



No. 65

VOTES and PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

FIRST SESSION – TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE

Monday, November 22, 2004

1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Petitions of citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan were presented and laid upon the Table by the following Members: Elhard, Draude, Bjornerud, Wall, Bakken, Huyghebaert, Brkich, Weekes and Dearborn.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

According to Order, a certain Petition regarding the Government's position on the mandatory amalgamation of public school divisions, presented on November 19, 2004, has been reviewed and pursuant to Rule 14(7) is found to be irregular and therefore cannot be read and received.

According to Order, the Deputy Clerk having favourably reported on the same pursuant to Rule 14(7), the following Petitions were read and received:

Of citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government to reverse the decision to force the amalgamation of school divisions in Saskatchewan and continue re-organization of school division on a strictly voluntary basis.

(Addendum to Sessional Paper No. 637)

Of citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government to take the necessary action to ensure that the CAIS program receives adequate provincial funding, the funding formula is changed to ensure equal access to compensation, and to contribute funds to the latest BSE assistance package released by the Federal Government.

(Addendum to Sessional Paper No. 638)

Of citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government to take necessary steps to ensure that this portion of #15 Highway be repaired and re-surfaced immediately so as to remove the safety hazard to all motorists who rely on this vital road for transportation and economic purposes.

(Addendum to Sessional Paper No. 639)

Of citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government to immediately address the concerns of all individuals affected by the TransGas Asquith Natural Gas Storage Project, pay 100% of the costs involved to rectify disruptions to water supplies, produce an environment assessment study encompassing a larger area outside the scope of the project, disclose the project's long term effects on these areas and consider alternative sources of water for the project.

(Addendum to Sessional Paper No. 640)

SASKATCHEWAN IDOLS RECOGNITION

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen, seconded by Mr. Gantefoer, by leave of the Assembly:

Ordered, That this Assembly do now recess for one hour, to pay tribute to our two Saskatchewan Idols, and that this Assembly reconvene at the call of the Speaker.

The Assembly recessed from 2:30 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

The Order of the Day being called for Question Nos. 513 to 516, 519, 521 to 549, and 551 to 553, they were answered. (See Appendix)

The Order of the Day being called for Question Nos. 512, 517, 518, 520 and 550, pursuant to Rule 46(1), the answers were Tabled and, by reason of length, converted by the Clerk to Return Nos. 300 to 304.

(Sessional Paper Nos. 648 to 652)

SECOND READINGS / DEUXIÈME LECTURE

Bill No. 75 - The Crown Corporations Public Ownership Act

Moved by the Hon. Ms. Atkinson: That Bill No. 75 - The Crown Corporations Public Ownership Act – be now read a second time.

A debate arising, it was agreed to unanimously on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS - 57

Calvert	Addley	Lautermilch	Hagel	Van Mulligen
Serby	Atkinson	Cline	Sonntag	Crofford
Prebble	Forbes	Wartman	Belanger	Higgins
Thomson	Nilson	Beatty	Hamilton	Junor
Harper	Iwanchuk	McCall	Quennell	Trew
Yates	Taylor	Morin	Borgerson	Wall
Toth	Elhard	Heppner	D'Autremont	Krawetz
Draude	Hermanson	Bjornerud	Stewart	Wakefield
Morgan	McMorris	Eagles	Gantefoer	Harpauer
Bakken	Cheveldayoff	Huyghebaert	Allchurch	Brkich
Weekes	Kerpan	Merriman	Chisholm	Dearborn
Hart	Kirsch			

NAYS - 0

On motion of the Hon. Ms. Atkinson:

Ordered, That Bill No. 75 - The Crown Corporations Public Ownership Act – be now referred to the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies.

Bill No. 83 – The Medical Profession Amendment Act, 2004

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Nilson: That Bill No. 83 – The Medical Profession Amendment Act, 2004 – be now read a second time.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to and the said Bill was, accordingly, read a second time.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Nilson:

Ordered, That Bill No. 83 – The Medical Profession Amendment Act, 2004 – be now referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

Bill No. 84 – The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 2004 (No. 2)**Projet de loi – n° 84 - Loi n° 2 de 2004 modifiant la Loi de 1995 sur les services de l'état civil**

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Nilson: That Bill No. 84 – The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 2004 (No. 2) – be now read a second time.

L'hon M. Nilson propose: Que le projet de loi – n° 84 - Loi n° 2 de 2004 modifiant la Loi de 1995 sur les services de l'état civil – soit maintenant lu une deuxième fois.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to and the said Bill was, accordingly, read a second time.

Le débat se poursuit et la motion, mise aux voix, est adopté et, en conséquence, ledit projet de loi est lu une deuxième fois.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Nilson:

Ordered, That Bill No. 84 – The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 2004 (No. 2) – be now referred to the Standing Committee on Human Services.

Sur motion de l'hon. M. Nilson:

Il est résolu que le projet de loi – n° 84 - Loi n° 2 de 2004 modifiant la Loi de 1995 sur les services de l'état civil – soit maintenant déferé au Comité permanent des services à la personne.

Bill No. 77 - The Public Works and Services Act

Moved by the Hon. Ms. Higgins: That Bill No. 77 - The Public Works and Services Act – be now read a second time.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to and the said Bill was, accordingly, read a second time.

On motion of the Hon. Ms. Higgins:

Ordered, That Bill No. 77 - The Public Works and Services Act – be now referred to the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies.

Bill No. 78 - The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Repeal Act

Moved by the Hon. Ms. Higgins: That Bill No. 78 - The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Repeal Act – be now read a second time.

A debate arising, and the question being put, it was agreed to and the said Bill was, accordingly, read a second time.

On motion of the Hon. Ms. Higgins:

Ordered, That Bill No. 78 - The Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation Repeal Act – be now referred to the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies.

