

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of residents of Saskatchewan I'd like to present some petitions this afternoon. I'll read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions come from Regina, Tisdale, Arborfield, Nipawin, and Maryfield areas of Saskatchewan. I'll present them now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I, as well, have some petitions to present to the House, and I'd like to read the prayer.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, these petitions are signed by individuals from Maryfield, Moosomin, Wapella, Spy Hill areas — south-east part of the province — and from Fairlight as well. I so present them.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have several petitions to lay on the Table today, Mr. Speaker, and I will read the prayer.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

These, Mr. Speaker, come from the area of Assiniboia and Lafleche and Swift Current, down in that country. I would like to lay them on the Table now.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a number of petitions to present today. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance

and financing arrangements.

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

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, come from North Portal, Estevan, Alameda, Lampman, Frobisher, Kincaid, Woodrow, Assiniboia, Rockglen, Mossbank, Codette, Nipawin, Wood Mountain, Willow Bunch, Bengough, Limerick, Melaval, all across Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present these now.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I as well have petitions to present on behalf of people of Saskatchewan. The prayer reads as such:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. governance and financing arrangement.

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

From the communities of Rama, Invermay, Buchanan, Vonda, Ebenezer, Cudworth, Prud'homme, and Saskatoon. And I'll table these now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to add the voice of many, many Saskatchewan residents to those that my colleagues have brought forward in a petition which states, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

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

Mr. Speaker, these people have signed up coming from such diverse areas as Mossbank, Grandview, Moose Jaw, Chaplin, Chamberlain, Central Butte — page over there, another page from Central Butte, Elkhorn, Moosomin, and indeed quite a number here from Saskatoon as well, Mr. Speaker. And it gives me pleasure to lay these on the Table on behalf of the petitioners this afternoon.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My petition today reads this way:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

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

I have petitioners here from Rocanville, St. Lazare, Tantallon, Weyburn, Moosomin, Maryfield, and Weyburn. I present them to the Assembly today.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to bring to this Assembly the names of many Saskatchewan people who . . . and I'll only read the petition, Mr. Speaker, read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have citizens from many communities around the province — Bracken, Saskatchewan; Orkney, Climax, Admiral, Frontier, Eastend, Claydon, Admiral, Ravensrag, Moose Jaw, Mortlach, Caron, Parkbeg — citizens from all over the province that I present today, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a petition, but this is regarding the Condie to Queen Elizabeth power line.

We the undersigned landowners, renters, and persons affected by and interested in opposing the construction of a 230 kV transmission line from Condie to Queen Elizabeth humbly pray that our signatures to this letter signifies our opposition to the said line construction.

And there are the signatures of 25 people from Saskatchewan.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

Of citizens of the province praying that the Assembly cause the government to reverse its decision to single out diabetics in the drug plan;

Of citizens of the province praying that the Assembly cause the government to reverse its decision to discontinue funding for health care facilities;

And of citizens of the province praying the Assembly postpone consideration of The Health Districts Act.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Special Committee on Regulations

Deputy Clerk: — Mr. Toth, chair of the Special Committee on Regulations, presents the committee's

second report.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to present today, seconded by the member from Prince Albert Carlton, the second report of the Special Committee on Regulations concurred in.

I just want to indicate that your committee has reviewed a number of by-laws and regulations regarding the Assembly process. And what we've found, Mr. Speaker, in a number of cases . . . in our most recent meeting we took the time to try and do some follow-up on a number of requests that had gone forward, and would add that in some cases we've had good response and good support from ministers responsible for different areas of regulations and by-laws and other areas. We're still waiting for a response and we will continue to follow up, but at this period of time we're pleased to present our report to the House.

And I want to thank all members for their work and diligence and their involvement in the process of the committee.

I therefore move, seconded by the member for Prince Albert Carlton:

That the second report of the Special Committee on Regulations be concurred in.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to concur with the motion and I would just like to make a couple of remarks. The work of the Special Committee on Regulations is a function of the legislature which is rather important in the sense that it serves as a watchdog and double-check on all of the regulations that are made by the members of the cabinet and passed subsequent to any Act. And quite often the work that is done is a result of follow-up requested by people who are affected by the regulations. And usually it's a matter of clarification.

During the work of the committee and also work of the cabinet this year, they tried to introduce . . . made several attempts to introduce new efficiencies. And one of the things that this committee was able to do was result in a saving of about anyplace from 12,000 to \$20,000 over this year as a result of transferring the work from an outside hired legal firm to asking the Legislative Law Clerk to do the work for the committee.

This was done by eliminating some duplications right within the government. I'm very pleased that the \$750 a day that it used to cost us for outside help, we are now able to do inside. And it shows that the government's . . . another step, small step, but put them all together, Mr. Speaker, they all add up to a savings for the Saskatchewan taxpayer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Roy: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the other members of the legislature, 27 grades 7 to 10 students from the Prud'homme School. Prud'homme is on the southern boundary of my constituency and it's a very, very nice community. The people there are comprised of people from many ethnic backgrounds, and certainly they've come together to form a very vibrant community. Mr. Speaker, the students are accompanied here today by their teachers, Mr. Stephen Kemp and Mr. Larry Bodnar; as well, their chaperons, Mr. Gilbert Leray and Mr. and Mrs. Ken and Lucy Miskolczi; also the bus driver Sandra Bodnar.

I will be meeting with the students and the teachers and chaperons after question period to have some refreshments with them and to discuss some of the activities that happened here today. I would ask all members to welcome them very warmly here today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce through you, and to you, to the members of the Assembly two constituents of mine from Eston, Blaine and Loreen Ilott. They are here to enjoy the proceedings this afternoon, as well as take in the Farm Progress Show. Mr. and Mrs. Ilott are good friends and neighbours of mine, Mr. Speaker, and I'd wish all members of the Assembly to give them a warm welcome to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Whitespruce Youth Treatment Facility

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to say to anybody listening that if this session has proven one thing, it is that the NDP government opposite will say anything at any given time.

Mr. Speaker, when the opposition asked about rural health care the Minister of Health told Saskatchewan people that there would be no hospital closures. None, she said. Scare tactics, she said.

Well the truth has finally come out. Mr. Speaker, I take you back to March 10 when the member from Moosomin asked the Minister of Health about the future of the Whitespruce Youth Treatment facility. She said, and I quote:

... the Department of Health will be doing a paper on institutional services within the province and how it should break down in the future. And that's going to be coming out very soon, within a few weeks.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health.

Madam Minister, three months later I have yet to see any study, paper, or announcement about what you intend to do with Whitespruce. Madam Minister, was the March 10 answer just another ploy to avoid the question? If there has been a study, will you table it today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister who's attending the rural health conference in Prince Albert today, Mr. Speaker, I can inform the member that the Department of Health, officials of the Department of Health, now are working with each of the institutional facilities that are funded by the Department of Health. We are conducting a review. Mr. Speaker, I do look forward personally to travelling and visiting those institutions myself as soon as the legislature finishes its sitting.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will have to settle for the associate minister then. Mr. Member, your answer on March 10 of your minister was unequivocal. She said, and I quote:

... information with respect to institutions and institutional sector in Regina and across the province will be forthcoming in the weeks to come ...

That's what she said on March 10. She promised that a study on the future of Whitespruce and other institutions would be coming out within weeks. And of course today is June 15. So the answer is obviously going to be different, right? Mr. Minister, your department employees seem to be willing to tell the truth when they are asked. Your department has informed us that your NDP government plans to cut the beds available for addiction treatment in Whitespruce in half — in half, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, is that the rest of the story? Will you confirm that that is what you have planned for Whitespruce, that you have had this plan in the makings all along?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, again we have an example in this legislature of members of the opposition, certainly not deliberately, but misleading this legislature. In March the member from Moosomin comes into this legislature and says as if it were fact, you people are closing the Whitespruce treatment facility — closing; he said that. Now today, these weeks later, the member from Rosthern comes in and says, well your plan ... now we know for sure your plan is to cut the beds in half at Whitespruce.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will explain to the member the plan. The plan is to review all of our in-patient facilities, all of them across the province; that includes Whitespruce and the programing at Whitespruce. As part of that review I will be visiting each of those facilities over the course of the next few weeks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, in response, this is what your department is telling us and the workers out at Whitespruce. This is the information that we're getting from them. So, Mr. Minister, you cannot be believed any more. You've given too many wrong answers in this Assembly. You've been too anxious to provide inaccurate and misleading information. You have no credibility, Mr. Minister.

Your department, I would suggest, does have credibility. They tell us that in spite of a waiting-list at Whitespruce you are taking half of the beds away for treating Saskatchewan children and that part of that facility now is going to become a detention centre for delinquent youths. Mr. Minister, is that accurate? Is that it? Are you taking half the beds used to treat and rehabilitate young adults and turning them into jail cells? Is that the case? Or are you saying that your department is not telling the truth? Which is it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I will repeat for the member from Rosthern and for all members of the Assembly the current situation. The current situation is that we are — Department of Health officials together with myself — are reviewing all of our institutional in-patient facilities for addictions treatment across the province. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that entire review, we will then be making recommendations and making decisions. To this point there are no decisions made.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you will admit that review is a euphemism for saying things are done but we don't want to tell you the results of what the decision that we have made. Mr. Minister, that's the record of your government.

Now, Mr. Minister, will you admit that placing juvenile delinquents with youths being rehabilitated for substance abuse and addiction is not an ideal situation? Mr. Minister, what of the treatment space that will be lost? This is the only treatment of this kind in western Canada and it has a waiting-list. Taking those beds away will surely mean even longer waiting-lists and a deterioration of services of those teenagers and young people suffering with that illness.

Mr. Minister, it seems you will be content in jailing them rather than treating them, probably because it's cheaper. Is that what your wellness model is all about, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that that kind of a preamble to a question deserves much serious response.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat again for the member, we are conducting a review of all of our in-patient treatment

facilities. We need to maximize the limited resources that are available to us in all aspects of health care to provide health care to the needs of Saskatchewan people, young and old.

Now if, Mr. Speaker, the member from Rosthern has a different definition for what review means, I assume that's a definition he used when he was in government. That is not the case here. This is a review of all of those facilities. It will be conducted carefully, and in cooperation and in consultation with those facilities.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Member, I want to remind you that three months ago your minister said: within weeks a definitive plan will be announced. Workers, concerned parents and youth are still waiting, Mr. Member.

Now your party was the one that congratulated the previous administration for implementing this program for our province's youths. You agreed with us that this treatment was long overdue. And you agreed that this kind of a centre was the best place of treatment rather than in the home where conditions are extremely difficult for rehabilitation.

Now what appears, that you're doing another NDP back flop, another flip-flop. Now it seems that Saskatchewan's human resource is not important after winning the election.

Mr. Minister, the fall-back rate for young adults in a community-based treatment program is over 90 per cent — the fall back. Compare that to the current rate in Whitespruce, which is under 5 per cent, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, would you not admit that the best place to treat young adults is in this centre and that your plan to eliminate half the spaces is much like your wellness plan — ill-conceived, ill-planned, and ill-timed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, for young people or for adults who may have an addictions problem, almost on an individual basis, the appropriate treatments will differ. For some, institutional in-patient care is the most appropriate treatment. For others, treatment in home and in community is the appropriate treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of the review and the goal of this Department of Health, of this government, is to provide with the limited resources available to us, the most effective and appropriate treatment for young people with addictions and for all people in our province who may find themselves in the tragic circumstance of being addicted to alcohol or drugs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Economic Policies

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and it centres around the Premier's chronic inability to tell the truth.

Mr. Premier, why do you insist on telling different versions of the truth depending on whom you're speaking to — the New York speech and the Harris speech.

Mr. Premier, yesterday Statistics Canada said that we had the worst economic record in Canada in 1992 — negative economic growth of 3.5 per cent. So rather than addressing the problem, you go off to the Rotary Club and tell them that the growth this year is going to be between 2.7 per cent and 3.9 per cent in 1993.

Mr. Premier, that sounds pretty good. But you know it isn't true. The Conference Board of Canada is predicting 1.8 per cent growth, one of the slowest growth rates in Canada. The Toronto Dominion Bank is predicting 1.5 per cent growth.

Mr. Premier, where did you dream up the numbers that you told the Rotarians yesterday? And instead of spending your time making up numbers to show what a great job you're doing, why don't you do something to address the real hurt that the Saskatchewan people are feeling?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the hon. members opposite would not recognize truth if it hit them in the face. And nine years — nine years, member from Wilkie — nine years you told the people of Saskatchewan that you would balance the budget, and nine years you racked up deficits which now have put us \$16 billion in the hole. And you have the audacity about telling the truth. Shame on you. That's why you're running in third position, and we're going to finish you off in the next election finally and completely.

Those numbers that are in that speech are numbers which come as the result of a variety of external estimates of our economic development. Some are lower as you have cited; some are higher. And the Department of Finance figures that are set out there, that's where the numbers come from.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, you said the numbers are between 2.9 per cent and 3.9 per cent. The Conference Board of Canada says it is 1.8 per cent. You stand in this legislature every day, Mr. Premier, and say to us that we should try and be a little more positive, Mr. Premier. I'm going to take you up on that offer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Premier, I'm going to take you up on that offer. I was reading through the Conference Board of Canada's economic forecast, and in spite of the

dismal overall outlook they are painting for our province, they do point to a few positives, Mr. Premier. They say the Husky oil refinery is a positive. They say Crown Life is a positive. They say the Meadow Lake pulp mill is a positive. They say Saferco is a positive. They say that relocation of FCC (Farm Credit Corporation) is a positive.

