

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

**INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER OF THE  
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**The Speaker:** — Hon. members, I hereby inform the Assembly that pursuant to an Act of this Legislative Assembly respecting a by-election in the constituency of Wood River, which was assented to on June 27, 2000, Mr. Delwood (Yogi) Huyghebaert is authorized to take his seat as member for the constituency of Wood River.

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

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you Mr. Yogi Huyghebaert, member of the constituency for Wood River who has taken the oath, and he has signed the roll and now claims the right to take his seat.

**The Speaker:** — Mr. Huyghebaert, I welcome you to this Assembly and I hope that your service here will be to your honour and that of your constituents. Welcome to the Assembly.

Let the hon. member for Wood River take his seat.

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

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**Mr. Elhard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition concerning the effects of tobacco on the health of young people, and the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to pass legislation to protect children from tobacco use.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And this petition has been signed by the good people of Cabri, Pennant, Lancer, and other communities in that area.

**Mr. Heppner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise to present a petition with approximately 1,000 names on them from a group more commonly known as the victims of no fault. And I read the prayer:

Your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to repeal the provision of the personal injury benefits contained in the automobile insurance Act and to adopt a return to an add-on insurance system which will provide benefits on a no-fault basis to all victims without taking the innocent victim's right to seek compensation from a person responsible for the accident, but with the appropriate modifications to reduce overall injury costs.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, these come from people from all over the province — 1,000 names of approximately 3,000 that have been handed in.

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to present a petition from citizens of this province who would like to see improved cellular telephone coverage in their area. And the prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause government to provide reliable cellular telephone service in the districts of Prud'homme, Bruno, Vonda, and Cudworth.

And the signatures on this petition, Mr. Speaker, are from the communities of Prud'homme, as well as Middle Lake, and Warman.

I so present.

**Mr. Thomson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition here today calling for a total smoking ban in all public places. The petition reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to legislate a total ban of smoking in all public places and workplaces in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

The petition has been signed by people from my hometown of Prince Albert as well as Shellbrook, La Ronge, and more from Prince Albert.

I so present.

**Mr. Krawetz:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present on behalf of residents concerned about municipal amalgamation. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to halt any plans it has to proceed with enforced amalgamation of municipalities in Saskatchewan.

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

Mr. Speaker, the dozens of signatures on these petitions come from two communities, the community of Buchanan within my constituency and Lipton.

I so present.

**Mr. Addley:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do also have some petitions to present in support of a total ban of smoking in all public places. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to legislate a total ban of smoking in all public places and

workplaces in the province of Saskatchewan.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

I so present.

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition opposed to nursing home fee increases. And the petition states that residents of nursing homes are there out of necessity.

Wherefore your petitioners will humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to rescind the recent large increases in nursing home fees.

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

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners come from my riding of Rosetown-Biggar, primarily from the community of Kyle, as well as Lacadena and Beechy.

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a petition to read today to retain Lanigan and Watrous hospitals:

Wherefore your petitioners will ever pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to take the necessary steps to ensure that Lanigan and Watrous hospitals remain open.

The people that have signed this petition are all from Young.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed mainly by people from Regina, and it's a petition asking that smoking be banned in public places.

And I hereby submit the petition, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. Eagles:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of citizens opposed to nursing home fee increases. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners will humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to rescind the recent large increases in nursing home fees.

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

And this is signed by citizens of Weyburn and Bromhead.

I so present. Thank you.

**Ms. Bakken:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition to construct a tower for cellular telephone service. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to utilize the present SaskTel tower at Lake Alma to include usage for cellular telephones or to construct a new cellular telephone tower at Lake Alma, Saskatchewan.

And it is signed by citizens of Lake Alma, Balgonie, Beaubier,

and Gladmar.

I so present.

**Mr. Bjornerud:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have petitions today to present on behalf of concerned citizens to do with the forced amalgamation of municipalities in the province. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to halt any plans it has to proceed with the forced amalgamation on municipalities in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds — actually thousands — of signatures here from all over Saskatchewan.

I so present.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have petitions to present today on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately take steps to begin reconstruction of Highway 47 from the Handsworth turnoff to Junction No. 1 Highway.

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

These petitions come from the people of Stoughton, Glenavon, Corning, Kennedy, Windthorst, Wawota, Wolseley, Grenfell, Estevan, Mr. Speaker, Kipling.

I so present.

#### 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.

Petitions of citizens of the province on the following matters:

The reduction of fuel taxes;

Provision of reliable cellular service in Prud'homme, Bruno, Vonda, Cudworth and Lake Alma;

To ensure the Lanigan and Watrous hospitals and the Cupar Health Centre remain open;

To ban smoking in public places and workplaces;

To restore the Paddockwood access road;

To rescind increases in nursing home fees;

To begin reconstruction of Highway No. 47; and

To oppose the reversion of Saskatchewan highways back to gravel.

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

**Interim Report of the Special Committee to Prevent the Abuse and Exploitation of Children Through the Sex Trade**

**Clerk Assistant:** — Mr. Prebble, Co-Chair of the Special Committee to Prevent the Abuse and Exploitation of Children Through the Sex Trade, presents its interim report which is hereby tabled.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise as Co-Chair to the Special Committee of the legislature to Prevent the Exploitation of Children Through the Sex Trade, and I wish to make some remarks in support of this report that is being tabled this afternoon in conjunction with my colleague, the other Co-Chair of the committee and the hon. member for Humboldt.

The first thing I should say, Mr. Speaker, is that the interim report is the cumulative property and work of seven members of the Legislative Assembly and the staff that worked and co-operated with them.

I would like to mention who those members are. I, the member for Saskatoon Greystone, and the hon. member for Humboldt are your Co-Chairs. Other very able members of the committee are: the member for Kelvington-Wadena, the member for Regina Northeast, the member for Saskatoon Meewasin, the member for Moosomin, and the member for Regina Dewdney.

Mr. Speaker, all of these members have worked very diligently in preparing the report that is being tabled this afternoon. And it's an interim report, Mr. Speaker. Our final report will be prepared and delivered we hope later this year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on two of the important principles that are guiding the work of your committee. One is that the involvement of children in the sex trade constitutes child abuse. We reject the use of the term child prostitution to describe what is happening to our children because this term fails to convey the fact that the child is the victim.

Second, our goal is to eliminate the involvement of children in the sex trade in this province. The committee promotes zero tolerance towards johns and pimps who perpetrate abuse, and towards others who contribute to the sexual exploitation of children.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that we should not underestimate the large number of children who are being tragically affected. My colleague, the member for Humboldt, will elaborate more on the details of this. But we are facing the reality now of over 500 children being abused by johns and pimps on the streets of our urban communities in any one year.

This is despite the efforts of many wonderful people working in paid and voluntary positions in our community, doing the best they can to assist these children. It's also despite the efforts of our government with respect to financial resources to these community groups and also recent changes to The Child and Family Services Act which strengthened the legislation and toughened the penalties for people who are caught abusing

children.

The majority of children suffering abuse are First Nations and Metis children, usually from very low-income families. In contrast, the vast majority of perpetrators are white males who have a good deal more financial resources.

The consequences for these children, Mr. Speaker, are horrendous. Sexual abuse leaves deep wounds that take many years to heal. Sometimes they never heal. Children suffer regular violence from johns. They catch sexually transmitted diseases. The very core of their being is often damaged. This is abuse of the worst kind, Mr. Speaker. Members of our committee are firm in their view that this assault on our children must stop.

Mr. Speaker, our committee began our consultations with presentations from resource officials from the departments of Social Services, Justice, and Health, who provided us with essential background knowledge on the programs and resources currently available in Saskatchewan.

Following this, the committee held a video conference with officials from the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, to examine both provinces' unique legislation.

In total we heard from 35 witnesses during this first phase of the hearings in Saskatoon and Regina. The witnesses came from a variety of backgrounds and interest groups, including Aboriginal government organizations, outreach programs, community-based organizations, municipal and police service officials, individual citizens, and youth.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has identified six main themes brought to our attention by witnesses which are outlined in the interim report. These areas of concern will in turn form the context of provincial hearings in the fall. The six areas are: (1) legislative approaches; (2) deterring offenders; (3) outreach and safe refuge; (4) long-term healing; (5) prevention; and (6) education and awareness.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to touch briefly on four of these areas. First let me say a word about legislative approaches. Your committee has examined two pieces of legislation in depth: Alberta's Protection of Children Involved in Prostitution Act and special amendments to Manitoba's Highway Traffic Act. Your Co-Chair, the hon. member for Humboldt, will speak to the Alberta legislation in some detail.

Let me just say by way of very brief introduction, that Alberta's law provides for the involuntary apprehension of children for a period of up to 72 hours, and provides funding for workers who offer follow-up support to children who've been removed from the street.

The Manitoba legislation was introduced in 1999. It is aimed directly at deterring johns and provides for the seizure and impounding of vehicles used by those charged with an offence related to prostitution. In Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, vehicles remain impounded if the johns in question were seeking sexual contact with a child under the age of 18. For men who sought sexual contact with adult women on the street in Manitoba, vehicles can be returned but only if men pay a \$400 fine and

attend a john school.

In our final report, Mr. Speaker, your committee will make recommendations on whether these legislative provisions, in whole or in part, should be adopted in Saskatchewan.

Second, I wish to say a word about the importance of deterring johns. Your committee has heard a consistent message from all presenters that we need tougher penalties aimed at offenders who abuse children on the street.

There was also a desire by many presenters to see changes to the law that would make it easier for police to investigate the activities of suspected johns. For example, the Regina Police Service recommended that the Saskatchewan government lobby the federal Minister of Justice to change the section of the Criminal Code dealing with offences related to prostitution, so that such offences are classified as a hybrid offence rather than as a summary offence. This would allow offenders to be fingerprinted and photographed and make it easier to track the movement of johns from one city to another.

There's also a good deal of interest, Mr. Speaker, in looking at how we could change provincial statutes to make it easier for the police to fully conduct an investigation against the suspected john.

Deterring johns is crucial to helping our children, Mr. Speaker. We can help one group of children get off the street and out of the sex trade, but a whole new group of children will soon fall victim to abuse unless we stop the pimps and the hundreds of male perpetrators in our province who are actively engaged in seeking sex with children on the streets of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, those making submissions to our hearings emphasize the importance of outreach services and safe house programming as important ways to help children increase safety and ultimately exit the street. The member for Humboldt will address these issues in more detail in her remarks. Let me just say that in our final report, Mr. Speaker, your committee will recommend what actions might be taken to increase safety to children and advance the supports available to help children.

Mr. Speaker, many children who have been pulled into the sex trade face serious drug and alcohol addictions and major self-esteem issues. Every child who has suffered sexual abuse faces a long healing journey. Our committee received many suggestions for improved services that would help these children heal. Your committee Co-Chair, the member for Humboldt, will also speak to these proposals in her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, and members of the Assembly, your committee has begun to examine two other areas where we believe progress can be made to reduce the number of children at risk on our streets. One is in the area of prevention.

Our committee heard on numerous occasions that Saskatchewan should invest in preventing the root causes of child sexual abuse on the streets, namely poverty, family violence, racism, and family dysfunction.

With respect to domestic violence, your committee received a briefing from the Manitoba government on their Baby First

program which screens all children who are born in Manitoba at the time of birth, identifies families at risk of abusing or neglecting their children, and provides those families with active support, including a home care visitor who works with them over the next two to three years.

