

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise once again on behalf of concerned citizens with respect to the closure of the Plains Health Centre and the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

The names on the petitions, Mr. Speaker, are from Kipling, Regina, White City, Grenfell, Edenwold, and other small communities from around Regina.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise to present petitions of names throughout Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

People of Regina and numerous Saskatchewan communities have signed this petition, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition on behalf of the serious concerns of the landlords who provide rental accommodation to Saskatchewan renters. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take action to allow an increase in the security deposits on rental properties to the equivalent of one month's rent.

And that your Hon. Assembly review the remedies available to the landlords who are not given sufficient notice by social assistance tenants who vacate properties, and whose rent in their new accommodation is paid by Social Services without regard for outstanding obligations in previous rental agreements.

The petitioners are from Saskatoon, Hague, and Elrose.

I so present.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to present names of citizens in Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

The people that have signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, are

primarily from Regina, but also Moosomin.

Mr. Gantfoer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise as well on behalf of concerned citizens about the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

Signatures on this petition are primarily from Regina and from southern Saskatchewan.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise today to present petitions of names of people from throughout Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

The people that have signed this petition are mostly from Regina, but also from Moose Jaw.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again today to present a petition of names from people in southern Saskatchewan regarding the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by residents of Pilot Butte and Regina.

Mr. Aldridge: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too present petitions of names regarding the Plains Health Centre. And the prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

And the people who have signed this petition are from Admiral, and the vast majority of them from Swift Current.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise with my colleagues on day no. 33 and with the people all throughout Saskatchewan to present petitions on their efforts in saving the Plains Health Centre. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

Mr. Speaker, the people that have signed these petitions are mainly from the Regina area. In fact in particular I see from Regina Coronation Park, Regina Victoria constituency, Regina South, Regina Elphinstone, Regina Lakeview, Regina Centre,

Regina Sherwood, Regina Wascana Plains, Regina Dewdney, and Regina Qu'Appelle Valley in particular, Mr. Speaker.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 12(7) they are hereby read and received:

Of citizens of the province petitioning the Assembly to repeal the Crown Construction Tendering Agreement; and

Of citizens of the province petitioning the Assembly to reconsider closure of the Plains Health Centre.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

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

To the Minister of Municipal Government: provide the revenue collected by the province from municipalities in the 1995-96 fiscal year for: (1) the hospital revenue tax; (2) the public health levy; (3) the social services levy.

I so present.

Ms. Draude: — I give notice that I shall on day no. 38 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of SaskTel: (1) how does SaskTel determine the areas and when coverage for cellular service will be given; and (2) what is the status for the town of Kelvington in SaskTel's plan for providing cellular service?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you a number of members of the board of directors of Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation. Seated in your gallery, I'd like to introduce Mel Watson— Mel, if you'll stand up and be recognized — Trent Beatty, and Sherri Cybulski who are with us here today.

They're here to observe question period and then a board meeting to follow later. So I want all members to join with me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

International Special Librarians Day

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me try out a new word on you — cyberjob. If we're having trouble wrapping our minds around that word, how about this one — cybrarian.

A cybrarian is, for the most part, a traditional librarian whose

role as information gatherer and distributor has dramatically expanded to the four corners of the electronic globe and back.

All this by way of saying that today is International Special Librarians Day, the day we recognize the hard work of the people in the Legislative Library, who sometimes manage to make us look as if we know whereof we speak. A special librarian, as the term suggests, is one who provides special information to special clientele. This includes legislative librarians.

The theme this year is, partners in global information management. And that is a daunting task, Mr. Speaker because we all know and hear constantly we are at risk of being electronically buried under a cyber-heap of information. With no one to organize, distribute, and otherwise filter this newly available blizzard of data, we are in danger of receiving less because we know not where to turn. Whether we like it or not, the days of the Dewey decimal system and the card catalogue are long gone.

As members of the Assembly who use our Legislative Library extensively to approach issues with the best information available, we today recognize our resident cybrarians, Marian Powell and her staff, on this special day, for the excellent work they do for us all year round.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Harvard Scholarship Award

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an outstanding student in my constituency, Terry Lechler from Middle Lake.

Mr. Lechler is one of two Canadians awarded a full scholarship to attend Harvard Medical School this fall. With an average in the mid 90's, he is among eight international students chosen to attend Harvard. During the five- to seven-year program at Harvard, Mr. Lechler will do a Ph.D. in biological and bio-medical sciences.

He is presently completing a double honours degree in biochemistry and microbiology. Raised on a farm at Middle Lake, Mr. Lechler credits the Middle Lake High School for excellent education and for laying the ground work. His professors credit him with a combination of academic brilliance and common sense. Congratulations, Terry Lechler. We are all very proud of you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Expansion of SRI Homes Inc.

Mr. Ward: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to give you a specific example of how the *Partnership for Growth* is working for the benefit of Saskatchewan business and Saskatchewan workers.

The *Partnership* is committed to cultivating a positive environment for economic growth through a number of steps, two of which are, reducing the number of regulations by 25 per cent over the next 10 years and simplifying the procedures for

complying with regulations.

SRI Homes Inc. in Estevan manufactures modular, mobile, and panelled homes. It employs 175 people. It also has plants in Alberta and B.C. (British Columbia) and serves those markets. Sales in Estevan are up in 1996 over 1995.

Because of the workmanship of its products and because it has effectively pursued expanded markets, SRI Homes has recently received certification from the Housing and Urban Development department in the U.S. (United States), which will allow it to sell into the U.S. market, primarily in North Dakota. And due to this expansion, SRI is presently in the process of hiring 15 new employees — Saskatchewan jobs for Saskatchewan people.

The Government of Saskatchewan was able to assist SRI in its expansion efforts by issuing a permit to make transportation methods compatible with those in North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, the initiative, the business acumen, the product, are all due to the people at SRI Homes. I congratulate all involved and I am happy to be part of a government which, through its assistance, helps business to expand and prosper. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Kelvington Wheat Kings Win Provincial Title

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As many people across Canada know, Kelvington is a town in rural Saskatchewan that has had a very successful hockey tradition, producing several NHL (National Hockey League) hockey players. That tradition continued on March 28, when the Kelvington Peewee Wheat Kings broke an 8:8 tie to defeat the Strasbourg Maroons in the play-offs. The victory gave Kelvington its first ever Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey Association provincial crown.

Kelvington's peewee team had to advance through some tough competition to eventually capture the championship. They played a tough series against Buchanan, Naicam, Kenaston, and Dinsmore. Kelvington's team was coached by Barry Schultz and Ken Len, and managed by Brian Schultz. The team endured a busy schedule this season, playing 51 league, tournament, and play-off games. Overall, they won 44, lost 3, and tied 4.

I would ask the members of this Assembly to join me in congratulating the Provincial C Peewee champions, the Kelvington Wheat Kings.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Tugaske Co-op's 60th Anniversary

Ms. Stanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I was happy to represent the government at a celebration at the town of Tugaske, a celebration that looked back over 60 years of cooperative success, and forward to many years of the same.

The Tugaske Co-op was established 60 years ago. That was

1936, during the Depression, not one of the great times of our history. Then, the people of Tugaske knew that the way to survive the hard times was not by turning against each other but by banding together in an economic unit — cooperation rather than competition. They obviously know this and do the same thing today.

Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, the case of Saskatchewan cooperative initiative is just one example of what the Premier calls the Saskatchewan way. It is the way — the spirit that built the foundation of our society and our economy. It is the same spirit that is taking us into the new century. And just in case you think I'm romanticizing too much, let me quickly point out that yesterday's celebration provided more proof that co-ops make good business sense as well as good neighbourly sense.

Along with the birthday cake, accompanying the children's choir singing to the assembled guests, as part of the ceremony, dividend cheques of 193,000 were distributed to the members. Now that's something to celebrate. I congratulate the Tugaske Co-op and wish it all the more years of success. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Human Rights in China

Mr. Heppner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just two days ago, many members made statements in this House in remembrance of one of the worst human rights atrocities ever committed in the history of the world. And today our Premier and University of Regina are honouring one of the top officials of a regime that continues to commit terrible human rights atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that Canada and Saskatchewan should continue to have economic relations with China; however, we should be using these relations as an opportunity to influence Chinese officials to clean up their human rights record and bring democratic reform to their country.

The position taken by our Premier, that he would not speak to Mr. Qiao Shi about human rights issues, is a complete abdication of his responsibility as a leader of this province. Yes, we must have relations with China. Yes, we must meet with Chinese officials. But we should be taking these opportunities to express our dismay with the ongoing human rights violations. We should not simply be providing photo opportunities for the Premier; we should not be heaping honours of degrees on the former head of the Chinese secret police.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister of Education will be attending the honorary degree ceremony on behalf of the government. I have a list of 25 members of the Chinese pro-democracy movement who are currently being detained by the Chinese government. Ironically, many of them are university students and professors. I would like to give this list to the Minister of Education and ask her to show the leadership the Premier failed to show by asking . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. The member's time has expired.

Provincial Geography Challenge

Ms. Bradley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to report that there are two students in Weyburn who know exactly where they are and precisely . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I'll ask members of the House to come to order, to allow the member from Weyburn-Big Muddy to make her member's statement. Order. Order. Order. Order. Order. All members will come to order.

Ms. Bradley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to report that there are two students in Weyburn who know exactly where they are and precisely where they are going. And they have a pretty good idea of what they will be going through on the way there.

These two students are on their way to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. Brandon Swertz and Michael Larson, both of Weyburn, recently finished first and second respectively in the provincial geography challenge held in Moose Jaw on March 30.

They will compete in Ottawa on May 18 at the national geography challenge sponsored by the Royal Canadian Geographical Society and the Canadian Council of Geographic Educators. The winners of the national go on to an international contest. The Canadian final will be hosted again this year by Alex Trebek, the Canadian host of the TV show *Jeopardy*.

Mr. Speaker, last year one student from Weyburn was one of our three provincial finalists. This year, there are two. Next year it is only logical that all three finalists in the national geography challenge will be from Weyburn — geographically speaking, a small city in the south-eastern corner of Saskatchewan, a large, rectangular province in the heartland of Canada, the best province in the best country in the world in which to live.

Good luck to Brandon and Michael. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

SaskTel Strike

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour stood in this House yesterday and publicly rejected a request by striking SaskTel workers to take their dispute to mediation. In the words of the minister:

. . . there does not appear to be sufficient flexibility in the bargaining positions for mediation to be successful at this time.

Mr. Speaker, if both sides are at loggerheads, this would appear to be the best possible time to bring in an unbiased third party, if only to provide both parties with the options to consider.

Will the minister explain how his government can claim to be doing everything it can to bring an end to this strike when he has rejected mediation and appears to be dragging his feet?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I'd like to thank the hon. member for his question, Mr. Speaker. I did not say outright that I rejected mediation. What I said was very clear, on the record. I read the letter that I had sent to the union in the House yesterday, and it's very clear to me at this time, after consultation, that there is not enough flexibility on the positions currently in existence for a mediator to gain a reasonable chance of success.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the opposition not to try grandstanding in this legislature to pretend that they're protecting the union members and the rights of working people.

If you look at the statements of the hon. member in the paper just recently, he agrees that SaskTel should not pay its employees more because of the incidents that were there. He says, quote:

They're being paid adequately. If you do great, that's fine and what should be expected, but this is not a share situation.

