

April 14, 1993

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before the reading of petitions I would like to move that this House now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 2:02 p.m. until 2:12 p.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 9

Swenson	Toth
Muirhead	Britton
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen
Martens	

Nays — 47

Romanow	Murray
Van Mulligen	Hamilton
Thompson	Johnson
Simard	Trew
Tchorzewski	Serby
Teichrob	Whitmore
Shillington	Sonntag
Anguish	Flavel
Goulet	Roy
Atkinson	Cline
Kowalsky	Scott
Carson	McPherson
Mitchell	Kujawa
MacKinnon	Crofford
Cunningham	Stanger
Upshall	Knezacek
Hagel	Harper
Bradley	Keeping
Koenker	Kluz
Lorje	Carlson
Lyons	Langford
Pringle	Jess
Lautermilch	Haverstock
Calvert	

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a long series of people who have signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, and to read the petition so that the people can understand what it's about. I would like to read the petition which says thus:

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly of
Saskatchewan . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think the member knows that he can only read the prayer of the petition — only the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Neudorf: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — I've made my ruling and the member can only read the prayer of the petition.

If the member doesn't proceed I will call on another member. The member from Rosthern, read the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The petition is coming from Eaton, simply states the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of the health districts so that communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine impact on the process without intimidation or threat of arbitrary action by the government.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislature, this petition has lots of dates on it and lots of names, Mr. Speaker, and they come from communities surrounding Eaton and from within Eaton itself. And as they have requested me to do, I'm very proud now to table this petition in this legislature on their behalf so that the government may be aware of what their ideas and thoughts and concerns are.

And, Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of this House.

The division bells rang from 2:18 p.m. until 2:28 p.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 9

Swenson	Toth
Muirhead	Britton
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen
Martens	

Nays — 48

Romanow	Calvert
Van Mulligen	Murray
Thompson	Hamilton
Simard	Johnson
Tchorzewski	Trew
Lingenfelter	Serby
Teichrob	Whitmore
Shillington	Sonntag
Anguish	Flavel
Goulet	Roy
Atkinson	Cline
Kowalsky	Scott
Carson	McPherson
Mitchell	Kujawa
MacKinnon	Crofford
Cunningham	Stanger
Upshall	Knezacek
Hagel	Harper
Bradley	Keeping

Koenker
Lorje
Lyons
Pringle
Lautermilch

Kluz
Carlson
Langford
Jess
Haverstock

Shillington
Anguish
Goulet
Atkinson
Kowalsky
Carson
Mitchell
MacKinnon
Cunningham
Upshall
Hagel
Bradley
Koenker
Lorje
Lyons

Serby
Whitmore
Sonntag
Cline
McPherson
Crofford
Stanger
Knezacek
Harper
Keeping
Kluz
Langford
Jess
Haverstock

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition I would like to lay on the Table today. This petition, Mr. Speaker, comes from my area and it's, as you notice, right full of names all through that area.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of the Health Districts Act so that communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine input on the process without intimidation or threat of arbitrary action by the government.

That the entire health care system is being reconstructed and the people in the communities affected have not had time or opportunity to properly have input into this process,

And that with the legislation involving far less dislocation and potential for social ill, your Assembly has seen fit to defer consideration of the legislation until a long process of consultation by the Assembly itself,

And that there is little more disruptive and threatening to a community than the threat of having basic health care services removed or placed under the control of non-local authorities;

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that this House adjourn.

The division bells rang from 2:33 p.m. until 2:43 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen

Nays — 43

Romanow	Pringle
Van Mulligen	Lautermilch
Thompson	Calvert
Simard	Murray
Tchorzewski	Hamilton
Lingenfelter	Johnson
Teichrob	Trew

Mr. Devine: — Thank you. I have a petition related to health care, Mr. Speaker.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of the Health Districts Act so that communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine impact on the process without intimidation or threat of arbitrary action by the government.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

These people are from Eaton, Mantario, Eston, Laporte, and several western rural communities, Mr. Speaker, and I am happy to table it.