Manitoba officials advise that for every dollar invested today in preventive programming, \$7 in future cost savings could be achieved.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, your committee is considering the contribution that increased public awareness and education can have in reducing the problem. Public awareness is critical to changing attitudes that exist towards the behaviour of johns and the involvement of children.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is critical that we change the current culture which exhibits some tolerance for men engaged in picking up children on the streets for sexual purposes. This is a totally unacceptable practice, Mr. Speaker, and that message needs to be sent clearly by everyone in our society.

Secondly, we need to rethink the use of the term child prostitute, which is an inappropriate term to use, Mr. Speaker, because it implies willing participation on the part of the child. No child chooses to be on the street, Mr. Speaker. Children are drawn into the sex trade and often remain there under threat of violence, under very severe pressure from a family member, or under enormous financial pressure, or as a result of a drug and alcohol addiction.

Community awareness is key to changing attitudes around these issues, Mr. Speaker. Some important public education endeavours have already been undertaken in Saskatchewan, including a provincial poster campaign, educational pamphlets, and a sign campaign by community groups in the stroll areas of Saskatoon. Your committee will examine what additional steps might be taken to advance public awareness.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the other members of the committee for their very hard work on this issue to date. I want to express my appreciation to the hon. member for Humboldt for the dedication to this issue she is demonstrating as we work together in co-chairing this process.

I want to express my appreciation to every one who presented in the first phase of the hearings. And I want to express my sincere appreciation to all the staff that supported your committee in this process.

I believe the interim report provides a useful framework on which we can build.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt:

That the interim report of the Special Committee to Prevent the Abuse and Exploitation of Children Through the Sex Trade be now concurred in.

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

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

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

**Ms. Julé:** — Mr. Speaker, in addition to the comments from my colleague, the hon. member from Saskatoon Greystone, in reference to the special committee that was established to prevent the sexual exploitation and abuse of children on our streets, I would like to make further acknowledgements.

I would like to acknowledge the several staff members we had assigned to the committee: the Clerk of the committee; our technical advisor, Randy Pritchard; the *Hansard* and broadcast staff who accompanied the committee during our hearings; the staff of the Office of the Clerk who assisted in the arrangement of the public meetings; the *Hansard* staff who helped with editing the report.

And I too, Mr. Speaker, would like to thank and commend my Co-Chair, the hon. member from Saskatoon Greystone, once again for his co-operation, his acknowledgement of the seriousness of this issue, and his great desire and intent to address this issue in a very successful manner.

Mr. Speaker, I would especially like to acknowledge another group of people that are very, very important when addressing this issue, and who have very courageously come forward with their testimony to the committee. These are the many youth and survivors of the street who presented to the committee.

Their emotional testimony was very, very colourful. It was very painful for them, and it was incredibly courageous of them to come forward. And I want you to know that your contributions will be valued greatly during the committee's deliberations. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all committee members, I wish to thank them again for their insight and courage in sharing their heart-wrenching stories.

Mr. Speaker, their testimony re-emphasized the need, the great need for this committee, because their words put a human face on the lives of children who are abused through sexual exploitation. Because of this, the committee is better able to understand the weight of our responsibility.

And, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would just like to quote from the report some of the comments that the youth who presented to our committee gave us in regards to their experience.

And this is from one youth who presented to the committee in March, and she said:

The first time I started working on the streets I was nine. Why did I do it? (Why did I do it?) To support myself. I had no one to depend on. I was somebody . . . I was an adult trapped in a nine-year-old's body. I had no respect for myself (and) I had no respect for anybody.

And a further quote, Mr. Speaker, from another youth. And this quote is in part, but it should give to the Assembly an indication of the kind of horrific circumstances that some of our children are in.

The stuff that went on in the house was unreal. You can't

even call it abuse; it's called torture.

Mr. Speaker, the mandate of this committee is all-encompassing. We will be addressing all aspects of the problem of the sexual abuse of our children on the streets. But most importantly we will be looking at solutions. In looking at those solutions, we have up till this point had some very, very wonderful presentations made by many people to our committee.

One of the very valued contributions came from the police in our various cities and in the police from other cities that really do show how us how tragic this situation is. I want to read another quote from Constable Sheree Gay from Regina Police Services and she says:

We see a 12-year-old girl on the corner of the street . . . She is waving at cars . . . and from our experience we know that she is out there selling herself . . .

A car will pick her up . . .

So we will stop that vehicle . . .

. . . when I pull that vehicle over and I approach the driver and I ask him for his driver's licence and his registration and he complies, and I see no signs of impairment, and I ask him who the young girl is, and he tells me that it's none of your business, basically as a police officer I have no grounds to arbitrarily detain him any longer.

If he tells me that that is his niece, (he doesn't tell me why) . . . doesn't tell me why she was on the corner or refuses to answer those questions for me, I have no alternative but to let him proceed. Because as the law states at this particular time, I don't have enough reasonable grounds to believe, based on the fact that that child was standing on the corner, that that crime is going to be committed — as the law stands now. So I can't explain to you how heart-wrenching it is for me as a police officer to let that john drive away.

Another quote that I think is very valuable, Mr. Speaker, is a quote from retired staff sergeant Ross MacInnes, Calgary Police Services, who previously did work in the province of Saskatchewan. And Mr. MacInnes tries to give us an understanding of what kind of horrific acts are taking place against our children in this province and every province. And Mr. MacInnes says:

She had been locked in a walk-in freezer in the back of a (Calgary) pizza shop. She had been on her back for 16 straight hours. She had sex with 42 men . . . this is not intended to shock you, ladies and gentlemen, this is intended to inform you of what is going on in this city and in Saskatoon and in every major city in Canada. This is our town after dark.

Mr. Speaker, the interim report makes reference to the estimated numbers of children who are being sexually abused and exploited through the sex trade in both Saskatoon and Regina. These numbers are very, very high.

I want to just tell the Assembly today that I've done a little

calculating, and when you calculate that 300 children in Saskatoon are being abused on our streets — out of a population of 200,000 — that translates into one in every 666 residents is a child that is being sexually abused on the streets.

But what the committee finds equally disturbing is the fact that this evidence tells us there is a significantly much larger number of offenders also seeking the sexual services of these children, therefore substantiating just how important the work of your committee is.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of this interim report is to define the scope of the problem and to share legislative issues discussed to date. It is also the committee's hope to promote awareness of the issue and begin to examine ideas put forward as prospective solutions.

Mr. Speaker, the committee is not making any recommendations at this time in this report. We expect to hold further hearings this fall to allow more community groups, individuals, and youth to voice their concerns, their suggestions, and their recommendations.

And as the member from Saskatoon Greystone has mentioned, the final report, including recommendations, will follow our next phase of hearings and be presented during the next sitting of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it's important to elaborate a little bit on some of the findings that we have had in respect to legislative approaches put forward. And I particularly would like to elaborate a little bit on Alberta's approach with their Protection of Children Involved in Prostitution Act.

The legislation brought forward in Alberta was intended to emphasize that children are victims of sexual abuse. They are not criminals, they are victims, and they need to be protected.

PCHIP (Protection of Children Involved in Prostitution Act), which is the acronym for the Act, allows for the involuntary apprehension and 72-hour assessment of children. The 72 hours that has been designated is meant to deal with immediate needs of that child, and it is not meant to take into consideration the further long-term healing of the child. It is meant to place the child in a safe place, out of the reach of johns and those who might harm them, while assessment is taking place.

PCHIP — as I mentioned — the legislation is to keep children safe from johns, from pimps, from drugs, from violence, and from death.

Early intervention has been tagged as very key, and there have been considerably less new children on the streets in Alberta since this legislation has been brought in. There have been no prostitution-related charges laid against children and youth since the implementation of that Act. And the police are finding that there are no more inconsistencies within the police enforcement in Alberta.

This legislation has been valuable in that it has been a catalyst for fostering new partnerships focusing on the needs of children, while ensuring at the same time effective and efficient coordination between existing agencies.

This legislation has been a powerful tool for raising awareness, and it has identified and helped greatly children who could not make the choice to leave the street.

In Saskatchewan, many of the presenters that came to our committee had some reservations regarding the Bill. Outreach workers in Saskatchewan have expressed concerns that involuntary seizure of children on the streets may damage their trust relationship with the children. They expressed concerns that the legislation may push the problem underground.

And they expressed their concern that 72 hours of apprehension, time in a safe house, does not necessarily translate into the child stepping off the street, as evidenced in many multiple apprehensions.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go on and speak a little bit about other aspects that were brought to our attention that we want to deal with. The member from Saskatoon Greystone has spoken quite at length on deterring offenders, and it's important to notice that both Manitoba and Alberta's legislation have a component in it to deterring offenders.

But I'd like to go to the long-term healing. Several witnesses that came to our committee emphasized that Saskatchewan lacks an appropriate long-term addiction treatment centre for children and youth. This is seen as absolutely necessary because drug addiction and alcohol addiction and all kinds of drug addiction are often part of the problem.

Most presenters that came to our committee felt a need for a holistic long-term treatment centre for children, youth, and their families. There was strong emphasis from presenters that this client group needs more programs that are culturally sensitive with a traditional Aboriginal approach. Many youth witnesses and a former street person informed the committee that there is a lack of services also for older women who wish to or already have exited the street. It was expressed that training opportunities or opportunities to return to school, as well as increased employment opportunities for youth to earn more money, was very important.

Mr. Speaker, there was some successful programs that were presented to the member for Saskatoon Greystone and myself when we attended the Edmonton conference. And one of them that is especially notable is the prostitution recovery centre. The prostitution recovery centre which is located in Minnesota is a residential facility that incorporates chemical dependency treatment, sexual trauma mental health care, and independent living training and preparation all under one roof.

So the centre also promotes stability for exploited women and children, and there are volunteer mentors that are there working with them.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to just touch a little bit on intervention outreach and safe refuge. We are fortunate in Saskatchewan to have a safe house in Saskatoon. Although the safe house is voluntary, it is serving a great purpose in establishing relationships with children on the streets because it's been noted that it's very important to establish trusting relationships in order to help kids off the street. The safe house and their staff are to be commended on providing children at risk with a safe

refuge from the street.

Mr. Speaker, some of the presenters felt that foster care . . . the foster care system was not an adequate resource for these children. They felt this could change if more Aboriginal homes were recruited as foster caregivers. Their message was that these children would be less likely to run from a foster home . . . or from a home they felt comfortable in.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to . . . I am pleased to second the motion put forward from the member from Saskatoon Greystone, and I leave this Assembly with these words.

And we look forward to reporting next session our final report on the sexual exploitation and abuse of children. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a second motion related to the committee report, by leave of the Assembly.

Leave granted.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that the special committee . . . I move, seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt:

That the Special Committee to Prevent the Abuse and Exploitation of Children Through the Sex Trade be authorized, during any period of adjournment of the first session of the twenty-fourth legislature, to make a report on its inquiries by filing the same with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly;

And that the report shall be distributed in accordance with The Tabling of Documents Act, 1991.

I so move, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Motion agreed to.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to the Assembly I'd like to introduce some very important people from Wood River — my campaign manager, Mr. Bud Romansky and his friend, Sylvia Dixon; my sister, Dulone Jepson; my brother and his wife, Dean Huyghebaert and his wife Jackie.

And I'd also like to say — I'm not allowed to use my own name in the House — but the pronunciation of my last name is the same as my brother's, and that is Huyghebaert. My niece, Deanna Huyghebaert, and her friend, Frank Gelin. And last but not least, my wife Phyllis. Would you please join me in welcoming them to the Assembly.

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with a great deal of pleasure today that I ask the Assembly to join me in welcoming a large number of guests that are here today. And because there are so many and I would risk offending by not mentioning them all, I will mention Barb Byers, the president of the Federation of Labour, and the affiliated and non-affiliated union members, workers, members of the public interested in the proceedings today, as well as my constituents that are in the gallery — and they know who they are.