So he comes to the House and tries to pretend that he wants something special for employees within this province, but yet on the other hand is saying they deserve nothing.

The Speaker: — Next question.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Mr. Speaker, my comments made were . . . we weren't getting into whether they should get a raise, shouldn't get a raise, or any benefits. What we were saying is, let's get the two sides back together and get this solved once and for all. The government's renegeing on its duties.

Mr. Speaker, David Durning, a spokesman for striking SaskTel workers, told reporters yesterday that in five days projects being conducted overseas by SaskTel International will be abandoned. Employees will leave their posts and return home to Saskatchewan.

Will the minister explain what, if any, plans he has to address the issue that could do irreparable damage to the reputation of SaskTel?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain what the member opposite is reading from. The union made an announcement at the onset of the labour withdrawal that they would consider in about two weeks' time whether they would recall some SaskTel in-scope employees who are working on overseas projects for SaskTel International. That time has not yet elapsed, Mr. Speaker, and that request has not been made by the union to this point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Health District Boards

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when this government began to restructure Saskatchewan's

health care system, people were told by the NDP (New Democratic Party) government that district boards would operate in such a way that it would truly reflect the needs of local people. Obviously one of the main duties of the board is to voice concerns of those they represent.

Mr. Speaker, in a move that completely flies in the face of openness and honesty, the media reported today that the Saskatoon District Health Board has approved a policy limiting its members from expressing their opinions about board decisions. Will the Minister of Health explain what he intends to do to preserve the integrity of the board?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is not an attack on me or the government; this is an attack the member is launching on the Saskatoon District Health Board. I want to say that my experience is that if you want to stop people from expressing their opinions, Mr. Speaker, there is no effective way you can do that.

But I do want to issue a stern warning to the Saskatoon District Health Board. I have a stern warning for them. And that is, be very careful listening to that member when it comes to being advised about openness and democracy. Because his practice, Mr. Speaker, is to get together with a small group of people, MLAs ((Member of the Legislative Assembly) from the Liberal Party, in a closed room in the Hotel Saskatchewan, to oust a leader democratically elected by men and women in the Liberal Party across the province.

So I say to that member and I say to the Saskatoon District Health Board, be very careful listening to that member when it comes to talking about openness and democracy, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the people in the Saskatoon Health Board District will in fact really appreciate an answer when the minister doesn't even come close to dealing with the same topic.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatoon District Health Board members who wish to speak out must first get permission from the board chairman or president, and there are a number of topics that are off limits, such as labour relations and personnel matters.

Board member Bob Russell is quoted on CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) radio as stating, and I quote:

Restricting members from speaking out will stymie public input on important issues such as how to cope with the board's \$8 million deficit.

Mr. Speaker, one has to question what happened to freedom of speech, democracy, and being able to carry out duly elected responsibilities by addressing health concerns of the public. Will the minister explain if the action taken by the Saskatoon District Health Board is the first step in muzzling all health board members from speaking out on issues which may reflect not well on that government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I was momentarily distracted looking at this photograph of the former Liberal leader kicking down the door of this Chamber to oppose the introduction of medicare. But you know, the member was talking last week, or was it the week before, Mr. Speaker, that the nurses in the health care system weren't going to get paid, because the member considers himself quite a champion of nurses and labour and medicare and everything else.

But do you know what the president of the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses said about that kind of tactic, Mr. Speaker? She said that:

This tactic demonstrates an appalling lack of moral judgement, using staff as pawns. We understand employees were encouraged to phone their MLAs and district health board representatives to complain. This is manipulative and demoralizing. It amounts to mental terrorism.

And I say to that member, and I say to the Saskatoon District Health Board, be very careful about what that member says, Mr. Speaker. His actions are different than his words.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

School Closures

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the NDP plan to decimate rural Saskatchewan is gaining momentum each and every day. The NDP budget decisions may force the high school in Annaheim to close.

I have in my hand a letter from the major employer in this community and in our province. Lionel Doepker, president of Doepker Industries, writes:

Without a local school, we would have a difficult time attracting and keeping people. A decision to close the school would seriously jeopardize our future in rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the Minister of Economic Development doesn't have the slightest clue about the intricate details of business as it works within a community. If he did, he wouldn't sit back and watch the Minister of Education butcher our local schools, and on the other hand talk about economic development. The minister is out of touch with rural Saskatchewan.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is, does the Minister of Economic Development realize the effects school closures will have on the business community of rural Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for the question. Mr. Speaker, the member and I had a discussion the other day about rural education — I believe in estimates — and what the member needs to understand is that, since 1971 in this province, we've lost about one-third of our

rural school enrolment. Mr. Speaker, over the years we lose students out of rural Saskatchewan and we have students going into larger towns or small cities, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our formula is based on enrolment. As well, our formula makes sure that we pay more for students living in rural Saskatchewan. The member will also know that The Education Act gives local school divisions the authority to determine whether or not to continue an educational program in a particular location. And I guess if she has concerns about that I would suggest she talk to her local school division.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Draude: — Mr. Speaker, what the NDP government is doing to our rural communities is shameful. The neglect is apparent to everyone, even the muzzled NDP back-benchers. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Economic Development summed up his commitment to rural Saskatchewan when he said, there was and still is no intention to provide a grant strategy for rural Saskatchewan. Obviously there is no strategy for rural Saskatchewan. It's not one of this government's priorities.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister admit that the devastating cuts to health care, education, and rural infrastructures, are making it impossible for businesses in rural Saskatchewan to create the jobs his government has asked us to create.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the member opposite, who continues to preach gloom and doom about the economy of Saskatchewan even though almost every indicator — even though almost every indicator, whether it's the price of grain, whether it's the price and production of potash, whether it's oil and gas, whether it's uranium — would indicate to those members opposite that the economy of Saskatchewan, rural and urban, has never been stronger. And that's the facts.

And yet that member every day comes to the House, gloom and doom, talking about how terrible it is. And she reminds me of the former Liberal leader who now sits as an independent, who used to come here in the session before the last election and preach gloom and doom about the economy of Saskatchewan.

That is not what the public of Saskatchewan believe; it's not what they want to hear. And I would urge the new member to take a positive view about the economy, because that's the biggest contribution she could make as a new member.

Don't listen to the member from Wood River, the former member from Shaunavon; don't listen to him any more. Be positive and believe in rural Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Gross Revenue Insurance Program Overpayments

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my questions this afternoon are for the Agriculture minister or his designate.

Mr. Minister, a number of farmers have contacted our office recently because they have received threatening letters from Saskatchewan Crop Insurance. These letters, which were sent by registered mail, say that if their outstanding GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) bills are not paid by April 30, they will not be eligible for the crop insurance program this year.

Mr. Minister, I believe that when you first broke your campaign promise and sent out the GRIP bills you said repayment would not be tied to the 1996 crop insurance program. Mr. Minister, why have you broken another promise to Saskatchewan farmers? Why are you sending out threatening letters? I want to pass this across to the member.

Hon. Mr. Renaud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the member opposite: the farmers in Saskatchewan know very well that when they have a bill owing that they are going to have to pay it. We have made the comment in this House many times that if the farmers have a concern with paying what they owe, that they should get a hold of the corporation and make arrangements so that in fact that burden, if there is a burden, can be lessened.

So I want to tell the member that farmers are responsible in the province of Saskatchewan and they will pay their bills.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, what you have done is sent out a threatening letter suggesting that you're going to withdraw crop insurance coverage for these people, even though you made the commitment, even though your government made the commitment, that that would not happen.

If you had kept your word in the first place, farmers would've never received GRIP bills. Now you're sending threatening letters out to withdraw crop insurance coverage to get farmers to pay GRIP bills they shouldn't have received in the first place.

Mr. Minister, when is your attack on Saskatchewan farmers going to end? Will you withdraw this threat today, Mr. Minister, and assure Saskatchewan farmers that GRIP bills will not be used as a way of leverage against their 1996 crop insurance program?

Hon. Mr. Renaud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the member opposite, I find it very hard to understand. Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan; yes, it's still got some problems but is doing very well. We have not seen grain prices like we are seeing now for many, many years.

I was just looking at an article here, herb and spice association, Mr. Speaker, from 10 members has grown to over 230 members in the last few years. There are over 150 businesses employing over 1,000 people in rural Saskatchewan, bagging and handling specialty crops. Farmers are diversifying: 296 food processing plants in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker; 217 licensed game farms in the province of Saskatchewan.

And this . . . the member opposite says that when a farmer owes a bill he shouldn't pay it? Farmers will pay their bills if they owe it.

Political Function Advertising

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, yesterday your SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) minister was caught sending out partisan NDP material using his MLA fax machine.

And in speaking with the media later, he said hundreds of faxes are sent out of his office every day so he can't be expected to have a full knowledge of what's happening in his office. He also said he can't be expected to know what's going on in his cabinet office with the fax machine there.

Mr. Premier, that's a complete abdication of his responsibility both as an MLA and as a cabinet minister. And whether he likes it or not, he does have the responsibility to follow the rules. This is the second time he's violated those rules.

Mr. Premier, since your minister is not prepared to take the responsibility for his actions, will you do so? Will you remove this two-time offender from your cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm really pleased that I have the opportunity again to speak to this matter.

First of all, I want to address the first point that the member had made and that's the fact that cabinet ministers and MLA offices, as my member from Souris Cannington would know, are very busy. And I would be surprised, as I'd stated, whether or not he has in his repertoire of knowledge an understanding of all of the full activities that are faxed out of his . . . or correspondence that goes out of his office.

Because in this business of being an MLA and working for the people of Saskatchewan, it's not always that you have all of the pieces of information that you need when you're dealing with the public. And certainly, when you have competent office staff — which I'm sure we all have — they perform tasks on our behalf which truly serve the people of Saskatchewan well and members do not always have a full appreciation of every piece of correspondence that leaves their office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to figure out exactly where the buck stops in this particular government, because the minister won't take responsibility for his actions; the Premier won't take responsibility for the minister he appointed. Perhaps the Justice minister can look at this issue.

Mr. Justice Minister, this is a clear violation of the Board of Internal Economy directives. This is this member's second violation. Will you launch an investigation into this matter and report back to the House what actions your department will be taking against the minister for SPMC?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to respond more specifically to the question that the member asked me yesterday, and would have done that in my first response except that by

the number of comments that he had made, it felt purposeful that I speak to them first.

But yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I did have an opportunity to review the information that was faxed out of my office in Yorkton, and it is true that there was a fax that was sent, and that fax, Mr. Speaker, was sent to the five MPs (Member of Parliament) who serve this province in Ottawa. And that fax was sent, Mr. Speaker, as an information to them, and that fax that the member from Souris-Cannington distributed is exactly the fax that went to them.

Mr. Speaker, this fax was sent by a member of . . . or by a staff who was serving in capacity of a part-time staff last week. This member had no knowledge — no knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that she was contravening any of the rules of this Assembly or that of my MLA office.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, if there is a contravention of the rule here, I will ensure that through the federal riding constituency association, when we determine the cost of what that fax was, we will make that remuneration to the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

No-fault Insurance

Mr. Osika: — The government's no-fault insurance scheme has now been in place for over a year. Mr. Speaker, since being elected to this House, I, along with my colleague from Canora-Pelly, have received several letters from Saskatchewan residents who have had trouble with SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) as a direct result of no-fault provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the former Justice minister of Saskatchewan told the residents that a review of the new system would take place once no-fault was imposed to see how it was working for the people of Saskatchewan. My question for the Minister of Justice is whether or not this review will go ahead and when?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think that, first of all, I want to outline to the House and to the members of the Assembly that the SGI no-fault insurance program has now been in place for just better than a year, and it is clear that this program is providing very valuable services to the citizens of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan.

