.

And one of the statements he said in there, Mr. Chairman, that I think is very applicable to this Assembly today, is that truth often poses a threat to power. And what we have from the New Democratic Party today in this Assembly is the fact that truth in many areas seems to present a threat to the power that they hope to exercise over Saskatchewan people.

And I think it might behave maybe members of that caucus to go and see that movie and just see exactly what they're acting like. And then maybe they would be prepared to come in this Assembly and answer questions to a very small opposition, a very small opposition that has limited research ability, but has the ability to stay in contact, I say, Mr. Chairman, with Saskatchewan people. And every day in this Assembly we present more and more petitions. We get more and more phone calls from people that are unhappy with this government — a government that said it would be open, honest, and fully accountable; a government that said it would have the spirit of community and co-operation; a government determined to restore the fundamental principles of democracy.

Fundamental principles, Mr. Chairman — when a member can't ask a question, take his seat and stand up and answer another one. Truth often does pose a threat to power, I guess, Mr. Chairman, and what we have in this Assembly today is that very fact.

The Chair: — Order.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, what we see here today is a very, very heavy-handed government. Interim supply, in my view, is a legitimate thing to be asking for — very legitimate. And also, Mr. Chairman, is it not also legitimate that the opposition should have the opportunity to ask questions of the Minister of Finance with respect to that interim supply? I think it's a legitimate thing to ask; that we should have that opportunity to ask those questions.

But now they've put closure on that motion, on the interim supply motion, Mr. Chairman. So what it in fact means is that there's an opposition of 10 members. We'd all, each and every one of us, would only be given the opportunity to ask one question each — one question, Mr. Chairman. So that means, Mr. Chairman, we'd all . . . to grant them supply, only 10 questions would be asked of the minister — 10 questions to supply him with one-twelfth of the budget for this period of time in the year. Absolutely incredible — 10 questions on one-twelfth of a \$5.4 billion budget. That's what it amounts to, Mr. Chairman.

Each one of us as opposition members are given the . . . charged with responsibilities to ask questions in various departments, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have responsibilities in a number of areas. We're concerned about what's happening in this province, Mr. Chairman. We're concerned about what the Minister of Finance is doing to democracy in this province, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The opposition . . . or I mean the government members are yelling at me to ask a question.

I will not ask one single question. I want the opportunity to ask question after question after question. We cannot ask more than one question. If we ask one question then we sit down, we lose our place. Simple as that. That's the facts.

You aren't even aware of that. We're not going to be subjected to only asking one question in this House about all areas of government. We want the opportunity to ask question after question after question. In Economic Diversification and Trade we have questions. In health care we have questions. In Agriculture we have questions. In Rural Development we have questions. Every area of government we have questions. And we are not allowed to ask those questions.

The fundamental, the fundamental principle of democracy is grievance before supply. Grievance before supply. And each and every one of you should take a lesson in that if you don't know it already. Each and every one of you should be aware of that.

We are not given the opportunity to ask questions. You want supply. You want supply and then you say we'll be

given the opportunity to ask questions in estimates. Well that isn't the way it's supposed to be in a democracy, sir, Mr. Finance Minister. That is not the way it's supposed to be in a democracy. Democracy says grievance before supply.

The people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, have a right to know, they have a right to know where you're going to spend their money before you ask them for it, not after, Mr. Finance Minister. And every one of the members in this House knows that. But they aren't going to uphold that principle of democracy. They don't care about democracy. We've seen their principles of democracy in the last little while: closure after closure after closure after closure motions.

That's the kind of democracy we can expect from these tyrants opposite us. That's the kind of democracy we can expect from you, sir, you and your government, the government that said they were going to govern with a spirit of openness and responsibility, openness and co-operation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here's examples of openness and co-operation from these people. Here's the kind of openness and co-operation we can expect from these people. That's the kind of democracy we can expect from you.

Maybe, I think, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just read into the record a couple of examples of things that members opposite have said before about closure motions. I think I'll take the time to do that. The member for Saskatoon South, this is what he said about closure in August 7, 1989 *Hansard*:

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I find this piece of legislation so abhorrent. He doesn't have the right to decide how long I can speak in this legislature. He doesn't have that right. The people of Saskatoon South have elected me to speak for them.

That's what the member from Saskatoon South said about closure motions. So I say again you don't have that right. You just don't have a right as a government to tell me whether or not I can speak in this legislature. The people will decide that.