Funny thing, Mr. Premier. These are all projects that came about as a result of the previous administration, Mr. Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — So you can see, Mr. Premier, the opposition can be very positive if only you'd give us something to be positive about, other than made-up numbers, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, when are you going to start addressing the issues of economic growth instead of making up numbers and hoping the problem will go away?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, the member . . . Mr. Speaker, the member's . . . I must say that in my judgement the questioning that the members have had, not only this question period but throughout this entire session, lacks so much credibility by virtue of concocted statements which these people through their back-room boys draft in question period, that it's hard to know where to start the answer.

An Hon. Member: — Back-room boys. They would resent that.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well I don't think they should resent that at all. I think it's quite an honour that they have actually seduced you people into reading those questions. So I give them the credit; I don't give you the credit. I think they got you boys buffaloed over there.

I don't know where one goes with a question which is so far off the mark like that, but I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the proof of the pudding will be in the eating, when the figures for '93 come out. Every external analyst of the Saskatchewan situation has indicated that there will be growth. I said some say less; some say more.

The numbers that we give are Department of Finance figures based on the information which we have, as the record shows. Yes, the Department of Finance last year were almost bang on, unlike yours over nine years. For the first time; unlike yours.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan are more optimistic. They are following the pattern of partnership that my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development who has just returned from an engagement in Melfort, is pleased to talk about. We're on the upswing, notwithstanding the doom and gloom of the people opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, you said last year that the Conference Board suggested that you were bang on, bang on in your prediction of economic growth. That's true, Mr. Premier, you were bang on — 3.9 per cent downturn in the economy. You were bang on all right, sir. We had a shrinkage in the economy of 3.9 per cent as a result of your policies.

Mr. Premier, when you spoke with the Rotarians, you used your luncheon to make up falsehoods designed to discredit the co-op movement. Fortunately someone from the co-op was there to point out how your versions of the truth differ depending on who you're speaking to. The vice-president of CCRL (Consumers' Co-operative Refineries Ltd.) says that you have disseminated misinformation about the deal in an attempt to discredit FCL (Federated Co-operatives Ltd.). That's what the vice-president said, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, you don't want to negotiate with the co-op. You want to legislate the deal. That's your goal, Mr. Premier. You want to legislate . . .

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

Mr. Boyd: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. You want to expropriate and you are prepared to do everything you can to push your political agenda to the forefront, Mr. Premier. Why don't you just tell the . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. I've been listening to the member and not only is he very long in his questions, but he's on the fringe of being very unparliamentary by using . . . Order, order.

I say to the member from Kindersley to please come back to parliamentary language and to put his question.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, will you tell the people of the co-op movement in Saskatchewan that you will not legislate an end to the upgrader over in northern Regina here. Will you legislate or will you negotiate, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, after that rather long-winded and, I might say regretfully, sorry diatribe by a young member who really should be coming to this legislature with a slightly elevated, more elevated approach in his rhetoric and his tone — but you do whatever you want to do. It's up to you entirely — after that diatribe all that I can say is the following.

Mr. Dahlstrom's recommendations as he articulated to me at that speech were all looked after by Mr. Justice Estey. Mr. Justice Estey had all of that information — all of that information — and he still concluded that the project had run financially

aground and that we had to have something done with the debt.

Now the second aspect of your question is: do we want to legislate or do we want to negotiate? The answer is we want a negotiated settlement. The Conservative government and Mr. Bill McKnight have indicated that they're prepared to buy the principles of Estey. We've indicated we're prepared to buy the principles of Estey. FCL has not so indicated they're prepared to buy the principles of Estey.

In the absence of their agreement, supported by you people who of course were behind this deal which has encumbered Saskatchewan to the extent of \$600 million, we have no deal. If the choice is no deal, period, versus legislation, regretfully there will be legislation. Because the one thing that we will not do is sit back and hope that the taxpayers' interests are protected. That policy of prayer may be yours, sir; it's not ours.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, while you can take great joy in trying to discredit anyone who disagrees with you, it is you and your government that is discrediting this province, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier.

In 1991, Mr. Premier, you said: party people and defeated MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) and candidates ought not to serve on government boards. That's what you said, Mr. Premier. If we do not succeed in this and continue to appoint party hacks, then we have not gotten anywhere. That's what you said, Mr. Premier. In estimates later this afternoon, we are going to be addressing those concerns of the people, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, how can you tell the people of this province of Saskatchewan that you are not going to be filling this Regina with NDP hacks when that is exactly what you've done since you have taken office, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, this is the most amazing diatribe from the member opposite. If the members care to read an article on patronage, I would refer them to the Les MacPherson article in the *Star-Phoenix* recently that talked about the appointment of Dave Tkachuk. And what he said at that time, it's like rifling through the refrigerator for a snack and going to that bottom drawer and getting out the decrepit broccoli — that's what he compared the appointment of Dave Tkachuk to. It's like rifling through the fridge for a snack and going to the bottom drawer and finding the decaying broccoli and choosing that as your snack.

That's what you chose — your federal government, the new Prime Minister, that's the kind of people that they're people . . . that they're appointing. For you to criticize this government is absolutely ridiculous.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, you responded to my colleague and said that the proof will be in the eating. Well I want to tell you, give you a sample of what the folks ate in the province of Saskatchewan in 1991, and I quote, Mr. Speaker: *Star-Phoenix*, September 21: the party has also promised to abolish the provincial flat tax. NDP party. Moose Jaw **Times-Herald**, October 17: but we're not going back to taxing people. Leaders' debate, October 5, '91: the PST is not going to be around after October 21 if we're in power. Member from Riversdale. *Star-Phoenix*, October 12: creating more jobs will also stimulate revenue without raising taxes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what the folks ate and what we've got today, as my colleague points out, is the big bellyache of rotten green apples that the Premier has delivered to the people of Saskatchewan. The economics of this province, Mr. Premier, are a mess.

Now, Mr. Premier, simple question: the people ate what you offered in the fall of 1991. Mr. Premier, here's the proof. What do you say about what they ate in 1991? Were you right then, or are you wrong now? Which is it, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to take that member seriously and I keep having to remind myself that he's the supposed leader of that political opposition on the other side of the Assembly. But I want to say to you, Mr. Member, the key initiative that we explained to the people before the election was getting the \$15 billion debt under control. We campaigned on that, and that is exactly what we are doing.

I might add there is a great deal of difficulty doing that when we have a federal government that insists on appointing people like Dave Tkachuk to the Senate at a cost of millions of dollars to the Canadian taxpayers — a lot of that, of course, being shared by the Saskatchewan taxpayers.

But I say to you that the goal of getting the debt under control has been in many ways achieved and we are now moving on to growing the economy and I think that 1993 results will clearly indicate that we're winning on that as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can see why the Premier and his government would rather talk about the patronage appointments of some other government rather than their own broken promises. The question that has to be answered, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier should have the courage to ask when he goes to groups like the Rotarians in Regina, is why in the face of all of the promises made in the fall of 1991 that he doesn't own up to the fact that his

government is taxing Saskatchewan residents into the ground, that as a result of that we have the city of Swift Current shopping in Medicine Hat. We have no growth in our economy and people continually asking to meet with this Premier to straighten out the economic mess.

Mr. Premier, I'll ask you again: in the face of the promises that you made to Saskatchewan people about no new taxes — and you said the proof is in the eating — why won't you take this opportunity before this House closes to confirm that you're meeting with Saskatchewan business leaders on a summit where you go and tell them the honest goods instead of going to people like the Rotarians and misleading them.

Will you do that, sir?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the member opposite that I don't know what he has against the Rotarians. They're an organization that serves Saskatchewan people well.

But what I do want to say, Mr. Member from Thunder Creek, that this government is working with business people every day. I just returned from a meeting of the chamber of commerce in Melfort. The mood in that group was very optimistic. They have opened 10 businesses in Melfort in the last year — not because of government policy, but because there is belief in the communities of Saskatchewan.

But I want to say, when it comes to the appointment and waste of taxpayers' money, I want to again to refer to a quote from the Les MacPherson column where he says:

Tkachuk, you may recall, was for many years the chief hack for the Devine administration, the most scandalous and least competent government this province has ever known.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, that is the problem that we are trying to clean up. After 10 years of that kind of waste and mismanagement, you can't expect us to get it done in 12 months, but give us four years and we'll have turned this province around along with the business community.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Community Health Centres

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of a significant new development in the course of bringing about health reform in Saskatchewan.

I've just now returned from the rural health conference in Prince Albert. At this conference it was my pleasure to release a report entitled, "A Guide to Community Health Centres in Saskatchewan." We expect that community health centres will be the

cornerstones of the health care delivery system throughout rural Saskatchewan. Along with ensuring access to a variety of health programs and services, they will also serve as the focal point for health promotion within their districts.

The purpose of the document released today is to help individual health districts develop and deliver services to Saskatchewan residents. It describes in detail the anticipated role of community health centres and how they fit into the health district model. More specifically the guide outlines the major programs and services these centres could provide along with practical information that will help local districts plan and operate their centres. In a sense it's a how-to book. It outlines the range of services that may be provided, from health promotion and prevention, to assessment, coordination, and integration.

Last, but certainly not least, it addresses the various treatment and care services and defines them in more detail. Finally, the document provides information to health district planners on how to actually establish and operate a centre. It addresses matters like location, hours of operation, and costs, the kind of down-to-earth information local officials will need to get their centres up and running.

The establishment of community health centres within local health districts is an important step towards making the wellness approach to health care a reality. For this reason we consider this new guide to be of considerable significance and I'm sure of interest to all members. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, I'd like to respond to the statement that you have just made and unfortunately it seems that the people of the province normally get information like this before the members of the legislature. But certainly considering some of the Bills before the House, that seems to be normal practice for you.

But, Madam Minister, I do look forward to eventually getting a copy of that community health centres guide from you. And you know what, Madam Minister, that I expect that having looked at what you've read for us this afternoon, I will now expect that this paper, once I have it in my hands, is going to outline exactly what people in this province are going to receive in so far as . . . an example, alcohol treatment that has been offloaded by you.

(1445)

That was a centre of discussion during question period, Madam Minister. What is going to happen to Whitespruce? What is going to happen to Calder Centre? What is going to happen to Myers House? And unfortunately we know what has happened to Myers House in spite of manifestations and protestations by the Minister of Labour prior to the election that indeed centres like this — important, significant centres, wellness centres as such — be given the appropriate

and adequate amount of funding so that they will be able to perform the duties that they have been charged with.

So, Madam Minister, I'm looking forward in your paper that it will be most enlightening and will assure the people of this province that they do not have as much to fear from your government as it seems apparent at this time.

So, Madam Minister, I expect that your paper will outline what role laid-off health workers are going to have in these community centres. How many laid-off workers, Madam Minister, will be employed in community centres, and how many families can rest easy, as a result of this paper, that they will not have to relocate.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I say to Madam Minister, I expect that this paper will outline government funding to help districts so that they will be able to determine if they have enough money to operate a community health district or a community health centre or not. That is what they're waiting for, Madam Minister.

Further I expect that this paper will tell us whether the Minister of Health pulled acute care funding from 52 facilities in rural Saskatchewan as a cost-saving measure or because the facilities were not being utilized or was it because that the previous government happened to build those facilities. I expect . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. I think the member knows that in a minister's statement, the minister's statement is to be short and the response is to be short. And the member has already almost taken twice as much time as the minister did in her statement, so I want him to wrap up this statement, please.

Mr. Neudorf: — A couple of points, Mr. Speaker, and then I will conclude. Madam Minister, I simply tell you that I further expect your paper to tell us exactly what the Minister of Health will do once all of the health districts are formed, and then you simply will have no reason to be in cabinet; everything is out of your realm of responsibility.

I expect the paper will give definitive answers to these questions and others that people, particularly in rural Saskatchewan, have. Maybe the paper will tell us once and for all what exactly the government's health reform policy is all about. People want to know, Madam Minister; they want to know what kind of health care they will have access to once the NDP government's health reform is complete. People do not want the government to continue playing with their lives and the lives of those around them, Madam Minister.

The Speaker: — Does the member from Saskatoon Greystone have leave?

Leave granted.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. I wish to take this opportunity to commend the minister, and in particular, those people who worked on the guide. It is extremely important that the citizens of Saskatchewan begin to have some tangible evidence that the government indeed has a plan and a specific kind of plan for health care in the province.

Now change, as we know, is always a very difficult thing for people because we're fearful of the unknown just naturally. And the more specific information that your government can provide, Madam Minister, the more quickly that the people of Saskatchewan will feel reassured.

I look forward with great anticipation, actually, to receive a copy of your community health centres guide.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now go to the Committee of Finance.

Leave granted.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the House now move into the Committee of Finance, the Executive Council in particular.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

General Revenue Fund Executive Council Vote 10

The Chair: — At this time I would like to ask the Premier to please introduce his officials to the committee.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce to the legislature, first to my left seated here, the deputy minister to the Premier's office, Mr. Ron Clark. To my right is the chief of staff to the Premier's office, Mr. Garry Aldridge. Directly behind me is the director of administration, Don Wincherauk. Seated to his left is the senior policy adviser for policy and planning, Ms. Louise Greenberg. And behind Mr. Wincherauk is the administrative budget and personnel officer, Ms. Bonita Heidt.

Item 1

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Premier, one of the major failings of your government is your record on patronage. If it isn't the worst example of your broken promises, it is tied for second place with about 10 other things that you've broken your promise on as well, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, you gave your solemn promise to the people of Saskatchewan that patronage was not going

to happen under your administration, that that type of thing was finished, it's something of the past, your government was not going to engage in that sort of thing, Mr. Premier.

On March 1, 1991, you said: partisan people, party people, and defeated MLAs and candidates ought not serve on government boards. If we don't succeed in this and continue appointing party hacks, then we've gotten nowhere.