And I now move the House do now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 2:47 p.m. until 2:57 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen

Nays — 43

Romanow	Lautermilch
Van Mulligen	Murray
Thompson	Hamilton
Simard	Johnson
Tchorzewski	Trew
Lingenfelter	Serby
Teichrob	Whitmore
Shillington	Sonntag
Anguish	Roy
Goulet	Cline
Atkinson	McPherson
Kowalsky	Kujawa
Carson	Crofford
Mitchell	Stanger
Cunningham	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper

Hagel	Keeping
Bradley	Kluz
Koenker	Langford
Lorje	Jess
Lyons	Haverstock
Pringle	

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muirhead: — I, too, Mr. Speaker, am proud to present this petition to the legislature this afternoon on behalf of the people from Eaton and surrounding area pertaining to their hospital. And I'll . . . as you wish, Mr. Speaker, I'll just read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone the consideration of The Health Districts Act so that the communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine impact on the process without intimidation or threat of arbitrary action by the government.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And I now move this House adjourn.

The division bells rang from 3:01 p.m. until 3:11 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsent

Nays — 43

Romanow	Lautermilch
Van Mulligen	Murray
Thompson	Hamilton
Wiens	Johnson
Simard	Trew
Tchorzewski	Serby
Lingenfelter	Whitmore
Teichrob	Sonntag
Shillington	Flavel
Anguish	Cline
Goulet	McPherson
Atkinson	Kujawa
Kowalsky	Crofford
Carson	Stanger
MacKinnon	Knezacek
Cunningham	Harper
Upshall	Keeping
Hagel	Kluz
Bradley	Langford
Lorje	Jess
Lyons	Haverstock
Pringle	

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy today to present a petition on behalf of the people from the west side of the province. The prayer I will read for you.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to postpone consideration of The Health Districts Act so that communities may continue their efforts to organize their people and have a genuine impact on the process without limitation or threat of arbitrary action by the government.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The Speaker: — I want to inform the members that the time for petitions has elapsed and I will not accept the motion of adjournment.

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

The Speaker: — What's the member's point of order?

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I understand from our own regulations that a point of order . . . or a motion to adjourn is always in order.

The Speaker: — On this particular item on petitions the motion of adjournment is not in order because the particular item has elapsed at this particular time. According to a ruling made by the Speaker in May 17, 1991, the total time for petitions shall be one hour.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The Speaker: — That motion is out of order because there has been no intervening proceeding.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that on Friday next I will ask the government the following question:

Regarding the government's rural health care policy, provide: (1) the actual amounts of money allocated specifically to hospitals: (a) outside of Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, and Prince Albert; (b) within the borders of Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, and Prince Albert; and (2) the average cost per patient to the provincial government of patients in hospitals: (a) outside the four major cities; and (b) within the four major cities; and (3) the number of special care beds in the province expressed as a proportion of the total number of seniors in the province

and comparative data for other provinces used by the Minister of Health to justify her policy; (4) the average distance to the nearest hospital over primary, all-weather highways for residents not living in a community with a hospital; and (5) the number of persons who died *en route* to hospital in each of the last five years; and lastly, (6) the number of hospitals in the province expressed as a proportion of the number of incorporated municipalities in the province with comparative data for other provinces.

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

Regarding health care consultations: (1) did any representative of the Minister of Health attend the public meeting in the community of Eatonia, Thursday, April 1, 1993; (2) if not, why not; (3) if so, provide (a) the name and the title of the representative; (b) a summary of the representations heard by the representative; (c) a copy of any report provided to the minister by the representative; and (d) the minister's response to the representations of the community.

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

Regarding the amount of money being spent on reviewing and studying the health care in Saskatchewan: (a) what was the total cost of the study involving the VON (Victorian Order of Nurses); (b) how many studies have been done regarding the effectiveness of treating alcoholics through facilities like the Whitespruce youth treatment centre; how much money has been spent on these reviews or studies; have these studies shown that Whitespruce and other treatment facilities are not viable or effective; (c) how many studies have been done under the NDP (New Democratic Party) wellness plan for health care in Saskatchewan; what is the total cost for these studies?