Bill No. 79 – The Wildlife Habitat Protection Amendment Act, 2004

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Forbes: That Bill No. 79 – The Wildlife Habitat Protection Amendment Act, 2004 – be now read a second time.

A debate arising, it was on motion of Mr. D'Autremont adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES / DÉBATS AJOURNÉS

Bill No. 19 – The Land Titles Amendment Act, 2004

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Cline: That Bill No. 19 – The Land Titles Amendment Act, 2004 - be now read a second time.

The debate continuing, it was on motion of Mr. Weekes adjourned.

Bill No. 68 - The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act, 2004

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Taylor: That Bill No. 68 - The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act, 2004 - be now read a second time.

The debate continuing, and the question being put, it was agreed to and the said Bill was, accordingly, read a second time.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Taylor:

Ordered, That Bill No. 68 - The Assessment Management Agency Amendment Act, 2004 – be now referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Infrastructure.

Bill No. 67 - The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Amendment Act, 2004

Projet de loi n° 67 - Loi de 2004 modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur la réglementation des boissons alcoolisées et des jeux de hazard

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Cline: That Bill No. 67 - The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Amendment Act, 2004 – be now read a second time.	L'Assemblée reprend le débat ajourné sur la motion de l'hon M. Cline: Que le projet de loi n° 67 - Loi de 2004 modifiant la Loi de 1997 sur la réglementation des boissons alcoolisées et des jeux de hazard – soit maintenant lu une deuxième fois.
---	--

The debate continuing, it was on motion of Mr. Morgan adjourned.	Le débat se poursuit et sur motion de M. Morgan, il est ajourné.
--	--

Bill No. 57 - The Irrigation Amendment Act, 2004

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Wartman: That Bill No. 57 - The Irrigation Amendment Act, 2004 – be now read a second time.

The debate continuing, it was on motion of Ms. Harpauer adjourned.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Van Mulligen:

Ordered, That this Assembly do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:12 p.m. until Tuesday at 1:30 p.m.

Hon. P. Myron Kowalsky
Speaker

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Mr. Weekes asked the Government Question No. 513, which was answered by the Hon. Ms. Atkinson:

To the Minister Responsible for Immigration: (1) Which Immigration department employees went on trips overseas since January 1, 2004 to recruit possible immigrants for Saskatchewan? (2) Which companies went on these trips?

Answer:

- (1) Barb Bond, Kirk Westgard
- (2) Yanke Group of Companies, Siemens Transportation Group, Northern Steel Industries

Mr. Weekes asked the Government Question No. 514, which was answered by the Hon. Ms. Atkinson:

To the Minister Responsible for Immigration: (1) How many trips overseas have employees of your department made since January 1, 2004 to recruit possible immigrants for Saskatchewan? (2) Please provide the cost of each trip, where department employees went and how many new immigrants have come to Saskatchewan as a result of these trips?

Answer:

- (1) 4
- (2) \$4,105 Zwolle (Netherlands), Gent (Belgium) January 26 to February 4, 2004; \$16,376 Esher, London, Oxford (United Kingdom), Utrecht (Netherlands), Gent (Belgium), Kiev (Ukraine), Bonn (Germany) March 17 to 26, 2004; \$1,589 Kiev (Ukraine) September 6 to 12, 2004; \$4,922 Esher, London (United Kingdom), October 12 to 15, 2004.

Over the next 24 months, an additional 270-310 Landed Immigrants are expected to arrive in Saskatchewan as a result of these trips. This includes individuals who have received job offers from employers who participated in the trips and will be applying to the Saskatchewan Immigrant Nominee Program (SINP), those now working in Saskatchewan on temporary work permits who will be applying to the SINP, those who have already applied to the SINP but have not yet received Landed Immigrant Status, plus their accompanying family members.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 515, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On February 17, 2003, the Premier said, "In March of 1997, the government believed it had an equity partner to share the risk of building storage sheds." Is there any written communication between Con-Force and the government that corroborates this statement by the Premier?

Answer:

Discussions with Con-Force regarding their initial interest in participating as a full equity partner in the storage facilities construction project were recently confirmed by Ron Adams, President of Con-Force and Brian Burnett, former Assistant Deputy Minister of Economic Development.

After formal discussions which included the preparation of proformas, Con-Force decided not to participate as a full risk-sharing partner. Minister Prebble's office confirmed this in telephone call with Mr. Adams on October 20, 2004.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 516, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: An October 21, 2004 Regina Leader-Post article states, "Provincial Cabinet Minister Peter Prebble said Wednesday that the government did believe in 1997 that Con-Force Limited intended to become an equity partner in the building of potato sheds for its failed Spudco venture." Is there any written communication between Con-Force and the government that corroborates this statement by the Minister?

Answer:

Discussions with Con-Force regarding their initial interest in participating as a full equity partner in the storage facilities construction project were recently confirmed by Ron Adams, President of Con-Force, and Brian Burnett, former Assistant Deputy Minister of Economic Development.

After formal discussions which included the preparation of proformas, Con-Force decided not to participate as a full risk-sharing partner. Minister Prebble's office confirmed this in telephone call with Mr. Adams on October 20, 2004.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 519, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: On August 21, 1998, Mark Langefeld of Judith River Farms Ltd. wrote to Ron Styles and Harvey Fjeld of SaskWater asking the following question: "Does Con-Force Industries really have a 51% interest in the storage buildings or is this a 100% SaskWater operation?" What was SaskWater's response to this request?

Answer:

Throughout the late summer and fall of 1998, SaskWater officials met on numerous occasions with representatives of LDPC, FCC and the Royal Bank in an effort to work through the financial difficulties LDPC was experiencing, in the interests of stabilizing the company and sustaining the development of the potato industry in the Lake Diefenbaker area.