Mr. Premier, your government has developed an extensive list of breaking that promise. Mr. Premier, not only you have made those kinds of statements about your government but as well the Attorney General has made those statements as well. On May 6, 1992, he said:

Mr. Speaker, we have committed ourselves to the appointment of qualified people and we have committed ourselves to the principle that we will not be making patronage appointments, and we have not.

Mr. Premier, there is ample evidence to suggest that you have broken your promise to the people of Saskatchewan on this issue. And we can go through them one by one if you like, and perhaps that would be the best way of doing it for the people of Saskatchewan.

Don Ching is an example of where you broke your promise, Mr. Premier. Zach Douglas is an example of where you broke your promise, Mr. Premier. Dickson Bailey, Howard Leeson, Sharon Mitchell, Terry Bekolay, Terry Stevens, Lorne Johnson, Ted Boyle. The list goes on and on and on, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, in light of the fact that you made the promise to the people of Saskatchewan that you would not be doing that sort of thing, you would not be engaging in patronage, why then have you engaged in such a long list of doing exactly that? Why is that, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the member's question. But like all — I shouldn't say all, but most questions that the hon. member raises, his assumption is false to begin with. He says, why is it that you have such a long list of patronage. Well the answer is we do not have a long list of patronage.

What the hon. member disputes is the appointment of some people and then he throws those people under the rubric of patronage. For example, he indicates, mentioning one name, Mr. Don Ching, who worked in the former administrations of government and has had extensive experience as a deputy minister of Labour; has had the experience of Crown Investments Corporation head; has been involved in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. This is a person who he describes as patronage, simply because he doesn't subscribe to the appointment of Mr. Don Ching.

Well you may not subscribe to Mr. Ching's

appointment, or to that whole list of appointments, but it is incorrect to say that that is an example of patronage. I will tell you what an example of patronage is. Patronage is people that you do not necessarily agree with their appointment, but patronage is the appointment of people whose sole criteria for appointment is their political connection and their political qualifications and their political work done for the governing party.

For example, Mr. Bob Andrew — do you know him? Do you know who he is, Mr. Member? You're not acknowledging who he is. Well I'll tell you who is. He is your predecessor, the MLA from Kindersley, PC. He gets a trade emissary at the Saskatchewan trade office in Minneapolis at a salary of \$97,000, having had no previous experience about trade. That is patronage.

Mr. Eric Berntson — do you know who Mr. Eric Berntson is?

An Hon. Member: — I know him.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — You know him. Yes, the member from Maple Creek knows him. Mr. Eric Berntson was the person who embraced Mr. Jean Charest. He's appointed to the Senate of Canada for no reason except to foist the GST (goods and services tax) on the Canadian and Saskatchewan public — cost of 71,000 in numbers, and higher than that.

Here's another individual, Mr. Larry Birkbeck. Do you know who this Mr. Larry Birkbeck is?

An Hon. Member: — Never heard of him.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Never heard of him, the hon. member says. Well I don't doubt that he would, although I think Larry is one of the more honourable people that's come forward. Larry received a 10-year municipal appointment to the Saskatchewan Municipal Board in 1990 at a salary of \$57,820.

Mr. Gordon Currie. Do you know who Mr. Gordon Currie is? Another Progressive Conservative MLA and cabinet minister, drug centre in Yorkton.

Mr. Gordon Dirks, \$30,000 contract from Education to do a study of private schools. Do you know who Mr. Dirks is? Mr. Dirks is a former PC (Progressive Conservative) minister.

Mr. Louis Domotor, February 21, 1989, special projects coordinator — I'll have something to say about that in a moment — special projects coordinator for SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation).

Do you know how SPMC worked, by the way, Mr. Member? Because we're going to get a little bit of a lesson on that this afternoon too for you. Mr. Louis Domotor was special projects coordinator. That is patronage.

Mr. Sid Dutchak. Do you know who Mr. Sid Dutchak was? He was a minister of the Crown, PC MLA,

appointed interim president of the Housing Corporation, 1958.

Mr. Tim Embury. Do you know who he was? He was appointed a . . . given a consulting contract, a number of them, with the provincial government. Former minister, PC MLA.

Mr. Ralph Katzman. Do you know who he is? I think the member from Rosthern knows who Mr. Ralph Katzman is. He was the long-time member for Rosthern as the PC until the current member who became the member from Rosthern pulled a midnight putsch on Mr. Katzman and got him un-nominated. And the member knows what I talk of.

Well at least he had some conscience. I tell the current member from Rosthern, he has some conscience in any event because he then appointed Mr. Katzman special assistant to the minister of Highways. PC MLA.

(1500)

Here's Mr. Myles Morin. I don't know if they know who Mr. Myles Morin is. Former PC MLA, head of the occupational health in Department of Labour.

Mr. Keith Parker. Do you know who he is? Former PC MLA, appointed assistant to the chairman of the Liquor Board, February 21, 1989.

Mr. Paul Rousseau from Regina, Saskatchewan, agent general in London.

Mr. Jack Sandberg, PC MLA and minister, customer relations, SaskPower.

Mr. Paul Schoenhals. This is one you should note, Mr. Member from Kindersley. Mr. Paul Schoenhals, a former minister and PC MLA, first full-time paid chairman of the board of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. First full-time paid chairman of the board of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Bud Smith. Do you know who Bud Smith is? Saskatchewan Gaming Commission. No, he doesn't know who Bud Smith is either. I mean these people sort of just want to forget all of these names.

Mr. Graham Taylor. Now this is a good one. He's heard of Mr. Graham Taylor. Appointed trade emissary to Saskatchewan Hong Kong trade office, salary approximately \$97,000.

Now this is a list of PC MLAs who went straight from defeat in 1986 or just prior to 1991, skipped the sinking ship, and were immediately tagged on to a variety of jobs like Mr. Domotor's, on special projects coordinators. By the way, and your recent senator, Mr. Dave Tkachuk, of which we'll have a few things to say a little bit this afternoon about that as well, that is what patronage is. Patronage is the appointment by the governing party of people whose sole credential is political activity and election, as this list — and it's a longer one — shows, with no other demonstrated ability or skill. That's what it is.

Patronage is not the appointment of people who may be sympathetic to the philosophy and the goals of the government, with whom you may disagree, but who have a demonstrated track record of skill. That's not patronage; that's a question of disagreement as to who should be appointed.

And we have said something that you have not done in nine years. What we have done is we have appointed the Public Service Commission to become once again independent, and for the in-scope employees, they will be hired on merit.

Now the hon. member from Moosomin is speaking from his seated position. And I would invite him to take part in this debate so that we can hear his contribution and . . .

An Hon. Member: — Sit down and he will.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Don't tell me when to sit down. I'll sit down when I'm good and ready and I'll sit down when you get the proper statement of truth, Mr. Member. So you do that. And you'll have your chance, member from Moosomin, very easily, because I have something about your involvement when you were in government as well which will be coming out about patronage and the corruption that was involved in the operations of that government from 1982 to 1991. That is patronage.

Now I say to the member from . . . MLA from Kindersley, please understand that. Now you just came back from Ottawa as well. And it turns out that your party revels in this. You know the outgoing Prime Minister has made 655 appointments in six months. You know what some of the appointments are? He has re-appointed Mr. Bob Andrew, National Energy Board — because when we got to office we ended that patronage appointment — he's appointed Bob Andrew for another 10 years to the National Energy Board just a few days ago, in order to prevent the inevitable, which is a change in government. He's done that for a large majority of the 655 appointments made in the last six months.

I could give you that list and they involve the Saskatchewan people. Mr. Dave Tkachuk — of whom I'll have something to say in a moment too, in response to one of your questions — Mr. Dave Tkachuk appointed to Senate. That is patronage, sir.

Do you support the appointment of Mr. Tkachuk to the Senate? You might tell us that when you get up next to ask your next question and make your next intervention. I think that he has been warmly received by the colleagues in your caucus. This is an exemplary choice for Senate. I have no doubt that you will state that view in support of your party. That is patronage.

So I say to you, Mr. Member, and to you, Mr. Chairman, that what we have done in this province is established a policy which tries, first and foremost, for the in-scope employees that the Public Service Commission should be the governing and

determining body — and it is. It is now independent and it's now merit based, and it's now basically advertised-based, and that is where the bulk of the employment will be when it is in scope.

When it is out of scope, that is to say, in those senior managements which are tied to cabinet and the ministers, we will look for competence first and foremost. We will do advertising where possible, perhaps not in all instances but in most instances. And we'll appoint people based on competence. They may be supporters of ours. They may not be. You may like them. You may not like them. That's not the issue. But what we will not do is involve ourselves in an orgy of patronage which you did prior to 1991. That's what I promised prior to 1991 then; that's what I promise the people of Saskatchewan today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Premier, but you promised that was all going to end. You said to the people of Saskatchewan, you said to the people of Saskatchewan in the election of 1991 that you and you alone were the one that was going to stand up in front of the people of Saskatchewan, and you were going to change all of that, sir. You were going to show the example and lead the way in Canada. You were the one, the great Premier of Saskatchewan, that could change that.

An Hon. Member: — I did.

Mr. Boyd: — You did all right. One of the first ones you brought to the trough was Jack Messer. You remember Jack Messer, Mr. Premier? Do you remember him? Lord of the Flies from Melfort, the guy up there who is suing your own government, the guy up there who is suing his neighbour over a few horse flies, Mr. Premier. Do you remember him? He happens to be, just happens to be, your campaign manager in the last election — makes him eminently qualified to be the SaskPower president, eminently qualified. Do you remember Carole Bryant, Mr. Premier? Do you remember who that is? Just happens to be associated with your party.

An Hon. Member: — The one that likes the Lexuses.

Mr. Boyd: — The one that likes the Lexuses, yes, remember that little . . . sordid little incident where Ms. Bryant and Mr. Messer had to give those back after a few people found out about them. Remember that, Mr. Premier? Your definition . . . here is what your definition of patronage was at that time, Mr. Premier. Partisan people, party people, and defeated MLAs and candidates ought not serve on government boards. That's what you said, Mr. Premier. You said you were not going to do it. You were going to change all of that, and the people of Saskatchewan believed you, sir. They believed you, and they elected you on the promise of no patronage in your government, and it wasn't weeks into your new administration before you started making appointments, Mr. Premier. That's what you did.

Carole Bryant, Jack Messer, Al Shpyth, Reg Gross — remember him? Defeated candidate Peter Prebble, remember him? Defeated candidate.

An Hon. Member: — What does he have to do with us?

Mr. Boyd: — Well he's working on, as I have it here, some environmental consultant for your government. That's what he does for your government, Mr. Premier ... (inaudible interjection) ... I'm not surprised he's after you and your environmental policy because there hasn't been a very good one of that either, but we'll deal with that at a later date.

Mr. Premier, you said you wouldn't do it. You have done it. The people of Saskatchewan believed you in 1991, and they don't believe you any more. The list is extensive, Mr. Premier. Very, very extensive, of people that have been appointed by you and your government to government boards and commissions all at the public expense, Mr. Premier.

Don Ching, Zach Douglas, Shannon Mitchell, Terry Stevens — long-time NDP provincial executive member, worked as the acting executive director on occupational health and safety — has nothing to do with your government; has nothing to do with the NDP Party, that's what you tell us.

Jack Messer, Shirley Leach, Debbie Simonson, Frank Buck, Debbie Packet, Gary Benson, Carole Bryant, John Chapman, Craig Dotson, Yvonne Gray, the list goes on and on and on, Mr. Premier.

What the people of Saskatchewan want from you, sir, is for you to live up to the promise you made. That's all they ask. At that time, in 1991, you said you wouldn't do it, and you have done it.

Mr. Premier, when are you going to become accountable to the people of Saskatchewan and live up to the promises that you made? When will the people of Saskatchewan clearly see that patronage is not a part of your government? When can we believe the statement that, if we don't succeed in this and continue to appoint party hacks, then we have gotten nowhere? When can the people of Saskatchewan expect that promise to be fulfilled, Mr. Premier? When will that happen? When can the people of Saskatchewan expect that promise to be fulfilled?

The list is extremely long. Ian Laidlaw is just another one that comes to mind, Mr. Premier. Not only that, you like to point out to the people of Saskatchewan how much all these appointments of the past, that you were going to correct, has cost.

The Minister of Education's MA (ministerial assistant) got a 35 per cent raise in pay, May 13 — Florence Matthies. On April 13 of '93 the Minister of Finance's MA got a 25 per cent increase. On May 19 of '93 the Finance minister, another MA got a 22 per cent increase. Gilda Treleaven, MA for the Environment minister, on April 14 got a 29 per cent increase. How long, Mr. Premier, do you want us to continue to point

out examples of where you have broken your promise?

Mr. Premier, the people of Saskatchewan believed you in '91. I think they want to believe your promise today. They want to believe that you're going to discontinue your practice of appointing party hacks, former candidates, defeated MLAs. That's the promise you made. You could talk all you like about what the previous administration does, but you, sir, you, sir, were the one that was going to stop all of that. You, sir, were the one that was going to stop all of that.

Jack Messer. Is he not a patronage appointment? Would the people of Saskatchewan agree with you, sir? Do they think for one moment that the campaign manager for you and the NDP in the last election would not be considered a patronage appointment? I don't think so, Mr. Premier.

I don't think that Carole Bryant would be considered not a patronage appointment. I don't think that a whole host of these other people ... Don Ching, your long-time friend, long-time law partner. Would he be considered a non-patronage appointment by the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Premier? I don't think so. I don't think he'd be considered as just a person you picked off the street, a random look through the phone call turned him up. Is that how you came to his name? Is that how you came to his name?