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Friday next ask the government the following questions:

Regarding the health care consultations: (1) did any representative of the Minister of Health attend the public meeting in the community of Brock on Monday, April 5, 1993; (2) if not, why not; (3) if so, provide (a) the name and the title of the representative (b) a summary of the representations heard by the representative (c) a copy of any report provided to the minister by the representative, and (d) the minister's response to the representation of the community.

I so submit.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Friday next ask the government the following question:

Regarding the prescription drug plan: (a) what is the estimated number of people eliminated from coverage under the prescription drug plan; (b) what was the cost of insulin to diabetics in 1991; what is the total cost to diabetics presently for insulin after coverage has been eliminated; (c) what was the cost of all types of oxygen in 1991; what is the total cost of all types of oxygen presently after the coverage has been eliminated; (d) what is the annual estimated savings for the Government of Saskatchewan through changes to the prescription drug plan; (e) how many people utilized the prescription drug plan previous to changes in the March 1993 budget; (f) how many people are eligible for prescription drug coverage after revamping the prescription drug plan?

I so submit, Mr. Speaker.

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

Regarding health care consultations: (1) did any representative of the Minister of Health attend the public meeting in the community of Prince Albert, Saturday, March 27, 1993; (2) if not, why not; (3) if so, to provide: (a) the name and title of the representative; (b) a summary of the representations heard by the representative; (c) a copy of any report provided to the minister by the representative; and (d) the minister's response to the presentations of the community.

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

Regarding the effect of NDP health care decisions on Saskatchewan seniors: (a) how many seniors benefited from the prescription drug plan in 1991; (b) how many senior citizens have been eliminated from coverage under the new version of the prescription drug plan; (c) how many Saskatchewan seniors have been forced to apply for social assistance since October 31, 1991; (d) how many seniors were eliminated from insulin or oxygen coverage under the prescription drug plan?

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

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The Speaker: — The notices of motions, oral notices, is not an intermediate proceeding and therefore that

motion is out of order.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Speaker: — What's your point of order?

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the regulations and rules of this Assembly indicate that intervening business is any time that *Votes and Proceedings* record a decision made by the Speaker. And I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that you made a ruling that the last movement for adjournment was out of order and therefore there is that intervening amount of business which makes my motion to adjourn legitimate.

The Speaker: — The member does make a good point that on a point of order, which is recorded in the *Journals*, that that is in order and therefore his point of order is well taken, and I will accept his motion for adjournment of the House.

The division bells rang from 3:26 p.m. until 3:36 p.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen

Nays — 38

Van Mulligen	Murray
Thompson	Johnson
Wiens	Trew
Lingenfelter	Serby
Shillington	Whitmore
Anguish	Sonntag
Goulet	Roy
Kowalsky	Cline
Carson	Scott
Mitchell	Kujawa
Cunningham	Crofford
Upshall	Stanger
Hagel	Knezacek
Bradley	Harper
Koenker	Keeping
Lorje	Kluz
Lyons	Langford
Pringle	Jess
Lautermilch	Haverstock

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Friday next ask the government the following question regarding health care consultations:

Did any representative of the Minister of Health attend the public meeting in the community of Weyburn, Tuesday, April 6, 1993? If not, why not? If so, provide (a) the name and title of the representative; (b) a summary of the representations heard by the representative; (c)

a copy of any report provided to the minister by the representative; and (d) the minister's response to the representations of the community.

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

Mr. Neudorf: — Questions, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — If the member is presenting some more oral notices, I'm not going to accept any more. And I want to draw members' attention to a decision made by Speaker Swan in March 21, 1986, and I quote:

To go on at great length reading oral notices into the record, when this is not necessary to effectively give notice, appears to me to be an abuse of a courtesy traditionally extended to members. A practice that is permitted as a courtesy only should not be permitted to obstruct the regular business of the House.

I therefore direct the member for Canora to submit any notices . . . he wishes to give by laying them on the Table as provided . . . (by) rule 38. This in no way interferes with the member's rights to place items on the order paper. It is not my intention to prohibit the reading of oral notices in the future, but only to remind members that oral notices are permitted as a courtesy and will not be permitted to be used as a means of obstructing the House.