These efforts included SaskWater's participation in the financial restructuring of LDPC with the transfer of the Lucky Lake Potato Terminal to LDPC for the original capital cost of approximately \$5.8 million; the provision of a \$2.8 million second mortgage and a \$3 million debenture to finance the transfer and the conversion of \$1.5 million in existing accounts receivable owed by LDPC to SaskWater into a debenture.

With specific reference to the relationship with Con-Force, this arrangement was detailed in SaskWater's 1997 Annual Report and Financial Statements, which publicly released in April 1998. While the financial statements used equity accounting, the nature of the equity investment by Con-Force was disclosed in the notes to the financial statements, specifically Note 12. This note also described the interim financing for the construction, the operating lease agreements and the share buy-back provisions of the unanimous shareholder agreements, as well as the negotiated sale agreements for two of the three storage facilities.

Although we have been unable to find any formal, written response by SaskWater to Mr. Langefeld's correspondence, Mr. Ron Styles, acting President at the time, reports that there were conversations with Mr. Langefeld subsequent to this communication, in which the nature of the Con-Force relationship was explained.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 521, which was answered by the Hon. ===:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: On October 10, 1998 SaskWater Corporation Information Item presented by Ron Styles stated that the Member from Meadow Lake, at the time Minister responsible for SaskWater, had approved a strategy to "create some financial expediency for Microgro through impacting the cash flow." What specific action did SaskWater take as a result of this strategy?

Answer:

For a detailed outline of SaskWater's business relationship with Microgro, please see response to written question #520.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 522, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: A November 18, 1999 CIC Board of Directors information item stated: "At the end of 1999, SaskWater has \$3.9 million in trust liabilities either associated with Rafferty/Alameda completion or owed to Ducks Unlimited which cannot be funded as the cash associated with these has been used to finance SPUDCO storage capital and losses." (1) Who made the decision to use this money to finance SPUDCO storage capital and losses? (2) Which Minister or Ministers approved this decision and which Ministers were aware of this decision?

Answer:

The above questions and related allegations by the Opposition that SaskWater improperly drained funds being held in trust for Ducks Unlimited and for Souris Basin development projects is premised on an inaccurate understanding of these specific arrangements.

The matter of trust liabilities associated with Rafferty/Alameda and Ducks Unlimited was thoroughly discussed at the November 28, 2002 meeting of the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations. Both SaskWater officials and the representative from the Provincial Auditor's Office explained very clearly that funds related to these projects were never held in specific trust accounts. Since the inception of these programs (1991 for Ducks Unlimited and 1994 for Rafferty/ Alameda) SaskWater has recorded these funds as deferred revenue with the remaining annual balances shown as outstanding liabilities.

Notwithstanding the Opposition's ongoing efforts to misconstrue this arrangement, it should be noted that the Provincial Auditor has never questioned the accounting treatment of these liabilities or the allocation of expenditures under these programs.

As the following history demonstrates government has met all financial commitments related to these liabilities.

Ducks Unlimited Fund

Ducks Unlimited upfronted monies to SaskWater at the time the Luck Lake and Riverhurst irrigation projects were being constructed. These monies were to fund the portion of the capital costs that related to the Ducks Unlimited project, as well as operating costs of their project for the next 30 years. This fund was drawn down by the annual capital and operating costs of the projects.

As at December 1999, the value of this fund was \$1,909,500. At the end of 2003, the balance in this account was \$530,400. It is expected that this account will be depleted by the end of 2004.

Deferred Funding (Rafferty/Alameda):

Construction costs of the Rafferty/Alameda projects were funded by the General Revenue Fund, the U.S. Government and SaskPower. Amounts received in excess of expenditures incurred were recorded as deferred funding. As construction costs were incurred by SaskWater, this fund was drawn down by that value.

As at December 1999, the value of this fund was \$1,292,900. On October 1, 2002, the balance of this fund, \$294,100, was transferred to the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority. As at March 2004, this fund was totally expended.

Depredation Fund (Rafferty/Alameda):

The Environmental Impact Assessment report done at the time that these projects were being constructed, dictated that a wildlife and waterfowl depredation fund be established. This was done in 1993. Interest was accrued to this account annually. The purpose of this fund is to provide compensation for crop loss claims made due to the damage caused by wildlife. The compensation formula has triggered no claims against this fund.

As at December 1999, the value of this account was \$1,016,400. On October 1, 2002, the balance of this fund, \$1,119,200, was transferred to the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority. As at March 2004, the account balance was \$1,182,900.

As confirmed by both SaskWater's external auditors and Provincial Auditor, these funds were appropriately accounted for, and all obligations related to these funds were met and are being met in accordance with the related agreements.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 523, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: A November 18, 1999 CIC Board of Directors information item stated: "At the end of 1999, SaskWater has \$3.9 million in trust liabilities either associated with Rafferty/Alameda completion or owed to Ducks Unlimited which cannot be funded as the cash associated with these has been used to finance SPUDCO storage capital and losses." What action was taken to discipline or reprimand those responsible for using these trust moneys to finance SPUDCO storage capital and losses?

Answer:

As outlined in the response to written question #522, funds related to Rafferty/Alameda and Ducks Unlimited were never held as separate accounts under trust conditions, and all obligations related to these liabilities have been and are being met by government.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 524, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: A November 18, 1999 CIC Board of Directors information item stated: "At the end of 1999, SaskWater has \$3.9 million in trust liabilities either associated with Rafferty/Alameda completion or owed to Ducks Unlimited which cannot be funded as the cash associated with these has been used to finance SPUDCO storage capital and losses." (1) Was a legal opinion obtained with regard to this matter? (2) If so, what law firm provided the legal opinion?