Is that how you came to Jack Messer's name? A random look through the phone book. Phoned him directly over at party headquarters? Well that's where you found him. That's where you found him, in party headquarters, because that's where he was working prior to your election, sir. Prior to your election he was sitting in party headquarters directing and manipulating and pulling the strings for your political campaign. And it probably was the work of him or someone like him who brought out the statement that partisan people won't be doing jobs for your government any longer, that you haven't gotten anywhere unless you stop that, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, how can you bring yourself into this Assembly and tell the people of Saskatchewan that you will not do it when there's clear example that you've done it right from the first day you took office?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, again if you listen carefully to the member's so-called examples of patronage ... He cites Mr. Messer. He cites Ms. Bryant. Then he cites Mr. Ching. I want to use Mr. Ching again as an example of why he cites him. Mr. Ching was deputy minister of Labour for a number of years in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Ching was the head of the government Finance office. Mr. Ching was ... he got that through competition in the case of Labour. He got there by way of transfer to the government Finance office through ability and experience. And then he worked at the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And I called Mr. Ching to take over the Crown Investments Corporation because of his proven track record in this area.

But I'll tell you, even if you disapprove of that, take a look at Ching's record of public service to the people of the province of Saskatchewan and stack that up against any one of — starting with the A's, Andrew, and ending up with the Z's, the Tkachuks of this world — stack up with any one of them who have never worked one iota within the legitimate civil service whatsoever.

(1515)

Now this business of patronage, I mean that's all the member has — those examples. He goes through a phone book and gives us names, two-thirds of which I have never heard of before. One or two have surprised my officials because these are people who have been long-time civil servants that even you have hired; goes through a telephone book and says, here's your patronage list. Why are you doing the hiring of patronage, Mr. Chairman? Well I mean, this is such a sophomoric, high-schoolish level of debating, Mr. Member, and Mr. Chairman, that it's hard to know how to answer.

But I want to come back to one last point about patronage. I think that there is well accepted in the Saskatchewan public, the belief that this party has no credibility on patronage. I'm not one who very often quotes my very good friend, Murray Mandryk, with respect to this matter. But I will say what Mr. Mandryk's headline says in the *Leader-Post* March 14, 1991.

"Patronage of little concern to Tories", is the headline. And the columnist writes:

But what may be the worst indictment of how indifferent the Tories have become to the patronage perception is how they have now allowed the issue to be raised in the context of summer students' jobs.

Now the hon. member might have known about this. He wasn't an MLA, but I'll just explain to him in case he didn't know how it worked.

What happened was in the premier's office, according to the *Leader-Post* March 14, 1991 headline, the following: "Devine's office tracking student job applications."

And the story, written by Mr. Mark Wyatt, another very good friend of the people of Saskatchewan, says as follows:

Devine's former principal secretary, Don Pringle, says he collected the lists in order to inform the MLAs about which students from their constituency got summer jobs.

By the way, were you called, Mr. Member from Kindersley? You must have been. Will you tell us when you get up in the next question whether you were called about summer jobs for Kindersley. I'll want to know the answer to that please, because I think you were called — I believe you were called —

and I believe you were part of the patronage network. I believe not only were you called, I believe you called the Premier's office and you told the Premier who you wanted by way of students in Kindersley to be hired.

You dispute that statement of mine. Will you dispute that? Because I make that statement about you, sir, and about everybody on the benches. That's what you did, and we'll just see . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He says we'll see. Well we'll see because I want you to get up and dispute that. That's how you did it with student hiring. You, sir, the great advocate now of no patronage.

Well we came to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, we did. We did come to office and we changed it. Here it is, headline: student hiring changed, provincial government picks students on a random basis. He laughs.

Even my good friend Murray Mandryk says, a definite improvement, and he describes how it's been changed.

The members opposite say why don't you do what you promised? I'm giving them a consistent, solid advice of what we promised we did. We changed the student hiring process, even the journalists recognize that.

Now the hon. member talks about the number of assistants. Well I want to talk about the number of assistants. I have a very simple answer to this one as well. What happened with the number of assistants is very clear. First of all, the Acting Leader of the Opposition, the former premier, the whole gang of you over there, you hid them everywhere. You hid them so much that they had to be uncovered in a special report by the Provincial Auditor.

Do you remember that special report of the Provincial Auditor? I think you were here now as a member of the Legislative Assembly, and on page 11 of the Provincial Auditor's report here's what's said:

The following corporations reported that they hired 32 people at a cost of \$1,198,489 to work at the offices of the ministers responsible for the corporations. These ministerial assistants were not hired according to The Ministerial Assistant Employment Regulations.

And then he goes on to talk about how the law was not followed. That's what you did, and you know why you did that? So that when it came to our estimates, when you were in the government and we were asking the former premier of the day about the hirings, he would say look at the small number of people I've got working in various ministers' offices.

What he did not tell the legislature or the public was that he had them buried everywhere in every agency and Crown corporation around. Only after did the special auditor's report reveal that, did that come to light

So what did we do? We said this policy is going to change. It took us a little while to change it, but we changed it. We changed the policy and now what we've done is every ministerial assistant is on a pay schedule, a three-tiered pay schedule, entered based on experience and work duties and obligations. The number that each minister has is regulated and the dollars paid to them are totalled up.

And lo and behold, what we have done as a promise fulfilled — the member asks, where's the promise — as a promise fulfilled what we've done is this: we now have 20 per cent less costs on salaries. Note this, Mr. Member from Kindersley, 20 per cent less cost in salary for all the ministerial assistants who are now above-board and see daylight, and we have fewer ministerial executive assistants to boot.

Now we put them to the Executive Council or the various department agencies, and then you say, oh well, you've got more numbers. Sure, we've got more numbers because we took them out of the Crown agencies and put them where they should be, properly accountable. But if you stack up your total, those that were hidden and those that weren't hidden, against our total, not hidden but right up there, we have fewer ministerial assistants and fewer dollars paid. That's the fact. Another promise made, another promise fulfilled.

We also said that the Public Service Commission would be based on the principles of merit and professionalism straight across the piece. And that's exactly what we've done. We've reorganized it, we've established it, and you can't do any more.

And if there's any one legacy that I'm going to leave, it is going to be that heaven forbid we should ever have another Progressive Conservative government in this province. I don't think that's likely in your lifetime, sir, and you're a little bit younger than I am. But . . .

An Hon. Member: — A lot.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — He says, a lot. Fine. Even a lot younger. It'll never happen in your lifetime, so that makes me even happier because we're going to be without a PC government for a longer period of time.

We're never ever going to have another government like the PCs come in and rape and pillage and abuse the civil service and demoralize it so consistently and so regularly and in such nefarious ways as in the last nine years you did. That's what you did. And you, sir, were a part of that patronage system.

Will you please deny that statement with respect to the calls to the Premier's offices in this regard.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Premier, in his normally enlightened view of things, the Premier likes to lower himself to a condescending fashion whenever he speaks to anyone in this legislature that disagrees with him. Isn't that true, sir?

You like to look at people and try and suggest that they

don't know anything because they don't agree with you. That's your view of things, isn't it, sir? If they don't agree with you, you try to belittle them in any fashion you possibly can. Has nothing to do with what anybody asked you as a question; it has a whole lot to do with your attitude towards people, sir.

Your attitude is shameful in this Assembly. It is the most unpremier-like way of dealing with people that anyone in this province has ever seen. You look at people and you say to them in your condescending fashion, you have no right to ask me questions about anything.

Well I remind you, sir, the good people of Kindersley elected me to this Assembly to do exactly that, to ask you questions about you and your government, not to try and defend, not to try and address anything at all to do with what happened in the past. What I was elected to do here, sir, was hold you and your government accountable. And that's exactly what we intend to do. We are going to hold you accountable.

I remind you, sir, when the previous administration was in government I was not an MLA, and any phone call I may or may not have made to you or the previous administration is absolutely irrelevant to anything we're discussing here today, sir. Absolutely irrelevant.

You, sir, in your condescending fashion speak down to anybody who disagrees with you. That's what you've done every opportunity that anybody that hasn't sat here as long as you, asks you a question. That's the way you deal with the people, sir. And I say it's shameful. It's shameful.

Mr. Premier, you say that some of the folks that we have listed you don't even know who they are or your officials don't either. Well maybe we can enlighten, maybe we can enlighten you and your officials on who some of those folks are: Don Ching, former law partner of yours; Zach Douglas — do you remember who Zach is?

An Hon. Member: — Who's that?

Mr. Boyd: — One of the new vice-presidents over at SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) who just happens to be, he just happens to be a friend of your seat mate across the aisle there, just happens to be a friend of his and former business partner with the Economic Development minister. Now he's the vice-president over at SEDCO.

Dickson Bailey — you happen to remember him? Sat in your administration under the Blakeney years, Mr. Premier. Unsuccessful NDP candidate in 1988. He's now a special adviser to yourself on social issues. Don't remember who he is. The most convenient memory I've ever seen, Mr. Premier.

How about Howard Leeson, remember who is he . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, okay, that's good. Howard Leeson, present deputy minister to the minister in charge of guarding the seal of Saskatchewan, NDP campaign organizer to Last

Mountain-Touchwood.

Shannon Mitchell, Shannon Mitchell — do you remember who she is? She's the daughter of the person who sits right behind you, sir. Do you remember who that is?

An Hon. Member: — What's the point?

Mr. Boyd: — What the point is, is those are examples of patronage. Those are clear examples . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No one is saying kick them out of Saskatchewan. Don't hire them to your government, though. That's what you promised not to do, sir. That's what you said on March 9, 1991. You said you wouldn't do that.

And they're all around you. Is there any seat mate that's within any distance — whispering distance — of you that hasn't got a job yet? Any of their family, any of their friends that hasn't got a job yet? Shannon Mitchell, the daughter of the gentleman that sits right behind you in this Assembly, has got a job with your government — nothing to do with patronage though. Don't accuse me of that. We wouldn't do anything like that, would we, Mr. Premier?

Defeated MLA Peter Prebble, he doesn't know anything about anything he's doing, anything about what he's doing these days. But he just happens to be on the air quality task force, something your government funds. Terry Bekolay, don't know who he is. Well, Mr. Premier, I know who he is and the people of Saskatchewan do. Former NDP president during the mid-'80s, campaign adviser, financial contributor to the NDP Party, has been made a Provincial Court judge by your government. Do you remember who he is?

Terry Stevens, do you remember who he is? The member back in the corner says, who is that? Terry Stevens. Well I'll enlighten you too. Long-time NDP provincial executive member, worked as acting executive director of occupational health and safety. Nothing to do with patronage; just another one of the people in a random search of the telephone book that you happened to turn up.

Ted Boyle, SFL (Saskatchewan Federation of Labour) communications officer who worked with you in the NDP and is now manager of corporate relations over at SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Nothing to do with anything that you would have and your government would have anything to do with.

Chris Banman, defeated NDP candidate, has been appointed to communications director, Communications Network corporate board of directors. That's where Chris is today. Elaine Driver, NDP provincial party president, has been appointed to the Lands Appeal branch. All examples of things you said you were not going to do but you've done since the day you've taken office, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, the people of Saskatchewan thought that you were going to put all of that behind you. You said

to them that you wouldn't participate in those kinds of things. You said, partisan people, party people, and defeated MLAs . . . is Peter Prebble not a defeated MLA? Is Lorne Johnson not a defeated MLA? Is Chris Banman not a defeated MLA? Well that isn't the information that the people of Saskatchewan believe. The people of Saskatchewan know that those folks . . . well the Premier laughs. Did Lorne Johnson run in Kindersley? Did he or didn't he? Was he defeated? Is he out serving on a board today? Yes he is. There you go.

The Chair: — Order, order. Order, order. I'd like the . . . Order, order, order. I'd like the committee members to calm down.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, you can always tell when the people of the government side don't like what they're being accused of, because they know that it's true. They know that the list is extensive. They know that the people of Saskatchewan believe that these people are patronage appointments, and they know that you're not — and haven't — told the truth on this issue, Mr. Premier.

You said that defeated MLAs and defeated candidates ought not serve on government boards. And we can provide you with name after name after name of people that are exactly of that quality of candidates, of exactly that kind of description, that fit it, and now have a job in your government.

(1530)

It's the sort of thing that the people of Saskatchewan have grown used to, sir. It's the New York speech when you're in New York and it's the Harris speech when you're in Harris. Both of them exactly the opposite, but both of them the people of Saskatchewan are supposed to believe.

Mr. Premier, let's go on and deal with a few more of them. Maybe you can remember some of these names from the past too. Sherry Leach, formerly the editor of *The Commonwealth*, has been appointed to the SaskTel board of directors. Not a partisan person, just happens to be the editor of *The Commonwealth*, the NDP paper. Just happens to be; a random search turned her up.

Debbie Simonson, NDP campaign manager, is now on the Crop Insurance board. Margaret Morrisette, the candidate that ran against the MLA for Moosomin is now serving in the Minister of Labour's office, I believe it is.

Mr. Premier, why don't you just stand up in this Assembly, why don't you just stand up in the Assembly here this afternoon and tell the people that this is going to stop, that you are not going to engage in this any longer? You made the promise, sir. Why don't you fulfil the promise?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, we fulfilled the promise on November 1, 1991 when we got elected.

And we did it in the ways that I've described, starting from the student hiring plan, which came right out of the Premier's office at that time, the Public Service Commission, the issues of the hiring practices, even advertising contracts, all of those things which you can get into. We've got work to do. We got more work to do; there's no doubt about that. It's not perfect, but I tell you it is one heck of a lot better than it has been in a very, very long time.

The member goes through a bunch of names and is confused on his facts, says somebody is an MLA when clearly the person's not an MLA. Then says here's another name, but fails to say that the person serves on agency, board, or commission, a power corporation board or a telephones board or some other agency, and then mentions another name, fails to mention the name is a ministerial assistant of which there is a political component to the job. And he just mashes and mashes it all into one and throws in a bunch of good people who have served loyally — he may not agree with them — this province for 20-25 years, and then says, when are you going to stop.