Since every member in the opposition have had an opportunity to present oral notices, I will not accept any further notices — oral notices — from members.

Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Neudorf: — I move that this House now adjourn.

The Speaker: — I believe that that motion is out of order. There has been no intermediate proceeding in the House.

All right. I stand corrected. Because the Speaker has made a ruling and that is recorded in the *Journals*, I will accept the member's motion for adjournment.

The division bells rang from 3:41 p.m. until 3:51 p.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen

Nays — 32

Van Mulligen	Trew
Thompson	Serby
Lingenfelter	Whitmore
Shillington	Sonntag

Anguish	Cline
Kowalsky	Scott
Carson	Kujawa
Cunningham	Crofford
Upshall	Stanger
Hagel	Knezacek
Koenker	Harper
Lorje	Keeping
Pringle	Kluz
Lautermilch	Langford
Murray	Jess
Johnson	Haverstock

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Speaker: — What's the member's point of order?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, my point of order is very brief and I would suggest very important to the democratic functioning of this Assembly. The context of the Assembly must be taken into account in any rulings that are made. The context of this Assembly is that this time is that the government has not only invoked Draconian time allocation, but has also served notice that it will impose closure on closure itself. That is the context.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are many completely legitimate questions that need to be answered before the health care Bill can be responsibly allowed to proceed. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the questions members of the opposition . . . in the current context of the Assembly finds itself in due to the actions of the government, that those questions are not only legitimately appropriate but that they are essential to the proper functioning of this House.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that members must not be prevented from giving full notice of their questions. And I ask you to use the same discretion in this environment as you did when you ended the opposition's main tool of holding the government accountable — that is, sir, when you ended prolonging bell-ringing.

The Speaker: — I have some difficulty understanding the member's point of order. Can the member point out to me what rule of the Assembly has been breached? Order. I don't need the member's advice. Would the member from Souris-Cannington tell me what rule of the Assembly has been breached?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, the ruling I am referring to is when you disallowed the continued reading of notices of questions. We feel that at the appropriate time it would be . . . to continue doing that, sir.

The Speaker: — I think the member fully understands. Beauchesne, I think, is very clear on it — understanding rule order 10: Speaker's rulings once given must be accepted without appeal or debate. There is no appeal on the Speaker's ruling, therefore your point of order is out of order.

Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 3:56 p.m. until 4:06 p.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen

Nays —29

Van Mulligen	Johnson
Thompson	Serby
Lingenfelter	Whitmore
Shillington	Sonntag
Anguish	Roy
Goulet	Cline
Kowalsky	McPherson
Carson	Crofford
Cunningham	Harper
Upshall	Keeping
Bradley	Kluz
Lorje	Langford
Pringle	Jess
Lautermilch	Haverstock
Murray	

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order which I think will be very germane to the proceedings this afternoon . . . And the first point I make is in agreement to a previous ruling where the Speaker had clearly demonstrated that when the proceedings in the Assembly are not consistent with his view of the proper and democratic functioning of the Assembly, he has complete discretion to intervene. And we have no problem with that, Mr. Speaker.

As authority to what I'm saying, I refer you to the events of last session when, contrary to the existing rules of this Assembly, the Speaker intervened in a division and ordered a vote to be taken. There was no provision in the rules for Mr. Speaker to intervene, but in his judgement the bell-ringing had gone on long enough.

By definite logical consequence, the Speaker must have the discretion and authority to find that debate has not gone on long enough, in this case again, regardless of what the rules say. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the Speaker has the right and — even as was stated by the Speaker — the duty to intervene when he feels that a division has gone on too long, then he also has a duty to intervene when it is apparent that the debate has not gone on long enough.

It is an historical principle that the Speaker is bound not to only assure the rights of the majority, but clearly he has an absolute duty to protect the rights of the

minority, Mr. Speaker. There's ample precedent day in and day out of the Speaker exercising discretion in this Assembly, and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, with historic impact.