Answer:

As detailed in the response to written question #522, the accounting treatment and the allocation of expenditures under these programs have never been called into question. Hence, no outside legal opinion was needed or acquired.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 525, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: In May 2004, lawyers with the firm Olive Waller Zinkhan Waller filed a \$10 million countersuit in the SPUDCO case, which alleged that the plaintiff's circulated "false or misleading financial information", that "erroneous information as to profitability" was contained in the business plan and that both the plaintiffs and their accountants "negligently or wilfully misrepresented the economic potential" of the potato venture. Is there any evidence the government has to substantiate this allegation?

Answer:

First of all, it is important to note that there has been a settlement of all allegations and issues in the actions brought by the plaintiffs and in the counterclaim. Both parties agreed not to make any further complaints or grievances about these matters. At the specific request of the plaintiffs, the settlement agreement included all allegations and issues arising from the counterclaim.

In this context it is entirely inappropriate to revive allegations that have been settled, but it should be noted that the application for the counterclaim was partly successful, in that the claim of negligent misrepresentation against the plaintiff Judith Rivers Ltd. was allowed to proceed.

Second, with specific reference to evidence in support of the counterclaim, related documents were filed with the court, and are publicly accessible at the Regina Court House.

And finally, when the allegations in a legal action are as serious as these were, with the significant claims for damages in excess of \$100 million, government has an obligation to mount a vigorous defence. The counterclaim application was advanced in response to a very serious threat posed in the actions following a comprehensive review and analysis of LDPC's business plans, projections and financial statements by Grant Thornton LLP, the forensic auditors engaged to assist in the preparation of government's defence.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 526, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: In May 2004, lawyers with the firm Olive Waller Zinkhan Waller filed a \$10 million countersuit in the SPUDCO case, which alleged that the plaintiff's circulated "false or misleading financial information", that "erroneous information as to profitability" was contained in the business plan and that both the plaintiffs and their accountants "negligently or wilfully misrepresented the economic potential" of the potato venture. Is there any evidence the government has to substantiate this allegation?

Answer:

As noted in response to written question #525, the counterclaim was advanced in response to the very serious threat posed in the legal action, as part of a vigorous defence strategy.

While it is entirely inappropriate to revive allegations that have been settled by mutual agreement and an order of the court, it is appropriate to note that the settlement was entered into without any admission of legal liability by government.

While government has acknowledged and accepted responsibility for certain mistakes it made with respect to its investment in the potato industry, the information and material filed in support of the counterclaim suggests that financial information generated through LDPC was not always accurate or timely, and that LDPC has substantial problems unrelated to any actions by government.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 527, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: In May 2004, lawyers with the firm Olive Waller Zinkhan Waller filed a \$10 million countersuit in the SPUDCO case, which alleged that the plaintiff's circulated "false or misleading financial information", that "erroneous information as to profitability" was contained in the business plan and that both the plaintiffs and their accountants "negligently or wilfully misrepresented the economic potential" of the potato venture. Who within government authorized the decision to make these allegations against the plaintiffs and their accountants?

Answer:

The counterclaim application was submitted in 2004 following the comprehensive review and analysis of LDPC's business plans, projections and financial statement by Grant Thornton LLP, the forensic auditors engaged to assist in the preparation of government's defence.

The counterclaim was advanced on the advice of legal counsel, as recommended by the Deputy Minister to the Premier, with the agreement and consent of the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 528, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: In May 2004, lawyers with the firm Olive Waller Zinkhan Waller filed a \$10 million countersuit in the SPUDCO case, which alleged that the plaintiff's circulated "false or misleading financial information", that "erroneous information as to profitability" was contained in the business plan and that both the plaintiffs and their accountants "negligently or wilfully misrepresented the economic potential" of the potato venture. Who within government authorized the decision to make these allegations against the plaintiffs and their accountants?

Answer:

The counterclaim application was submitted in 2004 following the comprehensive review and analysis of LDPC's business plans, projections and financial statement by Grant Thornton LLP, the forensic auditors engaged to assist in the preparation of government's defence.

The counterclaim was advanced on the advice of legal counsel, as recommended by the Deputy Minister to the Premier, with the agreement and consent of the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 529, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On October 17, 2003, lawyers with the firm Olive Waller Zinkhan Waller filed documents in court alleging that the Saskatchewan Party had committed to settle the SPUDCO lawsuit if it became government. Who within government authorized the decision to make this allegation in court?

Answer:

Last fall's application to advance a counterclaim was an attempt to put before the courts very legitimate questions about how this lawsuit was being funded and who would benefit from any proceeds.

It was well known at the time that the lawsuit was being funded primarily by investors from Alberta and British Columbia. Moreover, documents not disclosed by the plaintiffs until late August last year raised very serious questions about the complex network of limited partnerships involved in the fundraising arrangements and whether outsiders (parties with no direct interest in the lawsuit) were inappropriately involved in funding and promoting this litigation.

It should be noted that documents filed in support of the counterclaim application do not specifically allege that the Saskatchewan Party had committed to settle the litigation in question.

The counterclaim was advanced on the advice of legal counsel, as recommended by the Deputy Minister to the Premier, with the agreement and consent of the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 530, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: On October 17, 2003, lawyers with the firm Olive Waller Zinkhan Waller filed documents in court alleging that the Saskatchewan Party had committed to settle the SPUDCO lawsuit if it became government. Who within government authorized the decision to make this allegation in court?