(1530)

Mr. Chairman, and exactly that same principle holds today with the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan, the people of the Kindersley constituency, elected me to ask questions of this government, but we aren't able to ask those questions. We aren't able ask those questions, Mr. Chairman. We aren't given that right.

If I would have the opportunity to ask one question, I wonder what question one could pose to the Minister of Finance that'd be all-encompassing, that you could put forward and answer every single area of government. What question would that be?

Maybe it would be whether he wants to tender his

resignation. That would be a type of comment that I think the people of Saskatchewan would accept.

The member for Prince Albert Carlton, he's even here today; the member for Prince Albert Carlton, I see he's taken his place.

And it's interesting, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Chair: — Order, order. Order. Order. The member is drawing attention to the presence or absence of a member and he should know that according to the rules we have that he should not be doing that.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What did the member from Prince Albert Carlton say about a closure motion one time? Here's what he said, and I quote:

What we can say about closure, Mr. Speaker, and closure, or in this case it's a matter of closure on closure (which is exactly what we see here today incidentally). Sitting back and listening to a lot of arguments that (are) . . . presented, and listening carefully and knowing very well that this is the first time that closure has ever been proposed in this legislature and ever used in this legislature, I can say that to me that it smacks somewhat of totalitarianism.

I feel that closure is somewhat of an affront to democracy. I think and I believe that it is an antithesis of democracy — the exact opposite — because what (does it) . . . it stifles debate as opposed to what the democratic principle is of encouraging debate.

If democracy, Mr. Speaker, if democracy implies making decisions that reflect the public good and the public mood, then this motion of closure is definitely an affront to it, because closure offends the (very) democratic principle of free speech.

That's what the member for Prince Albert Carlton said.

Mr. Speaker, this government, as I said earlier promised — promised — the people of Saskatchewan in the election campaign and in their budget and in their throne speech that they would govern with the spirit of openness and co-operation.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we don't see that openness. We don't see that co-operation. What we see is closure. That's what we see from this government opposite, and the House Leader suggests that too. He's happy with closure. It doesn't make any difference to him whether we're able to ask questions or not. The people of Saskatchewan want us to ask questions. The House Leader, he doesn't want questions asked of his government.

Every single day that goes by, the people of Saskatchewan know just exactly what kind of government they've elected. They've elected a government with a heavy hand. They don't want opposition in this province. They don't want opposition in this province, Mr. Chairman.

We saw a few moments ago that they voted for the first time in history by themselves. No opposition at all. The Saskatchewan people now see what kind of people these people they have elected are. They've elected a government that will ram things through, roll over the opposition. They don't care about the principles of democracy one little bit, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I think it can only be said that this government simply does not respect the principles of democracy, and they will not uphold the principles of democracy. And we've examined that, and we've seen closely, exactly the way they'll govern in the future. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — I want to point out a number of things to the people of Saskatchewan that I think are significant. And they are examples, Mr. Chairman, of the kinds of things that I see this government doing. I rue the day that this would have to take place in a first year of a government's mandate. And as awesome as the overwhelming majority of that government is, I will say these things. And I hope the deeming of those people opposite will not exclude me from this Assembly because I say them.

I want to point out a couple of things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Chairman. One, the House Leader and the Minister of Economic Development in this province is doing to the people of Saskatchewan exactly what he did to the constituents of Elphinstone.

That minister and that member for the province of Saskatchewan took it upon himself to buy, Mr. Chairman, to buy the votes so that he could be elected in his constituency and nominated in his constituency. That, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, is a fact. And that is a fact that you are going to have to . . . that, Mr. Speaker, is what you are going to have to live with all of your life. You bought the votes to get the nomination in your constituency, sir, and no one across this province has ever done that before. You, sir, are the one that did that.

The second point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is this. The second point I want to make is this, and it is just as disgusting as that member from Elphinstone. And that goes to the Minister of Finance who on the steps of the legislature was the first one — and television will record that he was — the first one through the door and pushing his way in and kicking the security guard in this province, in this legislature.

That, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what he did. And that, Mr. Minister, is absolutely, totally disgusting. And you, sir, did it. And what you are doing in this legislature today is exactly that. You're thumbing your nose at every citizen in the province of Saskatchewan. You, sir, don't have the right . . . you, sir, don't have that right in a democracy to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out a couple of other things that I think are just as ridiculous. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out some other things. The Premier of the province of Saskatchewan on December 2 of 1991 said that he was

going to have an open, honest government and he was going to set stringent guidelines for conflict of interest. And that, Mr. Minister, is exactly what your Premier said. And what has he done? That, Mr. Minister, is exactly what he said, and what has done?