Throughout this course of the past year, there have been implemented a number of programs that are going to benefit the treatment side and to help people in terms of rehabilitation and recovery.

Truly, the no-fault insurance program, when it was implemented in 1995 — the statements were clear that we would review the program after we had an opportunity to assess the value of the program in respect to all of the rehabilitative services that it's provided.

And the assurances are still there, Mr. Speaker, that within the five-year period of which the no-fault program was designed to operate for review, that review will be undertaken.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Within five years, I believe I heard the minister say — that is a considerable length of time. There are already people that have suffered some personal, serious effects as a result of this program.

Mr. Speaker, in the October 1995 edition of the *Benchers' Digest*, a newsletter of the Saskatchewan Trial Lawyers Association, the former Justice minister clearly promises a review will take place of the no-fault system. And clearly, Mr. Speaker, there are many concerns in Saskatchewan regarding the system. There are clearly flaws in the system that simply have to be addressed within a period less than five years.

Will the new Minister of Justice live up to his predecessor's commitment and conduct a review of no-fault insurance, this time asking those who have had to go through with the system what they in fact think of it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Mr. Speaker, I want to just indicate that since the no-fault program has come into place we have seen, in this province, a reduction of the number of claims by better than 3,000.

Mr. Speaker, what else we have seen with the implementation of the new program is that we have seen improved benefits for rehabilitation services. Where now the government is . . . where SGI is currently paying in the amount of \$500,000 for the rehabilitation of people who are injured in a car crash, as opposed to the old program in which there were \$10,000 that were paid for people to rehabilitate.

Mr. Speaker, for all of the occasions that the members opposite can find where an individual might say that the benefits aren't sufficient enough, I can provide probably 10 of those letters that can show that the program is working well.

And I have here, Mr. Speaker, a letter from an individual from Saskatoon, who suggested that I might provide this to the members of the House, who says that, and I'll just quote the last part: If it had not been for the SGI policy no-fault insurance program established for victims, I don't know where I would be today and I don't know that I would be able to be mobile. And I want to thank the employees of SGI and all of their staff and associates for the excellent services that this program provides to people.

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to the minister: accidents are continuing even if there was a no-fault insurance plan introduced on January 1, '95. Minister in charge of SGI and this government have indicated that no-fault insurance protects the Crown agency from petty accident claims. However, as the minister is well aware, not every vehicle accident is minor in nature.

Case in point: a collision that occurred in January of 1995

involving the Markwart family of Regina, Mr. Speaker. A young girl died in this accident, while her father suffered serious injuries forcing him to undergo many months of therapy. Under no-fault insurance, Jan Markwart was paid 90 per cent of his net salary following the accident, but not pension benefits or sick leave lost through the months that he was off work.

In addition, Mr. Markwart, unable to return to his job as a fire-fighter, was also robbed of any opportunity to make claim. Will the minister indicate when people like Jan Markwart, who are victims of accidents, will no longer be victimized by this government's no-fault insurance scheme?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Mr. Speaker, I first want to indicate to the House and to the member opposite that he well knows and should be informed that it's not the place of this minister, or any minister, to be able to talk about the individual issues as they relate to a family.

And I want to assure the House that I personally, Mr. Speaker, have had the occasion of meeting with the Markwart family. I understand very precisely and clearly the issues that they face and also have had an opportunity to speak with the member opposite from Pelly-Canora about this case, and in great detail outlined for him the process under the no-fault insurance program and the benefits that it provides.

And just as an example, Mr. Speaker, because I noted that the information that the member provided is that under the old program the maximum per week earnings that a disabled person might earn was \$200 per week, Mr. Speaker. Today, under the new program, 90 per cent of the income derived from the gross revenue income program . . . or from the gross revenue income that they earn — earnings — is available to them, Mr. Speaker, to a maximum of \$50,000 — a far better benefit than has existed under the old program by a long way.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I'm honoured today to present a response to question no. 72.

The Speaker: — The answer to question 72 is tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 44 — An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act, 1993

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading of Bill 44, An Act to amend The Crown

Corporations Act, 1993.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is embarking on a major review of our Crown corporations in order to ensure that they will meet the challenges of the future from a position of strength.

And while it is true that these amendments are not directly connected with that review, it is in keeping with our stated policy of streamlining and modernizing the operations of our Crowns. In fact these amendments are directed at correcting some deficiencies we have found in Crown Corporations Act; deficiencies related to the operations of our Crowns in a fast-changing world. These amendments, Mr. Speaker, are of a housekeeping nature; nonetheless they are important changes.

One of these amendments completes the definition of Treasury Board Crown corporation. The present definition, Mr. Speaker, does not include Crown corporations that report to Treasury Board but have their own incorporating statute. Crown corporations that report to Treasury Board, with their own statute, don't fall within the definition of a Treasury Board Crown corporation or under the definition of a CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) Crown corporation.

This amendment allows the Lieutenant Governor in Council to designate which Crown corporations are Treasury Board Crown corporations. The change is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to ensure transparency in the operation of these Crowns. This ensures that these corporations will now fall under the authority of The Crown Corporations Act, 1993 in regards to such items as the tabling of annual reports.

Another change in the legislation proposed in this Act would be to provide specific authority for the Crown Investments Corporation to amalgamate with a subsidiary Crown corporation with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a change being made in order to avoid problems which have developed in the past.

An example of a problem remedied by this amendment, Mr. Speaker, would be the wind-up of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). When SEDCO was wound up, Mr. Speaker, and the decision was made to transfer its assets and liabilities to CIC, CIC did not have specific statutory authority that allowed it to get an order in council to amalgamate SEDCO's activities. Instead, they had to rely on the general authority section within The Crown Corporations Act, 1993.

This amendment allows CIC, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to amalgamate with a subsidiary Crown corporation. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, is designed to assist our Crown sector in adapting quickly to a changing world environment.

Another amendment, Mr. Speaker, would allow CIC to provide financial assistance to any body corporate. The current Act only allows financial assistance where CIC owns shares in a body corporate. This has been found to be too restrictive, Mr. Speaker, and again we are trying here to ensure that past problems are corrected.

Mr. Speaker, CIC is currently involved in a number of investments where it does not hold shares, such as many of the former SEDCO holdings. In order to ensure a proper winding-down and/or restructuring of such investments, CIC needs the proper authority and flexibility to make the best decisions for the people of Saskatchewan.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, gives CIC the necessary authority to deal with its investments in a proper fashion. But it can only do so with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, which means the actions are disclosed to the public and more accountability is the result.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation adds a new section to The Crown Corporations Act, 1993. This new section is proposed to provide specific authority for Crown corporations to engage in capital market activities. This is standard in their normal course of business, Mr. Speaker. For example, SaskEnergy is involved in commodity swaps on a regular basis involving natural gas.

A recent decision in an English court held that unless specific statutory authority existed for a corporation to engage in capital market activity, there is a question as to whether or not they have the authority to engage in those activities. The proposed amendments provide clear statutory authority for the Crown corporations to continue the activities that they are engaged in. Nothing new is contemplated by this section.

Mr. Speaker, CIC is the responsible manager of the public's assets and, as such, it has with this section anticipated a problem which could result because of a legal precedent in another jurisdiction and taken steps to ensure the problem does not arise here.

Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure all members of this Assembly can see, these proposed amendments do not encompass a major change in direction or policy within our Crowns. They do, however, clear up some important issues which have surfaced since the Act was passed in this Assembly some three years ago.

Mr. Speaker, since I have taken over responsibility for our Crowns, I have said time and again that they must be in a position to meet the challenges of a changing world. In a minor way, Mr. Speaker, these amendments are proposed for that purpose. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on Bill 44, entitled An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act.

Mr. Speaker, our Crown corporations sector represents approximately 40 per cent of the government's financial activity. The members opposite must agree that this is indeed a very substantial portion. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that this Assembly does not have a chance to examine the financial operations of the Crown sector.

By law, CIC and its subsidiaries raise revenues and spend

public money without an annual pre-approval of their budgets by this Assembly. As a result, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Legislative Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan are not able to fully understand the make-up of the Crown sector.

Saskatchewan people are hard-working, responsible people. They've been subjected to stifling taxes and sky-rocketing utility rates. A large portion of the money in the Crown sector comes directly from the taxes and utility rates that Saskatchewan people pay every day. I, along with my caucus, believe that people have a right to know what their money is being used for. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case.

Our own Provincial Auditor has gone to great lengths in an attempt to make the Crown sector more accountable to the public. His recommendations have fallen on deaf ears. This government refuses to take the advice of the Assembly's own expert.

The Provincial Auditor stated in his fall '95 report, and I quote:

CIC's annual report and its subsidiaries' annual reports lack essential accountability information.

He went on to say that:

... it is important to continue urging the Government to implement practices that will enhance its public accountability.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the Liberal opposition is committed to do.

Each spring the government introduces their budget for the upcoming fiscal year. Each year it is a budget that only tells one-half of the story. Obviously the Crown sector operates under different financial circumstances than do the departments which make up the General Revenue Fund.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are still dealing with the hard-earned money of Saskatchewan people. The people of Saskatchewan expect and deserve a certain level of service. Granted, our Crown corporations are providing the people with reasonable levels of service. These are the same Crown corporations that seriously lack public accountability.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen what the government does with taxpayers' dollars. They dump money into risky ventures and stock markets. The government has no place playing high-risk games with taxpayers' dollars.

The members opposite may say, look at Cameco shares — millions of dollars in windfall profits. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the stock market there are no guarantees. Saskatchewan taxpayers could have easily suffered major losses instead of profits. I say to the members opposite that the players play, and you're not the player.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment to The Crown Corporations Act does nothing to increase the public accountability of the Crown sector. In fact it will allow the Crowns to hide more of their financial dealings from the public.

This amendment would allow CIC to amalgamate with subsidiary Crown corporations by cabinet order. This would expose the public to far higher levels of risks than they are already subjected to.

This amendment would grant CIC far greater authority to engage in capital market activities. CIC would have the authority to utilize virtually every financial vehicle possible in order to fulfil its objectives and purposes.

Mr. Speaker, we don't believe this is acceptable. This government has yet to stand up and take responsibility for the financial dilemma that Saskatchewan is facing. They sit here for four years and blame Tory administrations, and now they have set their sights on the federal government.

When things go well in the province, the government is right there to take credit, but they're nowhere to be found in tough times.

The Minister of Finance actually believes that she balanced the budget, but it was really balanced on the backs of the hard-working people of this province. The Minister of Finance sat back with her knife and decided which budgets were going to get slashed. The result was substantial tax increases and severe offloading onto municipalities, schools boards, health care professionals. And the list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this government is not very good at handling taxpayers' dollars. They have criticized others for tax and spend policies, but they have taken it one step further, and they have adopted a philosophy of tax as much as humanly possible and then slash the essential services of health, education, and social services.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill gives CIC far too much authority to invest taxpayers' dollars in capital market activities. The role of CIC is simple. They are to monitor the performance and coordinate direction of subsidiary Crown corporations. CIC claims that the current Act is too restrictive, and therefore wants to have these amendments introduced.

