

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 28, 1993**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, before presenting petitions I move this House now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 10:02 a.m. until 10:12 a.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 9**

|          |             |
|----------|-------------|
| Swenson  | Britton     |
| Muirhead | D'Autremont |
| Martens  | Goohsen     |
| Boyd     | Haverstock  |
| Toth     |             |

**Nays — 30**

|              |             |
|--------------|-------------|
| Romanow      | Murray      |
| Van Mulligen | Hamilton    |
| Thompson     | Trew        |
| Simard       | Serby       |
| Teichrob     | Flavel      |
| Shillington  | Scott       |
| Solomon      | Wormsbecker |
| Goulet       | Kujawa      |
| Kowalsky     | Crofford    |
| Carson       | Knezacek    |
| Hagel        | Harper      |
| Koenker      | Carlson     |
| Lyons        | Renaud      |
| Pringle      | Langford    |
| Lautermilch  | Jess        |

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay a petition on the Table. I would like to read the petition to you, sir.

To the Hon. Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in legislature assembled.

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth that diabetics have been recently singled out by the government drug plan as being unique by virtue . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I just want to ask the member. Is the member . . . I assume the member's only reading the prayer.

**Mr. Britton:** — That's right.

**The Speaker:** — The member may proceed.

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Speaker, what I'll do, if it's all right, I'll just go down to the bottom paragraph. I don't know what your problem is up there but apparently . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I think that comment is totally out of order and I ask the member to retract that statement.

**Mr. Britton:** — I really do. I'm sorry, it was just . . . I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I was under the understanding I could read the prayer.

**The Speaker:** — The member may proceed with the prayer.

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

Therefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to single out diabetics in the drug plan by asking them to pay the cost of the medication; and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal which will have the effect of discriminating against diabetics compared to those others who use the drug plan to sustain life that is mandatory.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move this House adjourn.

The division bells rang from 10:16 a.m. until 10:26 a.m.

**The Speaker:** — Order.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 10**

|          |             |
|----------|-------------|
| Swenson  | Toth        |
| Muirhead | Britton     |
| Neudorf  | D'Autremont |
| Martens  | Goohsen     |
| Boyd     | Haverstock  |

**Nays — 20**

|              |             |
|--------------|-------------|
| Romanow      | Serby       |
| Van Mulligen | Flavel      |
| Thompson     | Scott       |
| Shillington  | Wormsbecker |
| Kowalsky     | Kujawa      |
| Penner       | Crofford    |
| Hagel        | Knezacek    |
| Murray       | Renaud      |
| Hamilton     | Langford    |
| Trew         | Jess        |

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I seek leave on behalf of certain members to introduce guests at this time.

Leave granted.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr.

Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly Mr. Hermanus Kasper. I'm going to ask him to stand if he would in your balcony, Mr. Speaker. He is the deputy permanent secretary in the Ministry of Finance in Namibia.

I had the opportunity to visit with Mr. Kasper a few minutes this morning and had some interesting exchanges about what's happening in his country. You may recall the Premier introducing two of Mr. Kasper's colleagues last Tuesday. The three officials are participating in a mentoring program being sponsored by the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, the Canadian International Development Agency, and the South African Trust Education Fund.

We're most pleased to be part of this opportunity to enable Mr. Kasper to study the systems of budgeting, accounting, and finance in our province. I hope you'll find your stay with us enjoyable as well as informative.

I would ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to join me in welcoming Mr. Kasper.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the Assembly 29 students from McLurg High School in Wilkie. It's a real pleasure for me because we don't get a lot of school visitors down here; it's quite a little ways.

And I would like to introduce you to the teachers, Jim Wickett, Eloise Johnson, and the chaperon is Florence Ward and their bus driver is Jim Smart. I would like to tell the students that I will have to leave and my colleague, Mr. Boyd from Kindersley, will be meeting with you later, and I hope you give him a hard time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask everyone here to give these students a warm welcome.

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

**Mr. Renaud:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you, and through you to the Assembly, I would like to introduce in your gallery 26 young adults from Porcupine Plain, Saskatchewan. Their teacher, James Bergerman and Barry Leier and their companion and driver Helen Kwasney.

Porcupine Plain, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is a beautiful community of about 1,000 people in north-east Saskatchewan, right near Greenwater Provincial Park; it's known as the home of the world's largest porcupine, Quilly Willy, and it's the reigning home of the schoolboys' provincial champions. And so I would like everyone to join with me in wishing them a splendid day in Regina and a safe trip home.

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

**Ms. Murray:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker,

I'm very pleased to introduce on behalf of my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Westmount, 50 grade 5 students who are seated in the west gallery. They are accompanied by their . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh. They are accompanied by their teachers, Aline Korol and Clément Bertoncini, their teacher assistant, Diane Duret and their chaperon, Donna Kish. I'm sure they'll have some very interesting questions to ask after the proceedings here this morning, so I look forward to meeting with them, and I ask all of us here to join me in giving them a warm welcome to Regina.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move this House do now adjourn.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. That motion is not in order. It's not an intermediate proceeding, and therefore the motion is out of order.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

### POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand that any time special leave is requested and granted that that in itself will be intervening business.

**The Speaker:** — I refer all members to Beauchesne's, 6th Edition, paragraph 385 and subsection (1) and subsection (2), and Beauchesne's is very clear in what an intermediate proceeding is. And for the edification of the members, I will read those two sections to them so that we do not have any further misunderstandings. On Beauchesne's it says:

The term "intermediate proceeding" used in Standing Order 60, means a proceeding that can properly be entered on the *Journals*. The true test is that if any parliamentary proceeding takes place, the second motion is regular and the Clerk ought to enter the proceedings to show that the motion in question is regular.

Referring of course to the first sentence, that they have to be entered into the *Journals*, and this introduction of guests is not.

Beauchesne's goes on in no. (2) to say:

It has never been understood in the House of Commons that the words "intermediate proceeding" covered speeches; it is not applied to arguments but it covers such things as utterances bearing directly on making motions, moving amendments, presenting reports, putting the questions, answering questions placed on the *Order Paper*, voting, naming a Member; it is construed as relating to procedure and not to debates.

The introduction of guests therefore is not, according to Beauchesne's, an intermediate proceeding and the member's point of order is not well taken.

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

**The Speaker:** — That point of order is also out of order because, as of May 14, the member knows that I made a ruling in this House instructing the Clerks, and I again want to read to the members the last paragraph of my ruling:

To avoid the prospect of misinterpretation in the future, I have instructed the Clerks at the Table not to record in the *Votes and Proceedings* points of order and to record Speaker's rulings only when the Speaker makes a statement from a prepared text. I hope this will in future avoid the necessity of raising a point of order like that raised by the Opposition House Leader.