What has he done is the question. By allowing you and your House Leader to have closure . . .

The Chair: — Order, order, order, order. Order. I'm having difficulty hearing the member because members on both sides are engaging in their own debates. And therefore I ask members to listen to the member while he's on his feet. And if you want to be recognized, please stand and you will be recognized at the appropriate time.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, Mr. Chairman, and I want to point this out to the people of this province of Saskatchewan, that we have leading in this province people who will misuse their power.

I had the privilege of watching the television, John F. Kennedy, the movie. And in that the lawyer says that you, sir, are . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out, and I just did . . .

The Chair: — Order. We're experiencing some difficulty with the microphones and we'll try it again, but the member's mike wasn't on. We'll try it again.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to point out to the people of this Assembly and to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, power in the hands of the wrong people and misusing democracy is occurring today in the province of Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Chairman, is what we're complaining about here today.

Your Premier said that my government has also initiated the development of a comprehensive code of ethics — my goodness sakes! — and stringent conflict of interest guidelines. My goodness sakes! You, sir, are a part of a government who has done that, and what have you done? You have thrown your hands up and said democracy is not going to run this province. This Speech from the Throne, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, said: that people want my government to be open, honest, and fully accountable. Mr. Minister, that is not what you're doing. In fact, you don't even have your deputy here today. Where is he? Allow that, allow that . . . allow that to be recognized as a part of the democratic process. You don't even plan on answering any questions. And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this is — this is grievance before supply for the people of the province of Saskatchewan giving you the right to tax. And that, Mr. Minister, is being affronted here today by your unilateral action.

People want my government to be fair. Well sir, here we have fairness. It's the most disgusting part of a democratic process that you could ever imagine. And, Mr. Member from Melfort or Yorkton or whatever, you have to be accountable for this, and you will be held accountable for this.

Fair and compassionate. Well my goodness sakes, it's time you were compassionate. You haven't delivered a

compassionate speech in the last six months in this Assembly. None of you have. That's why you treat diabetics with scorn. That's why you treat elderly with scorn. Kick them out of the hospitals. Number 1 and level 2 care — kick them out — you don't have any conscience; you don't have any compassion. That's the kind of government you are. That, Mr. Chairman, is why we are against the unilateral actions that are occurring in this Assembly these days.

This Assembly, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, are forums for debate, forums for debate and discussion. And, Mr. Minister, we are being curtailed on every hand, at every opportunity that you can. And you, Mr. Minister, are doing that every time. We have speech after speech in this House, in the last 10 years, that we can quote, where we have given opportunity for people in the opposition to talk. But have you given that to us, or to the people who didn't vote for you, and who never would vote for you again because of the kinds of things that you're doing?

That, Mr. Minister, is exactly what the problem is. And you, sir, are leading that kind of government. Kicking in doors, allowing people who have . . . who in order to get nominated will buy the votes, buy the memberships. That's what you're doing, sir. And we think it's disgusting and deplorable.

Truth often poses a threat to power. And that, Mr. Minister, is exactly what's happening here. Truth is posing a threat to the power of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, because truth is what the people and the citizens of this province want to have, and you, sir, are not delivering it, neither through this Assembly, nor through the leadership in this Assembly. You, sir, are acting in a disgusting, disparaging way. And I think, sir, you should resign and apologize. That's the reason why we're here discussing this. And, Mr. Minister, I challenge you, I challenge you in 20 minutes to take and refute all of the arguments that are going to be made by members of this side of the Assembly for the role that you are taking in your despicable use of power.

The Chair: — The question before the committee is the motion by the Minister of Finance. Is the committee ready for the question? The question is:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$371,537,300 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1993.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: — The second motion before the committee . . . the second question is the motion by the Minister of Finance:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993, the sum of \$371,537,300 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

Leave not granted.

(1545)

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the committee rise and that the Chairman report that the committee has agreed to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

The Speaker: — I wish to inform the members that according to rule 12(3) this will be the first item on the agenda after orders of the day tomorrow.