Mr. Speaker, the current Act is not restrictive enough. Currently the Provincial Auditor is conducting an audit on CIC's investment management system. The result of this audit will be reported in the 1996 spring report. I am sure the Provincial Auditor will have some serious recommendations for CIC investments management system. It is the hope of our caucus that his recommendations won't fall on deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, there obviously is some major problems with this Bill. Our caucus ... that anytime you're dealing with hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars, it is a very serious issue. The people of Saskatchewan need — and they deserve — to have their tax dollars going into the programs and services they so desperately need.

When we are dealing with the Crown sector we need to proceed with extreme caution. The members opposite know of several cases where Crown investments have and will continue to cost taxpayers very dearly. To open up the vault to CIC and say

spend as you wish, but make sure it gets cabinet approval first, is ludicrous.

Why don't the members opposite be open and accountable with the Assembly and the public? We all know how order in councils work. It is definitely not an acceptable way to give CIC authority to go on long shopping sprees.

Mr. Speaker, this government cries poor, closes hospitals, and threatens further cuts to health, education, and social services. At the same time, we see the size of cabinet and political staff sky-rocket. This is a time where prudent fiscal management and diversification needs to be at the forefront.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill needs serious examination and extensive input from the public. In order to do so, I move to adjourn debate on this Bill.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 43

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mrs. Teichrob that **Bill No. 43 — An Act respecting the Development, Implementation and Operation of an Emergency 911 System and to make consequential amendments to other Acts** be now read a second time.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, last year municipalities were promised 10 per cent of VLT (video lottery terminal) revenues, and according to a *Leader-Post* article on February 1, '95:

By the end of the day, the NDP were giving 25 per cent of the VLT revenue, likely between 19 and \$30 million dollars.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happened to change this back? This could have paid for an enhanced 911 system. Mr. Speaker, municipalities are sceptical — sceptical because the money could be withdrawn at any time because it stays in the hands of the government.

(1430)

I'd like to quote again from the *Leader-Post*, January 30:

But government local officials, fed up with having a revenue-sharing plan with the province cut repeatedly in recent years, are already talking about obtaining new and secure sources of revenue that could not be cut at the whim of the government.

Also in *The Western Producer*, October 26:

Henry Lesieur, a professor from the University of Illinois said the government's take on the machines is obscene. It is the worst take-out rate I have every heard of anywhere. Already people are losing even when it comes to winning. The amount the government's giving back is hurting them

even more.

Another quote in the *Star-Phoenix*, February 2, the Premier said his moral opinion on VLTs is, I don't approve of them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm worried that this 911 system will be just like amalgamation with municipalities and will be forced on municipal governments. I wonder again, were the communities ever asked about the government's 911 system, or is it like everything else the government does — they just don't listen and go ahead and do it on their own.

Mr. Speaker, 911 as presented in this Bill is only a number; a number of convenience, but falls far short of providing a service for emergency services for rural Saskatchewan — for that matter, all of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gantfoer: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to first of all thank the House for adjourning the debate on this issue yesterday so that I may have an opportunity to participate. And the reason that I wanted to is that since about 1994, in some extent I've been involved with the attempt to put a 911 system into the north-east of the province.

In 1994 the Melfort & District Chamber of Commerce was instrumental in recognizing the concern for emergency services. And it's really strange that sometimes good ideas come about in the very simplest way. Because what had happened is one of the children of our members had said that they were watching the 911 on television, the program that we've all seen. And they right away identified with that and they asked one of the members, who was the parent, is there 911 in Melfort? And of course they had to say, no there isn't.

And so the chamber of commerce at that time entered into initial discussions with the fire department and the district health board to see what indeed was the level of service for emergency care in the Melfort area.

And what we found was sort of a patchwork of very sort of disjointed services. If you wanted to phone for a policeman, you phoned one number. If you wanted to phone for an ambulance, you phoned for another one. If there was a fire you phoned a third number. And so it was very, very disorganized.

And coming out of this whole initial indication of, do we have 911 in our community, the chamber of commerce in Melfort and district decided that they would take the initiative to see if other people in the whole north-east were concerned about this as well.

And so in '94 they sent letters to all the RMs (rural municipality), all the municipal governments, all the fire departments, all the health boards — all of the people that we thought would be interested in discussing the whole concept of 911 in the north-east, sort of bordering on an area from Prince Albert down to Humboldt, across through Watson, and sort of north of Yorkton right up to the Manitoba border.

And they met in Melfort in an initial discussion and we brought a gentleman from the south-west part of the province who had been very instrumental in bringing forth a proposed 911 system into that area, almost to completion at that time. And it was

very interesting about how much of a common concern that people had in the north-east about a 911 system.

And so out of that initial meeting, they formed a steering committee of people from across the north-east who have been working since that time to bring a 911 system into the north-east.

It's interesting, because shortly after this initiative was undertaken by the chamber of commerce, it seems that even the past member of the Melfort constituency occasionally read the paper, and just before the last election, all of a sudden there was a great flurry about how this government was going to look at 911. And that came as a great surprise to people of the steering committee, because they had heard a million reasons of why this was impossible and how SaskTel just couldn't possibly do this.

In the discussions that ensued after that, it became critical that if this was going to work, it had to truly be a 911 system that people had come to expect and understand, not just in the cities of this province, but also, because of television and the 911 type of emergency shows that people saw, all through this country; that people came to expect that if 911 was actually called upon, the full kind of 911 enhanced services that they came to realize were necessary, would also be delivered.

And so the whole steering committee have clearly stated time and time again, that what they want is 911, but not just a speed dialer on the phone. What they don't want is just an operator, somewhere in Regina, that gets routed a call and then phones the fire department, phones the police department, phones the ambulance in Melfort in again a non-functional, disjointed way.

Because it would be really quite simple for everyone to just put in a speed dial button into their telephone so that these things could be done. And we'd save ourselves a whole lot of time and we wouldn't be making any false expectations for the people through rural Saskatchewan who really do believe that this is an essential service that's needed.

It became really essential because number one, the number of entry points for emergency services have decreased. Now there's been hospitals closed all over rural Saskatchewan and so the access points for people in rural Saskatchewan are much less now than they were in 1991.

If you had a problem, you knew where to go in your local community as quickly as possible. And now you get a situation where people don't know where to go, or the distances are so great that they do not have the ability to deal with that sort of a situation.

And of course the government points very proudly to their first responders. And that is a program that has merit in so far as it goes. It's a glorified St. John Ambulance course. And I have to tell you that farmers and people that are working in high-risk industries throughout the north-east and throughout rural Saskatchewan are not going to be very satisfied by the fact, if they get their arm or leg into a piece of machinery, that someone down the road or down the street or in the neighbourhood or at the farm next has taken a 40-hour course.

What they need to do is, number one, when there's a panic setting in, when this happens, is they need to go somewhere where they know that they can get reliable entry-point emergency care. And everyone in the province, everyone in the world, in North America for sure, understands that that's what 911 is meant to be.

We talk about what's happening in the cities, we talk about what we see on television, and we realize that that's what the expectations are. And we are very much in favour of a 911 system. But we are very much concerned that unless it's the full system, that we are doing a disservice to the people of the province.

What we really need to do is have the uniform expectations across the province and across the country. If someone is hurt and injured in Zenon Park, Saskatchewan, when they dial 911 they should have services on the other end of that telephone line that are the same as if they are hurt in downtown Saskatoon.

They need to have the enhanced service where there's a trained emergency measures technician on the other end of the line who can talk to them, who can counsel them, and while that's going on, electronically through the mapping system, which we think is very important and worthy of support, that they can see that this call is coming from Zenon Park.

Their equipment tells them that the nearest response facility is down the road as an ambulance or an emergency responder or whatever it is. And so as that conversation is taking place, that is so important that the appropriate emergency professional response teams are put into action.

And that is absolutely critical. Because if it isn't, all is you end up with is a panicky telephone operator at the other end of the line who just is doing glorified call forwarding. And that simply is a second-class standard for rural Saskatchewan that we're not prepared to accept.

And so I think that there are things that we believe are in this legislation that are very important. For example, the initiative to do the mapping so that the whole province can be set out so that the technology can indeed identify where calls are coming from. That's very important.

We need to make sure that this legislation, when you talk about a 911 entry point or a location, it isn't just a telephone operator who is doing nothing more than phoning the local authorities or ringing a beeper over there. What we need to do is make sure that everyone is linked into the system.

A number of years ago, in my area, there was an interesting example of how a system should work if it was operating possibly as we think it could. A farmer got his leg in a grain auger about a half a mile off of the highway. What happens when this occurs is everybody panics. All of us can say we can deal with this very dispassionately and we are going to rationally and logically go to the phone and we're going to dial the number that we need to dial and all the rest of it.

But in nine times out of ten, that doesn't happen. People panic.

They see blood, they see pain, they see a lot of disturbance, and what they want to do is take the appropriate action. And so the wife of the individual that got into this accident, she's panicking and she's trying to help her husband. She's yelling to another son into the farmyard to phone for help. The son goes into the house and he doesn't know who to phone.

So in panic he dials an operator. The operator didn't know where exactly to go, so they phoned the hospital. Well the hospital is not the ambulance. And so then the hospital directed it to the ambulance and the whole system sort of took time.

Good intentions were executed by everyone. But the very tragic thing about it, an ambulance was returning from Saskatoon, and when this was exactly happening, there was an ambulance fully equipped with two EMTs (emergency medical technician) in it who were less than a half a mile away from this accident site. And so this individual lost his leg because of this situation where he might have lost his life, and yet much better service could have been provided if the linkage electronically with the proper 911 system had been in place.

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, members, what we're concerned about is . . . First of all, let me say I'm very much in support of the principles of what I believe is the intention of what's being offered in this Bill for a 911 system. But I am also very concerned that what may happen is we only go just a small step of the way and that may indeed do more of a disservice to rural Saskatchewan and the people that think that they've got a true 911 system.

That is our major concern, that we want to assure ourselves, and I'm sure members opposite want to ensure to their constituents, that indeed the full 911 system is going to be made available across this province for our people and the people travelling through it. And those concerns, I'm sure, can be addressed in Committee of the Whole and we will be proposing suggestions at that stage.

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

Bill No. 39

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Anguish that **Bill No. 39 — An Act to Promote, Develop and Sustain Irrigation** be now read a second time.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My pleasure to rise again. Just a few comments before that I ask that we adjourn this debate once again, Mr. Speaker.

In listening to the minister some time ago when the Bill was introduced and talking about the wide consultation process with irrigators across the province, of whom I am one of, I kind of thought that possibly things had been kind of agreed upon amongst irrigators across the province. Upon some of the dozens of phone calls and letters I've received over the last week and a half, I have some concerns that possibly the consultation took place but the people that were issuing concerns to the government weren't listened to too closely.

There seems to be a lot of questions that the irrigators out there have, Mr. Speaker, that there doesn't appear to be any answers for. And once again, those producers and irrigators were given the same story that we're given in the House, that we will do all the things for the Bill in the regulations.

Of course we all know how we as Liberals, and myself as an MLA, feel about regulations, and it gives rise to some major concerns with this Bill as well. Some of the questions that are being asked out there is, is there just going to be further bureaucracy created, Mr. Speaker? They want to know if this opens the door for the province to sell water to irrigators — all sorts of questions, Mr. Speaker.

There's also a question arises that, is there going to be an overlap here with where we are headed with these two corporations along with the group that is coming together now of water users, Mr. Speaker. And we're wondering where that's headed and what the minister will have to say about that.