Since my ruling this morning was not from a prepared text, it is not entered into the *Journals*; therefore it is not an intermediate proceeding and the member's point of order is not well taken.

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will read the prayer to the Assembly of these petitioners:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to single out diabetics in the drug plan by asking them to pay the costs of their medication and that your Hon. Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to which will have the affect of discriminating against diabetics compared to others whose use of drugs to sustain life is mandatory;

The diabetics have recently been singled out in the government's drug plan as being unique by virtue of the fact that they must now pay virtually the full cost for insulin, syringes, and needles and that these costs imposed without consultation are an undue and unfair burden on this unique sector of our society, and that diabetics must bear huge costs associated with their medication and treatment and sheer survival which is without comparison to other disease and that this unfair and regressive initiative is totally contrary to the principles of medicare, namely universality, accessibility, and comprehensiveness;

And that this measure is in direct contradiction to the government's stated objective of implementing a wellness model.

Mr. Speaker, I have people here from Moosomin, Saskatoon, Fleming, who have asked me to present this petition to the Assembly.

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

The division bells rang from 10:37 a.m. until 10:47 a.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

### Yeas — 7

|          |             |
|----------|-------------|
| Swenson  | D'Autremont |
| Muirhead | Goohsen     |
| Martens  | Haverstock  |
| Toth     |             |

### Nays — 24

|              |             |
|--------------|-------------|
| Van Mulligen | Trew        |
| Thompson     | Flavel      |
| Simard       | Scott       |
| Teichrob     | Wormsbecker |
| Shillington  | Kujawa      |
| Solomon      | Crofford    |
| Goulet       | Knezacek    |
| Carson       | Harper      |
| Hagel        | Carlson     |
| Lyons        | Renaud      |
| Lautermilch  | Langford    |
| Hamilton     | Jess        |

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition this morning on behalf of Saskatchewan citizens, and I'll start with the prayer, Mr. Speaker.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. 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 Hon. Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

That back pain and other highly prevalent neuromuscular 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 extensive 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 a 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.

As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

And this morning, Mr. Speaker, I have citizens from the city of Saskatoon. It looks like they're fairly well

distributed through that city. The town of Cudworth, the town of Colonsay. As I say, Mr. Speaker, people in the Saskatoon and area that have a tremendous amount of difficulty with the government programs in health care.

And I so table, Mr. Speaker, and ask that this House now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 10:52 a.m. until 11:02 a.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 9

|          |             |
|----------|-------------|
| Swenson  | Toth        |
| Muirhead | D'Autremont |
| Neudorf  | Goohsen     |
| Martens  | Haverstock  |
| Boyd     |             |

#### Nays — 20

|              |          |
|--------------|----------|
| Van Mulligen | Murray   |
| Thompson     | Hamilton |
| Simard       | Trew     |
| Shillington  | Serby    |
| Solomon      | Flavel   |
| Goulet       | Scott    |
| Carson       | Kujawa   |
| Hagel        | Harper   |
| Lyons        | Carlson  |
| Lautermilch  | Langford |

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition from some of the citizens from the province of Saskatchewan:

Wherefore your petitioners . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I think the members know full well that they are not to interrupt if the member . . . when the member is presenting a petition. So I ask the members to please give her the privilege of presenting her petitions.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. 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 Hon. Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

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 been proven to be a low-technology, low-cost, conservative and safe form of treatment consistent with a 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.

The individuals who have signed this, Mr. Speaker, are from Wynyard, Saskatchewan; several people from Regina and Balgonie. And I so table and ask that this House now be adjourned.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Could I maybe suggest to those two members that they get closer together, so they don't have to yell across the floor.

The division bells rang from 11:05 a.m. until 11:15 a.m.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 9

|          |             |
|----------|-------------|
| Swenson  | Toth        |
| Muirhead | D'Autremont |
| Neudorf  | Goohsen     |
| Martens  | Haverstock  |
| Boyd     |             |

#### Nays — 21

|              |             |
|--------------|-------------|
| Van Mulligen | Lautermilch |
| Thompson     | Murray      |
| Simard       | Trew        |
| Lingenfelter | Flavel      |
| Teichrob     | Scott       |
| Shillington  | Kujawa      |
| Solomon      | Crofford    |
| Goulet       | Harper      |
| Carson       | Carlson     |
| Hagel        | Langford    |
| Lyons        |             |

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I'd like to present to the legislature this morning. And I'll just read the prayer into the record:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to single out diabetics in the drug plan by asking them to pay the costs of their medication and that your Hon. Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to which will have the effect of discriminating against diabetics compared to all others whose use of drugs to sustain life is mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, there are petitioners from all over the south-western part of the province, particularly from

Gull Lake, Maple Creek, Shaunavon areas of south-western Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I present this petition now, and I also move that this House do now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 11:18 a.m. until 11:28 a.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 9

|          |             |
|----------|-------------|
| Swenson  | Toth        |
| Muirhead | D'Autremont |
| Neudorf  | Goohsen     |
| Martens  | Haverstock  |
| Boyd     |             |

#### Nays — 22

|              |             |
|--------------|-------------|
| Romanow      | Lautermilch |
| Van Mulligen | Murray      |
| Thompson     | Hamilton    |
| Simard       | Trew        |
| Lingenfelter | Flavel      |
| Shillington  | Scott       |
| Solomon      | Kujawa      |
| Goulet       | Crofford    |
| Carson       | Harper      |
| Hagel        | Carlson     |
| Lyons        | Langford    |

**The Speaker:** — The Leader of the Opposition, why is he on his feet?

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

**The Speaker:** — What's the member's privilege?

#### PRIVILEGE

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Speaker, I've just been informed that the Associate Minister of Finance, the minister responsible for CIC (Crown Investments Corporation), is at this very moment speaking with the media pertaining to a Bill which has not been tabled in the legislature yet.

And, Mr. Speaker, the practice of this House, the fundamentals of the British parliamentary system, have always been that that courtesy be afforded to members of the Legislative Assembly before members go and talk to the press about items that haven't been before the eyes of all members of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is incumbent that you put an end to this practice before it gets practised by this government on a regular basis, because I consider this, sir, to be an affront to my privilege as a member of this Assembly, an affront to the privileges enjoyed by all 66 members of this House. And it is a practice, I think, Mr. Speaker, which all members of the Assembly should feel abhorrent about and one that would almost negate this Assembly sitting in any

formal manner at all if this is to be a practice practised in the province of Saskatchewan by any government.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is proper that you would call that member into this Assembly and ask that they explain themselves.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the question of privilege that has been raised by my colleague from Thunder Creek.