And also former member, Bob Lyons, now with the international labourers union, and Bob we'll see if it's still as much fun as it used to be.

But I ask you to join me in welcoming them here today.

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like to join the Minister of Labour in welcoming the working men and women of Saskatchewan here today to join in and watch the proceedings in the legislature today. So please join me in welcoming them.

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

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of visitors who are here today to witness the formal tabling of the special committee report in the Assembly, and both myself and the hon. member for Humboldt have the pleasure of making some of those introductions.

It's my pleasure to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, Sandi LeBoeuf, who is with the Saskatoon Tribal Council, and who is Chair of the working group to stop the sexual exploitation of children which is a working group of Saskatoon Communities for Children. It's very nice to have you here, Sandi.

Also present is Jacqui Barclay, who is also associated with Communities for Children and is a street outreach worker with Saskatoon District Health in Saskatoon. And I might add that we're very fortunate to have in the gallery our technical adviser for the committee, Mr. Randy Pritchard.

There are also some youth who are friends of mine who I will let the hon. member for Humboldt formally introduce but I want to welcome you.

And I also want to say a special welcome to my former seatmate, Bob Lyons, who is in the gallery this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

So please join me in welcoming all these special guests to the Assembly.

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

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, two very, very special women who have been very courageous in their life and have survived the streets and are now, Mr. Speaker, showing great leadership in their endeavour to certainly support and enhance the lives of women throughout

the province.

Mr. Speaker, we have with us Maggie Beacon, street survivor and new leader, as well as Sarah Ninnie, a street survivor from Saskatoon. And I'd ask the Assembly to give them a warm round of welcome and appreciation for the work that they're doing in making our society a more happy place to live.

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

**Mr. Kasperski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise today to introduce to you and through you to members and my colleagues in the Assembly, two very important women in my life seated in the gallery here on the main floor, Mr. Speaker — my mother, Sheila, and my grandmother, Gladys Campbell.

Mr. Speaker, and fellow members of the Assembly this is my grandmother's 90th birthday today. It's a great day in our family.

She was, Mr. Speaker, born in Hillsboro, North Dakota, 90 years ago today. At a young age she moved with her family to the Pangman area and her father died when she was young-aged. Her mother remarried, and she grew up in the Amulet area for many of you who may know; and I think the Weyburn-Big Muddy representative knows where Amulet is, near Ogema.

But anyway, it's just my distinct pleasure to have my grandmother here and I'd like all of you to join with me in welcoming her here today.

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

**Ms. Higgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to members of the House, two friends and former colleagues sitting in your west gallery. Darren Piper and Glen Stewart have been long-time associates and good friends, and they are business agents for the United Food & Commercial Workers here in Saskatchewan.

I'd like to welcome them here this afternoon.

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

**Mr. Addley:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, two special guests in the west gallery — Mr. Terry Drabuke from CanGro, he's the merchandising manager; as well, his friend and our friend from Costa Rica, Carlos Gutiérrez.

About 18 months ago I was able to participate in an educational co-operative tour of Costa Rica with Mr. Drabuke, studying co-operatives and the benefits of working people and providing jobs. And Carlos is now touring Western Canada investigating exciting business opportunities to provide jobs to people in Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic.

So if all members would please . . . We'll be speaking with the member from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley who's also the member for Terry Drabuke. So would all members please

welcome the guests here today.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you in the west gallery, Mr. John Melenchuk. Mr. Melenchuk is accompanied this afternoon by his mother, and I'd ask all members to join with me in welcoming them this afternoon.

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

**Hon. Mr. Sonntag:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All of us in this Legislative Assembly have staff who support us and have to work hard to make us look good. I probably have a staff that have to work particularly hard.

But I would like to . . . I'd like to ask members to join me in welcoming two of my staff here today in your gallery, Mr. Speaker — Corelie Bernat and Anne Marie Heffernan who have joined the Assembly today. They watch us every day on the legislative channel but this is the first time I think they've actually been in the Assembly to watch us.

So please join with me in welcoming them here today.

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

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Thank You's Extended

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to request leave to give an extended member's statement.

Leave granted.

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to thank all hon. members for allowing me some extra time for my statement today as this is the first opportunity I've had to speak in the legislature as the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for Wood River.

It's been a long time in coming, Mr. Speaker. I think all are familiar with the circumstances that surrounded the Wood River constituency going right back to the general election, a situation that led eventually to Monday's by-election.

I have a lot of people to thank for getting me here today. I wish to thank all of my supporters in the Wood River constituency who have worked so tirelessly, virtually since last August when the Premier called the general election. Without the support of my local team it would have been virtually impossible to cover the entire constituency during the short writ period.

I also want to thank my new colleagues, the members of the Saskatchewan Party caucus, for the moral support they lent me through the election campaign, and more importantly for the many hours of time that they spent door knocking and talking to concerned voters in the Wood River constituency. All of the MLAs here share in this victory with me.

I also want to thank all members of this legislature who were so

kind to pass a special Bill — and I kind of liked it being called the Yogi Bill last evening — to allow me to take my seat before the end of this session.

The people of Wood River have been without effective representation basically since last fall and they deserve to have an MLA to speak for them in this Assembly. On behalf of the people of Wood River, I thank all members for allowing that to happen more quickly than it might have happened otherwise.

And I want to thank my family for sticking with me, now through three campaigns in the Wood River constituency. Politics, along with my other activities, have kept me away from home much of the time and I want to thank them for their patience and understanding.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the contribution of the NDP-Liberal (New Democratic Party-Liberal) government in my victory. If it were not for the policies put forward by the government, policies such as forced amalgamation, abandonment of highways, closure of health care facilities, I'm sure my victory in Wood River would not have been so large this time around.

Mr. Speaker, I truly look forward to representing the people of Wood River beginning today. Highways, health care, taxes, jobs — these are all major concerns in my constituency as they are around the province. And I look forward to working with my colleagues to raise these issues with the government and to put forward positive Saskatchewan Party alternatives to the NDP-Liberal game plan that many people simply do not agree with. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### **Joni Mitchell Art Exhibit**

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was so mesmerized by your call that I was a little late on getting up to my feet.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly, there is a famous novel whose title everyone knows and often quotes: *You Can't Go Home Again*. Well the only problem is that the title is wrong. As a case in point this Friday night, this week, at the Mendel Art Gallery in my hometown, Ms. Joni Mitchell is coming home.

Joni Mitchell, of course, the Saskatchewan songwriter and composer of some of the most haunting and lyrical music of the last four decades. As *Maclean's* magazine says, she is, quote: "one of the most influential and celebrated songwriters of her generation" — a world class performer.

But Joni Mitchell is also a visual artist of no small talent and beginning Friday, the Mendel will be exhibiting 81 of her paintings, sketches, and montages. The exhibit is called "Voices", an apt description considering the variety of styles she has shown through the years in both her music and her visual art.

One characteristic of the exhibit, as we are told, is the strong artistic and personal attachment that Joni has to the Canadian

Prairies. This is revealed in several strong landscapes. Those of us who know and love the Prairies aren't surprised by this because while she lives partly in Los Angeles, she still is a prairie, Saskatchewan girl.

Which is where I began and close, Mr. Speaker — Joni Mitchell is coming home, in person and in spirit. I welcome her, I know all members welcome her, and I urge all of us to travel to Saskatoon to view the exhibit by one of Saskatchewan's favourite and most talented daughters. Thank you very much.

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

#### **Eastend Hang-Gliding Competition**

**Mr. Elhard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform you, and through you the members of this House that the community of Eastend is going to be hosting the 2000 Canadian hang-gliding championships this coming month, July 1 to 8.

Now this is the second time in four years that Eastend has hosted this competition. The Eastend area has some of the best thermal updrafts in the country, which have accounted for personal records being achieved for time aloft and distance travelled, according to pilots who attended the 1996 event.

The organizing committee is expecting some 40 pilots to compete from the four western provinces, as well as the northern United States. They will fly five flights in a 154 mile radius with landing zones in places as far as Leader to the north and the community of Chaplin to the east.

The Eastend championship, as far as I know, is the only competition that has been held in a non-mountainous terrain.

The organizing committee has invited those of this Assembly who are not faint of heart to experience the exhilaration that this sport has to offer by booking a flight.

I'll be taking your orders today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### **Congratulations to Watrous Businesses**

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to have some more good news coming out of rural Saskatchewan, this time courtesy of a rural newspaper, *The Watrous Manitou*.

The title of the June 5, 2000 article is titled, and I quote: "Local business initiatives speak of optimism in the rural economy." It goes on to say:

If recent activities in various sectors of the local business community bear any weight, it could be said that rural Saskatchewan is on a roll and exhibiting all the signs of people who are optimistic about the future of their community.

Mr. Speaker, this doesn't sound like the doom and gloom the opposition has been spreading around.

The article goes on to describe the success of four businesses in the Watrous area. The birth of Klisowski's Hyperbaric chamber and Murray's bath house bring two new exciting businesses into the area, while the rebirth of Watrous Home Building Supplies and the Pepper Tree Restaurant have expanded due to customer demand.

Mr. Speaker, things are beginning to look brighter in rural Saskatchewan. This government is committed to growing the economy so all residents of Saskatchewan, rural and urban, will share in the benefit.

I congratulate these four businesses in Watrous and their entrepreneurial spirit, Mr. Speaker.

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

### Grand Opening of Mennonite Heritage Village

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On last Sunday I had the great privilege of attending the grand opening of the Mennonite Heritage Village site in Swift Current. I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate the many volunteers who had the vision and determination to see this project through from a dream 10 years ago to a lasting monument of the Mennonite tradition of Swift Current and area.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the site to my colleagues and the people of the province. It includes an original period furnished Mennonite farm home, an original barn that is attached to the home in the Mennonite tradition by a breezeway, a summer kitchen and a windmill and many other wonderful artifacts.

This site is a lasting memorial to the great people whose work ethic, faith, and compassion for their fellowman helped carve a way of life out of the prairie dust.

Mr. Speaker, I'm intensely proud of my own Mennonite heritage, and while I wish I was more fluent with the language, I'm going to make an attempt this afternoon, with apologies in advance to the folks back home and the member for Rosthern and the member for Battleford-Cut Knife.

(The hon. member spoke for a time in German.)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

### Launch 2000 — CTV Regina

**Mr. Harper:** — More good news for Saskatchewan and Regina. On Tuesday, June the 27, I had the opportunity to represent the Government of Saskatchewan at the Launch 2000 sponsored by CTV's (Canadian Television Network Limited) Regina. Launch 2000 is a sneak preview of CTV's fall program lineup.

This lineup consists of many of the favourite programs such as *ER*, *Third Watch* and *Law & Order*, while adding in new programs such as *The Fugitive*, *Sopranos*, and many recently re-released movies.

A special congratulations to CTV Regina for leading all CTV

stations in sales in Canada last year. CTV Regina had the highest percentage of sales over budget and is number one in business development, reflecting the strong Saskatchewan economy.

Congratulations to Mr. Dennis Dunlop, general manager, Mr. Wade Moffatt, retail sales manager, and Mr. Geoff Bradley, creative services and operations director of CTV Regina — and on a very successful year. And we look forward to another exciting program lineup this fall.

Congratulations CTV Regina on a job well done.

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

(1430)

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Concerns in Wood River Constituency

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honoured to rise in the legislature today as the MLA for the constituency of Wood River.

And after virtually a year-long campaign, I really don't want to waste any time. I intend to do what I said I would set out to do.

Mr. Premier, no matter where I travel in the riding, the sentiment is the same. The NDP government has neglected us for too long, and we're not going to take it any more. Our provincial highways are in treacherous condition. We're forced to drive hundreds of miles to the nearest hospital. Our towns and villages are dying and the lack of economic development means our young people must head to the cities or out of the province for work.