I know that the minister wants to ensure that these changes are brought about smoothly and I know that he wants to do it with the cooperation of all irrigators, Mr. Speaker. And with that in mind, I would ask that we'd again adjourn debate on this until such a time that the irrigators across the province, especially in the constituency of Arm River, where we have hundreds of them, both on Lake Diefenbaker as well as on Last Mountain Lake . . . And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you probably even have some in your constituency.

So with that in mind, I would ask that we could adjourn debate on this Bill.

Debate adjourned.

(1445)

Bill No. 51

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Nilson that **Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Film and Video Classification Act** be now read a second time.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak on this legislation, which proposes some major changes to Saskatchewan's film and video classification system.

In this age of information, the influence of films and videos and television on the public is undeniable. For years, the Saskatchewan film and video classification board has reviewed thousands of movies scheduled for release in the province. The board was to rate the movies and videos hitting the theatres and the home video market. It applied a criteria designed to reflect community standards in Saskatchewan.

The amendments proposed in Bill 51 will significantly change how movies entering Saskatchewan are classified. The proposed changes would allow the Saskatchewan board to accept the classifications arrived at in other jurisdictions.

For example, Saskatchewan's board might simply accept British

Columbia's rating and review of a movie. Therefore, Saskatchewan's board would not have to even screen the film before approving its classification. In these times of fiscal restraint, when much needed social programs and services are being cut, it's hard to rationalize funding for Saskatchewan's own separate film and video classification board. Apparently about 95 per cent of the board's decisions were the same as rulings by other classification boards across Canada.

But at the same time, we must not relinquish responsibility for upholding the standard of movies that enter Saskatchewan. The amendments to The Film and Video Classification Act could lead the way to the dismantling of the board entirely, which causes us some concern.

The issue of censorship can trigger strong emotions and hot debate among Saskatchewan people. We cannot forget the uproar over the Saskatchewan film and video review board's ban on the movie *Exit to Eden*. Our province was the only jurisdiction in North America that imposed the ban on that particular movie. The board's decision quickly gained notoriety and fueled *Exit to Eden*'s publicity campaign. It sparked angry calls to radio open-line shows and was the fodder for some late night talk shows in the States.

Of course the decision was appealed and reversed, but many people across the province were incensed that a government-related body was restricting their choice of movies. I believe that it's important to make a distinction between adults' choice of movies and protecting our children from the senseless acts of violence and sex that are becoming more commonplace in films.

It's critical that Saskatchewan maintains strong representation in some type of film and video classification body, but we must uphold some standards for the sake of our children. Study after study has shown that children can be influenced by the violence and sex they are subjected to on television or in movies.

Ultimately, parents should be responsible for monitoring what their children are allowed to watch. Unfortunately, parents are not always able to supervise what their children are viewing. In this instance, the film and video classification board plays an important role in deciding what movies are suitable for children under 14.

Hopefully the staff at movie theatres and video stores are regulating admission or rentals according to those ratings. It is very sad to see our children becoming desensitized to horrible acts of violence or sex because they are exposed to so much of it through the media. It is this type of thing that is slowly pulling apart the social and moral fabric of our society.

I hope that the amendments proposed within Bill 51 do not mean that our province will eventually relinquish total responsibility for upholding the standard of movies entering the province. But we can discuss these concerns further in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to intervene briefly in this debate to say that I want to associate myself with the remarks of both the minister and the member who spoke previously, the member from Humboldt. I

think she expressed concerns that I feel very well, as did the minister. I think this is a positive initiative and therefore want to see this Bill proceed.

At this point, I don't want to say anything further and want to leave an opportunity for the third party, the Progressive Conservative caucus, the PC (Progressive Conservative) caucus, to make its comments known on this Bill. Thank you.

Mr. Koenker: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the members of the third party, the Progressive Conservatives, have nothing to say about this Bill, I would like to say a few words in support of it.

I think the member from Humboldt spoke very eloquently about some of the concerns she had with the Bill. Nonetheless, I would like to support it. I think film and video classification is very important and that this is a proper way for us to move in Saskatchewan on this matter given some of the financial constraints that we are experiencing. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Bill No. 50

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Nilson that **Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act, 1993 and to make a consequential amendment** be now read a second time.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And thank you.

I'm pleased that I've been given this opportunity to address the Assembly today with regards to the amendments that have been proposed with respect to The Personal Property Security Act. Due to the fact that the current legislation ruling the security of personal property is somewhat unclear, it is good to see that the Bill is before us today and that it does in fact clear up these inconsistencies of terminology and definitions.

The most confusing and unclear parts of the current legislation are the sections dealing with crops. This new Bill proposes to distinguish between produce and the land on which it is grown. This is a definite necessity for the determination of time limits on security interests on personal property. Due to the confusion that has been created over the years by the lack of clarity with regards to crops, it is due time that legislation is introduced to clear up terminology that is used throughout the content of this Act.

One of the intentions of this Bill is to distinguish between crops that are already in full existence and crops that are continuing to grow and mature. This is done in an attempt to eliminate confusion among secured lenders.

There are many other changes included in this Bill, but as a caucus that has the interests of rural Saskatchewan at heart, we

feel that any legislation that changes the way the people of this province deal with the land and the crops that provide for their livelihood is extremely important. The agricultural sector is the cornerstone of our economy. Not only does rural Saskatchewan depend on agriculture for the survival of their communities, but so too does the rest of this great province.

Rural Saskatchewan has been suffering constant hits by the NDP administration since the day this session began. We are glad to finally see some legislation aimed at the people who are part of the cornerstone of our society. This may be a small move by some standards, but any legislation that begins to recognize the importance that rural Saskatchewan has in our province is a step in the right direction.

Most of the farmers and people in the agricultural sector of our economy that we have consulted are in full support of these changes. If this Bill will make their lives a little bit simpler with regards to security interests, then they are in favour of the changes. No one can deny the fact that by simply clearing up definitions and terminology, confusion on the part of farmers and lenders will be lessened by a great degree.

We have not only consulted with many stakeholders regarding this Bill, we have also gotten some legal opinions on it. The standard conclusion has been that the existing legislation is so unclear and full of contradiction that even the lawyers that we have talked to had to admit that the wording of the current Act is extremely unclear.

Since the Bill before us today does clarify the definitions at hand and further straightens out terminology with regards to crops, I see no reason to hold up debate on this Bill at this point any further. Thank you.

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

Bill No. 12

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. Mr. Nilson that **Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act and to enact consequential amendments** be now read a second time.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have already spoken at length on this particular Bill. My colleague from Humboldt and I brought forward some of our concerns, particularly as they relate to families and to the well-being of children. These concerns have not changed. We are still deeply worried about the effects these amendments may have on children caught in bitter custody battles. And we will continue to raise these concerns until we are satisfied that the legislation protects our children as much as possible.

However, we won't drag out this debate by restating our past arguments. Instead, we would like to raise some further concerns about this particular Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my colleagues and I have all been talking to our constituents hoping to get a better indication of how this Bill will affect Saskatchewan people. And like always, our

constituents have some intelligent, interesting perspectives that we would like to pass on to this Assembly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the concerns we continue to hear relates to the suspension of drivers' licences. As the minister himself explained when he introduced the Bill, the amendment allows the director of maintenance . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I believe that the hon. member has already spoken to this Bill once and therefore cannot speak again.

Yes, on March 21, *Hansard* on page 434, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has spoken on Bill No. 12 already. Therefore another member will have to . . .

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that it would be possible, I suppose for this one time only, to make an exception. And if the member wanted to continue, if you maybe check for unanimous consent to the House for the member to speak on this Bill.

We would be willing to offer that from this side of the House, but not to make it a standard practice. It would be an exception in this one case. If he wished to continue and wants unanimous consent to continue his remarks, we would be willing to offer that.

Mr. Osika: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Assembly for the oversight and would ask leave to continue to speak to this Bill.

Leave granted.

(1500)

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I thank my colleagues in the Assembly for allowing me to continue. I will pick up where I began speaking about my colleagues and I having spoken to our constituents, and the comments that we've received, the interesting and intelligent perspectives that I would like to share with my colleagues here.

And I've mentioned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the concerns that we continue to hear are related to the drivers' licences. And the minister explained, when he introduced the Bill, the amendment allows the director of maintenance enforcement to direct SGI to suspend the licence of a person if he or she is in default of maintenance payments.

The minister claimed that this will only be used as a last resort. He described the steps to be taken before this last resort is reached. So my perception is that the government still has some underlying concerns about this section of the Bill as well.

Going back to what I said earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must look at how this Bill affects the children. Will this help prevent default payments? I don't think the members opposite or anyone can answer this with a very clear yes.

Let's say, for instance, that a person makes a living as a truck driver or a courier or something that absolutely relies on driving a vehicle. That same person has defaulted on maintenance

support for three months and the director has taken all other reasonable steps to collect the payments. Who is suffering? The children, because the money that could be needed . . . the money could be needed for food, shelter, clothing, or medication.

But if the court orders SGI to revoke that person's licence, he or she will no longer be able to make a living. With no money coming in, it will even be less likely that he or she can or will make the payment. So who is suffering? Still, unfortunately, the children.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not coming out in defence of men or women who default on payments; we are coming out in defence of children. And although we know that the government's Bill is an attempt to help the children, we aren't sure that that is the best answer in all cases.

We would like to see some sort of amendment that would recognize the unique circumstances behind each case. We believe that there should be some kind of panel to decide if and when it is appropriate to revoke the licence of a defaulter. In the long run, having a rigid law with no leeway could end up harming the very people this law should protect — the children.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have also been reviewing this issue of visitation as it relates to this Bill because it too is of great concern to some of our constituents. From our initial research, we think this Bill is lacking direction. Parents are worried that the new law is designed to protect one side of a custody battle and ignoring the other.

Even people who agree that the maintenance enforcement should be tightened are upset that the issue of visitation is not discussed.

Let me give you another scenario, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let's say a man is consistent — or a woman — with his or her payments. He or she is setting aside a portion of their earnings every month to make sure the children are provided for. But he or she and their spouse went through a nasty divorce. One or the other is refusing to let the other see the children even though the court has given visitation rights. What legal backup does he or she have? This is not a rare scenario, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is something that affects hundreds of men and women in this province. They feel helpless.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when people feel powerless because a law is too difficult to enforce, the law must be changed. Our legal system is designed to uphold law, to protect society, and to guarantee individual rights. As elected officials, we are obligated to do everything in our power to make sure the laws are effective. We must ensure that people have faith in our legal system, because if people lose faith in our laws, they will rebel and society will end up paying the price.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not alone in believing the visitation issue must be addressed. We have just started to scratch the surface of similar Bills from other provinces. Still, even from initial studies, we have discovered that both Manitoba and Nova Scotia have provisions respecting visitation rights of non-custodial parents. It's in the legislation. That means the

courts will have more power to enforce visitation rights given in the divorce settlement.

We would also like to see some way of tracking defaulters when they leave the province. As the law stands now, there is no reciprocal agreement with other provinces. What happens is that when a defaulter moves, the province has no legal way to retrieve the money. And in the long run of course, it is the children who end up losing the most.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I realize that all cases are different and I have little respect for parents who default on child support payments. However, I must admit I do have sympathy for parents who continue to pay and yet are still denied access to their children.