(1600)

The division bells rang from 3:45 p.m. until 3:55 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 30

Wiens	Calvert
Tchorzewski	Murray
Lingenfelter	Hamilton
Teichrob	Johnson
Shillington	Trew
Koskie	Serby
Anguish	Roy
Goulet	Scott
Atkinson	Crofford
Kowalsky	Stanger
Carson	Harper
Penner	Kluz
Cunningham	Carlson
Upshall	Renaud
Hagel	Jess

Nays — 9

Devine	Martens
Muirhead	Britton
Neudorf	Goohsen
Swenson	D'Autremont
Boyd	

The committee reported progress.

FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolutions be now read a first and second time.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move:

That Bill No. 86, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1993, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to on division and the Bill read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, and under rule 51(2), I move that the Bill be now read a second and third time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 71

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Ms. MacKinnon that **Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The second reading continuation on this Bill is extremely significant I think, in this time for Saskatchewan's history. And it's something that deserves our full attention and for full consideration. Albeit following the facade of democracy that we have experienced over the last three hours or two hours in this Assembly, it makes one wonder whether there is any point in the continuing on in this so-called democratic process. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Bill itself, Bill 71, indicates quite clearly again that this is a government that is bound and determined to take the bit in its mouth and continue on in its headlong rush to self-destruction as far as the NDP Party is concerned.

We have witnessed it on repeated occasions, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon — this attack on democracy, this total reversal of what the party apparently stands for and certainly what they stood for during the election and what they promised the people of Saskatchewan. And when we take a look at Bill 71, Mr. Speaker, there's some damning evidence here that that group across the way is bound and determined once more to take the bit in its mouth and continue on in that headlong path of destruction.

Because, Mr. Speaker, this Bill purports to do exactly the opposite of what those folks across the way promised that they would do last fall, in October of 1991, where they promised unequivocally that they would do more with less; that they would spend more on health, on education, and some of the other priorities that they felt the people of Saskatchewan wanted and that they placed.

And as we know and as their record will attest, the people believed them and the people supported them and the people voted for them. And sad to say, sad for the people of Saskatchewan, they are now paying the price. They are paying the price as is evidenced in Bill 71 — Bill 71, An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Assembly should be entering second reading on the debate on this Bill — a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that is going to impose user fees. Can you imagine that — an NDP government, taking the bit in

its mouth, is bound to introduce user fees? User fees for optometric services, user fees for chiropractic services, and certain unnamed services that I guess we will find out as the regulations are changed to accommodate this new Bill.

When we take a look at the optometric services, when we take a look at the chiropractic services and how they are going to be impacted by this Act that is going to amend the medical insurance Act, we know that they are going to specifically impact upon chiropractors and optometrists. We knew that before the Bill was tabled. We knew that when we had one of the series of leaks in the budget, leaks of things that were to come. And now we are finding out that all of these options are going to be imposed upon the people of Saskatchewan without consultation — and I will repeat that — without consultation.

This is the government that said that we will be open, that we will consult. But not only consult, Mr. Speaker, they promised that they would listen to the advice that the people of Saskatchewan would be giving them. Well not only are they not acting on any advice the people are giving them, they are refusing to even give a means whereby people can express their opinions. Public consultation did not, did not play any significant part in the development of this Act, of Bill 71.

However there's one bright spot or one good thing about this Act because this Bill, Mr. Speaker, epitomizes, shows clearly, distinctly for all to see, what the NDP stand for, what are they about. Along with the role that we've seen today, as my colleague has just expressing his opinion of the dictatorship role that they're playing, it also reveals to the people of Saskatchewan the height of deception and the height of hypocrisy of the NDP Party.

Now those are pretty damning words for an individual to get up and characterize a party that has been part of the fabric of Saskatchewan for so many, many years. They pre-dated by the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation). And when you take a look at what the CCF stood for and you take a look at Bill 71, which epitomizes what the current NDP administration stands for, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the comparison is very shallow, very hollow at least because, Mr. Speaker, the NDP are supposed to be the saviours of medicare. They're supposed to be the saviours of medicare; that's a reputation that they have. I don't know if it was particularly earned, but we'll grant it. That's the reputation that they have.

And what are they doing? What are they doing? They are disguising user fees by calling them something else — user fees on the health care system. And again, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is doing to the Saskatchewan people exactly what the NDP said they would never do.

And therein lies the great irony. Therein lies a great deal of disappointment in the people of Saskatchewan, in the NDP Party. And I'm not saying that a great deal of disappointment only by supporters of the NDP, but all people of Saskatchewan are disappointed in the direction in which this is going.