Answer:

See Government's response to written question #529.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 531, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a "partnership". The Premier was a member of Cabinet at that time. (1) What specific actions did the Premier take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement? (2) Are there written documents supporting these actions?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 532, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a "partnership". The Member from Prince Albert Northcote was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did the Member from Prince Albert Northcote take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 533, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. The Member from Saskatoon Nutana was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did the Member from Saskatoon Nutana take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 534, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. The Member from Regina Rosemont was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did the Member from Regina Rosemont take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 535, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. The Member from Saskatoon Massey Place was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did the Member from Saskatoon Massey Place take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 536, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. The Member from Regina Lakeview was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did the Member from Regina Lakeview take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 537, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. The Member from Yorkton was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did the Member from Yorkton take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 538, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. The Member from Meadow Lake was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did the Member from Meadow Lake take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 539, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Roy Romanow was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Roy Romanow take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 540, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Dwain Lingenfelter was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Dwain Lingenfelter take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 541, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Robert Mitchell was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Robert Mitchell take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 542, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Janice MacKinnon was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Janice MacKinnon take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 543, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Ned Shillington was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Ned Shillington take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 544, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Bernie Wiens was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Bernie Wiens take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 545, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Eric Upshall was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Eric Upshall take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 546, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Judy Bradley was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Judy Bradley take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 547, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Keith Goulet was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Keith Goulet take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 548, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Carol Teichrob was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Carol Teichrob take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 549, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On April 28, 1998, cabinet approved a plan to obtain the financing for the four SPUDCO storage facilities with total debt of \$14.5 million, yet no effort was made at that time by the government to publicly correct the inaccurate portrayal of the arrangement with Con-Force as a “partnership”. Lorne Scott was a member of Cabinet at that time. What specific actions did Lorne Scott take to encourage the government to correct the inaccurate portrayal of this business arrangement?

Answer:

Members of Cabinet all swear or affirm an Oath which prevents the release of information regarding discussions which may have taken place during Cabinet deliberations.

The 1998 SaskWater Annual Report provides complete and full disclosure of the nature of the business relationship between SaskWater and Con-Force, as found on pages 24-30.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 551, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On July 30, 1998, Deputy Premier Dwain Lingenfelter sent a briefing note on SPUDCO to Premier Roy Romanow indicating: “There are lapses in the requisite legislative authorities to permit SaskWater Corporation to process in certain areas of business they have undertaken.” (1) What specific action did Premier Roy Romanow take to address these lapses in requisite legislative authority? (2) Is there any written record of Premier Romanow’s actions?

Answer:

According to PriceWaterhouse Coopers and the Provincial Auditor, SaskWater complied with all relevant legislative authorities in 1997, 1998 and 1999; and unqualified audit opinions were reported in each of those three years.

Furthermore, the Provincial Auditor’s Spring 2000 Report which reports in detail on his special audit of government’s investment in the potato industry for the years 1996 to 1999 specifically states that SaskWater complied with the necessary authorities for its investment in the potato industry.

For further detail on SaskWater’s compliance with legislative authorities, see Government’s response to written question # 517.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 552, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On July 30, 1998, Deputy Premier Dwain Lingenfelter sent a briefing note on SPUDCO to Premier Roy Romanow indicating: "There are lapses in the requisite legislative authorities to permit SaskWater Corporation to process in certain areas of business they have undertaken." (1) What specific action did Deputy Premier Lingenfelter take to address these lapses in requisite legislative authority? (2) Is there any written record of Deputy Premier Lingenfelter's actions?

Answer:

According to PriceWaterhouse Coopers and the Provincial Auditor, SaskWater complied with all relevant legislative authorities in 1997, 1998 and 1999; and unqualified audit opinions were reported in each of those three years.

Furthermore, the Provincial Auditor's Spring 2000 Report which reports in detail on his special audit of government's investment in the potato industry for the years 1996 to 1999 specifically states that SaskWater complied with the necessary authorities for its investment in the potato industry.

For further detail on SaskWater's compliance with legislative authorities, see Government's response to written question # 517.

Mr. Morgan asked the Government Question No. 553, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Prebble:

To the Premier: On July 30, 1998, Deputy Premier Dwain Lingenfelter sent a briefing note on SPUDCO to Premier Roy Romanow indicating: "There are lapses in the requisite legislative authorities to permit SaskWater Corporation to process in certain areas of business they have undertaken." (1) Other than the Premier and Deputy Premier, which Ministers and other government officials were aware of this briefing note? (2) What specific actions did these Ministers and other government officials take to address the lapses in requisite legislative authority identified in the briefing note?

Answer:

According to PriceWaterhouse Coopers and the Provincial Auditor, SaskWater complied with all relevant legislative authorities in 1997, 1998 and 1999; and unqualified audit opinions were reported in each of those three years.

Furthermore, the Provincial Auditor's Spring 2000 Report which reports in detail on his special audit of government's investment in the potato industry for the years 1996 to 1999 specifically states that SaskWater complied with the necessary authorities for its investment in the potato industry.

For further detail on SaskWater's compliance with legislative authorities, see Government's response to written question # 517.

NOTICE OF WRITTEN QUESTIONS

The following Questions were asked on day no. 62 and are to be answered by day no. 67:

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 785:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: (1) Are there any other lawsuits pending against the government directly or indirectly related to SPUDCO? (2) If so, please provide details.

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 786:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: (1) Is any crown, department or agency of government considering any further investment or financial support for future investment in the potato industry or related industry? (2) If so, please provide details.