Well of course the assumption is that we started, and I don't buy the assumption that we started. And I think that his facts simply are so far off the mark as to be laughable. And I would say with the greatest of respect to the hon. member, not only are his remarks off the mark, that his party has no credibility in this debate whatsoever.

I've made my points now on this issue three or four times. I don't think there's much more I can add.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Premier, while we were discussing this earlier, you chirped from your seat that Chris Banman had nothing ever to do with the NDP Party . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Defeated candidate, that's what you said — defeated candidate, defeated candidate . . .

An Hon. Member: — You said MLA.

Mr. Boyd: — Okay, maybe I said it, defeated MLA.

Defeated MLA was one of the criteria that you used for people that should not be on government boards. There it is, sir. It's for you and everyone else to see. Partisan people, party people, defeated MLAs, defeated candidates. There's your statement. Defeated candidates. Banman may not have been an MLA, and it's a good thing for the province of Saskatchewan that he wasn't. But he was a candidate, and he was defeated.

He was defeated in the constituency of Rosthern in 1982, 1982. She was defeated in 1982, and you know it. She was defeated in 1982, and you know it, Mr. Premier. The fact is she was defeated in 1982. She ran in Rosthern. You said it never happened, but there's the evidence. It's sort of like the New York speech again, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, we can provide you with a whole list of these people, if you like.

Here's a defeated MLA just happens to come to mind: Jack Chapman. Remember him? Remember Jack? He's working on the Souris Basin Development Authority today, a government board. Said that would never happen, Mr. Premier.

Margaret Morrisette, defeated candidate, works in the Department of Labour today, defeated in this very last election, 1991. Said that would never happen. Jack Messer, defeated a number of years ago. Said it would never happen.

Mr. Premier, the people of Saskatchewan elected you because you made some promises. You did and said whatever it took to get elected. You said you were going to do all of these things, and then you've done exactly the opposite, Mr. Premier. All the people of Saskatchewan, all I'm asking you today, is to give the commitment to the people of Saskatchewan that you're going to stop it, that you're not going to continue with appointing these kinds of people in direct contrast — in direct contrast — to the promise you made. Just fulfil that promise for the people of Saskatchewan and we can move to something else.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — You can stay here as long as you want on this issue. So it's your choice entirely. But the promise has been fulfilled; I've been saying this to the member.

But I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, again about how . . . I mean I want to be very careful about this because the member is so sensitive about the way I speak and the way I address this Assembly that I don't want him to get upset and charge out of the House in hurt feelings. So I have to be very careful about the level of the questioning. But let me just give you a couple of examples as he struggles to make his point.

Marg Morrisette, he said was a candidate. I don't believe she ever was a candidate for the NDP. In any event she works not in the Department of Labour. She's charged to the Department of Labour; she works in the minister's office as a ministerial assistant. You may not like that, but that is of a different category.

Chris Banman. First statement he made was that he was an MLA — an MLA. I said no, not an MLA, not an MLA. Oh well, MLA, candidate, who cares? He's got something about Chris Banman. And then when someone pointed out that Chris Banman is not a he, but Chris Banman is a she, his next line was: well who cares; he, she, MLA, non-MLA. I don't care. I've got something for Chris Banman.

And this is the factual basis of this argument. Jack Chapman, he said. Do you know who Jack Chapman is? I know who Jack Chapman is. Do you know who Jack Chapman is? Who was he, member from Wilkie? I'll tell you who he was. He ran for the New Democratic Party in the 1970s.

An Hon. Member: — No.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Yes. He got elected as an

MLA. He came from the Power corporation. He defeated the current member from Estevan, the premier. Then in 1982 the current member from Estevan defeated Jack Chapman — defeated Jack Chapman. And you know, Mr. Member from Kindersley, what happened, to the credit of the member from Estevan? He rehired Mr. Jack Chapman to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. But now you say that's a patronage appointment. Hired by the Power Corporation under the PCs; hired by us, somehow that's patronage.

I mean with the greatest of respect to the hon. member, talk about a mishmash of names that are jumbled together. And all in an attempt to try to fight back Bob Andrew, Eric Berntson, Larry Birkbeck, Gordon Currie, Gordon Dirks, Louis Domotor, Sid Dutchak, Tim Embury. Let's see, I got so many pages here. Ralph Katzman, Myles Morin, Keith Parker, Paul Rousseau, Jack Sandberg, Paul Schoenhals, Bud Smith, Graham Taylor — all seated MLAs and defeated Tories. And all defeated and all appointed prior to 1991, and others, all in a vain attempt to say, well you're doing the same thing. Well we're not doing the same thing. And your facts and your lack of knowledge of facts proves it beyond a doubt.

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Premier, I don't believe you and the people of Saskatchewan don't believe you either. You made the commitment to them that you were going to change all of that. The Bob Andrews are gone. The Eric Berntsons are gone, Mr. Premier. They're not here any longer. You're the government, you're the one that was going to change all of that.

An Hon. Member: — We did.

Mr. Boyd: — No, you didn't. You didn't change that, sir. You didn't change that. You have defeated candidates, defeated MLAs, people working for you all over that are NDP partisans, party people. That's the facts, Mr. Premier.

The Minister of Education's assistant, 35 per cent increase; Minister of Finance, MA, Linda Lavineway, 25 per cent increase; 22 per cent increase went to Paul Faris, Minister of Finance; Gilda Treleaven, got a 29 per cent increase recently; Beverly Lynn Hewson got a 30 per cent increase; Margaret Giannetta, got a 30 per cent increase; Debbie Young got a 22 per cent increase; Allan Barss got a 33 per cent increase. These are all within the last month, Mr. Premier. All government people, all working as MAs in your offices in your government.

Mr. Premier, we just want to look at some of the folks that are working for you today. Dickson Bailey, Peter Prebble, Terry Stevens, Chris Banman, Jack Chapman — those are all examples of defeated people that worked for you at one time or another.

Mary McGuire — Mary McGuire was the candidate at Moosomin, Mr. Premier. I was mistaken and I admit it. It wasn't Morrisette it was Mary McGuire. That's who it was. Mary McGuire worked for the . . . was a candidate in the last election; now she's working in

the Department of Labour.

We stand corrected on that, but we still . . . the example holds, Mr. Premier. She was the candidate in Moosomin that the MLA for Moosomin defeated in the last election.

Mr. Premier, Don Ching, Zach Douglas, Dickson Bailey, Howard Leeson, Shannon Mitchell, Terry Bekolay, Terry Stevens, Lorne Johnson, Ted Boyle, Jack Messer, Chris Banman, Elaine Driver, Sherry Leach, Debbie Simonson, Frank Buck, Debbie Packet, Gary Benson, Janet Abells, Carole Bryant, John Chapman, Craig Dotson, Yvonne Gray, Frank Hart, Deborah Hartung, Arleen Hynd, Kathie Maher-Wolbaum, are all examples. And we can go on and on and on if you like, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, I just want to ask you one final thing: will you give the people of Saskatchewan the assurance that they're working . . . that they're asking for. Will you give them the assurance that you will not continue in this way? Will you keep your promise to the people of Saskatchewan?

Keep the promise that you made when you said you would not be engaging in that sort of thing. Keep the promise. And the promise was, partisan people, party people, and defeated MLAs and defeated candidates ought not serve on government boards. If we don't succeed in this, and continue appointing party hacks, we have gotten nowhere.

Well, Mr. Premier, I think the people of Saskatchewan believe you have not gotten anywhere on this issue. You have not kept your promise, sir. You have not kept your promise to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Scott: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Scott: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is my pleasure to introduce to the members of the legislature 22 grade 7 and 8 students from Odessa, Saskatchewan, along with their teachers, Lloyd Posnikoff and Marge Jackson; chaperons including Clara Klein, Sharon Posnikoff, Marie Lockert, Debbie Glas, Joan Lenz, and Edie Holzapfel.

They are on tour in Regina and stopped in here. And I look forward to visiting with the people from Odessa shortly and have pictures and drinks. And I'd ask members to join with me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**General Revenue Fund
Executive Council
Vote 10**

Item 1

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, we can only but repeat the response which I gave to the last — I think it was — question by the hon. member in estimates. But I must make two observations about the careless recitation of names under some, I suppose, attempt to try to get a headline about patronage in the government, careless in what it does to people.

He keeps on referring to Peter Prebble working for the government. I have the highest of admiration for Peter Prebble. I've served with him in the legislature. It may be that he is working for the government but for the life of me none of my officials can find that at the current time, and I just don't know what and why that name continues to insert itself in this very confused list.

I must take exception, special exception, to the mention of the name of Arleen Hynd as part of this list. Ms. Hynd is currently the deputy minister of Education and is a career civil servant with no political background. She served under the Devine . . . excuse me, excuse me, I apologize . . . under the former administration in the Power Corporation in a senior management level. She served in the federal government both under the Liberal and under the Conservative federal governments. She came back because we asked her to come back under difficult negotiations to come back to take the Department of Education under control. And I think she's done a super job for us as a deputy minister and can in a variety of areas.

(1545)

And this person, the member from Kindersley, as another example, had mentioned all the names about Chris Banman, and all of the other examples, just throws all kinds of names in there and levels these reckless charges. I don't think very many people are going to support that kind of an approach to estimates or support to this kind of an issue. I think we need to do more to clean up the question of patronage in government. I think we've done a pretty good job. Have we been perfect? The answer is no, we have not been perfect. By comparison are we like night and day? The answer is yes. I think we put a lot of institutional provisions in there and safeguards to prevent abuse in the future and I think the record clearly speaks for itself in that regard.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Premier, the problems that my colleague from Kindersley have been bringing up with the way that your government is performing go into all segments of our society and indeed the economy of this province.

Mr. Premier, one of those problems that has been with us for some time now is the NewGrade upgrader and your inability and lack of will to deal with it in a proper manner.

One of the problems, Mr. Premier, is just what the member from Kindersley has pointed out to you. You have filled CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of

Saskatchewan) with your political friends, with NDP activists, people with their own political agenda, people with their own political vendettas, people with their own long, political memories, people that served with you back in the 1970s as you rampaged through the Saskatchewan economy, nationalizing your way through corporate Saskatchewan.

And I'll just read these names into the list as we get into this discussion, Mr. Chairman, about NewGrade. And I hope the Premier has some different answers today for the Assembly than what he has given to the Rotarians; and what he has given to the north Saskatoon business community; what he did to the Progress Club in downtown Regina. Because those answers, Mr. Chairman, were all fraught with misconceptions, with half-truths, with not the whole story.

And part of the problem is the fact that his friend, his law partner, NDP activist Don Ching, is now the president of CIC, the same Mr. Ching who the media say has had a long-standing political feud going with Federated Co-ops.

Mr. David Dombowsky, the consultant over there. Remember Mr. Dombowsky? That's the guy that was pulled out of the phone book in the 1970s, according to the Premier, to run the Potash Corp of Saskatchewan — the very corporation which the then deputy premier, the member from Riversdale, drove through this Legislative Assembly. Spent hundreds of millions of dollars, borrowed hundreds of millions of dollars at high interest rates. That Mr. Dombowsky who was picked — a friend of the Premier — to run the Potash Corp now over at CIC, drawing down a big salary, and advising Mr. Ching on how to deal with Federated.

And who do we have for legal counsel? Who do we have for legal counsel on this issue that says that we bring in legislation that takes away the right to go to court? The right of recourse to the courts from a man that served as attorney general of the province of Saskatchewan for 11 years, the guy that cut the deal in the kitchen with Chrétien and McMurtry with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, that said that the recourse to the court would be enshrined for Canadian citizens.

Remember the charter? Remember the deal in the kitchen? Well who we have as the legal counsel at CIC is none other than Scott Banda, son of a former NDP MLA, NDP cabinet minister, friend of the Premier's. It's no wonder that we have clause 16 in the legislation that says that this government is so afraid of 230,000 co-op members that they would take the right of the court system away from them. That these citizens of Saskatchewan should have no recourse to question their government through a court system brought to them and presented to them back in 1981 by the then attorney general of the province of Saskatchewan, one of the founders of the new Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale.

And who else do we have over there? Well we happen to have Bill Hyde. He of the former vice-presidency of the NDP, long-time union activist, friend of the Premier, drawing a salary, advising on NewGrade.

Now is there any wonder, Mr. Premier, is there any wonder that we've got problems with NewGrade when all of these political friends of yours are hunkered down in the bunker over at CIC with all sorts of power — you passed a piece of legislation in here this session to make sure they had more — doing the dealing? Saying that we have to look at all . . . and Mr. Ching says, we're going to look at all the Tory deals.

We've got political vendettas to settle here. We've got political things to sort out because people in the old days didn't treat us right or people didn't do what we told them to do in election campaigns. So we're going to get it sorted out now because we've got all kinds of power; we're drawing down a fat pay cheque; we're friends of the Premier; and we're the be-all and end-all in the NDP Party. We'll do what we want.

And 230,000 co-op members in the province of Saskatchewan are saying, we don't think that's fair. We want to have honest negotiations. We want to have a government that listens to us. We want to have a government that treats us fairly, not simply listens to its political friends.

That's the problem, Mr. Premier, that the member from Kindersley was trying to point out to you. You said that such people should not be there. You said that you would do better, that we haven't gained a thing if we allowed people like that to be in those positions to exercise their political whimsical thoughts. That's the problem, Mr. Premier.

And now the situation has dragged on for months and months because you have built up this political agenda and you've told Saskatchewan people that it has to be solved immediately or the whole thing is going to fall down upon our ears.

Well it's kind of strange, Mr. Premier. It's kind of strange that Mr. Donald Gass for one, a person who you so often quote in this Legislative Assembly, when he takes a look at the proposals put forward by your political friends over at CIC, he says that co-op members in the province would be crazy to accept your terms; that you put the very refinery that the members have built since 1930 on the line; that they'd be better off to walk away from their refinery and buy their oil from Imperial Oil because of the deal you've proposed. Mr. Donald Gass who you so often quote as being eminently knowledgeable on financial affairs.