Mr. Premier, the message is clear. The people of Wood River want your immediate attention to these issues. Will you stop ignoring the serious issues facing the people of this riding?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I again want to welcome the hon. member to the Chamber.

In answer to his question, it is the government's policy to try to balance economic, social, and other programs in the best interests of both rural and urban Saskatchewan. But more specifically, I think the best answer to his question comes from today's *StarPhoenix* editorial on the by-election in Wood River which in part says the following, quote:

It's one thing for Saskatchewan residents both urban and rural to demand that the province increase spending on highways, improve health care delivery and fork over money to interest groups ranging from farmers to impoverished kids to teachers, all the while coming up with tax cuts to put Saskatchewan on par with Alberta. It's another for the government to deliver on all these competing demands without adding to the debt.

And here's the last quote:

Whichever political party promises to deliver it all is playing voters for patsies. Any voter who believes that turfing out the current government will, overnight, get all (the) highways . . . paved, rural hospitals reopened . . .

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

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Mr. Speaker, I can see why I got such a plurality in the election when we get answers like that — which we have been receiving for some time.

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

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Mr. Speaker, the issue front and centre during the campaign was highways. In fact once again, today, the good people of Climax are out on Highway 18 patching holes.

They've given up on receiving any help or seeing any proactive, positive action from this government, so they've taken the situation into their own hands like their neighbours in Val Marie did.

The fact of the matter is the amount of money from the Highways budget for administration has increased, and the money actually going to building and maintaining our provincial highways has decreased significantly. The people of Wood River know this and they will not be fooled by empty words and promises. They want action.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I would ask the hon. member to kindly go directly to his question.

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Mr. Premier, when are you going to live up to your responsibility and give our highways the attention they desire and require?

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

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I repeat what the Minister of Highways has been saying — that \$250 million a year over the next 10 years in Highways — this government has made a commitment to highways.

But I also want to conclude by this quotation from *The StarPhoenix* editorial today. Quote:

Whichever political party promises to deliver it all is playing voters for patsies. Any voter who believes that turfing out the current government will, overnight, get all (the) highways magically paved, rural hospitals reopened and waiting lists zapped, farm supports ratcheted up, and taxes slashed is practising a form of self-delusion not seen since the heady days of Grant Devine.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing, over on that side, the heady days of Grant Devine. They were turfed out in the 1980s.

I congratulate you on your win. You will never make it to the treasury benches because of that attitude.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I would like to just welcome again our very welcome and special guests and friends to the Assembly here today while I'm on my feet, but also to remind the hon. guests that the practice of the Assembly, the traditions, are to not allow people in the gallery to participate in debates or become involved in debates on the floor of this Hon. Assembly. So I would ask kindly for your co-operation.

### Liberal Election Commitments

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is now clear that the Liberal leader is going to completely ignore the results of the Wood River by-election. Yesterday, one day after the coalition government was soundly trounced at the polls, he stood in this House and he pledged his undying love for the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I guess that would make some sense if the NDP were implementing some of the Liberal platform. But that's not happening either.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has compiled a handy little checklist of 35 specific promises that the Liberal leader made in the last election and I sent that list to the leader. I asked him to check off the ones that he's actually accomplished. As far as we can see, he's zero for 35.

Mr. Minister, can you point to one item that the Liberal platform has been implemented in your government?

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

**Hon. Mr. Melenchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, certainly the Leader of the Opposition is as deluded as the other members opposite. When we formed this coalition government, we talked about our plan, we talked about how we would balance the agenda of the New Democrats and of the Liberals in putting forward a plan for the people of Saskatchewan.

**The Speaker:** — Order.

**Hon. Mr. Melenchuk:** — And, Mr. Speaker, when we put forward our plan in our Throne Speech and our budget, we talked about major tax reductions. Starting July 1 — some of the biggest tax reductions that this province has ever seen with a completely new tax plan beginning January 1, 2001.

We've just announced a health care review where we will be looking for efficiencies, where we'll be looking for accountability, based on the five principles of the Canada Health Act.

And when he asks me what this coalition government has achieved, I can point to many things in education, and health care, in taxation. But when we ask the members opposite what they have achieved from their platform — nothing, not one thing, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well since the minister doesn't want to mark his own paper, we'll mark it for him.

Let's start with health care. The Liberal leader promised to scrap all health district boards — wrong. To create 10 to 12 regional hospitals — wrong. Provide renal dialysis and a full range of diagnostic services in each hospital — wrong. Purchase four — count them four — mobile MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) machines — wrong. Create 300 new nursing positions — wrong. Create 132 new diagnostic treatment and occupational physical therapy positions — wrong. Keep all rural and urban hospital beds open — wrong. And, relieve waiting lists — wrong.

I hope you did better on your medical exams than you did on this one.

Mr. Minister, if the coalition is working so well, why hasn't the government implemented any of the Liberal health promises?

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

**Hon. Mr. Melnychuk:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, when we just announced the health care review and we talked about the three phases of the health care review would provide with interim strategies this fall, and a final report next spring, that will tie into an implementation cycle that will fall into the budget cycle as well as the legislative cycle of this government.

So, when he talks about what . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. I would ask all hon. members to allow the answer to be heard.

**Hon. Mr. Melnychuk:** — So when the member opposite asks what has been achieved within the nine months of this government in terms of the approach in health care, the approach in taxation, the fiscal responsibility that has been displayed, it is a marked contrast to the members opposite who promised zero in health care, who promised frozen money for education, who talked about their entire platform — major 20 per cent tax cuts and a little bit for highways and forget everything else — and they called that a balanced approach.

No, Mr. Speaker, they are not balanced. They are extremely imbalanced.

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

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe health care isn't the doctor's best subject. Let's try highways.

The Liberal leader promised to spend every penny of gas tax on highways, streets, and roads. They promised to spend \$277.5 million on highways, \$55 million on new rural and urban streets and roads fund, \$37 million on twinning the Trans-Canada and Yellowhead highways; and create 1,500 new seasonal highway construction jobs, create 100 new full-time and 500 new seasonal road construction jobs for municipalities.

Mr. Minister, if the coalition is working so well why hasn't the NDP adopted any, any of your highway policies?

**Hon. Mr. Melnychuk:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, the Highways budget this year — 250 million — is the highest expenditure of any provincial government in the history of this

province.

And when we talk about the per cent currently of net revenue from gas tax, it's 87 per cent. And of course I'd like to see that move up to 100 per cent at some point in time.

But I remember just recently the member from Cypress Hills said, that during the Devine years, 199 million was spent per year. But what he failed to say is that they borrowed 30 to 40 per cent of that money and we're still paying for it.

The fact of the matter is our Highways budget is budgeted for, it is balanced, and it is fixing the highways and roads in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's go . . . a few more Liberal promises. Cut \$4.7 million from the Premier's office. Cut \$7 million from advertising. Cut \$9.6 million from government travel. Save 6.2 million by getting rid of SOCO (Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation). I remember it — scrap no-fault insurance.

And here's a good one, considering the shape of the Liberal Party — eliminate the 6 per cent sales tax on funerals. Wrong again, Mr. Speaker. He can't point to one single Liberal policy that this government has implemented.

Mr. Minister, does the Premier even let you sit at the cabinet table, or do they have a little card table off in the corner for you and the member from North Battleford. Why aren't your policies being implemented by this government?

**Hon. Mr. Melnychuk:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, we talk about the achievements of this coalition government, and there are many.

And when we talk about our Throne Speech, we talk about our budget, it is now a matter of public record. In fact we are voting the estimates off for our budget right now.

And what that budget provides for is a major tax cut starting July 1. All people of Saskatchewan will see more money in their pockets starting this July. January 1, 2001, the biggest tax cut in the history of this province. So all Saskatchewan residents, all Saskatchewan citizens will benefit from that tax cut.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, there is more money for health care. When he talks about the mobile CT (computerized tomography) scanner that was recently announced for Moose Jaw and Swift Current, a positive — a positive.

And what we've said now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to education, is an increase of \$28.5 million.

So we have a balanced approach, Mr. Speaker, and our approach is to provide more for health care, for education, for highways, and still put more money into the pockets of the people.

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

### Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Gaming minister. Madam Minister, yesterday I asked you whether you had been advised of any financial irregularities at the Gold Eagle Casino in North Battleford. I asked you whether the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority had ever conducted a review of the Gold Eagle Casino lease agreement between SIGA (Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority) and 212317 Saskatchewan Ltd.

Here is the verbatim answer from yesterday in question period. You said, quote, “Mr. Speaker, the answer would be no.”

Madam Minister, *The Leader-Post* is reporting today that the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority conducted an audit of the Gold Eagle Casino in North Battleford in 1998. The interim result of the audit contains clear evidence of financial irregularities related to millions of dollars at the Gold Eagle Casino.

Madam Minister, how is it possible that you had no knowledge of a 1998 audit into SIGA’s gaming operations by your own department?

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I begin by congratulating the member opposite for the giant leap forward he’s taken in his seat in the Assembly.

I would also say that, Mr. Speaker, I know yesterday now that the member opposite . . . my officials have informed me that he was speaking from a first audit conducted by the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority. This document was a preliminary internal working report prepared by SLGA’s (Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority) internal auditor in June, 1998. It identified very preliminary issues that required further analysis.

After considerable work done by the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority, their findings were incorporated into a management letter sent to SIGA in June of 1999. Mr. Speaker, this management letter identifies issues that SIGA was responsible to resolve. SIGA acknowledged their responsibility and demonstrated that the progress had been made on some of these . . .

(1445)

**The Speaker:** — Order. Next question.

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Another question for the Gaming minister. Madam Minister, according to the audit conducted by your own department, SIGA overspent its 1998 budget by more than \$8 million.

Your own government agency’s investigation uncovered evidence that the Gold Eagle Casino in North Battleford overspent its promotions budget by more than a million dollars in the same year. The government investigation concluded that the Gold Eagle Casino spent \$300,000 more than it needed on lease space and that the inflated lease payment was made to a numbered company controlled by some of the same people who managed the casino operations.

Madam Minister, there are serious problems and yet it appears that either you were completely unaware of them or you were aware of serious financial problems uncovered by your own audit but decided to stay quiet about it.

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I would ask the hon. member to kindly go directly to his question. He’s been quite lengthy in his preamble.

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Which is it, Madam Minister — NDP government incompetence or NDP government cover up?

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, considerable work was done on that audit before a management letter was prepared with the final findings, and that was presented to SIGA in June of 1999. The audits conducted by SLGA are reviewed by the Provincial Auditor during his annual audit of SLGA.

In noting concerns in his spring 1999 report, the Provincial Auditor included some of the items noted in the management letter to SIGA. But he also stated, Mr. Speaker, in his spring report:

The operation of commercial casinos in Saskatchewan is relatively new. Accordingly, the Authority faces a challenge in designing systems and practices to regulate and monitor SIGA’s casinos. We think the Authority has addressed this challenge well.

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

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the government could have taken a great leap forward by coming clean on this two years ago. My next question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Premier. It is now clear that the NDP government was aware of the serious financial irregularities two years ago and they chose to cover it up. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Maybe it’s because the NDP was getting some of this gambling money.

Mr. Premier, the investigation into the operation of the Gold Eagle Casino by the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority found evidence that money is being funnelled from the gambling operations to the NDP. Mr. Premier, how much casino gambling money has been funnelled to the NDP?

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, preliminary internal audits, the first audits done, management letters sent to SIGA who’s demonstrating they’re working and progress has been made. They indicated further work needed to be done. Audits conducted by the SLGA are also looked at at the Provincial Auditor.