**The Speaker:** — Usually in this House I don't say that the member can't speak, but usually if a member brings up a point of privilege we allow the other side to speak and then revert. But I have no . . . it doesn't . . . both members were up at the same time, but it doesn't make any difference to me.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak very briefly to the question of privilege at this time. Other members from the government side may want to add as we would get into this discussion, if the discussion goes on. But I just want to make it clear that what is happening here today is unusual in a number of ways. I think the most clear unusual part of today's exercise is the bell-ringing that is taking place yet again in the Saskatchewan legislature.

I want to say very clearly that the question of privilege that is raised by the Leader of the Opposition, that is that Bills not be released before they are tabled in the Assembly, is one that has been dealt with in this Assembly a number of times and Speakers have ruled on a number of times.

I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, though that the most, I think, upsetting thing to the public is not whether the Bill is released or not. I think the public wants the Bill released. The most upsetting thing is the fact that the members of the opposition are again ringing the bells to keep the democratic process from going ahead in the legislature. And I say the interesting thing about that today is the member from Greystone is now involved in the bell-ringing exercise which is the first time she has lowered herself to that level.

I want to say that the ruling made by Mr. Speaker, by Speaker Tusa, back in June 2, 1988, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that you would review the *Hansard* of that day, page 1,773 clearly indicate that release of Bills is perfectly within the purview of the government at any time and is not necessarily done in the House, and I quote:

However, neither the rules or the precedents require that the Bills are to be kept confidential until introduction in the Assembly. For further clarification on this point, I refer the hon. members to other precedents of this House, namely dated January 19, 1976 and April 5, 1976.

I therefore rule that the hon. member for Regina

North East (at that time) does not have a point of privilege, but caution all hon. members that the usual courtesies shown to the Assembly should be maintained.

Now in that order, Mr. Speaker, before anything was said outside of the Assembly, I took the opportunity to meet with the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the third party, the member from Greystone, and met with her at her bench and in fact handed them directly — before it was handed to anyone else — copies of the Bill. So I think that all requirements of sharing the Bill with the Leader of the Opposition and the member from Greystone actually took place.

Now the press is coming to ask questions about the Bill that has been released to the members of the opposition and now all members of the Assembly. That's fair, and the minister in charge will respond to it.

So I just want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling has been made on this very issue at a number of times in the past, and I think we're perfectly within our right to share with the opposition the Bill that is in fact written and in place by the government.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I take umbrage with the Government House Leader's remarks, I want to thank you, sir, for allowing us the privilege of the point of privilege without the two-hour normal notice. And I know it's within your parameters to waive that two-hour notice on the question of privilege, so I just want to make that comment to you, sir.

But what we have just heard now, with the Government House Leader trying to justify an act that is almost unprecedented in this legislature is just shocking. When he tries to justify what this government has done this morning, Mr. Speaker, on the pretence that it is legally within their rights . . . Of course it is legally within your rights, but it is morally detestable, sir, for you to have taken this route and then to get up sanctimoniously and say, well just prior to doing this, we gave it to the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition is utter nonsense. That is utter nonsense.

We have not, under the normal rules of this legislature, Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order. I think the . . . Order! Order. Order! Will the members please come to order. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to apologize to the House for his actions. That is simply unacceptable in this House.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Speaker, I apologize for throwing that paper on the floor, but I am not going to be part of some kind of duplicity in this legislature.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I've asked the member, the Leader of the Opposition, to unconditionally

apologize to the House with no further statements. Order! I'll make the decision; I don't need the Government House Leader to tell me. Order. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to please apologize to the House unconditionally.

Order! I ask the member from Maple Creek, I think he's been in the House long enough to know that when the Speaker is on his feet to please not interrupt. Order. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to please apologize to the House unconditionally.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House unconditionally.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I think what we have witnessed, Mr. Speaker, is an act of character on the House Leader's . . . or the Official Opposition leader's part that is not characteristic of the government . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The member is speaking to a point of privilege and I ask him to please address his words to the point of privilege — only the point of privilege, okay? Order. Order! Order. Please have some respect for the Chair. Order.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for bringing the . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I ask the Government House Leader please to come to order . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will warn the Government House Leader one more time. Please come to order.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you for calling the Premier and Government House Leader to order.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Will the member from Rosthern please come to order. The member is to . . . I will recognize the member from Rosthern one more time to speak to the point of personal privilege. If he refuses to do so, I will not recognize him again. Speak to the point of personal privilege.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your ruling. Now what I want to do is address the points that the House Leader brought up. And I want to address them specifically, and also what our leader brought up.

Mr. Speaker, he says that they have done it according to the rules. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that you have no moral justification for it. Legally you may be within your rules. But morally it is detestable. We have not yet, Mr. Speaker — and this is part of my argument — we have not yet . . . In the blues we have a list of things and items under which items are carried. We have not reached the point of introduction of Bills. And yet we find now that the Bill is introduced, the media has a hold of it, the public has a hold of it. And now because they feel that they're doing us a privilege, the Bill has been given to members in this House.

Mr. Speaker, he also brought up the idea that the bell-ringing, the people don't like the bell-ringing. Mr. House Leader, Mr. Premier, Mr. Speaker, I agree, the

people of this province do not like bell-ringing. They do not like what we had to do this morning.

But I suggest to you, Mr. Premier, that they find it detestable, detestable what this legislation purports to do, which is to remove the rights and the freedoms . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. Order, order. Order. Order. Would the Premier please come to order.

I want to say I will give the member from Rosthern a few minutes to speak to the point of order. If he gets into the debate on the Bill, I will rule him out of order and I will accept no further comments from the member from Rosthern after that. Please speak to the point of personal privilege.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — The point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, that I am addressing, is in direct response to comments made by the member, the Government House Leader, who initiated the bell-ringing episode. And I take your direction, Mr. Speaker. If it's out of order for me to react to his comments, then I am obviously out of order.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Would the member just be seated. The member was getting into the debate of the Bill. That is what I've ruled out of order. You cannot debate the Bill.

The Leader of the Opposition's personal privilege was that the Bill was presented outside the House before it was presented to the House. That is the point of personal privilege and that is what you are to address yourself to if you wish to speak to the point of personal privilege. And I recognize the member from Rosthern to do so.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — The point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we have been witnessing here a government that is on a steamroller bend trying to do indirectly what they were not able to accomplish by the direct method.

Now it is a written rule, and I haven't got my finger on it but I'm sure my colleagues will be able to give me that citation, that you cannot do in this Legislative Assembly indirectly what you cannot do directly. That's a rule. That's an accomplished rule over periods of time that has been established through precedent and I believe has been also established in the written rules either of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan or through Beauchesne's in Ottawa.

And this government in its arrogant attitude, its undemocratic attitude, its steamroller attitude, has decided now that this Bill is going to be brought forward today. And our argument has been . . . And that's why we had this episode of bell-ringing. It's not because we wanted it; it's not because the people wanted it. They don't like it. But they detest the mannerism and the breaking of the privilege of us as members of this Legislative Assembly representing a million people in the province.