And then, Mr. Premier, we have a gentleman quoted from the consortium of Canadian banks who have much of the debt at the upgrader. And he says that there was no expectation that the upgrader would make money in this decade — no expectation for a whole decade; that the upgrader is performing as they thought it would. It had some start-up problems, but it was performing as they thought it would.

That's the problem, Mr. Premier. Maybe if you had gone out and sought some competent people to run CIC instead of your political friends, this political agenda of denigrating every last project that has been developed in the province over the last decade and putting it under attack for political reasons wouldn't be occurring.

Maybe if you had some competent people over there, Mr. Premier, they would say get off of this political agenda; let's get down to managing the economy in the 1990s. Let's get down to meeting with the people in the business community to see how we can do better. Let's meet with the business community, in this case co-op members, and say how can we do more in refining heavy oil. How can we expand the business? How can we generate new revenue and taxes and jobs? By working with FCL instead of against them. That's what would happen if you had competent people there instead of your patronage appointments. And that's the whole problem here.

You asked your current deputy minister to come back from Ottawa, I'm told, to redo the Public Service in the province of Saskatchewan, to professionalize it, to clean the patronage out. Because the statements that you were making in 1991 were believed by a lot of people, Mr. Premier, that if we can't do better than this, we have failed.

Well, Mr. Premier, we've gone to a lot of expense now. We've had Justice Estey brought in — eminent, qualified jurist in this country. Mr. Justice Estey says, I was very close to an agreement. If I'd had another week or 10 days, maybe I'd have had it.

But no, Mr. Justice Estey wasn't given that time. And I suggest to you, he wasn't given that time because all of your political friends, all of their political friends with their agendas, their own agendas, Mr. Premier, the Chings and the Dombowskys and the Bandas and the Hydies didn't want Justice Estey to settle that dispute.

Instead, they would prefer to see you bring legislation into this Legislative Assembly — legislation, Mr. Premier, that takes away the fundamental rights that you fought for in 1981. And I just want to read section 16, Mr. Chairman, into the record because I think it's important that the Premier understand what he's doing here:

Every decision of the minister pursuant to this Act and every certificate filed by the minister pursuant to this Act is final and conclusive and is not open to question or review in any court, and no decision made and no certificate filed by the minister shall be restrained by injunction, prohibition, *mandamus*, *quo warranto*, *certiorari* or other process or proceeding in any court or be removable by application for judicial review or otherwise into any court on any grounds whatsoever.

I would say, Mr. Premier, that that basically takes away the right, period. Totally. Gone. Shot. Finished. That you and your political friends at CIC can do this

to 230,000 members of the co-op movement in this province. It was bad enough that you did it to 60,000 farm families, that you took away the right to the court, that you could rewrite history. But why, sir, would you repeat that mistake again and again and again and that you would sully this Legislative Assembly doing that?

Did it mean nothing that when we brought our constitution home that you were so proud of, where you guaranteed to Canadian citizens, to Saskatchewan people the right and recourse of the court system? Did it mean nothing? It is one thing to step in and use this Legislative Assembly, sir, to take over the board of directors, to step in and take the funds of co-op members, to tax the dividends of co-op members, but it is another to be so frightened, so politically unsure of yourself, so weak-kneed that you would have clause 16 in to take away their basic rights.

That is why my member from Kindersley, Mr. Premier, asked you about your views on patronage and how you were going to be different. And I think it's only appropriate, Mr. Premier, that you be able to stand in this Assembly and say to co-op members why you would let your political friends and hacks over at CIC take away their basic right to recourse in the courts against your government.

I think that's a good place to start. Why would you let Ching and Dombowsky and Banda and Hyde take away the right of co-op people to seek recourse against you in court. That's a pretty basic premise that most people in this province and country have taken as a right of birth. Why would you let four of your political hack friends take that right away from 230,000 co-op members? Let's start there, Mr. Premier.

(1600)

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, again the hon. member follows the — how should I describe it not to further inflame the House? — the rather sad and pathetic, unfortunate approach of attacking civil servants. He's entitled to do that. But I tell you it doesn't do him well, and I don't think that it supports his argument very much.

I want to begin by replying to some of the points which have merit in the following way. When the Gass Commission reported on the financial mismanagement of the former administration, it recorded the following losses and write-downs all the way from internal Property Management Corporation loans — I hope the members will ask me about those in a little while — PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) shares, NewGrade Energy, 232 million; Cameco Corp. shares, Rafferty-Alameda, Grain Car — it's a long list — totals \$1.83 billion plus guaranteed debt.

NewGrade again, 334, that's plus another \$1.34 billion. Nonpayment for sale of assets, Weyerhaeuser — we were able to renegotiate with them a new deal which is to the benefit of Weyerhaeuser and the

taxpayers. But at the time of Gass this is what was reported. Investments of other concern, the Bi-Provincial upgrader, 177 million; Meadow Lake pulp, 140 million; total account for mismanagement, losses and write-downs, guaranteed debt, questionable investments, Don Gass found \$3.727 billion.

Now that is Gass, and Ernst Young by the way. It is little wonder therefore that those who have access to our books, both on the Crown corporation side and on the government side, come to the conclusion as follows as in the case of Moody's:

Demonstrated efforts by the current government to implement a comprehensive multi-year fiscal plan to stabilize and improve the financial performance of its budgetary accounts, (here's the key words) as well as manage the accumulated exposure to numerous Crown and commercial venture investments.

Note that. How to manage accumulated exposure to numerous Crown and commercial investments. They just totalled 3.7, nearly 3.8 billion. That is what Moody says is the big challenge.

I'll give you another version of that. Standard and Poor's from New York says:

The ratings reflect the government's strong demonstrated commitment to deficit reduction (and note this) and more rigorous management of its off-budget loans and investments reflecting past deficits as well as sizeable investments in unprofitable development projects.

Unprofitable development projects, Standard and Poor's. Now the member may put his head in the sand, but the business world at home and outside knows exactly what risk we face.

The member's too clever by half to pretend that this is somehow a problem created by politics.

September 1, 1990, my very dear friend, Mr. Dale Eisler, had an extensive column on the NewGrade operation. I'm going to take the time of this House, because the member took some time, to tell you what Mr. Eisler in 1990 wrote. The member from Thunder Creek probably knows, but I'm sure if the member from Maple Creek does, so I'd ask him to pay special attention to this.

Mr. Eisler wrote the following:

Make no mistake the NewGrade Upgrader has been a nightmare. What was supposed to be a symbol of the Devine government succeeding where the NDP failed has turned into an example of political expediency perverting economic common sense.

Later on:

The latest evidence came this week with yet another fire at the facility.

Talks about the upgrader's fire and the problems related to that which are not particularly relevant to this particular issue. Then he goes on to say this:

As for NewGrade's financial status, the situation is far worse. From the beginning (Mr. Member from Thunder Creek, he writes) the upgrader was driven more by politics than economics which has turned the project into a financial basket case.

Later on he writes:

The financial situation was so desperate that sources say the project verged on going into financial default late in 1989 and early 1990. A conversion of \$100 million in what were termed series A notes to non-guaranteed debt had become impossible.

Faced with the collapse and fearing the politic embarrassment it would cause, the Devine government (writes Mr. Eisler) sunk taxpayers' dollars even deeper into the project late last year.

And then the end of the quotation:

To put that in perspective, it means the Devine government will be on the hook for about \$600 million, most of it in the form of debt.

All of this because politicians wanted to make themselves look good.

Mr. Ching, Mr. Dombowsky, Mr. Banda — all these people that you so gleefully and recklessly malign and attack weren't even there at the time of that article and that conclusion. Back in 1990, \$600 million, Mr. Member from Maple Creek. That is what Standard and Poor's and that is what Moody's and that's what the bankers and the taxpayers know is what is so critical about this deal: \$600 million.

The deal was so bad, as I've pointed out in the past, one of the former government's key advisers, Philip Gordon, industrial consultant of Toronto who still is advising NewGrade, wrote on October 14, 1986, just a few days before the election in 1986, in a confidential letter — we didn't know about this — to the premier of the day, and he said this:

I have been witness to numerous demands presented by Federated which I believe to be unreasonable and inconsistent with any standard of normal practice business arrangements and incompatible with sound commercial terms as between the owner, NewGrade, and operator. Some of these demands were subsequently modified or withdrawn. Others remained on the table as of last Thursday, including several which I believe

to have substantial, potential, negative effects on the economy viability of the project.

Now this was written to the premier, he said, because he wanted to be on record to plead with the premier not to sign this deal going into the election.

There's an interesting side story which is why the member opposite I think may be persistent in his attack on the officials currently involved. Because prior to that time in 1986, Mr. Member from Maple Creek, what the government did opposite was it succumbed every time that FCL said in the negotiations, you've got to move this guy, or this person, this woman, because he or she is not doing the right job for getting this deal together. And there were at least two or three negotiators which were moved by the pressure that FCL put on the government of the day, much like the words of the member today in his attack on the current officers in CIC today. This is an old story, and it's an old tactic by FCL: get rid of the negotiators, and put in another set of negotiators and another set of negotiators until you get the kind of a deal which got us \$600 million in the hole.

The letter from Mr. Philip Gordon, and there are others — I'd be interested in getting into this debate very much — documentation. In fact the member opposite would know this, that the Department of Finance was so opposed in his administration to this deal that they were considering putting on a refinery tax on the NewGrade. You know that to be the case, unless the minister of Finance acted independently and simply without notifying the cabinet. That is a fact, member of Maple Creek.

Now all of the story then comes out in a different way. Here is a report on November 9, 1992 by Mr. Gord Brock of the *Leader-Post*. I got a copy. Headline says: "Report tells the full story." I'll be please to table this. I'm going to read you just a part of what happened about the time that Mr. Gordon wrote his letter. The story says this:

Despite opposition from the government side, FCL came out of this 1985 round of talks with a memorandum of understanding in support of its right to operate the upgrader.

Note the words — despite opposition from the government side.

"The deal we started with was not near as good as the deal we ended with," said Schoenhals. "That's what you get when governments get involved in business."

Mr. Schoenhals, of course, was at that time the minister of Energy who was negotiating this deal and advised the premier and the cabinet not to sign it.

Now I continue with the story. Empey — I'll stop here — Empey is Mr. Harold Empey of FCL, the current Mr. Empey who is involved in this debate. The story says this:

Empey credits Devine with pushing Saskatchewan negotiators off their stance against CCRL operating the upgrader. "I wouldn't know that but I'm damned sure it was Grant Devine."

Schoenhals, when asked why FCL's key demands made it into the final agreements, signed in December of 1986, said it was a question only one man could answer.

Who do you think that man was, Mr. Member from Maple Creek? That's right, the member from Estevan.

"Schoenhals was against it. He was not going to make the deal," said McPhee (one of the negotiators that was moved out of it). The Co-op escaped with what it wanted because Devine "must of said, Yeh, let's do it."

The story concludes by saying:

Devine could not be reached for comment last week.

Could not be reached for comment last week. I might add, could not be reached for comment last week and hasn't been reached for comment ever since. That's the record.

And today the member gets up and he says, move these people again — move them again. Well I'm not going to move them. I'm not going to move them because faced with this horror story that everybody understands, we've got to act.

Here's the association of Saskatchewan taxpayers:

It's a bad deal and a bad partnership. Negotiations between the government and Federated Co-op should be with an eye to limit any further losses to taxpayers.

And it keeps on going: . . . compliments the government in the stands that we take. Association of taxpayers.

Here's the Regina *Leader-Post*, April 30, 1993, talking about this issue editorially: "All options costly in any upgrader rescue."

Last week former Supreme Court justice, Willard Estey — about the furthest thing in the world from an NDP hack — confirmed this in a potentially explosive report calling for the project to be refinanced.

The NDP, Estey and media reports agree that former premier Grant Devine cut a bad deal with Federated Co-operatives and the federal government, with far too much money borrowed.

"The project has, in a financial sense, run aground," wrote Estey in his report. "Operating at capacity, it cannot sustain its existing debt

load."

That is what the editorial . . . And they end up saying, quote:

In the meantime, one doesn't want to sound like a broken record, but one cannot avoid it: another fine mess you got us into, Grant Devine.

Editorial of the *Leader-Post*.

You can accept or reject the editorial *Leader-Post*; I reject a lot of their editorials. And I do not want to personalize this with respect to the former premier, except that is the history of the negotiations which got us into this circumstance. That's where we are. I didn't create it. Myself and the advisers of the government are trying to get out of it.

I have said to the members opposite, I've said to FCL, we want a negotiated settlement. I even think the Leader of the Opposition said on CKRM or one of the radio hot line shows during the course of this debate over the last several weeks, I think even he said the deal's got to be renegotiated. That's one small step for mankind.

What he's got to tell us is, along what grounds? And the only grounds which has possible meeting room for all three of the actors involved is the Estey report. And what does Estey recommend? He says \$150 million from Ottawa should be pumped in; 50 million should be pumped in by FCL, plus 10 million each of the next three years in exchange for which FCL would get equipment; he says Saskatchewan, notwithstanding that we're \$600 million in debt on this, should pump in another 25 million, plus 10 million over the next three years, and set up a new governance and this thing can work. No one's come up with a better numerical or logical position. Nobody.

(1615)

Now all that I ask the Leader of the Opposition is this: I don't want to politic on this issue, I don't ask you to confess or admit what the deal's a good deal or a bad deal, but if you and I can find common ground that the deal's got to be renegotiated, then I ask you, sir, if you want to be really of help, tell me what other numerical, economic, negotiated deal other than Estey would work. Because I tell you they spent six months, the finest economic and legal minds under the mediation of Judge Estey, and they could come up with no other option.