Given that situation, I ask the Speaker to suspend the notice of motion under rule 34 at least until such a time as he has thoroughly reviewed his options and reported back to the Assembly.

Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, in just a brief comment on the point of order by the member from Rosthern, I want to indicate that we have now seen the opposition members, the Conservative members, obstruct the House by moving adjournment motions after points of order a number of times.

I would refer you, Mr. Speaker, and members, to the *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Beauchesne's, 6th Edition, page 112:

384. (2) A Member may not use a point of order to secure the floor in order to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much ask you to look at this, seeing as the members of the opposition are using points of order to adjourn the House in order to obstruct the working of the government. I think that the public watching the proceedings here will know full well that the members of the opposition are doing nothing more than obstructing the working of the government, and I'd ask you to rule on that as well.

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

Mr. Toth: — Speaking to the point of order raised by . . .

The Speaker: — We have two points of order here and I don't know which one you want to speak to. If you let me clarify . . . I don't know which point of order you wish to speak to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no. Well it's very difficult to know whether you have two points of order until you hear the member speak. What I'm saying is that I think that . . . if you let the Speaker clarify it, I'll tell you very shortly.

I want to speak first of all to the point of order raised by the member from Rosthern. The member from Rosthern is right that the Speaker has used discretion in the past where the rules of the Assembly simply did not apply or simply did not exist and the Speaker has used his discretion. In this particular instance the rules are very clear. Rule 34 is a closure motion. It's very clear on how it shall function and it has been properly introduced, and so the Speaker really has no authority to say no to rule 34. The rule is very clear.

I now want to address the point of order raised by the Government House Leader, and that is that the member from Rosthern did not get on a point of order

to move adjournment of the House. He has not moved adjournment of the House and therefore the point of order by the Government House Leader is not well taken.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Speaker: — What's your point of order.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, my comment wasn't on the member from Rosthern . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. That is not a point of order. That is not a point of order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Point of order.

The Speaker: — If the member's on the same topic, I will not accept his point of order. I have made my ruling.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Point of order.

The Speaker: — What's the member's point of order?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — The point of order is in the Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, 6th Edition, on page 112: The use of motions to adjourn the House . . . Pardon me . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. I have already ruled on that.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that this House adjourn.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. I want to draw the attention to the members on page 384, Beauchesne:

A member may not use a point of order to secure the floor in order to move the adjournment of the House.

The member from Rosthern has just got up, asked on a point of order to move the adjournment of the House. And that . . . Order, order.

I think the records will clearly indicate that when the Government House Leader was up on his feet, the member from Rosthern got up on his feet and asked on a point of order. I recognized the member from Rosthern on a point of order and he said: Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the House.

Beauchesne is very clear on that, that the member cannot get up on a point of order to move adjournment of the House and therefore the member is out of order.

Mr. Neudorf: — I move this House now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 4:21 p.m. until 4:31 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen

Nays — 33

Van Mulligen	Trew
Thompson	Serby
Wiens	Whitmore
Tchorzewski	Sonntag
Lingenfelter	Flavel
Shillington	Roy
Anguish	Cline
Goulet	Scott
Carson	McPherson
Cunningham	Kujawa
Upshall	Crofford
Hagel	Harper
Lorje	Keeping
Lyons	Kluz
Pringle	Langford
Murray	Jess
Johnson	

The Speaker: — What's the member's point of order?

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Speaker, my point of order . . . and I refer you to chapter 14 of Beauchesne's and to the practice of this House and to constitutional precedent in the context of the Canadian parliament and that point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 3 is irregular and must be ruled out of order. The Bill is irregular, Mr. Speaker, because it relies on financial revenues that are not votable by this Assembly and therefore are beyond the jurisdiction of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it is well-established constitutional practice that the Assembly may not consider measures over which it has no legal authority nor allocates monies which it does not have the power to raise. Mr. Speaker, Bill 3 purports to allocate monies belonging to private citizens and charitable organizations without any legal or constitutional basis for those allocation decisions, specifically monies raised, Mr. Speaker, in trust for such things as the construction of local nursing homes and hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis that the Bill is irregular and cannot be considered by this Assembly, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that it be ruled out of order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I want to draw members' attention to Beauchesne:

A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

And the member's right place to raise that point of order would have been when the Bill was introduced

in the House — at that time and not days or weeks later.