He mentioned some of the items of concern in the report in 1999. Members opposite did not question that at that time. And that report also stated the auditor felt that there are many challenges in this area. We do not deny that, Mr. Speaker. But the authority was moving to resolve some of those issues, put systems in place, and the authority was trying to address those matters, and we’re doing well.

Mr. Speaker, some of the items in the Provincial Auditor’s report in June 1999 remain unresolved. No one’s questioning

that. They were brought to my attention further in a letter to me in June. We're now conducting an independent audit . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order.

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

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Mr. Speaker, another question for the Premier. Mr. Premier, according to your own government's audit, and I quote:

. . . it should also be noted that there are sponsorship for political party functions such as NDP golf tournaments and the Premier's dinner.

The auditor clearly identified this as an issue and you chose to cover it up.

Mr. Premier, do you think it's appropriate for casino gambling money which is earmarked for the social and economic development of First Nations people to be funnelled to the NDP?

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

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, overspending, if it were an offence, according to the auditor, these members opposite with their \$1.8 billion over budget to date in their spending initiatives should be cited, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, the political grandstanding happening here does not do justice to these issues. Many of the details that are outlined in those reports are now going to be examined in an independent audit done independent of government.

I would ask the members opposite to let that audit process unfold. I'm not going to speculate on whether those items will be cited or others. This information confirms that we're doing the right thing. An independent audit team, having full information, looking at the full details, they will do so independent of government and . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Next question.

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

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, we have been informed that SIGA gambling revenue been used to purchase thousands of dollars worth of prizes for your NDP golf tournament in 1998 and 1999. Can you confirm this, Mr. Premier?

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

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, I think this does confirm that we're doing the right thing. Mr. Speaker, there are many details they have from a very preliminary working paper, one snapshot in time. Many other people have mentioned they have concerns — they have concerns, Mr. Speaker.

We have concerns. That's why we're conducting a detailed review, an audit process in underway. I'm not going to discuss the details of that audit or the status of that audit right now. I don't want to interfere with the audit team's work and neither should the member opposite. I'm not going to speculate on the results of that work and neither should the member opposite. When the detailed review by independent auditors, who are independent of government, have their work completed, they will make those findings public, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, you should have done the right thing two years ago when the auditor first raised these concerns.

Mr. Speaker, another question for the Premier. Mr. Premier, you are the Premier who brought casino gambling to Saskatchewan. You are also the Leader of the NDP. Is it appropriate for the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan to receive gambling money from those very same casinos?

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

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, when they talk about doing our work and doing it well, SLGA prepared information in a management letter to SIGA. SIGA has some responsibility to act upon those. They were making progress in some areas. Many areas we still identified that were unresolved and needed the work.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the operation of casinos in Saskatchewan, the Provincial Auditor does say we face many challenges, Mr. Speaker. We have to design systems, look at regulation and monitoring practices and put those all into place, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Auditor says and I state, he thinks the authority has addressed these challenges well.

Mr. Speaker, I think we're facing these new challenges and we're doing it well. We're asking for an independent audit that will look at all of the information including what the member opposite drags in here for political gain. He will . . .

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm please to provide the . . . table a response to questions no. 206, and by leave of the Assembly, also to provide the answers to questions no. 207, 208, 209 and 210. Questions answered this season, Mr. Speaker.

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

Leave granted.

**The Speaker:** — Those answers are tabled.

Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Kasperski:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave, to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Kasperski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to my colleagues in the Assembly, a good friend of mine, Virgil Cairns, seated in our gallery. He's my constituency association president, and as many of you know these are very valuable people we have. And, Virgil, it's my pleasure to welcome you here today on behalf of my members.

With Virgil are two of his friends and two of my friends — Vikas Khaladkar and Bob Todd — from the carpenters union.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask all members to welcome them here today.

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

(1500)

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

#### **Bill No. 59 — The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000**

**The Chair:** — I'll invite the Hon. Minister of Labour to introduce her officials.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Today with me is Sandra Morgan, the deputy minister of Labour; John Boyd, director of policy and planning; Jan Whitridge, manager of legal analysis, policy and planning; and Doug Forseth, senior labour relations officer with the labour relations and mediation division.

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to welcome the minister and officials to the Chamber today. As I did yesterday, I'd like to take this opportunity again to speak out against Bill 59. And as I said, my colleagues have spoken against this Bill a number of times in the past, but I'd also like to continue to inform the general public of the consequences of this Bill, and again, correct many of the misrepresentations and false statements made by the minister concerning this Bill.

And once again we will outline the real reasons why the government is introducing this Bill in such a rush.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to start out by referring to a letter sent to the Saskatchewan Alliance For Economic Growth by the Minister of Labour. And it goes into the regular explanations of what her view of this legislation is and I'd just like to quote some of it. It goes on to say that:

I believe that it is important to note that on the outset these amendments will not affect the majority of Saskatchewan's construction companies, but only those companies that have been double-breasted and, as a result, operating as both union and non-union at the same time.

And it goes on to say:

The amendments are intended to level the playing field for both union and non-union construction companies by prohibiting double-breasting.

But at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, that this statement is . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order. Order. Why is the Minister of Health on her feet?

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Chair, a point of order. I believe I heard the member referred . . . makes reference to the Minister of Labour making false statements. I believe that is unparliamentary language and I'd ask the member to withdraw the insinuation that the Minister of Labour has made false statements.

**The Chair:** — Order. I thank the Hon. Minister of Health for raising the point of order. Regrettably I did not hear that part of the conversation and so I direct this to the hon. member for Redberry Lake. If in fact you did say that the Minister of Labour had misled or issued a false statement, that is unparliamentary, and I would provide an opportunity to withdraw it.

But I'm quick to point out, I did not hear it and I'm in the hands of the hon. member for Redberry Lake on this matter today. And of course I would be checking *Hansard* when it's available tomorrow.

But if the hon. member for Redberry Lake did in fact say that, I would ask that you withdraw it. If not, then you have the floor.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Mr. Chair, I would like you to check *Hansard*. I'm not aware if I said it or not.

But my point was, Mr. Chair, that many of the statements the minister's making about this Bill, many people in the construction industry and in the general public basically don't agree with. And that was the point I was trying to make. And throughout today's proceeding we'd like to clear up many of these statements and make the record straight about what really the intent of this Bill is.

I'd like to go on to quote from this letter to the Saskatchewan Alliance for Economic Growth. It says:

Saskatchewan is the only jurisdiction with legislation permitting double-breasting and prohibiting this practice will put our province's construction companies on the same footing as those in other provinces.

And it goes on and on.

I'd just like to point out that these statements unfortunately

don't hold water. In other provinces not every construction company which operates in the same sector of an industry is found to be a double breasted company, as there are many differences based upon the scope and the extent of the second operation.

And also traditional industrial work in Saskatchewan has been done by unionized workers in the commercial and industrial work by non-unionized companies. So I'd just like to point that out.

The letter also goes on from the minister, stating that, "This Bill is not forcing unionization." Well I don't know what else you could say about this Bill but that it is forcing unionization.

Yes, the minister hides behind her statement that the company is being unionized, not the worker. Well that's fine and dandy, but at the end of the day the worker has to pay . . . the union dues are deducted from the worker's cheque and at that point the worker isn't entitled to participate in union business, but they still have their dues deducted.

And as we know in the construction industry, Mr. Chairman, there are times throughout the winter months especially that the construction workers are laid off, and when they are rehired they will be forced to join a union. So again I'd just like to point out that discrepancy.

The other ones that go on in the letter is concerning on the subject of subcontracting:

. . . this legislation does not require Saskatchewan contractors to hire unionized subcontractors.

Well, Mr. Chairman, technically in the Bill maybe not, but we all know that through provincial agreements they will have to be unionized. They will have to deal . . . subcontractors will have to be unionized. And so that effect will spread out through the economy, and the so-called mom and pop operations will have to be unionized in order to participate in these contracts.

Also another item that's of very great concern is considering our First Nations. And it goes on to say, it does not contain any provisions that would affect Aboriginal hiring or other provisions containing either collective agreements or project agreements. But of course if there's any Aboriginal companies that are deemed to be spinoff companies, they'll be automatically unionized. So that comment does not hold any weight as well.

It also goes on to talk about the construction labour relations association, and we know that if this Bill passes, the construction companies will be forced into having that association as their representative, at the minister's discretion, by the way.

I'd like to at this point read into the *Hansard* a letter that I have. It's from the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce dated June 27. And it's to the Minister of Labour, and it's concerning amendments to The Construction Industry Labour Relations Act, 1992. And the letter . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order. Why is the Associate Minister of

Health on her feet?

**Hon. Ms. Junor:** — With leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Ms. Junor:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd to introduce a colleague of mine, a special guest in the gallery, in the east gallery — Rosalee Longmoore who's the president of SUN (Saskatchewan Union of Nurses) and other SUN members with her. If Rosalee could stand?

And I'd like to welcome her to the proceedings today.

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

**The Chair:** — Why is the member for Athabasca on his feet?

**Hon. Mr. Belanger:** — To ask for leave to also introduce a guest.

Leave granted.

**Hon. Mr. Belanger:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To you and through you and to the rest of the members of the Assembly, I want to introduce a very special guest in the gallery opposite. The guy's name is Allard Merasty . He's from Ile-a-la-Crosse, and he's brought a bunch of young kids here today to do some lobbying and some meeting with some ministers.

And I think it's very, very important that we recognize some of the unheralded heroes from our northern communities, and Allard's a fine example. And certainly as a role model I look to other people as some of them people that I want to be like when I grow up, in many senses, and Allard is certainly my role model. He works very hard. He has a number of boys he takes care of and works with the young people. He's also an excellent athlete.

So I want all the members of the Assembly to welcome Allard, to thank him for bringing the young people down all the way from Ile-a-la-Crosse. Thank you.

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

**The Chair:** — Why is the Minister of Municipal Affairs on his feet?

**Hon. Mr. Serby:** — For leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

**Hon. Mr. Serby:** — Thank you, to the member opposite. I notice sitting in the gallery is someone by the name of Suzanne Stewart. She's hiding behind the clock which is an unusual thing for Suzanne to be doing, is to be hiding behind anything, because she's been quite a strong advocate for our nurses in the province and certainly from the part of the province that I come from, and a very diligent worker in the health care profession.

And I really appreciate the opportunity to see you again, and for

you to be here to witness the proceedings of the House. And have a great summer.

I'll ask all members to join me in welcoming Suzanne to the House this afternoon.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

#### **Bill No. 59 — The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000 (continued)**

#### **Clause 1**

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to continue by reading this letter into the record. It says:

Dear Minister Crofford:

We are in receipt of your June 9 correspondence responding to our May 10, 2000 letter wherein we set forth some of the serious concerns we have regarding the proposed amendments to the CILRA. We were extremely disappointed with your response as the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and its members continue to have significant concerns with the proposed legislation and the long-range implications it will have.

In your June 9 correspondence you state that the legislation is intended to create a level playing field for the construction industry, thus allowing for greater fairness and competitiveness and suggest that this legislation is on the same footing with other provinces. This is not accurate. In other provinces not every construction company which operates in the same sector of an industry is found to be a double-breasted company as there are differences based upon the scope and extent of a second operation. In essence, there is and will be a significant problem with the expansive definition of "sector" in Saskatchewan. This definition will cover industrial, commercial, and institutional jobs in Saskatchewan. Traditionally, industrial work in Saskatchewan has been done by unionized workers and the commercial institutional work by non-unionized workers. For example, work at a mine site, which is industrial in nature, should not be in the same category as building a school or commercial building. In other provinces, the two operations in this example would not be regarded as being the same sector because they are not competing as they are doing different work, and therefore there would be an automatic certification.