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 787:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conduction by Ernst and Young recommended, "Invoices should be prepared when potatoes are shipped to ensure that revenue, accounts receivable, and inventory amounts are accurately reflected." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 788:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conduction by Ernst and Young recommended, "Invoices should be prepared when potatoes are shipped to ensure that revenue, accounts receivable, and inventory amounts are accurately reflected." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 789:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conduction by Ernst and Young recommended, "Inventory should be confirmed/counted/reconciled regularly to confirm that there are no inventory management issues such as theft or excessive shrinkage or spoilage." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 790:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conduction by Ernst and Young recommended, "Inventory should be confirmed/counted/reconciled regularly to confirm that there are no inventory management issues such as theft or excessive shrinkage or spoilage." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 791:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conduction by Ernst and Young recommended, "Controls over inventory held in facilities operated by RAP and LDPC should be reviewed to confirm that there are no inventory management issues such as theft or excessive shrinkage or spoilage in those storage facilities." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 792:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conduction by Ernst and Young recommended, "Controls over inventory held in facilities operated by RAP and LDPC should be reviewed to confirm that there are no inventory management issues such as theft or excessive shrinkage or spoilage in those storage facilities." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 793:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conduction by Ernst and Young recommended, "Appropriate allowances for shrinkage and spoilage should be developed and incorporated into the financial statements." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 794:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Appropriate allowances for shrinkage and spoilage should be developed and incorporated into the financial statements." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 795:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Overall financial reporting for SPUDCO, including the Storco's, should be adjusted to provide better management information, to improve the quality of information provided to the SWC Board, and generally to better reflect the magnitude of SPUDCO's investment and risk." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 796:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Overall financial reporting for SPUDCO, including the Storco's, should be adjusted to provide better management information, to improve the quality of information provided to the SWC Board, and generally to better reflect the magnitude of SPUDCO's investment and risk." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 797:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Efforts should be made to have the Storco's year end financial statements completed in conjunction with SWC's audited financial statements." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 798:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Efforts should be made to have the Storco's year end financial statements completed in conjunction with SWC's audited financial statements." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 799:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "The SWC Board should direct Management to produce monthly or quarterly financial statements as the SWC Board requires. As well, CFI should be required to provide an acceptable level of service or SPUDCO should consider terminating the management services contract." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 800:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "The SWC Board should direct Management to produce monthly or quarterly financial statements as the SWC Board requires. As well, CFI should be required to provide an acceptable level of service or SPUDCO should consider terminating the management services contract." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 801:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "SPUDCO should prepare interim balance sheets and provide this as part of its financial reporting package to the SWC Board." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 802:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "SPUDCO should prepare interim balance sheets and provide this as part of its financial reporting package to the SWC Board." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 803:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Discussions should be held between relevant SWC finance and administration personnel, CFI finance and administration personnel and SPUDCO personnel to determine what additional financial reporting is required." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 804:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Discussions should be held between relevant SWC finance and administration personnel, CFI finance and administration personnel and SPUDCO personnel to determine what additional financial reporting is required." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 805:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Inventory costs should be capitalized on a periodic basis that ensures the financial statements presented to the SWC Board are accurate. For example, if the SWC Board intends to review the SPUDCO statements monthly, inventory costs should be capitalized on a monthly basis." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 806:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Inventory costs should be capitalized on a periodic basis that ensures the financial statements presented to the SWC Board are accurate. For example, if the SWC Board intends to review the SPUDCO statements monthly, inventory costs should be capitalized on a monthly basis." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 807:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "In summary, we recommend that SWC consider adopting consolidation accounting to resolve the above issues to allow a full understanding of the risks SWC faces with regards to SPUDCO, including the Storco's. More discussion between SWC and Price Waterhouse and the Provincial Auditor is required before conclusive recommendations with regards to the financial accounting issues can be made." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 808:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "In summary, we recommend that SWC consider adopting consolidation accounting to resolve the above issues to allow a full understanding of the risks SWC faces with regards to SPUDCO, including the Storco's. More discussion between SWC and Price Waterhouse and the Provincial Auditor is required before conclusive recommendations with regards to the financial accounting issues can be made." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 809:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "To the extent that Storco's are considered a subsidiary from a legal perspective as well as an economic perspective, consideration should be given to whether OC's are required for transactions related to borrowing, lending, sale of assets, and leasing." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 810:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "To the extent that Storco's are considered a subsidiary from a legal perspective as well as an economic perspective, consideration should be given to whether OC's are required for transactions related to borrowing, lending, sale of assets, and leasing." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 811:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "SWC Board and Management should work together to outline clear roles and responsibilities related to governance for SPUDCO including ways to achieve clearer, more concise communication to the SWC Board and CIC and to ensure that the SWC Board has a clear understanding of the principal risks of all aspects of the SPUDCO operations, especially Storco's." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 812:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "SWC Board and Management should work together to outline clear roles and responsibilities related to governance for SPUDCO including ways to achieve clearer, more concise communication to the SWC Board and CIC and to ensure that the SWC Board has a clear understanding of the principal risks of all aspects of the SPUDCO operations, especially Storco's." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 813:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Given the newness of the operation and the magnitude of the investment, Management must ensure that appropriate attention is given to all SPUDCO transactions." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 814:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Given the newness of the operation and the magnitude of the investment, Management must ensure that appropriate attention is given to all SPUDCO transactions." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 815:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Management should focus on providing a more integrated picture of SPUDCO including all aspects of operations." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 816:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Management should focus on providing a more integrated picture of SPUDCO including all aspects of operations." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 817:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Management should work to ensure decisions are made in a timely fashion that allows full consideration of all alternatives." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 818:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "Management should work to ensure decisions are made in a timely fashion that allows full consideration of all alternatives." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 819:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "The SWC Board should direct SPUDCO Management to develop clearly defined criteria related to the exit strategy for SPUDCO." What specific action was taken by SaskWater as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. Morgan, to ask the Government the following Question No. 820:

To the Minister of Crown Management Board: The June 25, 1998 SPUDCO Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended, "The SWC Board should direct SPUDCO Management to develop clearly defined criteria related to the exit strategy for SPUDCO." What specific action was taken by Crown Investments Corporation as a result of the recommendation?