The NDP said over the last five, six years, utilization fees,

user fees — call them what you will — this is abhorrent, you may not do that, you should not do that, you cannot do that, it is not right. Mr. Speaker, what do we see in Bill 71? We see user fees. We see the beginning of a two-tiered health system: for them that's got and for them that hasn't. Something that the party across the way always said they would never do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the NDP in the past were always very, very high on consultation. When they were in the election mode, they ran around promising to consult with everybody, and like I said before, not only consult but also to listen to what the people were telling them.

And now as we have witnessed again this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, it's a sad and a sorry day when we find the government doing exactly that which they always said they would never do. And therein again lies a great deal of disappointment as far as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned. They expected something different from you folks. They expected something more. And it would be laughable if it were not so devastating; the impact and the effect of your actions upon the people of Saskatchewan.

And I would ask you, I would ask you folks across the way, why are you so afraid to go to the people? Why are you so afraid to meet them face to face in town hall meetings, in public hearings, where you would be accountable at the local level, as a local MLA, in your seat with your people, the people that elected you, the people that put you here, the people that had trust and faith in you that you were going to do what you said you would do? And you're doing exactly the opposite.

Why is the Minister of Health . . . or why was the Minister of Health so reluctant to go out and to face health care professionals, the users of the system? Why were they not consulted before such dramatic and — yes, Mr. Speaker — Draconian measures were even contemplated, let alone put in effect? The professionals were not even consulted. They were not even consulted. And the only reason they have had any input whatsoever is when we, as the official opposition, brought it to the awareness of the people of Saskatchewan some of the dirty deeds that were afoot in the ministry of Health.

It's ironic, Mr. Speaker, that here we are discussing a Bill in this legislature, discussing user fees on the 30th year, on the 30th anniversary of medicare. The people of Saskatchewan sincerely and honestly believed and thought that the NDP were the only party that would protect, hold sacrosanct, medicare. And that party right now, Mr. Speaker, is destroying, is destroying the universality of that province . . . of this system in our province.

The wellness model, based on the wellness model. That seems to be the buzz word. And I know that you're aware, Mr. Speaker, in the class-room situations, teachers are great ones for buzz words. Well the political buzz words in the medical field these days seems to be the wellness model. And I am highly suspect — highly suspect — of the wellness model forming the parameters of what our health care system is going to be in the future.

I have no problem with the wellness model in itself.

There's good to be done in promoting healthy life-styles. We had that in the Everyone Wins program when we were government. And I dare say, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to remind you how the Minister of Health chided and ridiculed the amount of money that we were spending on the wellness program at that time as being an utter waste of money, that the money could be spent better elsewhere and else how. But, Mr. Speaker, the irony of it is, when we turn to a Bill like we're discussing today, is that the total premise, the basis for the direction and the future of health care in this province, is based on the wellness model. It's based on the wellness model.

And I submit to you that the wellness model is based on one premise: to save money. Again efficiencies of scale must be built into the health system. Efficiencies must be improved. That's a given. We have no problem with that.

(1615)

But if the entire premise is going to be we must save money and at the same time impact negatively on our Saskatchewan people — all people, particularly rural people — then it becomes questionable. But, Mr. Speaker, it becomes even more questionable that when that bit is taken into the mouth of these people and they go off in a direction like this, it is so often totally counter-productive.

And I'm going to do that here for the next few moments to show you folks that in your deficit-reduction mode, where the end justifies whatever means you use to attain it, you are not ultimately going to be saving money in the health care system. But you're going to be doing it at a great sacrifice to the people of Saskatchewan — and for nought, for nought.

The wellness model, the way you guys and gals are developing it, is not going to work in Saskatchewan. It's not going to work particularly for rural Saskatchewan. The only time that the wellness model will really work is if you are well. But if you're a sick person out in rural Saskatchewan, it does not bode well for you.

Thirtieth anniversary of medicare — this is the year. And this year is going to be remembered that the NDP has betrayed the medicare system. This Bill, this actual Bill here is the one that's probably making John Diefenbaker turning over in his grave right now; that's not what he had intended. And it's making Tommy spin in his grave, quite literally, because it's totally the antithesis of what this great province's medicare system was based upon.