I can understand why some of these people would want to react in anger and withhold payments until their former spouse allowed them access. Again, I'm not saying I support it, but I do feel some sincere sympathy. We believe that if visitation rights were better protected, we may hit at the root of the problem. Maybe we would see a decrease in defaults because parents would not have any reason to justify, even in their own minds, withholding payments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know laws are often used as both a punishment and a deterrent. And we know that sometimes this is the only answer. But any time we can get to a problem before it takes root, we should.

In the long run it will benefit everyone. It will give more power to parents on both sides of the custodial battle. It will help prevent a backlog in our already overcrowded courts. And most of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it will make sure our children are receiving the money they need to survive. And as we all know, that's the most important thing of all.

As I mentioned earlier, we are examining the maintenance enforcement and visitation Acts in other provinces, but we see no reason to halt progress on this Bill.

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

Bill No. 58

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Nilson that **Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act and to make a consequential amendment** be now read a second time.

Mr. Aldridge: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have the opportunity today to further discuss the proposed amendments to The Land Titles Act.

Like many of the previous Bills already introduced in the House during this session, The Land Titles Amendment Act, 1996 will have some great impacts on many people and organizations across this province.

We feel that this Bill affects, for the most part, Indian bands across the province, especially those bands who are financially

sound enough to be looking to purchase land and gain land titles.

There are five or six basic amendments proposed through this Bill, the most important of which allows Indian bands to own land in their own name. Through this Bill, Indian bands will no longer have to be registered as a corporation in order to purchase and own land. Regulations to this Act, as we understand it, will set out the names that bands will use when dealing with the land titles system.

While we do support the intentions of this amendment, we do have some concerns about the potential outcomes of such changes to The Land Titles Act. We agree in principle with the reasons for many of the amendments included in this Bill, one of which being the desire to reflect Indian bands in the land titles system. But we do have some concerns that this Bill does not deal with the issue of taxation. The key issue here is whether this land that bands will now be able to purchase will be tax exempt. This is an extremely important issue that needs to be looked at more closely before this Bill passes through this House.

Many of the other amendments included in this Bill are simply housekeeping, and we really have no concern with those. An example of such an amendment is one in which duplicate certificates of title can now be destroyed a year after the duplicate is cancelled. As this change simply aids in the reduction of administrative paperwork, we have no problems with this.

In the process of improving and streamlining services to the public, amendments to this Act allow for more flexibility when it comes to providing personal information. Current legislation requires only original copies of documents to be submitted to the Land Titles Office. Amendments will allow for certified or notary copies to be used. And again this is just one more example of the Land Titles Office working to simplify the process in order to save time and money.

The other key issue in this Bill is with regards to the lapse of a caveat. Current legislation puts responsibility to notify the caveator of the intent to lapse the caveat by the person who has the intent to lapse the caveat in question. These procedures are confusing and some time consuming for all parties involved. As these procedures are often strict and unfamiliar to most people, they have proven time and again to be inefficient. Through amendments to The Land Titles Act, the responsibility to notify caveat holders of the pending lapse will now be in the hands of Land Titles personnel. The reason behind this is to reduce errors and to streamline the process. Again this is seen as a positive move, as it simplifies the process for all parties involved.

(1515)

The main changes to The Land Titles Act are being done to simplify administration and eliminate red tape. While we agree to this in principle, we feel that some issues with respect to land purchase by Indian bands have been left out of the discussion. Taxation of land owned by Indian bands has not been addressed in this Bill. Not only this, but there is no mention of

amendments to be made to current legislation that does deal with taxation of land.

For many people that will be involved in and affected by the amendments proposed by this Bill, the issue of taxation is an important one. And it must be dealt with before this new legislation can go any further.

Full consultation with bands involved needs to be pursued further. The issue of whether land purchased by bands will be taxable or not needs to be cleared up and straightened out for the benefit of all parties involved. We fail to see how legislation that directly involves Indian bands does not also deal directly with the issue of taxation. And it's for this reason that I would respectfully request that the debate on this Bill be adjourned.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. It has been brought to my attention that the hon. member from Thunder Creek has already adjourned debate on that motion once, so another member will have to adjourn the motion.

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would move that we adjourn debate.
Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my right is John Edwards, who is the director of municipal policy and legislative services. Behind me is Jean Lazar, who is the manager of municipal management services. And on Jean's right is Jim Anderson, who is the senior policy analyst in the Department of Municipal Government, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1

Mr. Bjornerud: — Madam Minister, I'd like to also welcome your officials here today to the House. We really have very few questions on this, Madam Minister. We really find no fault with this. We think it's probably mostly housekeeping and agree with most of it.

I just have a couple of questions. In section 10 where we're talking about, "at the time he or she submits the nomination paper, is a Canadian citizen . . ." and one of our questions, has it ever been considered to include landed immigrant? And why we're asking that is there is a number of landed immigrants such as British subjects that have been within the country for 50, 60 years, have never got their Canadian citizenship. We wondered if that has ever been taken into consideration.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I thank the member opposite for that question. I think the purpose here is to be consistent with the election Acts at other levels. And as the member will be aware, this is the case as well in provincial and federal elections — that landed immigrants or other than Canadian citizens, don't have the privilege to vote.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you. Going on to section 11, Madam Minister, and I realize it's just a housekeeping thing that has been changed, but one of the things we wonder about, and I'm just going to quote from the explanation. It says:

26.1 (2) No person is disqualified from being nominated, elected or holding office as a member of a council by reason of his (and that's been changed) having an interest in a contract with a municipality.

I think possibly where our concern is, and I don't think it's with the very small contractors — and I know how it works, how a member who is affected by it can ask for leave from the meeting and exclude themselves — but I'm wondering, in the case of a very large contractor that a contract may be up into the hundreds of thousands dollars with the municipality, if there isn't a concern where a conflict of interest would come in at that point.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — This is meant to apply to not so much . . . not people that are doing business with elected bodies, but employees of elected bodies. And this one makes the provision for school board employees to have the same . . . to be in a level playing-field with employees of municipalities, universities, and so on. So it's just meant to make it consistent for the employees of school boards.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, I'd like to also question on where we're talking on — and I'll quote. It's from section 13(3.2) and I'll just run through it:

If all or Part of the contents of the notice mentioned in subsection (1) are, in the discretion of the returning officer, distributed by mail or delivered to all resident electors of the municipality, or school division, as the case may be, or if reasonable actions are taken . . .

I agree with the intent of this. I know how expensive it gets for municipalities, school boards, etc., to advertise in the papers. I know it's been a bone of contention in our RM for a number of years.

The question I have though, is to do with reasonable actions. What really is the definition of a reasonable action I guess, is what I'm asking. And possibly, who makes that decision? Who would that lie with — the administrator, or who?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question raised by the member opposite I think would be that in the first instance, the definition of reasonable action would be in the discretion of the returning officer, and ultimately, if his discretion was to be challenged, it would be decided in the courts.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Madam Minister. I'd like to go on now to voting machines, 59.1. And I guess the first question I have is what kind of voting machines would be allowed or what specifications are we going by there?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Well the member may know that

particularly the larger urban centres have been studying the voting and tabulating votes by computer for some time. And this is meant to be an enabling clause. There's no one doing it at the moment, but it's enabling so that when they're ready they would be able to use that kind of electronic equipment for voting.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, I'd like to ask too, could voting by phone, say with a PIN (personal identification number) number be included in this category?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, this would be specific to computerized tabulation, for instance. And PIN numbers by phones wouldn't be covered.

Mr. Heppner: — Madam Minister, my first concern about this Bill regards some of the provisions allowing school board employees to run for school boards. I have some serious questions about that because basically I feel board members need to look after the interests of their ratepayers and of the students as the number one situation.

Can you tell me, Madam Minister, what provisions will be made to ensure there's no conflict of interest involved in having employees sitting on the board. Will they be expected to exempt themselves from discussions relating to staffing, school closures, and those sort of things? Will the conflict of interest regulations be similar to those used by health boards who have district employees serve on the board?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, the response to the question posed by the hon. member is that if they are successful in the election, they would have to resign. So the situation you described could not occur. They take a leave of absence in order to campaign and run for office, but if they are successful, they must resign. The provision that's added is their ability to take a leave of absence to seek the office.

Mr. Heppner: — Thank you, Madam Minister, because I think it's too bad that the health boards don't have similar regulations. Because what happens now, you basically end up with a board of units in many cases because they can't get involved in two-thirds to three-quarters of discussion that takes place.

A question on resort village elections. This Bill extends a franchise to out-of-province cottage owners for the councils of resort villages. In proposing this, you cite precedents that allow out-of-province property holders to hold office in RMs. However the fact that there's a precedent for it does not necessarily make it right.

Madam Minister, could you tell us how many other jurisdictions, particularly neighbouring jurisdictions, are reciprocal privileges extended to Saskatchewan residents who own property in their jurisdictions?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information. I'm not sure. We haven't copied our legislation or modelled it after what exists in our neighbouring provinces. What we have responded to is the applications or submissions, if you like, by the Provincial Association of Resort

Communities on behalf of their members.

We have done an analysis to the effect that we are assured that out-of-province owners and lessees do not form a majority, or close to form a majority in any community. And we haven't extended it to . . . they can't hold office; they can simply vote. They cannot run for office. The privilege that's added is strictly the vote and it applies to municipal elections only. They cannot vote in school elections. There the same provisions apply that you must be a resident for six months and so on.

(1530)

Mr. Heppner: — Okay, thank you and I appreciate the direction that you're going with that one.

On the computerized voting, have any provincial standards on voting machines been established and what studies have been done on them?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the member's question about whether any standards have been set, this hasn't been done yet. The Act simply is enabling in terms of the method, and any standards would be developed through regulation pursuant to the Act.

Mr. Heppner: — A question I have a little further to the machines, Madam Minister. Will the system simply be used to count physical ballots that are marked in the usual way or will the voter vote through the machine? And will any sort of physical ballot be retained?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, the response is that either of the circumstances that the member describes could be; it would depend upon the system adopted by the municipality. And that's when, in consultation with them, we would take a . . . have more analysis and develop the regulations along those lines.

Mr. Heppner: — Okay, and I guess the concern, Madam Minister, that I'm trying to express is that we ensure that no voting irregularities could take place because of using a new system that's there.

Madam Minister, this legislation throws the door open with regards to how people can mark ballots. The Bill in fact allows them to mark their ballot with any kind of marking device, any colour, not just an X.

On the one hand, I think we appreciate these changes will make it harder for ballots to be unfairly discarded, and that part's definitely a positive one. On the other hand, we may have gone too far with these changes. Given how very loose these provisions are, how will the electoral officers be able to tell if a person actually intends to spoil their ballot or not?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, what we would do in this instance is we would monitor this very closely. People would want to be sure that the scrutineers at all levels of election were properly schooled before, and that if any problems of this type do emerge, we would certainly be prepared to amend the regulations to deal with that.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 29 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The SaskEnergy Act

Clause 1

The Chair: — Will the minister introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have with me Mr. Vern Gorr, the director of policies, rates, and regulations, to my left here this afternoon. On my right hand side is Mark Guillet, general counsel and corporate secretary to SaskEnergy.

Mr. Aldridge: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. I would like to welcome the minister's officials here this afternoon and do appreciate their attendance and their close scrutiny of our questions and the answers thereafter.

TransGas, being a wholly owned subsidiary of SaskEnergy, through this Bill and its loosening the franchising with respect to TransGas, will that have any effect on the profitability of TransGas?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — No, it should not have an effect on the profitability of TransGas. The changes that are being proposed are more amendments to cut down on some of the red tape in some of the transactions that have to be gone through.