Mr. D'Autremont, to ask the Government the following Question No. 821:

To the Minister of Finance: Please provide the formula or the methodology on how the Department of Finance determined how much money the Government of Saskatchewan would lose over the next three years as a result of the Smoking Ban due to be implemented in January 2005.

Mr. Brkich, to ask the Government the following Question No. 822:

To the Minister of Agriculture: Presently there is a deal pending between Saskatchewan Agriculture and the Federal PFRA with regards to the transfer of ownership of a provincial pasture located near Nokomis, SK, and a PFRA pasture located north of Kindersley, SK. When will the formal transfer of these pastures be completed and how will they affect local employees' status within the transfer?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 823:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: During the calendar year 2001 (January 1 through December 31), what was the total value of investment authorized by the Government of Saskatchewan through Order in Council for Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation or any of its subsidiaries to invest in Navigata Holdings Inc., Navigata Communications Inc., or any successor corporation of either Navigata Holdings Inc. or Navigata Communications Inc.?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 824:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2001, what was the net profit or net loss posted by Navigata Holdings Inc.?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 825:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: During the calendar year 2002 (January 1 through December 31), what was the total value of investment authorized by the Government of Saskatchewan through Order in Council for Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation or any of its subsidiaries to invest in Navigata Holdings Inc., Navigata Communications Inc., or any successor corporation of either Navigata Holdings Inc. or Navigata Communications Inc.?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 826:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2002, what was the net profit or net loss posted by Navigata Holdings Inc.?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 827:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: During the calendar year 2003 (January 1 through December 31), what was the total value of investment authorized by the Government of Saskatchewan through Order in Council for Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation or any of its subsidiaries to invest in Navigata Holdings Inc., Navigata Communications Inc., or any successor corporation of either Navigata Holdings Inc. or Navigata Communications Inc.?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 828:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2003, what was the net profit or net loss posted by Navigata Holdings Inc.?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 829:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: During the period from January 1, 2004 through November 15, 2004, what was the total value of investment authorized by the Government of Saskatchewan through Order in Council for Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation or any of its subsidiaries to invest in Navigata Holdings Inc., Navigata Communications Inc., or any successor corporation of either Navigata Holdings Inc. or Navigata Communications Inc.?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 830:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications: For the fiscal year period January 1, 2004 to September 30, 2004, what was the net profit or net loss posted by Navigata Holdings Inc.?

The following Questions were asked on day no. 63 and are to be answered by day no. 68:

Ms. Eagles, to ask the Government the following Question No. 831:

To the Minister of Health: Provide the average percentage of wage increases awarded to administrative positions in the Sun Country Regional Health Authority for the fiscal year 2004-2005 and the total amount of money these increases cost for this fiscal year.

Ms. Eagles, to ask the Government the following Question No. 832:

To the Minister of Health: What public consultation process took place prior to the recent changes to the delivery of services and staffing in the Sun Country Regional Health Authority?

Mr. Gantefer, to ask the Government the following Question No. 833:

To the Minister of Health: Please provide the terms of tendering contracts with pharmacies as well as the policies for administering prescription drugs in the Moose Jaw Pioneer Lodge, Five Hills Regional Health Authority.

The following Questions were asked on day no. 64 and are to be answered by day no. 69:

Mr. Brkich, to ask the Government the following Question No. 834:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Telecommunications Corporation: (1) Has SaskTel decided to replace the FleetNet 800 service? (2) Will SaskTel be providing any grants, loans or other assistance to our rural fire departments and emergency service providers to help them pay for the new communications equipment?

Mr. Hermanson, to ask the Government the following Question No. 835:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: In 1998, (1) Did SaskWater/Spudco receive any compensation from Monsanto for any of the genetically modified New Leaf potatoes? (2) Was any of this compensation from Monsanto provided to any of the producers who grew genetically modified New Leaf potatoes? (3) What quantity of genetically modified New Leaf potatoes did each of these potato packaging and processing companies buy? (4) Were each of these potato packaging and processing companies informed by SaskWater/Spudco that they were buying genetically modified New Leaf potatoes? (5) What steps did SaskWater/Spudco take to inform consumers in Saskatchewan and other markets that they were eating genetically modified New Leaf potatoes? (6) Were any genetically modified New Leaf potatoes ever mixed with other varieties of potatoes before being shipped and sold by SaskWater/Spudco? (7) If so, which producers received this compensation and how much did each receive?

Mr. Hermanson, to ask the Government the following Question No. 836:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: In 1998, (1) What quantity of genetically modified New Leaf potatoes did SaskWater/Spudco own at the beginning of the year? (2) How much did SaskWater/Spudco pay for these genetically modified New Leaf potatoes? (3) To how many producers did SaskWater/Spudco sell genetically modified New Leaf potatoes as seed potatoes? (4) What quantity of genetically modified New Leaf potatoes did each of these producers buy? (5) How much money did SaskWater/Spudco receive from each of these producers for these genetically modified New Leaf potatoes? (6) What quantity of genetically modified New Leaf potatoes did each of these producers grow under their agreements with SaskWater/Spudco? (7) On what date did SaskWater/Spudco become aware that the genetically modified New Leaf potatoes were under review by Agriculture Canada? (8) On what date did

SaskWater/Spudco make this Agriculture Canada review known to each of the producers to whom it had sold genetically modified New Leaf potatoes for seed? (9) How did SaskWater/Spudco sell or otherwise dispose of all the genetically modified New Leaf potatoes it owned in 1998? (10) What quantity of genetically modified New Leaf potatoes were sold to potato packaging and processing companies for human consumption? (11) Which potato packaging and processing companies bought genetically modified New Leaf potatoes from SaskWater/Spudco to be sold for human consumption? (12) For each shipment of genetically modified New Leaf potatoes that were sold outside Saskatchewan, was a Ministerial exemption obtained from the federal Department of Agriculture? (13) Did each of these Ministerial exemptions identify that the shipments contained genetically modified New Leaf potatoes?