Your correspondence also states that the amendments will put union and non-union firms on a level playing field within our province. Unfortunately, you have ignored the competition from outside of Saskatchewan. The legislation will force general contractors who bid industrial work on a unionized basis to become unionized for the commercial and institutional jobs. This will make them uncompetitive for commercial or institutional work and will result in out-of-province businesses bidding for and receiving work that would otherwise have been performed by

Saskatchewan companies using Saskatchewan employees. Not only will Saskatchewan construction businesses lose in the scenario, but your government will no longer receive the revenues as a result of these contracts. Many of the employees that will come in will be out of province residents and will file their tax returns in other jurisdictions, and will pay provincial tax to other provinces.

Your comment that eliminating double-breasting will not prevent firms from hiring non-union subcontractors is misleading. As you are very much aware, collective agreements typically have clauses that restrict the ability of the unionized contractors to contract work to a non-union contractor. As a result, unions will effectively be able to prevent the general contractors from using non-unionized workers for their commercial and institutional work. This is the goal that has been stated publicly by the unions in their media reports and literature that has been distributed in your legislation promotes this goal.

In numerous interviews and in the House you have stated that the amendment Act will not affect in any way joint ventures with Aborigines. We would suggest that this is not accurate. If a First Nations business is found to be a unionized spinoff, the CILRA (Construction Industry Labour Relations Act) makes that business subject to provincial collective bargaining agreements negotiated through the CLR (Construction Labour Relations Organization). In such instances there is an obligation to hire unionized people. How will those provisions coincide with another initiative brought in by your government to provide equity employment opportunities for Aborigines? To the extent that Aborigines are not unionized, they will lose their opportunities to work and thus the employment equity opportunities that should exist will be eroded.

(1515)

The Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce believes quite strongly that this legislation will result in a significant erosion of our construction company base and with the skilled workers. The legislation that you are introducing will directly result in fewer workers and ultimately less income tax for the province. The proposed legislation is short-sighted, politically motivated, and not in the best interests of Saskatchewan residents. We strongly urge you to reconsider your position, and to the extent that the legislation passes, that you delay proclamation until you have had a further opportunity to seek input from all parties and make a rational decision based on the growing economy.

The Provincial Chamber recently introduced Action Saskatchewan which talked of creating an environment that would be stable and would promote business development. This legislation is extremely regressive and Saskatchewan business and new businesses looking to come into this province will not know what is coming next and will not have the assurance that there will be steady and constant laws that will govern their operation. We have been doing our utmost to champion the province and suggest to people that this is a good place to carry on

business. But it becomes very difficult to do so when the government refuses to listen to the reasonable requests of business and brings in regressive legislation.

Sincerely, T.G. Davis, President  
Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce

And I'd like to table this letter, Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Chair:** — Order. Why is the Minister of Health on her feet?

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Earlier I raised a point of order that the member did indicate that the Minister of Labour made . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order, order. I already told the . . .

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — I've got a new point of order.

**The Chair:** — You have a new point of order? I didn't understand that.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Yes, I have a new point of order. I did review *Hansard* from June 27, 2000, page 2218. And in the member from Biggar's remarks, he did say this:

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to stand in this House today and continue to speak out against this Bill, as many of my colleagues in the Saskatchewan Party have done for a number of weeks — not only to speak out against Bill 59, but continue to inform the public of the two consequences of the Bill and correct the many misrepresentations and false statements made by the Minister of Labour and outline the real reasons the NDP is so desperate to pass Bill 59.

I would argue, Mr. Deputy Chair . . . Mr. Chair, that this is unparliamentary language, and I would ask you for your ruling.

**The Chair:** — To the point of order?

**Mr. Weekes:** — I withdraw those remarks and I apologize. And if I said it again today, I also withdraw and apologize. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** — I thank the hon. member for Redberry Lake for dealing with this point of order immediately and effectively.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I'd like to just basically ask the Minister of Labour, how can you dismiss this letter out of hand and should you not take their concerns into stride and hold this Bill until the construction industry people have had a better look at the whole situation and discuss it with your government?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to just start out by maybe clarifying a little bit for the member what my role is as Minister of Labour because there seems to be a little bit of confusion. He understands his role to be to speak for the chamber of commerce, but I want to lay out what I think my role is.

And I think the best way I can do that, because it's expressed so well, is laying out some of the preamble to the Canadian Labour Code. It says:

Whereas there is a long tradition in Canada of labour legislation and policy designed for the promotion of the common well-being through the encouragement of free collective bargaining and the constructive settlement of disputes. And whereas Canadian workers, trade unions, and employers recognize and support freedom of association and free collective bargaining as the basis of effective industrial relations for the determination of good working conditions and sound labour management relations.

And I would add as well, Mr. Chair:

Whereas the Government of Canada has ratified convention no. 87 of the International Labour Organization, concerning freedom of association and protection of the right to organize.

That's very important, Mr. Chair, because I'm going to come back to that, protection of the right to organize.

And has assumed international reporting responsibilities in this regard.

And I'll just add and certainly hope that our House would adopt a similar stance:

The Parliament of Canada desires to continue and extend its support to labour and management in their co-operative efforts to develop good relations and constructive collective bargaining practices, and deems the development of good industrial relations to be in the best interests of Canada and ensuring a just share of the fruits of progress for all.

And so it's my job, Mr. Chair, to try to create that environment that can give effect to Canada being a signatory to international labour agreements — certainly the kind of provisions that we're trying to include in things like NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), the labour side agreements.

Now I'll move from there to the member's specific questions. I was hoping for a little more of a dialogue, but seeing as you gave me the whole load, I guess I'm going to have to give you the whole load back here.

The one thing I guess that I'll start out by saying is this question of whether this exists in other jurisdictions. There is nowhere in which this Bill differs in essence across Canada. And the essence of that Bill is no double-breasting, you can't be union and non-union at the same time. People have a democratic right to choose to be union or non-union, and unionized employers at the bargaining table with unionized employees.

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

**An Hon. Member:** — A point of order.

**The Chair:** — What is the member's point of order?

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people in the galleries are not allowed to participate . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order. The member raises a point of order before the Chair had an opportunity to deal with the issue.

I thank the hon. member for raising the point of order, and simply wish to remind our guests in the galleries that we do, all members, sincerely welcome you here, but ask that you respect the institution and not participate in the debate through applause or action.

Why is the member of Health on her feet?

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — As the Acting House Leader, I want to respond to the point of order and would . . .

I have a new point of order.

**The Chair:** — A new point of order.

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — I would ask you to rule, Mr. Chair, on whether it is appropriate for members on the floor of the legislature to draw members in the gallery into the debate on the floor.

**The Chair:** — I thank the hon. Acting House Leader for asking the Chair for a ruling on the appropriateness of members drawing gallery guests into debate. Order, order. And certainly on that point of order, it is well taken. It is inappropriate for any member to draw in our guests into debate, and I thank the hon. member for raising the point of order.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. These are exciting times in the legislature, and I have to say that I want the member to understand that I take all of his questions very seriously because I do see it as my responsibility to be fair in these matters.

Now you talked about forced unionization, and I want to ask the member a question, Mr. Chair. If he signed a contract, and if the person that he signed a contract with then created another company to avoid being responsible for that contract, would he consider that to be appropriate?

And that's what we're talking about here. We're talking about companies that were certified, duly certified under the regular labour relations process, who then chose to create spinoff companies in order to avoid their legal obligations under the appropriate labour relations system that we had here in Saskatchewan.

I don't think you would want someone you had signed a contract with to do that, and neither did the workers who were certified under those unions like it when the person that they signed that contract with did that. And I think if you think about this, you'll be able to understand that very well.

Now the other thing is you asked about subcontractors being obliged to follow this. Well the fact of the matter is I found the member's question very strange because you talked about even though the legislation doesn't do it, that other agreements do. Well the fact of the matter is those other agreements are

collectively bargained. And if you're suggesting that I should write legislation in such a way that I'm predetermining what will be collectively bargained, I would say to the member that that would be inappropriate.

And so I just say to you that I think the problem you're referring to is one for the parties to settle at the bargaining table, and it's not really appropriate in the discussion of the Bill.

The next thing I'll talk about is the member quoting from the chamber of commerce. Now it's perfectly legitimate to quote from whoever you want.

But I guess there's one thing I want be clear about. I know the member thinks I was motivated by relationships with people in the union movement to put this forward. But when you understand the basic principles of the right to unionize and the right to be able to effect that right, the fact of the matter is we had a very big flaw in the legislation that had be corrected. And it wasn't a matter of any direct lobbying on behalf of this group of people that cause me to do this.

It was the result of two things. Several years of meetings and consultations on this subject, and people were surprised that this happened but I'm going to read a quote from Mr. Bob Mitchell that took place quite early in this process, where basically he said that if the industry was not able to come to agreement on this, then he would have to make the decision for them. And I think that statement was made in 1998. It says here:

Mitchell hadn't set a deadline for an agreement, but he won't let the talks go on indefinitely.

"I've made it perfectly clear that if they can't resolve this issues themselves, then I'll resolve it for them. And I don't want to do that because nobody would be happy with that solution."

Well, Mr. Member, and, Mr. Chair, the reason we're here today is the intransigence of some of the parties in compromising on this issue. And I'll just quote again from 1996, December:

The Saskatchewan Construction Association walked away from mediation talks with Kelleher on November 20 saying that double-breasting didn't need to be explored because it had already been dealt with.

And it's this lack of spirit of compromise that is the reason that we're in this House today, having to have made a decision on a process that went on for four years with no resolution and very little compromise on behalf of the parties that you purport to represent here today in this discussion.

The other quote I'd like to give you when you speculate on the propriety of these kind of changes, this is from a Board of Conciliation report in 1985, and I'll just read a quote here:

The concept of unrestricted spinoff companies is in our view fundamentally at odds with the principles of trade unionism as enunciated in our Trade Union Act. To allow a continuation of double-breasting in the industry as presently exists seriously jeopardizes the continued existence of the unionized construction industry.

The solution to the spinoff company is instead the establishment of collective bargaining framework which will ensure that agreements are competitive in the real world and readily reflect the reality of market conditions.

Now just to help the member understand who believes these things, I'm going to read the names of the members of the board of conciliation that signed this statement: Richard Hornung, Q.C., Nick Sherstobitoff, Q.C., and Larry Seiferling, Q.C.

Now as well the member speaks to the level playing field. And I know that's there's people who think I don't understand this, but I totally understand this. What happened under the Bill as it existed prior to the changes we're talking about today, is if you were a unionized contractor who didn't spin off, or if you were a unionized contractor that came into being after the provisions of the Bill in '92, then you would be able to spin off but the other people wouldn't. So you would have an unfair competitive advantage in terms of those other people.

(1530)

And the people who are now complaining about fairness were quite happy to have that unfairness exist as long as it wasn't them who were suffering. And now that that situation may exist for them, if they prove to be certified, they're now worried about the unfairness. It would have been nice if they had worried about the unfairness when it was being applied to other parties of their sector instead of the narrow self-interest that we've seen in this discussion.

The other comment I guess I would make was I had what I considered a rather elevated discussion with the head of one of the major companies in Saskatchewan who's concerned about this Bill, from his office in Alberta. And I very much appreciated my discussion with that gentleman because he was very honest and forthcoming.

He said, look, our company is unionized in other parts of Canada. It is unionized in BC (British Columbia). It is unionized in Ontario. And one of the things . . . and he says, we don't mind that. That's okay for us to be a unionized company. He said one of the things that makes it work for us is because the governments in some areas have union tendering policies.