We feel that the franchise is fully protected; the amendments just help clarify the franchise.

Mr. Aldridge: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. Does the government have a ballpark figure on the number of new natural gas recovery projects that would start up in this province as a result of this proposed legislation?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I'm not sure what the hon. member means by gas recovery projects. These amendments we don't believe will adversely affect the future development of natural gas within the province of Saskatchewan. It just clarifies what our franchise is and what the rights of the producers are in terms of how they differentiate between a gathering line and a transmission line, with some other minor details that flow into it.

But in terms of gas recovery, I'm not quite sure . . . you'd have to clarify what you mean by that. I don't understand the term in the context you're using it.

Mr. Aldridge: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. Would you please then explain, will this have any effect on any gas wholesalers? For example, CEG in Saskatoon, would there be any effect on them?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — No, there should be no effect on the companies like the ones that you have mentioned. If this does

anything it enhances the private sector's opportunities to do business, especially those who would be new coming into the province or have not had a long track record in the past.

Because I think what'll happen is that the industry that's in existence now doing the development of natural gas within the province would look at this and see it as a smoothing of some of the red tape that's there, a better clarification of what TransGas's franchise actually means. They would in turn be talking to other companies who are involved in exploration and development of natural gas. And therefore we see this as having a positive side. We don't anticipate any downside from the amendments that we're proposing to the legislation here this afternoon.

Mr. Aldridge: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. So then this does appear — and I just would ask again for your corroboration on this — but it does appear that this would have a broad industry support. And if I might just have you just reiterate that again, please.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — As far as I know, and I've checked with the officials here today, we are not aware of anyone in the industry who has a negative comment about what we're doing here. It's been done in consultation with Saskatchewan Energy and Mines who have a long track record with the oil and gas industry in Saskatchewan.

We have not had any feedback. Many of us keep in touch with companies who are involved in the exploration and development of natural gas, both as elected officials and also people who work within the Crown corporation. And as far as we know, there have been no negative comments by anyone in the industry about this. They see it as a benefit, not a detriment. And it is a benefit to us because it clarifies our franchise within the province.

Mr. Aldridge: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. It's nice to see a positive piece of legislation coming forward then, and I would just like to thank the minister's officials for those answers. Thank you.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. Just before we move on too fast along the Bill, I want to give the Conservative opposition a chance to ask a few questions also.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Well I appreciate the intent of the member, but as I say, we have done wide consultation on this Bill and we'd like to proceed with it now. Others seem to have concluded all the comments that would indicate interest in the Bill.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1545)

Bill No. 40 — An Act respecting Pharmacists and Pharmacies

The Chair: — I invite the minister to introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With me today is Mr. Drew Johnston, who works for the Department of Health; and Mr. Rick Hischebett, who is a solicitor with the Department of Justice and the legal adviser for the Department of Health.

Clause 1

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Chair. And first of all, Minister, welcome to your officials. We're certainly not going to put them through a very hard scrutiny this afternoon because I think it's important to acknowledge right up front that you've worked very closely with the pharmacy association in the drafting of this Bill. In fact the information that we have, in talking to some of the pharmacists, that it's been a good number of years that they've actually been lobbying and hoping that this type of legislation is brought forward. And so I would like to congratulate you in terms of that process.

There are a couple of questions that some of our pharmacists raised, and I think it's important to get clarification on the record. Because it's our expectation that perhaps it's just clarification and misinterpretation or vagueness in the way the people we consulted read this.

And it has to do around the issue of, will the district health boards have an opportunity through this legislation in essence, if they choose to, to be able to be recognized as applications for permits to operate pharmacies under the Act.

And it's, I think, running out of page 14, section 19 that they point out as a particular concern. And this section has caused concern that perhaps organizations like district health boards would be able to own and operate pharmacies under this section, and they're concerned about that. Can you tell me, Minister, is this a concern that's legitimate, or is this a possibility that's envisaged or not?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well firstly, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the member for his comments about the legislation and the consultation that has gone on. And I agree with the member's characterization of the legislation as long overdue and generally welcomed by pharmacists and other health care professionals.

I would not want to say to the member that the concern is illegitimate; what I would want to say is that the concern is not really altered one way or the other by this legislation. This legislation will be new professional legislation for the pharmacists, but it will not really change the status quo with respect to the issue of regulation of pharmacists.

But I want to say that while the current Act does not change the current situation, it is not our intention that publicly funded health facilities compete with the private retail pharmacy sector. This has not presented a problem in the past even though there are some pharmacies in health facilities. And they really have only existed where there is an issue as to the availability of drugs or the availability of certain drugs that retailers don't wish to carry because there's no volume to them and somebody might like to get the drug from, for example, the Royal University Hospital in Saskatoon.

If it becomes a problem — which we don't think it is; we've had 28 full-time hospital pharmacies with permanent staff so far; 43 part-time pharmacies; 3 hospitals which dispense to the public; these have not presented a problem — but we have agreed with the association, and I've met with the association myself, that we will revisit the matter should it become an issue.

So the Act does not address the issue but nor does it change the current situation in this regard. If there is a problem, we've agreed that we will address it. We don't anticipate a problem.

Mr. Gantefer: — Minister, in your meeting with the association, I would expect that from your remarks that the association has accepted your undertaking to review it if it becomes an issue. Is there a protocol in place to have that in place or is it just simply an undertaking that you've agreed with the association?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — No specific protocol. It would be a matter of ongoing dialogue; that if there is a problem, I'll be getting together with the association. And they're aware of that with respect to that problem or other problems that they may have.

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you, Minister. I think that's particularly important. It's sort of a double-edged sword, I suppose, in some northern areas where it's maybe necessary that district health boards, through hospitals or emergency stations, would be in a position to assist the community, where pharmacies may not be available.

On one side you have that dilemma; on the other side you have the great concern of small, local pharmacies, particularly in rural Saskatchewan, that would feel really pressured in their practices if the local hospital, or whatever the facility is, would get into the dispensing of drugs. So I'm sure that you and your officials appreciate the concern that's been expressed.

In section 34(1), with regards to disciplinary action by the discipline committee, a person found to be at fault can be ordered, among other things, to seek medical treatment and/or counselling. Is there going to be or is it envisioned that someone in the disciplinary committee has a medical background to be able to decide if a person is indeed in need of this kind of treatment and/or counselling?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — That, Mr. Chairman, would be on the basis usually of expert medical advice that would be presented to a professional conduct committee, such as a discipline committee. And this would not be unique to The Pharmacy Act. This would be more or less common provision in professional legislation generally, The Legal Profession Act or The Medical

Profession Act. That it might be that a member of a particular profession has a problem, perhaps abuse of alcohol for example, and one of the conditions of practice might be that that person had to get the appropriate counselling and assistance to deal with that problem.

But normally no, there would not necessarily be a medical expert on the panel that would be reviewing the matter. They would rely on an expert witness with respect to that matter in the same way that a judge in a court would not be a medical doctor, but might make a decision based upon medical evidence presented to him or her.

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you, Minister. Essentially those were the main points that the pharmacists that we consulted with raised. I believe that, from our discussions, that the association is very supportive. Were there any other issues that I raised, that are flagged, that are of concern, that individual pharmacists have maybe have raised with you in regard to this that you would like to put on to the record? Because I think that this seems to have very wide support.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — No, not in particular that I'm aware of. I think the member is correct that the Bill does have wide support.

I'm sure that there are particular members of the pharmacy profession, and perhaps even the profession itself, might wish that the wording in some respect or other was different, but these matters, as the member knows, are always a matter of compromises between health professionals and the association and the government and so on. And I think it's fair to say that the pharmacists generally, and their association, are quite pleased with the Bill and anxious to have it proceed.

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you, Minister. I would like to particularly thank your officials, not so much for the effort they had to put in it today, but in recognizing the fact that because there was so little grilling today probably is an indication of the work that you did previously. So thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well I thank the member for those comments on behalf of the officials. And I too want to thank the officials very much for the good job that they have done, as well as the association of pharmacists in the province who has worked very well with the province on this issue.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 71 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1600)

**Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend
The Mental Health Services Act**

The Chair: — Will the minister introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. With me today is Dr. John Elias who works for the Department of Health. And also, I previously introduced Mr. Rick Hischebett who is a

lawyer with the Department of Justice, who also is the legal adviser to the Department of Health.

Clause 1

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mr. Minister, and I welcome your officials. We're very pleased to have them here with us today.

I would ask you to refer to section 33, it's just a comment I have on that. And the section is amended so that the nearest relative of a person with mental health problems no longer has to be notified. There has been concern regarding that current legislation . . . it is my understanding that there has been some concern regarding current legislation which requires the closest relative to be notified no matter what the situation.

I can understand the intent and the necessity of the amendment, because in the case of spousal abuse, this simply is not appropriate. For instance, you know, with spousal abuse, it's not appropriate that that relative should be notified. So in most part, I do understand the reasoning behind the change and I approve of it, but it's still a bit vague and so I have a couple of questions.

There's no mention of the age of the person in question. Is it correct to assume that if the person is under the age of 18 that a parent or guardian will be contacted with regard to the minor's mental health?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — I thank the member for the question, Mr. Chairman. The answer to that is different outside a hospital setting than a counselling setting or a doctor's office type setting. There is no statutory or regulatory provision that says anything about the specific age of 18. And so the common law applies. That is the law that has been set down by the judges over a long period of time.

And that law would say that the person providing the treatment, in this case a psychiatrist I suppose, would have to make an assessment whether the person was of sufficient maturity to make an informed consent to the treatment.

And so generally speaking, when you're dealing with a younger person, the parents or guardians would be informed, but not necessarily if the psychiatrist was of the view that a 17-year-old for example, was capable of consenting to the treatment on their own. And in that respect this Act wouldn't change the law one way or the other. That has always been the law, and this would not alter that state of the law.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you. I certainly am not completely informed about what the law has been in the past, but I do have some concern with the fact that in rural areas we have got a shortage of psychiatrists, as your own government has stated in some of their documents here. And that if a physician in fact, rather than a trained psychiatrist, would be taking this upon him or herself to determine that community treatment would have to be necessary and he can do that without consent of parents, I feel that there is a little bit of apprehension on my part with the authority there being misused possibly at times, or just not appropriate.

It's just my belief that if there are parents certainly there and they have got sound minds and bodies, that if they're able to come to the assistance of their child and to determine whether or not treatment could be needed, I believe they should be there and they should be informed of this. If it comes to the point where a physician has overall authority, without question, about treatment of a youth, without in fact having some sort of responsibility to parents, I question whether that would be good for our society. I would ask you to comment on that.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — I should have more clearly stated in my last answer two things, Mr. Chairman. The first is that it would only be a case, I think generally speaking, of abuse by the parent of the child where the medical person would make a decision that it was not wise to advise the nearest relative which, if there was a parent, would always be the parent, unless the child under 18 was married, for example, in which case it would be the spouse.

But if you're dealing with a parent and somebody under the age of 18, the only circumstance I can think of where the parent wouldn't be advised would be where the medical person made an assessment that there was abuse in the family, and therefore for that reason it might not be appropriate.

But there's another aspect to it that I should have advised the member in answer to the first question, which I didn't, and that is that where the physician did not advise the parent, the physician would be required to bring that to the attention of the official representative, and that person is a person appointed by government in various districts throughout the province to oversee the rights and interests of the people in cases where their affairs are being handled by somebody else.