Now the people of Saskatchewan are enraged — those who know — though many of the people in Saskatchewan are not totally aware of the contents of this Bill. They have not been impacted by the effects of that Bill, but those who know, those who have looked, those who have studied, are already angered by the betrayal that is inherent within this Bill. Health care groups are angry. They feel betrayed; they feel left out.

And I know what I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker. I have met with these groups. I have sat down around their boardroom tables and talked to the groups, which they tell me is much, much more than the Minister of Health

was willing to do. And that's why these health care professionals are angry, they are enraged, and they do not intend to take it lightly or sitting down.

This Bill unfairly singles out the optometrists and the chiropractors. Why is the Minister of Health singling out a small group of health care professionals in our province? Why is she doing that? These are smaller groups. These are groups that are finding it extremely difficult to fight back. And yet the Minister of Health has singled them out as target groups. But I believe that, the same as with the diabetics, the Minister of Health has underestimated, has underestimated the numbers of people that are going to be affected by this action.

Now if the Minister of Health was truly dedicated to creating a wellness model or a blueprint of our province, she would not impose a Bill like this on the public. She would not be singling out small groups in our province like the chiropractors, like the optometrists — medical professionals who are actually delivering low-cost, high-quality services for the people of Saskatchewan.

Low-cost preventative measures — and that's important, Mr. Speaker — low-cost preventative measures. It has the potential of fitting in well with the wellness model that she is trying to implement in this province. It has the potential of fitting in well. But not the way, not the route, and not the direction in which the Minister of Health is steering this wellness model.

Now prior to the leak, prior to the budget leak, chiropractors presented a proposal to the government — a proposal that clearly outlined the unjustness of singling out chiropractors for any undue attention. Because, Mr. Speaker, as you're well aware and people of this province are well aware, chiropractic treatment is effective. It is effective. It's a non-invasive — doesn't do anything to your body — it's a non-invasive, drug-free treatment. There are no additional health costs for chiropractic patients that are spiralled into the system — no additional costs. There are no additional costs for medication or hospitals or any other kind of specialist activities and services.

Chiropractic services are viewed as one of the most cost-effective methods for treating society's most costly medical complaint, and that's low back pain. I don't think there's any member in our family, in all of our families, that hasn't at one time or another been affected by it. And these treatments, cost-effective treatments, prevent higher medical costs at a later date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question that has to be asked is: how does imposing user fees on these services fit into the minister's wellness model? How would you include user fees in a system that has a potential to be cost-effective, deliver a good quality service, and now you turn around and you put a user fee on? Doesn't make sense. And yet that's exactly what Bill 71 proposes to do. Exactly. That basic fact relates directly to the principle of the Bill.

I'm going to just walk you through a brief example. Take Yorkton. Take Yorkton. What impact does this Bill have the potential for doing to the people and the citizens around Yorkton? It's a rural area, and this entire area has

one physiotherapist located in the hospital — one physiotherapist. I know from experience, physiotherapists in Saskatchewan are relatively rare. They are difficult to attract.

Well this physiotherapist in Yorkton spends each and every day treating in-patient clients. She has . . . this physiotherapist has no opportunity to treat the community at large. In many instances chiropractic services are used as an alternative to physiotherapists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the simple bottom line in what I'm saying about this example in Yorkton is, if this Bill, if Bill 71 is passed the way it is right now, the citizens of Yorkton are no longer going to have equal access to that type of a treatment.

The community, particularly the rural component of that community at large, is going to suffer. Clients no longer will have the option of going to and being covered by chiropractors. They are going to turn their attention to the physiotherapists. That's the one that they're going to go visit.

Physiotherapists whose services are billed by whom? They're billed directly to the government at high cost to the government — much higher cost to the provincial coffers and the provincial taxpayer.

So the situation that you have is that the people who use chiropractors will now let their condition, since they're going to have to be paying, they're going to let their conditions go untreated. And certainly, the potential is there for their health to suffer as well, and/or they will be forced to wait to see their physiotherapist. And/or, they will have to use and be prescribed drugs to live with their ailments, many times could have been prevented by going to the effective use of chiropractors.

So I ask you again, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Minister of Health: how does this fit into your wellness model? How is this, I ask again, cost effective? How are you going to save money?

Because after all, that's the only thing that is leading your wellness model — budget driven, deficit-reduction driven — on the backs of the Saskatchewan people, and the backs of the Saskatchewan people are hurting, and they need chiropractors. And yet you are putting in . . . developing a vicious spin into this entire system.