Mr. Bjornerud, to ask the Government the following Question No. 837:

To the Minister of Health: (1) How many orthopaedic surgeons are currently practicing in Yorkton? (2) Is the Region's Health Authority currently recruiting additional orthopaedic surgeons for the Yorkton hospital?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 838:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of potato did Spudco purchase in 1997?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 839:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of potato did Spudco purchase in 1998?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 840:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of potato did Spudco purchase in 1999?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 841:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of potato did Spudco purchase in 2000?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 842:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of seed potatoes did Spudco sell to Saskatchewan potato producers in 1997?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 843:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of seed potato did Spudco sell to Saskatchewan potato producers in 1998?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 844:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of seed potato did Spudco sell to Saskatchewan potato producers in 1999?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 845:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: What varieties of seed potato did Spudco sell to Saskatchewan potato producers in 2000?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 846:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco mix different varieties of potato in 1997?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 847:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco mix different varieties of potato in 1998?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 848:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco mix different varieties of potato in 1999?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 849:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco mix different varieties of potato in 2000?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 850:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco store the different varieties of potato separately in 1997?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 851:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco store the different varieties of potato separately in 1998?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 852

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco store the different varieties of potato separately in 1999?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 853:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: Did Spudco store the different varieties of potato separately in 2000?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 854:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: (1) Did Spudco obtain federal ministerial exemptions to move potatoes inter-provincially in 1997? (2) For what varieties, and in what quantity? (3) If exemptions were requested for blended variety potatoes, were the make up of the blends provided, and in what quantity?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 855:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: (1) Did Spudco obtain federal ministerial exemptions to move potatoes inter-provincially in 1998? (2) If so, for what varieties, and in what quantity? (3) If exemptions were requested for blended variety potatoes, were the make up of the blends provided, and in what quantity?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 856:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: (1) Did Spudco obtain federal ministerial exemptions to move potatoes inter-provincially in 1999? (2) If so, for what varieties, and in what quantity? (3) If exemptions were requested for blended variety potatoes, were the make up of the blends provided, and in what quantity?

Mr. Dearborn, to ask the Government the following Question No. 857:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Water Corporation: (1) Did Spudco obtain federal ministerial exemptions to move potatoes inter-provincially in 2000? (2) If so, for what varieties, and in what quantity? (3) If exemptions were requested for blended variety potatoes, were the make up of the blends provided, and in what quantity?

The following Questions were asked on day no. 65 and are to be answered by day no. 70:

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 858:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Government Insurance: What discounts do SGI employees, executives and retirees receive on their SGI bills?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 859:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Power Corporation: What discounts do SaskPower employees, executives and retirees receive on their SaskPower bills?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 860:

To the Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated: What discounts do SaskEnergy employees, executives and retirees receive on their SaskEnergy bills?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 861:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Transportation Corporation: What discounts do STC employees, executives and retirees receive on their STC services?

Mr. Elhard, to ask the Government the following Question No. 862:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority: What discounts do SLGA employees, executives and retirees receive on their SLGA purchases?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 863:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Watershed Authority: (1) How many wells have been affected by the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project? (2) Where are these affected wells located?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 864:

To the Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated: (1) Has an environmental impact study been completed on the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project? (2) If so, what are the findings?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 865:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Watershed Authority: What scientific basis does TransGas have that the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project will not affect local groundwater quality and quantity?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 866:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Watershed Authority: According to Saskatchewan Watershed Authority Vice President Wayne Dybvig, "Seventeen wells in the Vanscoy/Grandora area were sampled by Authority staff between November 8 and 10, 2004. These 17 wells were deemed to be at the highest risk, based on previous data." What previous data is being referenced?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 867:

To the Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated: According to Saskatchewan Watershed Authority Vice President Wayne Dybvig, "Seventeen wells in the Vanscoy/Grandora area were sampled by Authority staff between November 8 and 10, 2004. These 17 wells were deemed to be at the highest risk, based on previous data." What previous data is being referenced?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 868:

To the Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated: What scientific basis does TransGas have that the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project will not affect local groundwater quality and quantity?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 869:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Watershed Authority: (1) Has an environmental impact study been completed on the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project? (2) If so, what are the findings?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 870:

To the Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated: (1) Were environmental impact studies done on any other TransGas Natural Gas Storage Projects completed in the province? (2) If so, what were the findings?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 871:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Watershed Authority: (1) Were environmental impact studies done on any other TransGas Natural Gas Storage Projects completed in the province? (2) If so, what were the findings?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 872:

To the Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated: (1) How many wells have been affected by the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project? (2) Where are these affected wells located?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 873:

To the Minister Responsible for Saskatchewan Watershed Authority: Will there be public involvement prior to the re-start of the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 874:

To the Minister Responsible for SaskEnergy Incorporated: Will there be public involvement prior to the re-start of the Grandora/Dunfermline/Vanscoy TransGas Natural Gas Storage Project?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 875:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Provincial Youth Advisory Committee in the fiscal year 2000?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 876:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Provincial Youth Advisory Committee in the fiscal year 2001?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 877:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Provincial Youth Advisory Committee in the fiscal year 2002?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 878:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Provincial Youth Advisory Committee in the fiscal year 2003?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 879:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Provincial Youth Advisory Committee in the fiscal year 2004?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 880:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism in the fiscal year 2004?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 881:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism in the fiscal year 2003?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 882:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism in the fiscal year 2002?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 883:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism in the fiscal year 2001?

Mr. Weekes, to ask the Government the following Question No. 884:

To the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation: How much did your department give to the Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism in the fiscal year 2000?