And 240,000 adult members of our society are saying it is wrong, and as an opposition we were trying, Mr. Speaker, to address those concerns of those individuals. And the government in its arrogance has circumvented that process, legally correct but morally apprehensible, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and they will pay the price.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Order. I ask the member from Regina Rosemont to please come to order and withdraw the statements that he referred to the opposition as being hypocrites. I ask him to apologize to the House.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Mr. Speaker, with no disrespect to your . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I ask the member to unconditionally withdraw the statement and apologize to the House.

**Mr. Lyons:** — Sir, I apologize for standing up to the taxpayers and the people . . .

(1145)

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I ask the member to please withdraw the statement that he referred to the opposition as being hypocrites, and to apologize to the House. And this is your second warning.

**Mr. Lyons:** — I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, withdraw.

**The Speaker:** — And apologize to the House.

**Mr. Lyons:** — And I apologize to the House.

**The Speaker:** — I thank the member. I have heard two members from the opposition. I will hear one more member from, if a member wishes to speak, from the government side, and then I will take into consideration the comments made by members.

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of privilege . . .

**The Speaker:** — No, I will not take any more from the opposition. I'll take one more from the government side, and I think I've heard sufficient on the point of privilege.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to just speak for a moment to what's happened this morning. The rule, I believe fairly interpreted, is that the government must make every effort to bring to the attention of the opposition first, before it makes a public statement. We did that. It was on the order paper. They knew that.

We never got to it because the opposition prevented us from doing so. But we made every effort to get to it. It is patently obvious, Mr. Speaker, the opposition is trying to avoid the introduction of the Bill and therefore the dissemination of the Bill. Because once it

is public . . . once it is tabled, the Bill is public and everyone's going to know what it is.

It is patently obvious to me and to everyone else who's observing the proceedings, the opposition are attempting to obstruct and prevent that of which they complain, that they're not getting the Bill and that the public aren't getting the Bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for this House to give any credence to the point of privilege raised by the member from Thunder Creek is simply to play into their hands. And this House should not be an instrument of a silly, foolish game by the opposition.

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

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to address the point regarding the point of privilege. I believe we're into a very serious matter in this Assembly . . .

**The Speaker:** — I've listened to two members from each side and I think that is sufficient for the Speaker to examine the comments that have been made and make his decision. Give me a minute; I want to consult with my Clerk.

The matter of personal privilege that the member from Thunder Creek, the Leader of the Opposition, has brought forward is certainly a very serious . . . a point of privilege. And no member brings it forward very lightly. I think therefore it is incumbent upon the Speaker to review all the comments that have been made by members on both sides, and what other Speakers have said on this particular topic, not only in our jurisdiction, but in other jurisdictions. Therefore I will reserve my judgement and bring forth my arguments early next week.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The point of adjournment is not well taken at this time because there has been no intermediate proceeding taking place, and therefore we will move on to the next item on the order paper.

**An Hon. Member:** — I don't follow that at all, Mr. Speaker. Not at all. Mr. Speaker, I'm on my feet for reading of petitions.

**The Speaker:** — I think the member knows that a ruling made by former Speaker Tusa allowed only one hour for the presenting of petitions and that hour we have well exceeded. Therefore we are on to the next item, of reading and receiving petitions.

## NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for return showing a list of all meetings held

between any member of the Government of Saskatchewan and the business community regarding changes to workmen's compensation and occupational health and safety legislation since November 1, 1991 — (a); and (b) a list of all organizations and representatives contacted previous to drafting amendments to workmen's compensation and occupational health and safety legislation since November 1, 1991; (c) a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and all labour organizations or representatives consulted regarding the workmen's compensation and occupational health and safety legislation since November 1, 1991; and (d) a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, and any such organization representing the business community regarding changes to workmen's compensation and occupational health and safety legislation since November 1, 1991.

And I present this to the Assembly.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, in my duty as House Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition it's incumbent on me to know precisely what your feelings and interpretations of rulings are. And I would ask if I could have a clarification on a previous ruling made, because it's very germane to proceedings.

So if I could just refer you back, sir, to a ruling you made on . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I think the member is out of order. We are on the presentation. There are no clarifications on Speaker's rulings, and that precedent has been set a number of times by former Speakers — a number of times by former Speakers, and certainly also by Beauchesne's. We are on . . .

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

**The Speaker:** — Pardon me?

**An Hon. Member:** — On a point of order.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that prior to the proceedings a member asked leave to introduce guests and that leave was presented, Mr. Speaker. Now in no. 385 of Beauchesne's, 6th Edition, 385, no. (2) . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I think the member knows full well that if he had a point of order on the introduction of guests, he should have brought it up at that time when he was in the House, which he didn't do. So I think the member is out of order on this point of order. We are on notices of motions and questions.



**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue a return showing:

(a) a list of all contracts currently under review or that have been reviewed since November 1, 1991; (b) a list of all contracts that have been broken or rewritten by the Government of Saskatchewan since November 1, 1991; (c) a list of all individuals who held contracts that have been broken or rewritten since November 1, 1991; (d) a list of all court cases that have resulted from the Government of Saskatchewan breaking contracts or rewriting agreements since November 1, 1991; (e) a list of all expenses incurred by the Government of Saskatchewan in legal fees, departmental costs, etc., as a direct result of rewriting or breaking of contracts.

As a motion (debatable).

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move than an order of the Assembly do issue a return showing:

(a) a list of all individuals hired by order in council in the fiscal year of 1991; (b) a list of all individuals hired by order in council in the fiscal year of 1992; (c) a list of all individuals hired by order in council in the fiscal year of 1993; (d) the total cost of salary paid to the individuals hired by order in council in the fiscal year of 1991; (e) the total cost of salary paid to the individuals hired by order in council in the fiscal year of 1992; (f) the total cost of salary paid to the individuals hired by order in council to date in the fiscal year of 1993; (g) a list of individuals hired by order in council receiving salary hikes in the fiscal year of 1991; (h) a list of individuals hired by order in council receiving salary hikes in the fiscal year of 1992; (i) a list of individuals hired by order in council receiving salary hikes to date in the fiscal year of 1993; (j) a list of individuals hired by order in council employed by the ministers' offices; and (k) the total cost in salary paid to individuals hired by order in council and employed in ministers' offices.

Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

A list of all fees and charges levied by the Government of Saskatchewan; and amount of increase in each fee and charge from March '91 to March '92; an amount of increase in each fee and charge from March '92 to March '93; total revenue raised by fees and charges in the fiscal year of '91; total revenue raised by fees and charges in the fiscal year of '92; total revenue raised by fees and charges to date in the fiscal year of '93; the projected revenue of the fees

and charges of the fiscal year of 1991; the projected revenue for the fees and charges of the fiscal year of 1992; the projected revenue for the fees and charges of the fiscal year of 1993; a list of studies conducted, analysed, and the impact that these fees and charges have on the taxpayer of Saskatchewan; statutory authority for each fee and charge; and where applicable, the order in council number authorizing the increase; the date the fee or charge first came into existence; the purpose of each fee and charge; the minister responsible for each fee and charge; a list of all fees and charges that are income tested; and a list of all fees and charges that are waived for seniors, low income people, and other special interest groups.

I so present to the Assembly.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave, to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the east gallery I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, a citizen of Regina who is very interested in the procedures of the House and who I believe has never before been in the Assembly. I'd like to introduce to you Mr. Glenn Caleval and ask that the Assembly welcome him here today.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order with regards to introducing guests.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that on no. 385 in *Parliamentary Rules and Forms* of Beauchesne's, pages 112 and 113, 385(2), Mr. Speaker, and I quote parts of it for you:

It has never been understood in the House of Commons that the words "intermediate proceedings" covered speeches . . .

So intermediate proceedings do not cover speeches.

. . . it is not applied to arguments . . .

Which I would suggest is debate.

So intermediate proceedings do not cover speeches. They do not cover debates, but it covers such things as:

. . . utterances bearing directly on making motions, moving amendments, presenting reports, putting the questions, answering questions placed on the *Order Paper*, voting, naming a Member . . .

**The Speaker:** — Could I ask the member what his point of order is, as far as introduction of guests is concerned. Could you clarify that for me please?

**Mr. Neudorf:** — My clarification is that introduction of guests by leave is intermediate business, and that's the point I'm trying to make for you, sir. So what we just have witnessed is an intermediate business because it concludes the quotation that I was presenting to you, Mr. Speaker. It is construed as relating to procedure and not to debates.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that any time a procedural event takes place, it is intermediate business that is recorded in the *Journals* and therefore is fair game to any kind of motion of adjournment following. It's very precisely listed here for you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — I take the member's point of order, but we have checked also with the House of Commons and that is certainly not the interpretation that the House of Commons have placed on this. And the House of Commons only have regarded intermediate proceedings anything of a substantial nature that takes place in the House as it pertains to motions.

Certainly introduction of guests is not considered as a substantial undertaking by members in this House. It does not bear on the proceedings that take place in the House as such, and it is not an intermediate . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, it's been moved for leave — that's the point. You're missing the point.

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

(1200)

#### NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

(a) provide the number of notice of . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Will the Premier please come to order. Order. Will the Premier please come to order.

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

(a) provide the number of notice of farm foreclosures delivered to individuals in Saskatchewan for fiscal year of 1991; (b) provide the number of notice of farm foreclosures delivered to individuals in Saskatchewan for fiscal year of 1992; (c) provide the number of notice of farm foreclosures delivered to individuals in Saskatchewan to date for fiscal year of 1993; (d) the number of farm foreclosures for the fiscal year of 1991; (e) the number of farm foreclosures for the fiscal year of 1992; (f) the

number of farm foreclosures to date for the fiscal year of 1993; (g) the amount of land owned by Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan; (h) the number of farmers in arrears with the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan for the fiscal year of 1991 and the total of the arrears; (i) the number of farmers in arrears with the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan for the fiscal year of 1992 and the total of the arrears; and (j) the number of farmers in arrears with the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan to date for the fiscal year of 1993 and the total of the arrears.

I present this.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

(a) a list of all the trips by any minister of the government of Saskatchewan since November 1, 1991; (b) a list of all costs incurred by the trip including salaries of pilots, expenditures for food and accommodation, incidentals, and any other expenses involved with each trip; (c) a list outlining the purpose of each trip . . .

Does the Premier want to talk?

**The Speaker:** — The member has the floor and he should continue with his motions.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought perhaps they wanted to talk.

(c) a list outlining the purpose of each trip taken by the minister or associate minister, since November 1, 1992; (d) a list of those accompanying the minister including departmental officials, ministerial assistants, and the like; (e) a list of accomplishments or agreements signed or met directly as a result of each trip; (f) a copy of an agenda which lists the organizations, governments, or individuals which the minister or officials met with on each trip.

I hereby submit.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a notice of motion for return. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

(a) a copy of all polls and services conducted by the Government of Saskatchewan since November 1, 1991 regarding the issue of establishing a French education school system and all costs incurred by conducting these opinion polls; (b) a list of estimated cost involved with establishing a third education system in the province of Saskatchewan including administrative costs, departmental costs, text books, supplies, hiring of educators

and all other projected costs; (c) a list of public meetings that have been held regarding the establishment of a third education system in Saskatchewan since November 1, 1991; (d) a list of all parental organizations, local government officials, and others that have been consulted regarding the establishment of the French education system in Saskatchewan; (e) a list of all meetings attended by the Minister of Education regarding the establishment of the French education system in Saskatchewan.

I so table.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

(a) a list of all consultations or meetings that the Minister of Economic Development attended regarding negotiations with Federated Co-operatives Ltd. since November 1, 1991; (b) a copy of all correspondence including letters and memorandums regarding the Co-op upgrader and refinery between the Department of Economic Development, the office of the minister responsible for Economic Development, the Crown Investments Corporation, and Federated Co-operatives Ltd. since November 1, 1991; (c) a copy of meeting minutes in which Mr. Don Ching was in attendance regarding negotiations with Federated Co-operatives Ltd. since November 1, 1991; and (d) a copy of all meeting minutes taken in which the Minister of Economic Development or a representative of the Economic Development department or a representative of the Crown Investments Corporation were in attendance regarding negotiations with Federated Co-operatives Ltd. since November 1, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, and while I'm on my feet I would say that we're ready to go into question period after which, by agreement with the Government House Leader, there will be a member's short statement of three minutes, after which the House will adjourn.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Co-op Upgrader Review

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I'd like to follow up with you where we left off a few days ago in question period. You keep asking me, and the question is, do I support the Estey recommendations?

Now the Estey report is a well written and comprehensive document that recommends an infusion of funds is necessary to keep the project afloat. But try as I might, I cannot find the words, expropriate or legislate, in order to obtain those funds. Neither do I find the words, bad deal or sweetheart deal, used by Justice Estey in describing this agreement. Those are your words and your

judgements.

The rightness or wrongness of the agreement with FCL (Federated Co-operatives Ltd.) is not the issue. The issue was and continues to be, how can the debt be restructured in order to make this project financially sustainable from the province's perspective.