I will however, because it is a very involved point of order, take the member's point of order under advisement.

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

Mr. Toth: — I move this House adjourn.

The division bells rang from 4:36 p.m. until 4:46 p.m.

The Speaker: — The question before the . . . Before I put the question I do want to draw members' attention to rule 18:

(2) When the Speaker is putting a question, no Member shall enter, walk out of or across the Assembly, or make any noise or disturbance.

I do want to draw members' attention that it is their responsibility to try and abide by the rules that they have set.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Toth
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Goohsen

Nays — 32

Van Mulligen	Johnson
Thompson	Trew
Tchorzewski	Serby
Lingenfelter	Whitmore
Teichrob	Sonntag
Shillington	Flavel
Anguish	Roy
Goulet	Cline
Cunningham	McPherson
Upshall	Kujawa
Hagel	Crofford
Bradley	Harper
Lorje	Keeping
Lyons	Kluz
Pringle	Langford
Murray	Jess

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure at this time to be able to introduce two people that are very near and dear to me and that is in our gallery opposite us, is my son Dean and his wife Brenda who have come down for the day and part of tomorrow, I suppose. He comes here every session because he likes to see what's going on and I think he's had a memorable afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to please help me welcome Dean and Brenda.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hospital Closures

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to direct my question to the minister responsible for the closure of 52 rural hospitals in Saskatchewan, the Minister . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Before the member asks a question, I want to make it very clear that I've noticed that this is becoming a habit in this House of not referring to the minister by the proper portfolio. And it's also very inflammatory to question period to preface those remarks by a description of the minister. And I ask all members to please refer to the proper portfolio of the minister and direct your question to that minister.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Health. The minister is responsible for the closure of 52 hospitals in rural Saskatchewan.

Madam Minister, throughout this debate you have repeatedly stated that these decisions about bed reductions and hospital closures will be up to the new district boards. But every time we've asked you for the list of hospitals targeted for closure, you said there was no such list. You said, and I quote: we will establish district boards and the final decision will be made by them. And that was only two weeks ago.

Madam Minister, now it turns out you have targeted 52 rural hospitals for closure on October 1. Madam Minister, I ask you: how do you justify your actions in light of your earlier statements? How do you justify misleading this House and the people of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite knows full well that there has been no misleading of the House by the members on the government side. The afternoon's performance by the official opposition, quite frankly, is nothing short of a disgrace of this legislature, in a blatant attempt to stall the passes of passage of legislation which would have in fact empowered the community groups to organize themselves and to realize the objectives that the Minister of Health and the government have talked about.

This shows the absolute inconsistency of their point of view — in the one hand refusing to allow the debate, on the other hand getting up and being critical of us, supposedly, in this point of view.

Mr. Speaker, the member full well knows the question is misplaced and he knows that the government's intentions here have been always to consult and to work with the communities. In this context we

continue to pursue that objective.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I thank you. And I thank the Premier for having the courage to get up in this most difficult and trying of times. And I'm sure we appreciate that, Mr. Premier.

I'm just aghast and amazed that you have the audacity, sir, to get up and accuse us of one day where we are representing the wishes of rural Saskatchewan to slow you folks down — you being the minister and the person responsible for 17-day closure of this House.

Now your House Leader is invoking closure. He's threatening closure on closure on debate. And the people of Saskatchewan, sir, are telling us, they are telling us, slow them down. That's what we are being told, Mr. Premier. And what we are doing today, what we have done here today is . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Does the member have a question? I want the member to put his question.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is an attempt on our part to convey the message of rural Saskatchewan in particular to you as Premier. Mr. Premier, will you stand up and assure and reassure the people of Saskatchewan, particularly rural Saskatchewan, that yes you have taken note and yes you will slow down and yes you will come to the meetings and address the concerns of these people? Will you do that, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the question by the hon. member opposite is the same old repetitive question that the official opposition has attempted to ask in the futile attempt — and I want to stress this — the futile attempt and the futile goal of trying to derail much-needed health care reform.