And so now we may see, when all these changes come through, that we will have the same group of employers coming back to us asking to reinstate the CCTA (Crown Construction Tendering Agreement) because then it will be fair.

And I'm trying to explain to you that I totally understand these arguments. And there may be real competitive issues, but you know where you resolve those? In my view you resolve them at the bargaining table. And that is the appropriate place for those discussions.

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Now the member talks about the tradition in Saskatchewan of doing union work in the industrial area and non-union in the commercial. Well, I just have to say that you have us confused with Alberta, because that has never been a tradition in Saskatchewan. We've always had a small

sector.

And the fact of the matter is that again those kind of matters can be dealt with at the bargaining table and have been in some instances. And I would suggest that rather than continuing to support the notion of unfair labour relations, it would be much more helpful to talk about what could be done to get parties around the table and actually get realistic about dealing with some of this stuff.

On the issue of out-of-province workers coming into the province and taking jobs away, there was more out-of-province workers in this province when Devine first brought in his Bill than there's ever been in the history of the province. And everybody who works in that industry knows that.

And I'm sorry that maybe that you don't know some of this history so that you might be a little more sensitive to all the unionized workers who lost their homes, lost their possessions, became unemployed as a result of Grant Devine's Bill.

But the fact of the matter, there's a lot of bitter feelings out there, and I reiterate this is about fair . . . this is about fair law. It's not about law that serves somebody's self-interest. Because the very companies who are worried about fairness today didn't worry about it when it applied to the other partners in the sector.

And the other one you talk about — income tax, less income tax. I don't know how closely you've looked at the job profiles in Saskatchewan, the tax tables. But unless you're independently wealthy, in this province if you can afford to pay taxes you're likely a unionized worker, and the only reason you can afford to pay taxes is because you are.

I'm not saying that there's nobody else that makes money. But the fact of the matter is that many of the good-paying jobs are in the unionized sector, and those are the taxpayers. So I think you shouldn't play too fast and loose with the term taxpayer.

Now on the other point of Aboriginal, it's nice after our party's been involved in working on these kind of issues for 25 years in our government that you finally discovered that Aboriginal people live in Saskatchewan and you're concerned about it. But the fact of the matter is there are no Aboriginal clauses imbedded in legislation anywhere in Canada.

But what we have done in Saskatchewan and certainly did a lot of, starting with the Blakeney government and subsequent to that, was we imbedded initiatives for Aboriginal employment and business development in provincial contracting, tendering, and lease agreements.

Many of the northern leases contain clauses that require the inclusion of Aboriginal people in those developments, I'm sure clauses that many of the people you're talking about fought their inception.

Under the internal trade agreement . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, we have people here who know this history. And, Mr. Chair, under the internal trade agreement the exemptions on the competition clauses for regional and other matters of development, there are advantages for employers who partner with Aboriginal construction companies. There's no question

about that.

The origin of this particular exemption is in section 15 of the Canadian Constitution. Now I will mention that the building trades council has been working with the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) to promote hiring and training of young Aboriginal workers. And I think they have an action plan on the go at the very moment to have the 15 affiliated unions hire and indenture young Aboriginal people.

Certainly in projects that go on in reserves there's quite often affirmative clauses that unions are involved in working with. And as well in the Contact Lake Gold Mine project, or in northern construction, many of the construction unions are involved in this.

So I believe that both non-union and union employers should be concerned about Aboriginal hiring, Mr. Speaker. But the fact of whether you're union or non-union does not prevent you from caring about, agreeing to, or negotiating these kind of provisions.

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. The minister referred to a document. I would ask her to table that document please. And also in 1992 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You were reading from a document I understand; I would like you to table it. Table them all . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . After that — you were reading from a document.

You made reference to unrestricted double breasting. Well I believe in 1992, Madam Minister, there was a change in laws that prohibited any more double breasting. And you made reference to the right to organize.

Well it's interesting you used the right to organize. Right now with this law the workers of this province don't have any rights. They will be forced into a union. And if not forced into the union, they are forced to pay union dues. And once they're laid off, they will be forced to join a union or else they'll have to go elsewhere for work.

Also other things that you mentioned. You talk about other provinces, other jurisdictions. Well in Alberta the industrial sector is unionized and the commercial sector is not. And the Labour Relations Board has restrictions on whether they can investigate whether they're of a common employer. So they can be owned by the same people, but still one be unionized and one not. I would think that's a spinoff company that exists.

And also the whole reason why this Bill's been brought forward. You talk about instability, tension, no one negotiating. What was the problems? There were no problems. It was only in the . . . the only problems were in the mind of the government.

You talk about the unfairness of things. Well nobody was complaining. The business was . . . industry was working very well. They hadn't had a strike in over 18 years. So I'm not sure what the minister is really talking about there.

And you go on to talk about out-of-province companies coming

in to work during the Devine years. Well, Madam Minister, what do you think is going to happen now? I mean if you force companies into unionized contracts, the regulations and the rules that these companies have to abide by are going to increase their costs.

So when they bid on a contract in the province, a non-unionized, out-of-province company can come in and take that job. That means less jobs for Saskatchewan people. And not only less jobs but we lose some of our tax base because the profits will go out of the province. Out-of-provinces companies will pay their taxes in other provinces.

And as far as the Aboriginal workers are concerned, it's just interesting to see the Aboriginal people are making a step forward, creating their own jobs, creating businesses, and going forward. You're going to force unionization down their throat as well.

And I just have a scenario which we've touched on before, but basically it goes like this. A worker who works for a new unionized construction firm will have to pay dues deducted from their wages, even if they do not belong to the union. If that worker were laid off, which is common in the construction industry because of the seasonal nature of the work in Saskatchewan, that worker upon rehiring will be forced to join a union.

But an open-shop company from Alberta who does not have the extra costs of doing business, they will likely outbid the Saskatchewan unionized company. That same construction company worker could hire out with this out-of-province, open-shop construction firm, the Alberta firm, and then this out-of-province firm would take its profits home and pay its taxes in another province, let's say Alberta.

The Saskatchewan worker also has the option of moving to Alberta and working in Saskatchewan with this open-shop company. And if he moves to Alberta, he pays his taxes at a reduced rate to the Alberta government.

So I just see this whole Bill as a lose-lose-lose situation for the whole province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Madam Minister, just for the record, could you tell us, tell the House how this Saskatchewan Bill will benefit the people of this province, considering the potential of lost jobs, lost tax base?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd be happy to do that.

What I'd like to start with is, a lot of this seems to be premised on the fact that in order to be competitive you have to be non-union so you can pay less so that you can compete and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I would say to the members opposite, if they truly believe that people will get paid more, then they would not likely unionize, and they would not likely have a concern. And certainly if non-unionized employers were to be unionized, they certainly would not be prevented from paying their workers those high wages that they're currently paying them.

But what I want to talk about right now is something that's called the Merit Contractors Association. Now Merit contractors — I think they're part of this alliance that you are referring to — the Merit contractors' on-line newsletter that's entitled *Open Mind* . . . three years ago, the Construction Industry Institute initiated a research project on how to attract and maintain a skilled construction workforce.

And they came up with all types of reasons as to why the industry can't attract and retain qualified workers. And I'll just read these out. This is what the craft workers say that work in the Merit companies.

There was 1,200 craft workers employed by 21 construction workers . . . companies interviewed. The first one was:

Poor pay and benefits. Craftworkers want wages and benefits that are competitive both in the construction industry and in other industries in which they find employment.

The second one is:

Non-permanent employment. Young people don't want to work in an industry that has a reputation of laying off people on project completion. If permanent employment is available in another industry, construction workers can't be blamed for leaving.

The third one is:

Poor job safety. All the contractors said they'd put safety as number one, but the craftworkers still say there's a lot of places where safety is not given enough attention.

Number four is:

Poor treatment by supervisors. When The Business Roundtable did a study a number of years ago, it found that the number one reason workers quit was because of poor treatment from their supervisors. Ongoing supervisory training and human relations is a must for every construction company. The composition of the workforce is changing today, so it is even more critical to train supervisors on a continuous basis.

And the last reason the workers gave in the Merit shops was:

Poor working conditions. Craftworkers need to be provided an environment in which working conditions are conducive to supporting a high level of productivity. This (means) having clean Port-a-johns, and smoking and break areas.

So I only read that into the record so that the member can understand that members of the industry understand these to be problems. These are not problems that have been invented by this government or invented by somebody else. The very people that signed the letter you're talking about have done a study which has told them they've got troubles in their own roost. And I just bring that to your attention.

The next thing I want to come back to, I mentioned I would come back to the Canada Labour Code's description of the right to unionize, which is considered to be a democratic right both

by the international labour organizations which is made up of members from around the world of all stripes of government. It's a basic fundamental democratic right.

Now you say people are forced to join a union. Today in this province if you're a health care worker and if you go to work for a health care facility that has a union, you join that union . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you're forced to join the union; well okay, well you're out of the closet then. It's good to know that that's your view of the thing.

I don't think I need to say any more about that, Mr. Chair. We obviously have a basic difference of opinion on what these rights mean and how they're maintained.

The other comment I would make is in Alberta they do legislate their sectors. Now if the industry in this province hadn't spent 17 years fighting being fair, then we might have got on with those discussions you're talking about. And I'm certainly prepared to sit down with all members in the industry following the passage of this Bill to talk about how to deal with those very practical problems.

But I believe that those problems will be solved. As I mentioned, the president of one of the companies that you're talking about agreed with me when I had a private conversation with him. He agreed with me. Because his company is unionized and he knows that the solution to his problem isn't just de-unionization. He knows he has to sit down with the workers and work these things out.

And I considered him a sophisticated president of a sophisticated organization. And I think if him and I can understand each other, then you and I should be able to understand each other.

The other comment I would make . . . you talk about increased costs. I guess I would need the member to explain to me, if the costs are not wages, what are the increased costs that he's talking about?

**Mr. Weekes:** — Mr. Chair, I'd also like to quote from the Merit contractors survey. It reads:

In construction, a 1993 Merit Contractors Association survey revealed that 89 per cent of respondents surveyed thought that their work was satisfying, that they felt a sense of accomplishment from the work they performed. Over 81 per cent said they would recommend working for that particular company to their friends. And a similar percentage disagreed with the notion that they'd be better off in a unionized environment.

Madam Minister, can you tell us how many people are employed in Saskatchewan directly by the construction industry?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Chair, the labour force survey indicates that there's 23,500 workers in this sector in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Weekes:** — I'd like to ask the minister how many of these companies were grandfathered in 1992 and how many workers

do they employ currently in Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Chair, we don't know that. And continued requests of these organizations like the Saskatchewan Construction Association to tell us these numbers have not been forthcoming, so we just don't know.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, could you give us a guess or an estimate, these changes to the Act, will they cause the numbers to go up or down?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well I guess the best thing I can do for the member there is to quote *The Leader-Post* . . . let's see, what's the date here — Monday, June 12, 2000, "Sask. job market sizzling hot."

'We've got jobs all over the place,' said Doug Elliot, publisher of Sask Trends Monitor.

"They are . . . full-time jobs and a lot are for youth — it's more good news."

. . . Saskatchewan (is) still far below the national unemployment rate.

Most of the 14,600 increase in jobs came in full-time work . . . 18,600 higher than May of 1999. Part-time employment dropped by 4,000.

There simply won't be anyone to fill the jobs . . .

"I don't think we have enough people . . ."