Now what am I to do? I've virtually pleaded with FCL to meet with them. They've refused. Although there are meetings going on now, they refused prior to the legislation. I must admit that there are meetings going on now, to everybody's credit, and I hope that they move on. But I've virtually pleaded with them. I've pleaded with the Leader of the Liberal Party and with you, sir, to understand our circumstance. And if we are not right, if Estey is not right, if Estey doesn't work, then what does work?

And your silence is deafening here. The silence is deafening because there is no other option except that Estey report.

And you can do whatever you want with all the people involved in this project. It's your right in this House to say what you want. But I say to you, sir, that attacking the personalities even if you dislike them or disrespect them is irrelevant. Even if Ching and company were dismissed tonight, and we put a whole brand-new crowd, it would not change the spots on the leopard. It would not change the hand that we were dealt with. It would not change Moody's report; it would not change Standard and Poor's report. It would leave the taxpayers exposed to 600 million and it would not change the fact that the only way out of this swamp is Estey. That's the position.

So please, with the greatest of respect, and I have a lot of respect for you — disagree with you politically as you do with me — but the personality game business in this issue is irrelevant. Don't fall into the FCL situation as it took place in the 1980s. Tell this House, tell me what a better solution might be. That's all I want to know. And if it works I'll grab it tonight. I'll grab it immediately to negotiate a settlement. Tell me what's a better way.

The Chair: — Order. I have listened carefully for the past nearly half hour during which there's been one question put by the Leader of the Opposition and one answer by the Premier. I remind members of the committee that we are in Committee of Finance reviewing expenditures for Executive Council.

I also remind members of the committee that on the blues under adjourned debates there still sits a Bill No. 90 — An Act to protect the financial viability of NewGrade Energy Inc. It is my opinion that the question and answer would be much more appropriate under review of Committee of the Whole for that Bill than in review of the expenditures of Executive Council.

I do recognize that the Leader of the Opposition made reference to some individuals associated with Executive Council in his question and that the Premier made some passing reference in his answer. But I would ask all members to recognize that what is before us is not Committee of the Whole for the Bill, but the expenditures for Executive Council in Committee of Finance.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

The Chair: — And what is your point of order?

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, I've been here for a considerable period of time and I believe that when Executive Council have their estimates, that on those occasions there is a wide-ranging discussion on policy as it relates to the various aspects of government. I believe that subsequent to that we have dealt with these kinds of issues in a very pragmatic

way. I don't think we've been going into details that would ask for individual assignments of individual estimates that deal with dollar values.

We've been dealing with policy as it relates to the individual items that have been raised. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the opposition leader and the committee have the right to access that information about the policy that the Premier of the province has and that he is going to lead the government in. I believe that we in the opposition have the right to ask those questions, and I would ask that you rule on that please.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, I've listened to the member raise his point of order. I'm not sure if I hear there a point of order or a challenge to your description.

The Chair: — The Chair has heard the point of order presented by the member from Morse and receives it as a point of order. I accept the point of order. I simply point out that I did not rule either the Leader of the Opposition or the Premier out of order, but cautioned them that we are still in Committee of Finance consideration of Executive Council, that I had heard some reference to specific clauses of a specific Bill which is before the House, and that is not appropriate debate in Executive Council Committee of Finance estimates.

So having presented that caution to members, I know that they will recognize and respect the traditions of this House and continue with the Executive Council estimates in the Committee of Finance.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Premier, the question I asked you — and I believe it is a policy direction of your government and is very legitimate in your estimates — is why you would wish to take away the right of 230,000 co-op members to have legal recourse against your government. That is a very conscious, wide-ranging, broad policy decision. And it has happened repeatedly in this Legislative Assembly.

Now I say it is very relevant, Mr. Premier, that your political appointments, the patronage system that you run, people who cannot be hired without your say-so, that those people are part of this broad, fundamental policy decision of yours to take away the legal rights of Saskatchewan citizens.

And I say very emphatically, Mr. Premier, that I don't believe that Ching and Dombowsky and Banda and Hyde and others who are your political appointments, have the right to take away legal recourse . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, sir. I'm glad you've admitted that, that it is a policy decision of yours. And I'm glad you're owning up to it, that you hired them, that they're your friends, and that that decision to take away the recourse to the courts is your decision. That's a fundamental policy decision.

Now I want you to square that with me, Mr. Premier. The fact that a lot of people think that there's been a lot

of political gamesmanship going on here, not economic reality.

And I'll quote to you. You quoted some articles to me. Paul Martin, a person who is an eminent journalist in this province — I guess is probably as good as Eisler or Mandryk or anybody else that . . . It says, and I quote, May 29, 1993:

But the NDP has done a masterful job of portraying the upgrader situation as a disaster needing urgent attention. If you stop to think about the financial realities versus the political realities, it seems the urgency stems from Brian Mulroney's decision to retire. The NDP wants to deal with Ottawa now, not with a cabinet under the leadership of Kim Campbell whose views on the upgrader are unknown or Jean Charest whose Saskatchewan organizer is (the member from Estevan), the (individual) who negotiated the deal in the first place.

See, Mr. Premier, there are a lot of people out there that believe that the political agenda has gotten ahead of the economic agenda on this one. So much so that I believe Federated Co-op have taken the unprecedented, unprecedented action in their entire history of taking out full-page ads in newspapers all over this province, saying that this threat to their membership and system is a totalitarian act unworthy of a democratically elected government. As I so often hear people quote to me, this bunch of new-found Democrats that now sit in the Government of Saskatchewan are being accused by Federated Co-op and its hundreds of thousands of members of being a totalitarian government, unworthy.

Well, Mr. Premier, I would think if I were one of the people that so strongly believed in repatriation of the Canadian constitution and worked so fervently on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to allow Saskatchewan people to have recourse in the courts, that you would not want to be associated with a piece of legislation that emphatically takes away the rights of, in this case co-op members, to take issue with your government in the court system.

You could have brought legislation in here, Mr. Premier, and done all sorts of things but you don't have to take away that right. It's no wonder they think you are totalitarian and undemocratic. What is there about the court system that scares you? What is there about that that makes you feel weak at the knees so that you have to listen to your political friends in CIC and bring in such Draconian legislation that you have to do that. Answer that for me, Mr. Premier. Why take this policy position that you have to take the right to court away? Would you do that, please.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to do so and I've done this before in a variety of ways. But I'll try one more time to see if I can persuade the Leader of the Opposition.

I'm reading from page 13 of the Estey report. Now I'm assuming, in a sensible debate which we're having,

that at least one common fact we can agree to and agree upon is that Mr. Justice Estey is a neutral, independent, competent person. Now if you don't buy that, then obviously we have a major disagreement.

An Hon. Member: — Totally, totally.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — All right, the member says, totally. Here's what he said, page 13. Just listen for one brief moment on this, not even a moment:

There are only a few possible avenues of escape from these forces of debt.

I'll stop there. These are the forces of debt I was describing to the member from Maple Creek — \$600 million.

There are only a few possible avenues of escape from these forces of debt (Estey writes). The measurements of the financial problems are clear. New money must be infused in the project so that the debt load will be reduced to a burden which the Upgrader project by itself can bear.

Now this is the part that I really want to underline for the House and for the public. Estey writes:

This restructuring of the project debt may be painful, but is the only escape route for the avoidance of the calamitous consequences to the community of the collapse of this project.

Now those are not the words of the Premier, not the words of the member from Riversdale. These are the words of Mr. Justice Estey. This restructuring is the only escape route for the avoidance of what? The calamitous consequences to the community of the collapse of this project.

So it's not me, although I share that finding. I would make that statement from what I know of the deal without Mr. Justice Estey's conclusion. But the people of Saskatchewan and Canada have this finding by an eminent jurist and probably one of the pre-eminent commercial lawyers in this country — "the calamitous consequences to the community."

Now you ask, why legislation, and why legislation in that form. Well for the obvious reason that if we cannot get a negotiated settlement and legislation has to be implemented, in the words of Mr. Justice Estey in another section, "to protect the overarching public interest," how can a responsible government pretend to permit that legislation to allow somewhere down the road the "calamitous consequences to the community."

You can't. You have to act in a way which prevents the calamitous consequences to the community. I don't like this legislation any more than you do, and my preferred route would never be to have it. Nobody wants it. But I tell you, sir, that if you should be sitting on this side of the House and in this chair, I honestly

believe this about you, although you were part of the government that struck this deal, faced with these findings, and I believe that you would do it, because your former government was contemplating the refinery tax.

(1630)

In fact there's a lot of work done in the Department of Finance on a refinery tax, breaking the deal, because you yourself knew that it was bad. Here you are, to a transcript of the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) several weeks ago. This is Barry. I don't know who Barry is, but somebody from the CBC. Barry Burgess, I'm sorry.

If you were premier and you had the same situation, the same financial situation that exists now between the governments of the day and the co-op, would you have tried to renegotiate the deal? Rick: For sure.

Now I know your argument will be, I want to renegotiate the deal. I do too. We're on common ground. But answer me and to the House, what happens if everybody except FCL agrees to the way out of this calamitous consequence to the community, as Estey describes, except FCL. What would you do as Premier then?

And you can't say to me, oh well, I'll fire Ching and I'll put in somebody else, because that's not the hiccup. The hiccup is FCL will not subscribe to the principles of Estey. In the words of the report the only route out of this calamitous consequence is this project.

Now faced with those facts and that situation what's your choice? You have two. You do nothing and walk away from it and hope that something works out, or in the alternative, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, or in the alternative, what you do is you come up with legislation based on Estey and hope that we can negotiate a deal. That is exactly what we're trying to do, and we ask for your support.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Premier, you still refuse to answer the basic question, and I think if you look through Estey and you read it carefully he also said that a legislated solution was not one that would make anyone happy.

Now what I asked you, Mr. Premier, if you have to take the step of legislation — and I don't believe you do because I believe there is a negotiated settlement — why take away the basic rights? If you believe that legislation is necessary and your government is willing to put itself on the line, fine.

But what you are saying, I am going to design legislation that even if I am wrong, even if I abuse and use and allow my political cronies to do whatever, I am not going to allow you the recourse to the court system.

Now, Mr. Premier, it's one thing to legislate. It's one thing to say, I'm taking over the board of directors, I'm

taking part of your dividend, I'm doing this, I'm doing that. But you don't even have the courage, sir, to allow people to challenge you in the court system. You don't have the courage that if you are wrong, that the standard procedures of all Canadians to seek recourse for a wrong done is not open to them.

And I say to you, sir, that is weak-kneed. That is why we question your friends in CIC. That's why we question if the right choices have been made over there, that perhaps if we had had professionals instead of patronage appointments we wouldn't be in the situation we are today. We wouldn't need to not only have legislation, we wouldn't have this need to take away their right to the court system. You're not infallible, Mr. Premier. You're not infallible.

Mr. Premier, just answer the basic question. Why not only legislation but why must you take away that basic right — in this case co-op members — to take your government to court if they see they are wronged in the process, that one of your political friends takes advantage, that something hasn't been construed properly, that there's a half-truth comes out, that there's something that isn't fact being talked about in this issue and someone says the facts were misconstrued. Mr. Premier, I think we should settle this in court. Why are you scared of that basic right, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, I make two responses. First of all, the hon. member's references to the advisers to the current government who, after all, I remind the hon. member are trying to clean up this situation which they did not create, he questions their competence. Well he can do that, but I'll tell you how competent or incompetent they may be, they did not advise you, sir, to get into this \$600 million hole that we are. I think that was the height of incompetence. They're trying to salvage this thing.

But the second aspect of this question is very simple. The words of Justice Estey: the restructuring of the project debt may be painful — I'll stop there and add my own words — either through negotiation or legislation. Perhaps it's more painful through legislation. But either way, the essence of the words remain. It may be painful, but it is the only escape route, only escape route legislatively or negotiatedly. Either way it's the only escape route in the words of Mr. Justice Estey — the only escape route. Why? To avoid the calamitous consequences to the community, the collapse of the project — the calamitous consequences to the community.

And so when you ask why we introduced the legislation and the sections in the form that we do, it is because Justice Estey has told us this solution, which was what the legislation embraces, is the only escape route. It is the only solution to avoid the calamitous consequences to the community. That's why.

Any other suggestion says we should expose the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan to the calamitous consequences to the community in the case of the collapse of the project. That is what you're

arguing. You're arguing that we should simply allow that exposure and the potential calamitous consequences to remain. And I do not share that view, and I don't believe the majority of the taxpayers share that view either.

I think the majority of the taxpayers, knowing exactly the province's fiscal situation, knowing exactly the reports of Ernst & Young, and Gass, knowing exactly the \$3.7 billion of write-offs and debts in the Crown side that we inherited, know that we have got to get a deal which is fair to all sides, both sides. It's all we ask: fair to FCL, fair to the taxpayers. And the way out is Estey. This thing could be solved in one hour — one hour.

An Hon. Member: — If you got your way.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — No, if I followed Estey.

An Hon. Member: — If you got your way.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — No. The member for Morse says, if I got my way. If we followed Estey.

An Hon. Member: — There's only one way I would ever get out.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well the hon. member says, only one way. Now I'm inviting you as the official opposition and a would-be government to tell me what is another way, and don't say, well we can negotiate, move Mr. Ching and all of that stuff because that, I mean, is too transparent.

Tell what another solution is. And by the way, if you think that this solution isn't the case, then I say you are attacking Estey. That's what you're doing. You're attacking Estey. Six months, he comes up with this, and you say this isn't good enough. Well I'm sorry; we agree to disagree. And until I hear a better one, until . . .

An Hon. Member: — He said don't legislate.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — He did not say that either. But until I hear a better one, there is no other choice in cleaning up this mess that you have put on the people of the province of Saskatchewan; I'm sorry to say that.