When he says, slow it down, make no mistake about it, people of Saskatchewan, what he's really saying is, stop it dead in its tracks — kill. And the former premier confirms that right now from his seat and desk.

And I want to tell you that if you don't record the health care system, then what'll happen is reform will take place. The only way that reform will take place though is the way that reform is taking place in Alberta where they're saying that there should be privatization of health care.

That may be the Conservative and the Liberal approach to reform to health care, but it is not ours. Ours is a publicly funded system of support of accessibility to health care and we maintain to preserve it and aim to preserve it. And we're not going to give in to your supplications and petitions to kill medicare and hospitalization as you've done historically in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Premier, what are you telling the people of Saskatchewan? A futile attempt. Are you telling them now, all of those people in Saskatchewan who are writing in and phoning in to us, are you telling them that their efforts are futile? Are you telling them that their attempt to save rural Saskatchewan, to save their way of life, is futile?

What you have just confirmed, Mr. Premier, is that you are not willing to listen. You are not willing to give them that choice.

Your Minister of Health has gone out on repeated occasions and said they will be making the decision. Well, Mr. Premier, the axe came down today — 52 communities axed, cut. And you talk about preserving health care.

Mr. Premier, will you do what the people of this province are asking — give them a true input into the decision-making process. That's what they are asking. They want you to be fair. Give them a fair hearing. Go out to Macklin; go out to all the . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. I think the member has asked his question. Let the Premier answer it.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, what I've said I will say again. The official government's attempts to kill this Bill . . . the official opposition's attempts to kill this Bill, to kill this Bill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. The official opposition's — not attempt, their stated goal, to kill this Bill, is futile. It's not going to succeed. You don't want to delay this Bill; you want to kill this Bill.

You want the system to go unreformed. And when the system goes unreformed, what happens is what your colleagues in Alberta are doing, namely promoting the privatization of medicine, and that means the destruction of health care.

And I'm telling you, that's not what the people of Saskatchewan want, that's not what this government wants, and the issue is simply this: you're either going to be onside in reforming and rebuilding and saving the hospital system and saving rural Saskatchewan or you're going to be part of that same old gang that you were with in 1962 when you fought medicare, the KOD (Keep Our Doctors committee).

I'm sorry, we're not with you; we're out here to save health care and we're going to see this Bill passed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. As someone much wiser than me said, is, methinks he protesteth too much. I really think so. He talks about us killing the Bill, Mr. Speaker, while the real executioner of rural health care is standing and sitting right in that chair.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — That, Mr. Member and Mr. Premier, that is going to be your legacy. That's going to be the legacy that you're going to leave Saskatchewan. That is why they are calling you all over the province right now, the one-term Premier. You're killing the province, you're killing medicare, you're killing the people in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Premier.

Now I want to give you a short message. This is the message I want to leave with you today, Mr. Premier. Last night there were meetings in Frontier, there were meetings in Kindersley, and there were meetings in Herbert. And this is the message that we have received back as the official opposition. They are saying they haven't received enough information. They are saying that the time frame is too short. They are saying that the bed targets are inadequate. They are saying there's no local control.

Mr. Premier, it's not the opposition . . .

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

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Premier, the question I have is not mine but the people of rural Saskatchewan in particular. They have asked me to ask you, considering all these items that I have brought forward, will you have the decency to say August 17 is no magic number; we will give you a sufficient time to assess what is happening to rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Premier. You're trying to cut him short because you know it's mushrooming . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Let the Premier answer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think there were two aspects, or two questions, if one really thought and looked hard at it. One was, the question of more information. Note how contradictory these people are, Mr. Speaker. The first question was the very fact that our Health department people were out in rural Saskatchewan providing more information, which he described in these overly dramatic terms about execution. That he was very critical of . . .

The Speaker: — Will the member please come to order. It now being 5 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.