So how does reducing public access to chiropractic services fit into the wellness model? Can someone answer that for me . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll be asking the Minister of Health. I have been very patiently and slowly and carefully leading you folks across the way through an actual example of what is going to be happening here. And it doesn't make sense to me. I'm just wondering if it makes sense to you. It's going to be budget driven; we're going to reduce this deficit, we don't care how.

But not only are you hurting the health of the people of Saskatchewan, you're not saving any money. You'll probably wind up costing more money. And that's something that I can't understand.

And I will be asking the Minister of Health in estimates afterward if she can lead me through examples that will prove that there will be cost effectiveness as well as maintaining the integrity of the health system that we have now. The only link seems to be, the only link seems to be that if it hits or hurts rural Saskatchewan, then it fits into the wellness model.

That's a hard thing to say. But when you start taking a look at all the areas that have been impacting negatively on rural Saskatchewan — not only in health, but economic, agricultural, jobs, in rural Saskatchewan — the pattern is developing. And this Bill 71 has its own niche in that pattern and that mosaic that is being developed.

And the Minister of Health is playing her role and her part in that model. And I've been spending some time with the chiropractors. This Bill 71 also impacts another group that was not consulted, that did not know what was going on, that did not have a role to play in the development of this wellness model. The consultative process once more seems to have broken down.

I want to take a look at the optometric services and how the user-fees system pits rural Saskatchewan against urban Saskatchewan. And it's happening. That is happening.

I was on the open-line show a couple of weeks ago talking about these kinds of things. And a caller came in and said, so what? Close all those rural hospitals. We don't need those rural hospitals. Madam, where do you come from, I asked. Saskatoon. How far do you live from a base hospital? And I think that answers the question right there. That answers the question right there.

And that is why a system like this does nothing to unify and to salve the emotions and the feelings between rural and urban Saskatchewan. It actually pits one against the other.

In larger urban centres, once more something very similar to the example that I gave you with chiropractors and physiotherapists, the same analogy can be made between the optometrists and the ophthalmological care that is given. Ophthalmological services are fully covered by medicare, Mr. Speaker. They are fully covered by medicare.

(1630)

In most rural centres, however, only optometric care now exists. Ophthalmology is not there. Optometry is. Urban patients with decreasing vision will still be able to have full treatment, will still have that access to full treatment, whereas rural patients will have to either now pay for an examination or travel to the city to receive free ophthalmological care. So they are going to have that option. It pits once more rural against urban. The rural folks can still go see their optometrist, yes, but they're going to have to pay for it. But they have the choice, I guess, of going to the ophthalmologist in the city and getting free care, and then paying for the expense of going there.

How is it cost-effective, I ask the Minister of Health again,

to allow doctors to refer patients to a more expensive ophthalmologist for treatment, but not allow referrals to optometrists? How is that cost-effective? I have no answer to that yet. Why will the government allow referrals to that profession when many services are offered by optometrists — optometrists who are more accessible to all residents of Saskatchewan?

So, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is unfair to the health care professionals who provide these services, but it's also unfair to those who receive these services. This Bill is essentially creating two types of patients, not only for chiropractic services but for optometric services as well. And as I said before, essentially it's creating a two-tiered system. And the two classes that are being created are those on welfare, who are fully covered, and then everyone else. Talk about unfairness.

The Minister of Health is also forcing chiropractors to absorb costs for those on welfare. Chiropractors are receiving \$13.10 to treat a welfare client and \$17.30 to treat everyone else. Now that begs the question: why are patients on welfare worth less when they have the same aches and pains as those people who are not on welfare? What's the rationale, I want to ask the Minister of Health? This is a terrible principle, Mr. Speaker, to base a health care system on.

Where's the universality? Where's the quality of treatment? Where's the equal access? Where's the equality of access? These are questions that have to be asked. These are questions that are going to have to be answered. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, chiropractors presented alternatives to the government and the optometrists tried to give alternatives to the government.

When they learned from the official opposition what the NDP government was going to do, they came up with alternatives. They presented alternatives. But did the Minister of Health, not having consulted in the first place, listen to them? Did she hear them? Well she heard them, but she didn't listen to them. She rejected them outright. The Minister of Health essentially was saying, it's my way or the highway, be it pot-holes or be it gravel.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is attempting to pit professionals of this province against each other. And I want to get into that in quite some detail during the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker. During the Committee of the Whole I will be asking for answers on why the optometrists are allowed to overbill on the Minister of Health's advice and direction, I might add, while chiropractors have been instructed not to, because the legislation isn't in place yet. This unequal treatment, this unequal treatment is creating two classes of professionals, Mr. Speaker, perhaps to coexist with the two classes of patients being created by this same piece of legislation. And that's ironic. That's ironic. Divide and conquer, as my colleague was saying before.