So, Mr. Premier, I'm asking you why it is that you and your government refuse to extend an olive branch to Federated Co-operatives in an attempt to resolve this impasse. And why do you insist on this charade of willingness and openness to negotiate while waiting for FCL to make the first move?

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, this question is a question which has been asked many times by the members of the House. And I've given the same answer many times, the effect of which is to say that we do not refuse to negotiate. We have negotiated. You'll recall just a few moments ago the Conservative opposition gave notice of motion of a question detailing the times and the dates of meetings, and we'll be very pleased to provide that in due course.

I have attended meetings. I've been present at a meeting that Mr. Justice Estey convened where members of FCL were at and members of the federal government were at. This has been going on and on and on.

Mr. Justice Estey failed in getting an agreement and thus he recommended the solution which is set up there. And I repeat again, we are prepared to, at some initial cost, adopt that solution. I've said that to FCL. And if you think it's a reasonable conclusion of Mr. Justice Estey — as you say, it was a well-written report — if you think that's a reasonable way out, we would need your assistance to say that you too would urge FCL to buy the Estey recommendation.

Now what happens — and I'll close on this answer — if one of the parties or the other party, FCL, simply says, I'm sorry, I'm not going to even negotiate on the principles of Estey? What do we do?

The other alternative, I say to the member, is to just let the deal lie as it is. And I won't raise my voice or the rhetoric when I say, I cannot do that for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and the hundreds of millions of dollars which are at risk as a result of this deal. I cannot do it.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, there's no such thing as only two alternatives to anything. You and your fellow members had a chance to oppose this deal when it was being written, but you chose not to. And please don't keep claiming that you didn't know the details of the

deal. There is more than enough evidence to the contrary, and in fact I have that evidence written.

The member from Quill Lakes, in the Committee of Finance in May of 1986, cited all of the details of the deal. Similarly, the previous leader of your party and the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for Regina Elphinstone, he too knew all the details of the deal in July 16, 1987 in *Hansard*.

So when you tell me that you did not oppose this, because in quotes, as you stated last Tuesday, "... the deal was made (in secret)" and that it was only when, and I quote again, "... the Gass Commission opened up all (of) the books and said that this was a bad deal ...". You, sir, are rewriting history because you've known all along the details of this particular deal.

So I ask you again, you who accuse others of flip-flopping, what was your stand on this deal when you had a chance to oppose it?

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's factual base is a country mile off the facts — a country mile. Now I don't know if the hon. member knows how long a country mile is but it is pretty long.

August 14, 1987, quote, Hon. Mrs. Smith, July 16 ... August 14, quote:

Mr. Chairman, we undertook to do that (Mrs. Smith says). We contacted verbally and with a letter, and the answer that I received from Federated Co-operatives Ltd. I would like to quote one line and it simply says:

The disclosure of these agreements would have significant commercial prejudice to both NewGrade and CCRL (Consumers' Co-operative Refineries Ltd.)

She then goes on to cite other sections, quote:

We do not feel it is reasonable to expect us to disclose operational information to competitors which competitors are not required to disclose ...

And I have the entire transcript here where my former leader and other members of my caucus were asking, including Mr. Speaker if I may so, not to drag him into the debate, when he was in the official opposition, time after time for the tabling of the documents. We were flat out turned down, not only prior to 1986 but after 1987. There can be no disputation of that fact.

So I just don't know how the hon. member can concoct any indication that the agreements were tabled when the record ... All you have to do is check the record of the House to see if they've been tabled. They're not there.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, may I suggest that not only did you not oppose the deal which you now so vigorously condemn, but your fellow members went out of their way to hail this agreement, including Mr. Speaker, I could quote ... I'd like to quote the Deputy Premier, the member from Regina Dewdney, who stated on August 25 of 1987:

... the New Democratic Party members and the New Democratic Party caucus support whole-heartedly the involvement of Co-operative refineries in this project. We support it because this is a good example in Saskatchewan of a Saskatchewan company, with Saskatchewan people, using Saskatchewan talent, initiative, and energy, to build in the interests of Saskatchewan people.

*Hansard*, August 25, 1987. He went on to say:

... this project is positive. We have supported it from the beginning.

August 25, 1987, *Hansard*.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who said that?

**Ms. Haverstock:** — The Deputy Premier said that, sir. Now, Mr. Premier, without rewriting history, as you are known to do periodically, do you still contend that you and your colleagues were opposed to this agreement with Federated when it was struck?

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — The answer to that is so simple that I'm surprised the hon. member would have the audacity to raise the question. I can endorse those words today if I had not known today what the agreements are. These documents will be tabled for you to see in full, Madam Member.

What the Deputy Premier said when he was in opposition was based on the statements made both in terms of press releases and other information that the government tabled. But the point that is key to this discussion is this: that at every turn when the official opposition asked for the release of the documentation, namely the operating agreements, the fundamental agreements, they were denied.

And if you dispute what I say, I challenge you to go to the Clerk's Table right now to that period and get the tabling of the documents. They never were tabled. So what do you expect any opposition or any hon. member to do after a while except to make statements of either support or rejection based on the information which is got to them? That information was not got to them.

When that information got to them was when we assumed office and Gass looked at the books and the operating agreements were put forward. And I repeat to you again, Madam Member, do you support Estey's way out of this or not? That's the key. Because his fundamental resolution is that the financial project of this deal has run aground. That's what he said. You cannot avoid that.

So please don't run. Please don't flip-flop. Please don't hide. Tell us, in the interest of the taxpayers, do you as the Leader of the Liberal Party want to continue to endanger \$600 million and more of the taxpayers of this province of Saskatchewan, contrary to what your oath as MLA should be?

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — I'm glad to hear you say, Mr. Premier, that you concur that the Deputy Premier in August of '87 stated those words. Because in July of '87, the previous leader of your party, Mr. Allan Blakeney, stated: we have \$610 million of a project, 100 per cent of which is at risk of the taxpayers; about 400 million of that money of provincial taxpayers' risk and the other with federal taxpayers' risks.

Now you are saying that the Deputy Premier in fact didn't know when he made his comments, one month after Allan Blakeney made these comments in *Hansard* in this particular Assembly?

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — What are you saying, Mr. Speaker, you're saying we have the documents? Are you saying . . . Make that allegation, make the allegation that the documents were tabled when they were kept secret totally. They were never released.

We made the statements based on what these people told us, which as you should know, rather than joining them today in this unseemly protest and joining them in this unseemly attack on the taxpayers' interests, what you should know based on what they were telling the people of Saskatchewan was absolutely, virtually false in almost every other respect. Now all of a sudden you flip-flop and you accept the position that we should follow their numbers.