Mr. Swenson: — Okay, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Premier, let's be very careful here. Are you telling this Assembly today that Justice Estey recommended clause 16 of this Bill, that Justice Estey said that in potential legislation you should take away the right of co-op members to seek redress against your government in court?

I want you to be very emphatic when you answer that Justice Estey recommended that to you and your government, to your friends over at CIC, because I think that's important because I know you received a letter from Diane Lemieux, the secretary of the Redvers Co-op board and was addressed to you on June 8, 1993, two-page letter. And in the second-last paragraph Ms. Lemieux is saying to you:

Finally, as members of the co-op movement we are flabbergasted at this action by your government to legislate. We are deeply concerned that your government has left no option to the co-op membership other than to demand later this month that FCL return the refinery to its original state and to seek recourse through the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now is this why your friends have advised you to put that section in? Because you are afraid of people like Ms. Lemieux, the secretary of the Redvers Co-op. And are you saying — and I want you on the record here, Mr. Premier — that Justice Estey recommended to your government that you take away the rights to the court. Because I think it's very important for all people of this province to understand and understand it very clearly.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, the hon. member, I haven't seen that letter. I'm sorry that I haven't, I don't deny that it's been mailed and it's in my office. That's no problem; I mean, I accept that it's there. But I will ask the hon. member from Thunder Creek how does he react to a motion passed by the Kinistino Co-op, the motion by the Kinistino Co-op is supporting the government in its actions.

Well the member from Morse laughs when the Kinistino Co-op does it because it's undemocratic, he doesn't like it. But he accepts it if another co-op goes the other way. Of course this is a contentious debate. And the co-op membership is all . . . not all over, there are a lot of people who support the government in the co-op membership for what we're doing. I'm not talking about the FCL management. I'm not talking about the people in management level, I'm talking about the cooperators.

So I mean, you can give me these resolutions and one should look at them, but I'll give you resolutions in the other side.

Now the question you ask specifically is: did Mr. Justice Estey recommend section 16? Mr. Justice Estey spoke only in this report. He had no hand, we did not give him, it is not his responsibility, it was not his mandate to draft the legislation. We drafted it. I take responsibility for that as the leader of the government.

Now the legislation in section 16 and other forms, you ask me: well why did you put section 16 in there? Because I come back to Justice Estey's reports that the restructuring, painful, is the only escape route — the only escape route, which if it's destroyed or prevented, however, could have calamitous consequences to our community, the community that for the time being I've been . . . took an oath of office for to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. That's why. That's why. Very simple.

Mr. Swenson: — This is very important, Mr. Premier. Now you've said you took the responsibility that this is the policy decision of your government. Now it's a pretty long bow then to go back and quote Estey about

this being the only solution and the calamity for the community. I don't think a former head of the Supreme Court of justice, Mr. Premier, is ever going to recommend, ever going to recommend, that any government take away the basic rights of its citizens to go to court.

I mean you had other options. You could have used the notwithstanding clause. You could have done all sorts of things. So don't try, Mr. Premier, and say that Justice Estey gave you this bow to draw. You made a policy decision that is tied to political decisions that is tied to your own political agenda to take away the rights of individuals.

And isn't Ms. Lemieux going to be shocked to understand that she can't get to the Supreme Court? She might like to get there, but she can't get there because you, sir, have taken the right away. You have taken the right . . .

Tell me, Mr. Premier, what is so calamitous? We've got all sorts of opinions here that the thing isn't going down the drain tomorrow, next week, or next month. We know that the majority of the financing isn't up for voluntary review until December 31, 1994 — voluntary, not mandatory, voluntary review — some 18 months from now. We know that, sir.

We know that government hasn't put hardly a dime into the thing in the last three years. Justice Estey says it is an operating success. It is paying the interest, Mr. Premier. It is employing people. It is processing 53,000 barrels of Saskatchewan crude a day. And at the same time, it is providing employment and royalties and taxes to your government. Now it's an operating success. It cannot service the principal amount that it has incurred.

(1645)

And yet you, sir, and your government have made a crisis out of it. There is no one, including Justice Estey, who said that thing is going to go bankrupt next week or next month. And you know that. You know that the financing, you know that the financing isn't due until December, 1994. And yet you create the situation where you, the Premier of this province, would take away the right of Ms. Diane Lemieux, citizen of Saskatchewan, co-op member, from questioning your motives and the motives of your political friends at CIC through the court system.

That is one heck of a policy decision, Mr. Premier. You, the guy that was in the kitchen in 1981. You sure did cook up a storm. I wonder how Chrétien and MacMurchy are doing these days when they know that you're taking away the rights of Saskatchewan citizens in their thousands to go to court. I think they would have booted you out of the kitchen, Mr. Premier, if they'd have known what you were going to do.

Now I want you to go back to the basic tenet. I want you to explain to me and explain to Ms. Lemieux, because I suspect that you'll write a reply, of why as

Diane Lemieux, citizen of Saskatchewan, co-op member, proud Redvers resident, why you would want to take away her recourse in the court system if she finds something not quite right about what you're doing, Mr. Premier. Why are you taking that right away?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, every time the Conservatives speak on this, and again in my mind confirmation of why they brought this province to the edge of bankruptcy, \$16 billion, because of their attitude which simply says this: why should you do anything? It's not going to go bankrupt tomorrow. Why do we do anything?

This is how these people governed for nine and a half years. Not facing up to the reality of problems, but some sort of policy of prayer, some sort of policy of hope, some sort of negotiated suggestions in vague generalities.

Well you know, the hon. member himself knows the answer to that very easily. In the last 18 months, two years, the differential, which is where this project is really dependent, has varied anywhere from \$4 a barrel to \$10 a barrel. If it goes below \$6 a barrel, we lose money big time.

In fact you'll recall, just before you called the election in 1991, we lost money big time. You forked over another \$75 million, roughly speaking, \$75 million. And the member says, what's the rush, what's the hurry? We're going to be left at the whim of the international oil market, is what he says. Do nothing, adjourn the legislature, don't pass the Bill, and maybe that differential will go down to two bucks or three bucks. What's the hurry? Tomorrow it might go down.

An Hon. Member: — Not likely.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Ah, not likely. Well I hope that it's the case, not likely. But are you telling me that's how you make a business decision? On hope? Mr. Chairman, this is absolutely unbelievable. I mean it explains why we're at \$16 billion.

Now the hon. member opposite talks about why you take the rights away of people from the legislature. Well would he mind telling me why — and he might say this to Ms. Lemieux as well — why it is that his government introduced under The Police Act . . . when a citizen has a complaint under The Police Act, why does government introduce this section, section 72 in 1990? You introduced this, sir, and you were part of the treasury benches. So when you write Ms. Lemieux I hope you tell her why you did this, quote:

. . . every decision or order of the commission (referring to the police commission) is final, and no order, decision or proceeding of the commission shall be questioned or reviewed, restrained or removed by prohibition, injunction, *certiorari*, *mandamus* or any other process or proceeding in any court.

That's what you did.

1990, I can go . . . Farm Tenure Arbitration Board. Want me to read you the provision? Section 27.5(1), you passed this same provision, various legislation which you have enacted — the federal law, federal PCs.

So I hope that what you will do is that you will, in writing to Ms. Lemieux, tell her why it is you took away her right, Ms. Lemieux — proud citizen of Redvers, proud cooperator — why you took away from Ms. Lemieux, her rights to challenge the police abuse of authority out of the police commission. A fundamental right that I fought for in the kitchen with Mr. McMurtry and Mr. Chrétien and you took it away. You took it away. You denied Ms. Lemieux's right.

Now I guess the standard is that if you took away Ms. Lemieux's right, it must have been for good reason. And by the way, no \$600 million hanging over Ms. Lemieux's head. Nope. But when you did it, it was for good reason.

When we do it, when the judge, former Supreme Court justice of Canada says about the project: the only escape, otherwise it's calamitous consequences, then you play politics. You say we shouldn't do it. Then it's all the old advisers at CIC are playing politics.

So you know what we should do, Mr. Member? I'd like to have an exchange of letters — mine to Ms. Lemieux about why section 16 is in there in the context of your deal and in the context of the \$600 million that is left exposing — and more by the way, add the federal exposure — I will explain section 16 in that context, if you will explain to Ms. Lemieux in your letter why you put in the equivalent of section 16 in the various Acts — I just named one because I think it's important how the police people are governed — if you will explain to her why you put that in for her and took away her basic rights there.

Can we have a deal; can we agree to that, Mr. Leader of the Opposition? Will you explain to her?

You might start, by the way, by trying a bit of an explanation to me and this legislature for that provision which now you find in essence so onerous and undesirable today.

Mr. Swenson: — I'd be happy, Mr. Chairman, to make that commitment. I will give that explanation to Ms. Lemieux. And unfortunately I haven't had the benefit of the Saskatchewan taxpayer helping me go through law school like they did the Premier. So I will seek some eminent legal advice when I respond to Ms. Lemieux, as I would hope the Premier would do.

Because obviously if this Premier sets a policy direction — and he obviously has because we started out with farmers and then we've gone to co-op members, and I don't know where we're going down the road future-wise.

But if the solution, the solution to all of the political

problems that the Premier can conjure up is simply to take away the rights of Saskatchewan citizens . . . and not only in this case are we talking about Saskatchewan citizens. There's 750,000 people in western Canada that this Premier of Saskatchewan says, I'll take your rights to the courts away.

I mean it's bad enough when he does it within our own boundaries, but when he says and sets the precedent in three other provinces to 750,000 people, I wonder what kind of a message that leaves out there. What kind of a message does that leave with anyone that might want to put 2 cents into this province — 2 cents?

Because I'll tell you, if this Premier and his political friends get a little bit exercised at you or if you don't fit the agenda, if you don't squash the deal in the middle of the election campaign like we told you to, then some day we're going to come back and we're going to settle the account. We're going to settle the ledger up because you didn't do what we told you to do, because you got in the road of our political agenda. You got in the road of my road to the Premier's chair.

And if that be the case, I'll set a policy decision and I will happily share letters because I don't think this Premier can answer Ms. Lemieux in Redvers, Saskatchewan, of why he needs that kind of Draconian power. I don't think he can answer that. Because if he could have, because if he could have, Mr. Chairman, he'd have done it a long time ago.

It wouldn't have been any necessity for Mr. Vern Leland to send a letter out to all co-op members in the province saying that this Premier is undemocratic, that he's totalitarian, that he abuses the power of his position in this government. There would have been no point in Mr. Leland sending that out. All that would have happened was we would have had some honest negotiations going on.

And I'd love, Mr. Premier, I'd love to take the opportunity to boot all your friends out of CIC and go over and negotiate the deal for you. I think that'd be a heck of a challenge. I'd love to boot them all out, yes, and go over and give a good shot at some kind of negotiation where there wasn't some kind of political agenda, some kind of political agenda from your friends, Mr. Premier.

Because I believe and Justice Estey believed that there was a negotiated solution available, that there was an opportunity . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Premier, Justice Estey said, just give me another week, maybe 10 days — we're close; we're close. And in the legislature a week and a half ago, we said well, Mr. Premier, it's not too late. Give Justice Estey a call. If he thinks he's close, bring him back. You've already spent a ton of money; what's a little bit more? Let's get the thing done. Let's not use this kind of legislation. Let's not take away the rights of Saskatchewan people.

Because once that abuse is used in this legislature, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately once it becomes a policy decision of this new-found democrat from Riversdale,

it'll be used over and over and over again. And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that is the wrong kind of a policy decision for the man that heads the Executive Council of the province of Saskatchewan to be taking.

He says the former government took away the rights. I remember a scheme called the land bank. Went out and bought a million acres of Saskatchewan farm land, spent a couple hundred million bucks, borrowed most of it, fairly high interest rate, bought a bunch of farm land. But you know what, Mr. Chairman? Even though the PC government philosophically disagreed, philosophically disagreed with that program and the expenditure of \$200 million, the equivalent of 4, 5, 600 million today, not one of those individuals had the right of recourse to the courts taken away from them — not one, not one.

Mr. Chairman, those people could sue the Saskatchewan government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and the Premier says, I acted for one of them. Well how the heck did he get to the court if they didn't have the right to get there. There wasn't a piece of legislation that took their right away. He acted for them. You know what? The co-op can't even get a lawyer. They can't even get a lawyer because there's no point, because this Premier and his government take the right away.

Mr. Chairman, what we're trying to say to the Premier today, and why he would not answer the question, is why he is willing to use this Legislative Assembly to take that right away. We don't question the right to bring in legislation. We don't question the right, Mr. Chairman. This Premier can bring in legislation. He can take over the board of directors. He can tax the dividends of co-op members. That's his right, as he did when he nationalized potash mines and uranium mines and oil companies and everything else. That's his right.

But you know, Mr. Chairman, he still could have left the rights of Saskatchewan citizens to question his judgement in the court system. He could have used his legislation. He could have used his majority. He could have had all these guys over here that stand up and down once in a while and they could have voted yea; yes, we're going to do this; we're going to take over your dividends. They could have voted yea. But, Mr. Chairman, he could have left that basic right there.

And I say to you the reason he didn't is because he knows the process is fraught with the politics of his patronage appointed friends. He knows that the process is tied to a political agenda, not just an economic one. He knows the process will be questioned, Mr. Chairman, down the road. And that is why we not only get legislation, we get the abrogation . . .

The Chair: — Order, order. It now being 5 o'clock, the committee will rise, report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Just before you call it 5, I

understand the agreement was that we would report progress and go out of committee. Is that what you're planning on doing? You're not calling it 5 — I'm just curious — you're not going to call it 5?

Mr. Chairman, I move we rise to report progress. We don't want to call it 5. I move we rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.