So that the safeguard you would have in a case where the parent was not advised is that another person — not the physician, because as you said the danger is that somebody has too much control — would have to be informed of that fact, and the official representative would be obligated to sort of look out for the interests of the person undergoing the treatment and make sure that if the relative wasn't being advised, that in fact what was being done was appropriate.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you. Are there any sort of mandatory requirements for the status of that person that you refer to that would in fact have the authority to, I guess, get permission for their treatment?. I'm assuming that you mean if a person is under the care of the department or something in some way or other, the department of maybe Social Services or whatever. Who is . . . give me some examples of who that other person may be that a physician would be obligated to contact.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Yes, the answer to the question is that these official representatives I'm referring to are people in the community who do not work for government and are not usually themselves physicians, or in any event if they were, would not be involved in treating a person.

And they are appointed on a part-time basis to advise people who are made subject to treatment orders as to their rights and the procedures they can follow to appeal if they feel something inappropriate is being done. So that in effect, they are sort of

like ombudspersons for people who allegedly have a mental problem and who have been made, in effect, subject to an order at the behest indirectly of the state because of the legislation.

And so if you didn't have the nearest relative advised, you would have consultation between the physician and the official representative. And the official representative, in carrying out their duties, would speak to the person concerned and see what they had to say. In many cases of course, they would be quite happy to have the treatment because they might appreciate the fact that they do need some treatment in the community.

And in cases where they were not happy, the official representative would advise them to go to another step which would be to appeal the order that was made with respect to them. At all times, it being the intent of the legislation to make sure that the rights of the individual concerned are duly taken care of.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I still am not completely clear, and I somehow need to be completely sure that I understand who those official representatives might be. Would it be a judge of a court in a town? Who would it be? Because as time goes on we have a lot of communities that may have a physician's service in one way or the other but we don't have maybe judges or whatever, so I need to know who that might be.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Yes, these official representatives, I'm advised, are all lawyers in private practice throughout the province. And so somebody would be appointed in Saskatoon and Regina and Swift Current and Weyburn — wherever there was a need. And they would not be civil servants; they are not employees of the government; they're not judges; and they're not medical people. They are lawyers who are, among other things, trained in being advocates for people and trying to look out for their rights.

And as a practical example, if a community treatment order was made in my community, say — well say for me, that I had to see a psychiatrist every two weeks. I would go . . . or to you — I hesitate to suggest that — then I would go, if I was dissatisfied, to the lawyer who was appointed in Saskatoon and I would say, I am being mistreated by the state, or by the psychiatrist, or by somebody else; what are you going to do about it? And their job would be to assist me, first of all, to be aware that I'm complaining, because maybe there is something to the complaint — so it's a safeguard — and secondly, to help me go through whatever hoops I have to go through to appeal the decision that has been made with respect to my case.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. In the case, Mr. Minister, where there would be for instance, a person needing treatment or recommended for treatment that is under the care of Social Services, would the lawyers appointed be legal aid lawyers or would there be other lawyers that . . . and if there is, who is paying for them?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — No, the lawyer would be the same in every instance whether you were on social assistance or not on social assistance. The Department of Health would enter into a contract with a lawyer in the community to provide the service

as official representative. And then the lawyer would be paid for the time that the lawyer would put in dealing with whatever problems were brought to the lawyer's attention.

The individual concerned would not pay the lawyer. The lawyer would send a bill to the Department of Health, and the Department of Health would then pay the bill of the lawyer for whatever services were rendered. And it might be that no services were rendered because nobody had any complaints. Or it might be that there were a lot of complaints and then the lawyer would be paid according to the volume of the work.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you. I can see this, you know, in my mind's eye, I can certainly see a big bill being tallied up to the government in time over it with this sort of thing. I think it would be much more advisable to make sure that we have a situation in this province where we have enough psychiatrists in the first place.

What is, in fact . . . is the government doing anything to counteract the shortage of psychiatrists for you know . . . and we don't have enough in the rural areas and I guess it's basically because rural areas are being depopulated as such. But what is being done to get more medical graduates and psychiatrists to stay in the province?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — I should say to the member, Mr. Chairman, in my last answer I was not quite correct in the sense that the amount that we would pay the lawyer in each area is determined in advance. There's sort of a block amount based upon the past volume of matters to be dealt with in that area. So that you make an estimate of the time that has to be spent.

The question of the lawyers is not directly related to the availability of the psychiatrist. You would have the lawyers being the official representatives and doing what they do, whether or not you have psychiatrists. In fact you might have the lawyers being busier where you do have the psychiatrist because then presumably there are cases that have to be dealt with because the official representative would be safeguarding the person from the psychiatrist, if I can put it that way. I'm not suggesting that that has to be done in a lot of cases. But in theory, the idea is that if somebody is being abused by a medical person, then they can go to this third party.

(1615)

In answer to the last part of your question, which was what are we doing about the availability of psychiatrists in some of the rural areas, I would say to the member that in the last few years the number of practitioners in the province has been relatively stable. I would agree with you that there are probably not a sufficient number of psychiatrists in some areas of the province. But that isn't a problem that has recently arisen or is getting dramatically worse in the recent past.

I think the answer to it is probably that some of the districts pay specialists a salary as opposed to fee-for-service because the volume of work in a given area may not be such that a specialist would be attracted to a smaller centre as opposed to a larger centre. But in some districts they will pay a specialist, which could include a psychiatrist, a certain salary because they wish

to have that specialist service available to the people in their area.

And so I think the answer primarily is probably just providing an adequate salary for the psychiatrist through the district in areas where the volume of work is not such that a psychiatrist would be attracted to practice there by the fee-for-service system.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, how many people do you estimate are directly affected by community treatment orders in Saskatchewan annually?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — I'm advised that presently the number is 15 or 20, but it could be as high as 35 to 40 people per year that would be affected by community treatment orders in the province.

And I should say that the community treatment order is designed to be less intrusive to the individual than if you committed them to an institution. The idea is that if you have a person who needs treatment because they may be a danger to themselves, or their family is having trouble with them but they are not a danger to society in the sense of being violent and they're not suicidal, then the idea is, under the community treatment order, is they could be treated in the community.

And the order simply would require them, for example, to attend at a medical office perhaps to take their medication if there's a problem with them staying on their medication. Or perhaps they need psychiatric counselling, or perhaps a variety of other circumstances.

But I would stress that it's not a large number of people. And in some ways the concept that this Bill amends is a concept that is less intrusive and more respectful of the rights of the individual than the traditional committal order which simply would commit the person to an institution somewhere.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. It sounds a little bit to me like you're leaning then towards deinstitutionalization in cases where there is not a really extreme danger to society or the person. Is that correct? Okay.

Is there any kind of a monitoring of patients that are under community treatment order — close monitoring by anyone in the community or by a wellness clinic, anyone responsible maybe through a wellness clinic for these patients?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — I'm advised that in each case the individual's situation is monitored by their psychiatrist and also by a designated case manager who normally would be a community health nurse.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you. But in rural areas, if there isn't a psychiatrist there and it's been the attending physician that in fact ordered care and a lawyer that has helped the patient understand their rights — which is very nice — but we just then have a physician, and we don't have a psychiatrist, so . . .

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Okay. If you had that situation, you wouldn't be in the situation that this legislation would apply to.

In other words, you'd have to have a psychiatrist providing the treatment before you would have an operative community treatment order. So in every case where there was a community treatment order, a psychiatrist would have to be involved.

And you raise a valid point that perhaps there are some places where there is no psychiatrist. If that was the case, you wouldn't be dealing with a community treatment order. In that vicinity at least, some other step would have to be taken.

Ms. Julé: — I thank you, Mr. Minister. It's certainly, I think, incumbent upon your government to realize that there is a great number of centres throughout Saskatchewan who may have a physician coming into the community and giving these kind of orders, but where there certainly is no access to a psychiatrist. So it's just a little bit of a concern that I have there. And I'm just wondering again about going back to the validity of a physician taking on the full authority to recommend treatment when there is no psychiatrist around, and never mind the first psychiatrist, there's not a second one around.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well there is no case, I should explain, Mr. Chairman, where you would have an order made by a physician alone. In every case the order would have to be made by a psychiatrist. The only issue here is that, where you need a second signature, for a period of 21 days you can have a physician who is not a psychiatrist, but is certified to perform this function, sign as, in effect, the second psychiatrist, whereas now you need two psychiatrists.

But there is no problem with respect to coverage of the province by the first psychiatrist. There has been no problem in terms of availability of at least one psychiatrist to make any community treatment orders that are necessary. And the psychiatrists do travel around the province, and there is accessibility there.

What this Bill does is it simply says, if you don't happen to have two psychiatrists available, then for 21 days a physician could sign as the second psychiatrist.

Ms. Julé: — I thank you, and I have no more questions.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. You know as we're hurrying through the Bills in these past days, I note that the member from Greystone and the Conservative opposition never seem to get a chance to stand up in the House and ask questions on any of the Bills. Perhaps if they're in the House, they could really offer them that opportunity.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The Chair: — Will the minister move that the Bill be reported without amendment?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, before I do that, I'd

like to thank the member opposite for her questions and thank the officials for attending today.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that you test the House on a Bill that passed through adjourned debates earlier today, Bill No. 50 — The Personal Property Security Amendment Act. I've had consultations with the Opposition House Leader and I feel that there is a disposition within the House to pass this through Committee of the Whole today. And that I would ask you to test the House that this Bill could be reported without amendment.

Leave granted.

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act, 1993 and to make a consequential amendment

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I move that Bill 50, The Personal Property Security Amendment Act be reported without amendment.

The Chair: — We have to vote this one through clause by clause, Minister, before we can do that. So you're just a little bit ahead of yourself.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was anxious and overstepped my bounds. If you would proceed with going through the Bill, clause by clause, I would appreciate that at this time.

Clause 1

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. I think as a whole the Bill has no concerns from the official opposition, other than I would just like one clarification. Section 37, I see we're striking out the word "growing" in relation to crops. Are you able to just give me an explanation as to why this is being struck?

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Well the officials aren't here at the present time. As I mentioned, there has been consultation. I thought that there was agreement between the official opposition and the government side of the House. I can't answer that question and I know full well that the member opposite knows that I can't answer that question. If he's trying to embarrass me, it worked to some extent. But I'm a hard individual to embarrass, so I'd like to offer to you that I have no explanation for your question and to see if we'd be willing to proceed without having a specific answer to the question that was asked — the very serious question that was asked by the hon. member opposite.

Mr. McPherson: — Well all right, Mr. Deputy Chair. I'm sure that there isn't a lot of consequence from the striking out of this word. And I don't think there are any concerns by our party. But there again, if the member from Greystone or the Conservative opposition, or the third party, if they're in the House, would they please get up and ask a question.

Clause 1 agreed to

Clauses 2 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1630)

THIRD READINGS

**Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend
The Local Government Election Act**

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The SaskEnergy Act

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

**Bill No. 40 — An Act respecting
Pharmacists and Pharmacies**

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

**Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend
The Mental Health Services Act**

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I move this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act, 1993 and to make a consequential amendment

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, I'd ask you to test for leave of the Assembly to do third reading of the Bill at this time. This Bill was dealt with earlier today in the adjourned debates, it passed into committee, we dealt with it in committee, and I understand we need leave of the Assembly to pass third reading today.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