Well I'm sorry, Madam Member, you can perhaps want to do that. I'm not going to do that; Gass said we shouldn't do that; Estey says we shouldn't do that. We say today as a government that we can't do that and we say the taxpayers say that it shouldn't be done. So join us.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's most interesting to hear about flip-flops when all we've been talking about is the last several years when this particular government will not take responsibility for comments it made in the past.

Mr. Premier, the member from Regina Albert North was quoted on August 25, '87 as well, as saying:

I'm sure that the Co-op pioneers must be pleased as Punch just to see this happening now — the expansions over the years. And the NewGrade upgrader is certainly in keeping with that very fine Co-op tradition.

Mr. Premier, do you think the co-op pioneers in this province are pleased as Punch to see you legislating an agreement, legislating an end to a contract with Federated which is essentially the same as tearing up a contract with co-op members throughout our province?

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the members of the co-op movement support FCL's management decisions in signing up a

deal of this nature which is unconscionable and immoral.

I believe that the co-op movement wants the FCL as members of this province, responsible citizens, to strike a fair deal for not only FCL but for the taxpayers.

And while we're on flip-flops, I remind the hon. member that she said, according to the *Regina Leader-Post* of April 16 when in the debate on hospital cuts, the following. This is what you said:

"I don't like game-playing at taxpayers' expense. It's \$10,000 per day in this legislature to pay the per diems of those of us sitting in this house," she said. "This is a ridiculous waste of people's money."

At the time that bell-ringing went on. Today you, Madam Member, flip-flopped and now you like the games-playing at a further cost of taxpayers.

I tell you, that is very consistent with your position, very consistent, that we ought to allow the taxpayers' money to go at risk with the upgrader. And I am not going to accept that and I do not believe that the rank-and-file co-op members are going to accept that either. And frankly you disappoint me that you are.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question this morning is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, the issue this morning is you breaking a contract with 240,000 co-op members.

Mr. Speaker, 240,000 co-op members in this province are paying for an ad in newspapers all over the province today that says that their Premier is a threat to democracy. That's what it says, Mr. Speaker — a threat to democracy, in the paper today.

Mr. Premier, Tommy Douglas was never categorized as a threat to democracy by co-op members in this province. Allan Blakeney was never categorized as a threat to democracy by co-op members in the province.

We have just seen in this legislature this morning, Mr. Premier, where you will transgress on the time-honoured traditions of this Legislative Assembly to take away the rights of 240,000 co-op members to have legal and binding contracts; that you would take a Bill out into the rotunda before members of this Assembly have a chance to look at it in order to break that contract. That's why they say, Mr. Premier, you are a threat to democracy in this province.

How do you answer those 240,000 co-op members who paid for this ad today? How do you do that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that the Leader of the Opposition does not throw that document at me, at the members of the legislature, as

he did a few seconds ago. So I would ask him to contain his emotional approach on this thing because this certainly is not — this certainly is not very much in support of a democratic act.

Just a few moments ago, sir, you're the one who scattered paper all over the legislature, and now you stand up and say you are a defender of democracy. You ask me how Douglas and how Blakeney escaped by virtue of not being accused in this context. They escaped because they never had preceding them, a government that would enter into such a crazy-quilt deal and such a crazy aspect of financing as we inherited, thanks to you, sir.

And if the co-op movement thinks . . . I won't say the co-op movement. If the FCL management thinks in those ads that we are doing something to them, I repeat my offer. Today — I will even advance them the \$1 — they can take the upgrader, lock, stock, and barrel for \$1. Whole thing. Won't take a thing from them. I'll sign the deal right now. We'll drop the legislation right now.

Why don't you advance that? They'll take on the liabilities and the operations. This is such a good deal, I'll turn all of it over to FCL right now. That's the promise.

I say to FCL, give me your response. You can take it for \$1 right now. How do you like that? Would you support that?

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, any time that your House Leader comes over and dumps a pile of garbage on my desk, I'll certainly stand in this legislature and throw it back because that's what that is.

Let me tell you what co-op members are saying about you, Mr. Premier, and why that was a pile of garbage. And I quote:

For a duly elected government to even consider this sort of legislation is truly frightening. Every person and every business in Saskatchewan should be alarmed at this action. It is a blatant and unethical abuse of power.

Mr. Premier, that is what 240,000 co-op members are saying about you today, that they're paying for to send the message in this legislature. And that's what they're saying about that pile of garbage that your minister came over and plunked down on my desk. They don't like it one bit. They're willing to campaign against it. What they want from you, Mr. Premier, is for you to keep your word, the word that you would sit down and negotiate, not legislate. Why won't you do that for 240,000 co-op members?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, I

am prepared at all times to negotiate. I'll make two offers to FCL. I will sign a deal based on Estey and the principles of Estey. Here's a public offer of negotiation. If they don't like that, I will make an offer of giving them the FCL refinery as it is, the upgrader, for a buck — lock, stock, and barrel. There's another offer.

**An Hon. Member:** — It's theirs already.

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — They can take it. It's theirs already. The member from Moosomin says, it's theirs already. At \$600 million of your taxpayers, that's how flippant you are. It's theirs already, theirs already. And he says . . . We take all the risk, they take the profits that go up. Here are two offers that I've made, I say to the Leader of the Opposition.

He will continue to throw objects, he says, in this legislature. Please, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, stand up and tell us how that squares with your professed love for democracy.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in my eight years in this legislature I've never seen a government try to sneak a piece of legislation into the rotunda out there when they wouldn't give it . . . when they wouldn't give it to the members of the Assembly first.

You, Mr. Premier, are so afraid of what the people out there are saying that you would try to use duplicity in this House this morning in order to threaten 240,000 co-op members. You say that you didn't know.

The member from Greystone has outlined where your party stood on it. The co-op members say today that this process has been going on since the NDP (New Democratic Party) were in power back in 1981, that you've known all along about everything.

But today, Mr. Premier, and yesterday and the day before, you try to say to co-op members around this province that it's all their fault. Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, there are 240,000 co-op members that don't want their dividends taxed by your government because you can't keep an agreement. Mr. Premier, why don't you give the commitment today that you'll walk out of this legislature this morning and go and pick up the phone and start doing some honest negotiation, rather than simple politics all the time, that you're now taking out on 240,000 co-op members. Why don't you do that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to try to elevate the rhetoric around this debate except to note that when the Leader of the Opposition gets up in this House and says that he has never been associated in eight years with a government which would not table its legislation in the House, is patently incorrect.

The ruling of Mr. Speaker Tusa in 1988, that the House

referred you to, sir, was exactly because when we were in opposition we complained, and Speaker Tusa said, oh no, you could do it. And they did it . . . he did it.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have before me here July 17, 1987 *Leader-Post*, headline: Smith refuses to disclose agreements on oil upgrader. If you don't believe me, maybe you'll believe the *Leader-Post*. Then I have July 18, 1987: Smith refuses to give in about releasing contracts. Pretty shaky, the hon. member says. You see, I mean the facts simply are ignored by these people.