But, Mr. Speaker, it will not work. I don't believe that the Minister of Health is going to succeed. The professionals are not going to fall for it. The people of Saskatchewan are not going to accept it and they're not going to fall for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of other grave

concerns. For example, the ramifications of this Bill on the public because insurance agencies will not cover people for the difference of what the government pays. This is the total cost; here's what the government pays. Who pays the difference? And right now insurance agencies are not looking upon that at all favourably, picking up that difference. I know Blue Cross isn't going to touch it.

Mr. Speaker, further I have grave concerns as to why the Minister of Health secretly put an August 10 deadline on this Bill. She said it will pass by August 10. I don't think it's up to the minister to decide when legislation passes. That's what the legislature is for. At least that's what the legislature has been for up until today.

But of course, what direction this government is going to take from here on in, to ramrod its legislation through unilaterally, remains to be seen. But, Mr. Speaker, the contents of this Bill, the contents of Bill 71, do not promote wellness. They do not promote wellness because what they do promote is personal financial restrictions — these restrictions which will prevent individuals from getting preventative treatment. It's going to do exactly and precisely the opposite of what the minister intends, both in terms of cost saving and in terms of effective treatment.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the health care professionals should have been consulted. They should have been consulted before the cat was out of the bag, and then whoops, okay, now we'll consult. They should have been allowed, the health care professionals should have been allowed, to assist the government in developing a strategy which better fits a wellness model.

Unilaterally, and I say to members opposite again, unilaterally imposing user fees without looking at its alternatives is wrong. It's wrong. Unilaterally imposing fees affecting the entire population without consultation or public hearings is wrong. It is wrong.

The wellness model should ensure that health care services are available and accessible to all residents of Saskatchewan — all residents, urban, rural — with no distinction. That's what health care is based on. That's what it used to be based on.

And if this Minister of Health is allowed to have her way, that will be a thing of the past because we will have the uniqueness of having a two-tiered system, a two-tiered system of professionals and a two-tiered system of those requiring services.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, should be taken to the people. It should have access to public hearings — not just a bunch of happy bureaucrats running around doing the bidding of the minister, but true public hearings.

And I know the member from Shaunavon wishes — not the former member, the member of Shaunavon now — wishes that the Minister of Health had consulted before embarking on unilateral decisions that are going to have tremendous impacts on towns like Eastend, for example, where 500 people came out the other night to protest vocally, loudly, vehemently, against the kind of reaction

that she was creating by not consulting but coming in there after the deed has been done, forcing unilaterally the will of the NDP misguided new health policies upon the people of Saskatchewan as an after effect. And then when the cat is out of the bag, going forward and saying, well here, this is what we planned to do; please give it our blessing . . . or your blessing. It won't work that way. It won't work that way, Mr. Speaker.

There are so many unanswered questions, there are so many problems, there are so many people that want their concerns expressed in this House, that when the Bill comes to committee, Mr. Speaker, we will be addressing many, many of those issues.

And at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to adjourn this.

The division bells rang from 4:39 p.m. until 4:49 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 7

Neudorf	Britton
Swenson	Goohsen
Boyd	D'Autremont
Martens	

Nays — 31

Van Mulligen	Calvert
Wiens	Murray
Tchorzewski	Hamilton
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Teichrob	Trew
Shillington	Serby
Koskie	Roy
Anguish	Scott
Goulet	Crofford
Atkinson	Stanger
Kowalsky	Harper
Carson	Kluz
Penner	Carlson
Cunningham	Renaud
Upshall	Jess
Hagel	

The division bells rang from 4:54 p.m. until 5:24 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 30

Van Mulligen	Hagel
Wiens	Calvert
Simard	Murray
Tchorzewski	Hamilton
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Teichrob	Trew
Shillington	Serby
Anguish	Roy
Goulet	Scott
Kowalsky	Crofford
Carson	Stanger
MacKinnon	Harper
Penner	Kluz

Cunningham
Upshall

Renaud
Jess

Nays — 1

Martens

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

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.