You know what this is all about? They are afraid to get into the debate of this legislature because they're afraid of the facts which are going to come out about the dealings and the finances. But they'll get those facts in any event.

And I say to you and I say to the people of Saskatchewan as I close this answer, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Liberal-Conservative coalition trying to prevent this information and debate — this coalition, this violent display coalition which we saw — I say, you're not going to thwart the taxpayers' interests. We're elected. We took an oath to defend the taxpayers. You did too, Madam Member from Greystone; you did too, Leader of the Official Opposition. And it's frankly shocking that your oath means nothing; your histrionics and your defence of a rotten deal means more. Shame on you! Shame on you!

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, your political agenda means nothing to me. The defence of a contract signed on behalf of 240,000 Saskatchewan citizens does mean something to me — 240,000 Saskatchewan citizens who expect more out of their Premier than simply using the easy way out to walk into this Legislative Assembly and use the threat of expropriation, to use the power of his majority to take away the rights of Saskatchewan citizens.

Mr. Premier, my oath has nothing to do with you taking away the contracts of 60,000 farm families, taking away the contracts of civil servants, taking away the contracts of co-op members. My oath has nothing to do with that. My oath, sir, is to defend people against those actions of your government.

Now, Mr. Premier, instead of doing it one more time, as you have done throughout your career, why don't you take away the hammer of legislation and negotiate? Why take this easy way out, Mr. Premier? Is it simply to satisfy the political agenda of the member from Riversdale? Is that what we're talking about, Mr. Premier?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says, take the easy way out. I've been in this legislature off and on for 22, 23 years, and I want to tell

you, the last 18 months can be categorized in any way that it wants, but easy is not the description.

Trying to clean up the mess facing the province of Saskatchewan and the debt of \$16 billion, this deal which is the most difficult and worst of all negotiations is not easy. Introduction of legislation is not easy. These are difficult and tough decisions, not easy decisions. They're right decisions; they're responsible decisions.

Because FCL refuses to negotiate, refuses to change, and therefore endangers not only that project but the sensibilities and the viabilities of the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan. He refers to that FCL ad, he says at risk, at risk. What that ad missed was the most important category at risk, and that is the taxpayers and the fiscal stability of the province of Saskatchewan. That is our responsibility, and by golly we're going to do it. And that's not easy. It requires leadership.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave, the Minister of Education has a statement to make at this point.

Leave granted.

#### STATEMENT BY A MEMBER

**Hon. Mrs. Teichrob:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The statement I am about to make is a difficult one for me, the most difficult that I have ever made. I have today asked the Premier to relieve me of my duties and responsibilities as the Minister of Education, Training and Employment effective immediately. The Premier has accepted my resignation.

Mr. Speaker, my reasons for resigning my position as a member of the cabinet are personal, and I want to share these reasons with members of the Assembly and with my constituents.

My husband and I, as many of you know, have been involved in farming since the late 1960s. We, like thousands of other farm families, spent many years building up a successful farming operation. Moonvale farm is a mixed farming operation which includes both commercial turkey production and a cow-calf operation. We expanded our farm in the 1970s with a 15-year loan from farmstart which was paid off in full in 1989. Our farm produces 30,000 birds per year and enjoys gross revenues of about \$400,000. It has been a strong and successful farming operation. My husband and I built it up ourselves with the help of our family, and we're still involved in the operation.

In the early 1980s, my husband and I guaranteed loans for our two daughters and their husbands to begin their own farming operations. One farm was a 28,000-bird table egg operation; the other farm produced hatching eggs for the Saskatchewan industry, one and a half million eggs per year. Over the years, in an effort to keep their operation going, my

husband and I helped both of our daughters' farms in amounts of more than a quarter million dollars. This was in addition to substantial loan guarantees with ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) and the Farm Credit Corporation.

Unfortunately these new farms faced many of the same difficulties thousands of other farms faced during the 1980s and although the farms were productive, financial success was limited. As a result, in 1989 one of our daughters and her husband voluntarily transferred their farm back to the Farm Credit Corporation. The other farm remained in operation, managed by our son.

In early 1991, however, before I became a member of the legislature, my husband and I moved from Moonvale farm and turned its operation over to our daughter and son-in-law. At this time our family sat down with ACS and FCC (Farm Credit Corporation) to agree on an arrangement to consolidate all loan guarantees in an attempt to stabilize the financial situation.

From that arrangement until today there have been no material changes in these loans. However, low commodity prices and high costs have rendered the projections we made in early 1991 unrealistic. The situation has reached a point where my family and I must sit down with our advisers and the lenders to review the arrangement made in 1991 and find a resolution, whatever it may be, to this outstanding problem.

I met yesterday with the Premier to brief him on the difficulties and to tender my resignation from cabinet so that my family and I can pursue these alternatives without any suggestion or even a perception that I might be in a conflict of interest situation. It is my priority to maintain my family's reputation and integrity and to help my family through this difficult financial situation.

I will not use my position as a member of the cabinet to in any way influence the outcome of these discussions. Because the matter will soon be at a crucial stage in the negotiations with a provincial Crown corporation, it is not appropriate for me to continue in cabinet while these matters are being addressed.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and I have known each other for nearly 40 years. We went to high school and university together in Saskatoon. I know the Premier as a man of decision, honesty, and integrity. I would never do anything to cast even the slightest shadow over him, his government, or my family. And this is the reason why I have asked to step aside at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in public life for more than 25 years as a reeve, RM (rural municipality) councillor, as a member of the University of Saskatchewan Senate, director of the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency, the Saskatchewan Research Council, and many other elected and volunteer positions.

My husband and I have always worked hard to put our family first and have done whatever we could to contribute to public life and to make our province a better place. I believe strongly that the key to making a contribution to public life is one's ability to maintain their personal integrity. Mr. Speaker, that is why I have taken this course of action today.

I have informed the Premier that it is my intention to continue as a member of this Assembly for Saskatoon River Heights and to represent my constituents to the best of my ability. I remain firmly committed to the actions and the directions of this government and intend to continue to play whatever role I can in or out of cabinet to see our policies come about.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to thank my personal staff for all their hard work and support and to also thank the staff of the numerous departments, agencies, and Crown corporations I have worked with over the past 18 months for their cooperation with me and for their commitment to our province.

I want to acknowledge the presence of my husband in the gallery of the House today in support of my decision.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my caucus and cabinet colleagues, and particularly the Premier, for the help they have given me and the wisdom and leadership they have shared with me. I take a great deal of pride in believing that my time spent in cabinet has made a contribution to this province which we all love so much.

I thank the Assembly for its indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Assembly adjourned at 12:41 p.m.