And so basically I would say if you're concerned about people having work, it's my impression that there is enough work to go around, and increasingly, as capital budgets increase, there will be even more work to go around. And I think everyone, instead of applying themselves to fighting over labour Bills, should apply themselves to how to deal with the real issues in growing our economy.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, what are the rules regarding out-of-province construction companies doing work in Saskatchewan and will they be affected by this Bill, or are only Saskatchewan companies affected?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I would think that the member opposite should be painfully aware of things like NAFTA and the Internal Trade Agreement. And the fact of the matter is, is all projects over a certain size have to be tendered. It's part of the opening up of markets across Canada and in North America. And so certainly those are tendered.

But I did specify that under ITA there are exemptions for matters of regional development or Aboriginal development. So there are circumstances in which preference can be made if a case can be made for those things in Saskatchewan. And certainly, having high expectations within your tendering agreements makes it less profitable for companies to parachute in from outside.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. I wasn't referring to NAFTA or any of those. I'm referring to this Bill. This is

what we're discussing. What effect is this Bill going to have on out-of-province companies?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I thought I was fairly clear in that answer. All tendering is governed by the ITA (Internal Trade Agreement) rules, or exemptions from, and any company inside or outside Saskatchewan would be subject to those rules. Laws don't exist in isolation. And there is nothing in this Bill that would either hinder or help that process.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Speaker, I guess it comes to the point, would you have an estimate about how many out-of-province companies, which would be free from provisions of a union, bureaucracy, red tape, and so forth, are likely to take jobs in Saskatchewan? And take them out from under provincially owned firms who will have to pay the higher costs brought on by the union red tape?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — You know, I would be way happier if the member said to me, let's get together and bring all these players in the industry together, look at these bogeyman, see how real they are, and see what solutions we can reach together for the common benefit of our Saskatchewan companies and our Saskatchewan workers.

Because I don't think this scaremongering, speculating on things that might happen and could happen is really a very useful exercise.

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman of Committees. Madam Minister, and to your officials, I would just like to also ask a few questions on this Bill. I had the chance to speak to it in second reading debates and I have talked to a number of people in the industry and people in my home constituency about their views on this particular piece of legislation. And so it is with that input in mind that I would like to enter the discussion and the questioning here in Committee of the Whole.

And in doing that, I'd like to maybe set the context for my remarks, Madam Minister, and Mr. Chairman of Committees, by referring directly to some . . . just a couple of the examples of the input that the MLAs were receiving and that I received as well. And if I can, I'd like to quote a little bit from these missives that I have. One's an e-mail and one's a written letter, both from people who are employees in the industry. And some have . . . with some very, very good questions that I think the minister has tried to address and the member for Redberry Lake has done a good job of asking, but one that will set the preface for my questions.

This one particular e-mail begins:

With regards to the enforcement of certification to open shop contractors.

(He says) I am an open shop employee.

I do not wish to be a union member.

And I would gather from that statement neither does he wish to pay union dues or have his employer automatically deduct union dues.

If the workplace and open shops are to be non union it is their right to do so.

Are you sure that you've received all the info about the open shop contractors:

(He asks the legislators of this province, and he lists some examples.) (Are the) wages better? (Is the) training better? (Is the) work fairness better? (Are the) benefits better? (What about) apprenticeship (is that) better? (What about) RRSP (plans is that) better?

In his view, and I think we should respect it — he is an employee in the industry — his view is that open shop contractors are the leaders in all areas. He says:

No political party has asked me or my co-workers if we want to be certified.

(He says that's) our choice.

Before you try and pass laws or bills be sure you and your co-workers are educated from both sides, with open ears.

The changes you are trying to run through the house will open the door for open shop Out of Province Contractors.

That's his view, and I'm still quoting from the e-mail, Mr. Chairman of Committees.

Open shop contractors will march in and overcome our economy, as bad as it is.

Finally (he says) ask yourself honestly, do you feel that you are benefitting the worker or are you telling them they have no choice . . .

And he has signed that as you can with e-mail messages.

We have another from a journeyman electrician here in the province of Saskatchewan. And no doubt you've maybe seen a copy of this letter, Madam Minister — your officials have. But again I'd like to read it into the record, Mr. Chairman, if I can.

I am writing to express my disgust and frustration regarding the NDP government and their undemocratic plans to impose unionization of the construction industry in Saskatchewan.

I do not deny there is a place for unions and that history shows the work that they have done for labourers over the years. However living in a "free country" . . .

And unfortunately he puts quotation marks around free country — perhaps he felt that he had to given the nature of this legislation. But he says:

However living in a "free country" it has always been my right to choose. If it was my wish to belong to a union, I would vote for certification not be ordered to do so by a "democratic government"?

And if I may interrupt the quotation momentarily, Mr.

Chairman, I think that's entirely the point. Some of the points have been raised by the member in committee and others in their speech during second reading debates. The point is that these companies are free to certify now — that right exists now, today, in the province of Saskatchewan, before this Bill is given Royal Assent.

And if they have that right to do so now, why does the government feel it's incumbent upon them to impose certification — basically to force unionization? Because that's what this Bill is all about.

If the Labour minister . . . Back to the quotation from the letter, Mr. Chairman.

If the Labour minister (the) Hon. Joanne Crawford, and the Labour Relations Board impose their plans many of my other rights could be taken away or lost. I will be forced to join a union, pay union dues and my seniority could be in jeopardy. In addition I'll lose my right to manage my own pension funds and some of my RRSP's.

To make matters worse the government's plan will allow unfair advantages to out of province contractors. This plan takes money out of my paycheck and could in effect take my job away.

He asks these questions:

What are the freedoms that my family came to Canada for?

Where is the loyalty to our people by our government?

And finally:

Where will they stop if we don't stand up and stop them today?

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Madam Minister, in several of your remarks in addressing some of those questions put forward to you today, and during some of the speeches during second reading, we've often pointed out that there is currently no labour instability in this industry. Have there been lockouts? Have there been strikes? Have there been an inordinate number of unfair labour practice grievances launched?

The answer to those questions is no. And the CLR (Construction Labour Relations Organization), the construction labour relations association will now be the organization that negotiates on behalf of everyone — although they get no choice in that by the way.

And, Madam Minister, as a bit of an aside, I think you'll understand when you've stood in your place and said that every other province has the same thing, there's nothing in this piece of legislation that doesn't exist anywhere else, I think you perhaps would want to expand on your remarks here today and we'll give you the chance to do that. Because on this one issue of the right of employers to choose the organization that bargains for them, in so many other provinces in the Dominion those employers are given that right. And you're going to take

that right away from them, take that right away from them and arbitrarily assign them an association over which they have no influence and no choice.

How is that democracy? How is that democracy, Madam Minister, and Mr. Chairman? I don't understand that. Employers under this regime, this government, will not have the right to choose who will do the bargaining for them. No wonder they're upset, Madam Minister. No wonder their employees are upset and they're sending e-mails and letters to the legislators of the province of Saskatchewan.

But the CLR, who is this anointed body, in their commentary dated June, 2000, Mr. Chairman, says:

From CLR's perspective, the legislative changes could be quite disruptive to the stability enjoyed by our industry over the past several years.

That's the group, they represent the employers for whom I guess you've said you're doing this, you're taking this action for these people, for the CLR. I think that's worth reading again, Mr. Chairman:

From CLR's perspective, the legislative changes could be quite disruptive to the stability enjoyed by our industry over the past several years.

Madam Minister, you've said countless times in this Assembly and outside that you've had hundreds or over a hundred or a hundred meetings in terms of consulting on this particular piece of legislation. I am sure — I know for a fact — that you met with CLR on much more than one occasion. In fact, I wonder how many of the hundred that constitute a meeting of the government and CLR.

Did CLR tell you what they've said in their June 2000 commentary? Did they say that this could lead to instability in labour relations in the construction industry, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — So many good questions, Mr. Speaker, so little time.

I want to start out, I want to start out by saying the member opposite isn't the only person who gets letters. And I could get . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order, order. Order, order, order. Now I asked for members' co-operation. The questions have been certainly audible and I ask for the respect for the answers to be audible as well.

(1600)

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I haven't received any letters from workers opposed . . . I've got a very few letters at the very beginning and I've received stacks of letters recently from workers who support the choice to be in a union.

And I would also say that I've also received letters from contractors who work co-operatively with their union, are very glad to see that there will be a level playing field now, and that spinoffs can't underbid.

And I've also quoted previously from the Board of Conciliation, which I did send over to the members opposite, in which Larry Seiferling, Nick Sherstobitoff, and Richard Hornung — all Q.C.s (Queen's Counsel) — said that this was a necessary change in order to effect the right to make that choice of unionization and also to get rid of double-breasting that jeopardized the existence of the unionized construction industry.

Now if people are to have the right to unionize, we've got three lawyers here who have agreed that this is a pretty fundamental provision to that right.

And I speak again to the Canada Labour Code that says that in industrial relations in Canadian society it's considered to be a fundamental right. And in order for a fundamental right to have meaning, Mr. Chair, it's got to be able to be effected.

So just as he has some letters from people who oppose the fact that if they join a unionized workplace that they may have to become unionized, there's also people who would like to know that their employer's unionized so they have the choice of becoming unionized if they wish to. So I guess that's just something where you have your own opinion.

But there's also a body of law that regulates industrial relations in Canada and in every province. And I will emphasize to the member opposite that the Labour Relations Board doesn't impose anything. They are like a quasi-judicial body that adjudicates law — 50 per cent employers, 50 per cent employee representatives — and they come to their best adjudication on the laws that exist.

So I would think that it would be unfair to characterize them as imposing anything.

Now as far as the CLR goes, partly because of the instability that existed prior in the construction industry to Mr. Devine's actions, and then subsequently in the intervening years, there was felt to be a need for a central body that did bargaining for that industry.

And the employers when they were . . . had concerns about the CLR wasn't about the fact of the CLR, what their concern was about was the right to be represented in the CLR.

And so the change we've made in this legislation, Mr. Chair, is that any unionized employer can now be a member of that body and has a right to be represented in the bargaining. So I think that that should satisfy the concern that employers have.

And as to the quote from the CLR, Mr. Matthews having been a player in this for a long time understands the tensions, and I think what his belief is, is because of the letters that we've seen from the alliance and what not, that he believes that people intend to keep the tension going and intend to keep disrupting things. So I think he's just reflecting his understanding of what's been going on for a long time.

But I do want to be very specific because the members continue to insist that there were no consultations. Well that just isn't accurate.

This is the number of meetings by organization. There was 50 meetings with business organizations, 12 with labour, and 18 with others. The organizations that were represented were CLR, SCA (Saskatchewan Construction Association), SCLRC, the chamber of commerce, the CFIB (Canadian Federation of Independent Business). And when these parties were asked if we could share the individual names of people who participated, they said no.

And under freedom of information, if a third party is requested to declare information that was confidentially given by them, we can't reveal it unless they give their permission, Mr. Chair. So I would have liked to have been able to actually list all of the people.

But four years of consultations took place. I read the quote from Mr. Mitchell that gave two years' warning that really we needed to see some progress and compromise, and unfortunately that compromise wasn't there.

But at the end of the day . . . I will also, just in the interests of letting you know how the consultations went, this is from June 6 of '98 where Manley McLaughlin, the executive director of the Saskatchewan Construction Association, described negotiations as delicate but said a June resolution is possible. McLaughlin said the first draft of an MOU (memorandum of understanding) has been released by organizations representing union and non-union companies.

Now unfortunately, the hope that was existing at that time, Mr. Chair, that this MOU would continue and that compromise would happen, people would understand that all parts of that industry have slightly different needs, and they need to work together. That was our hope, Mr. Chair. But it didn't happen. But certainly the discussions went on for a very long time.

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Chairman of Committees, and, Madam Minister, thank you.

I don't think my point was that you haven't had consultations. The question was are you listening? Did you listen when you consulted with all of the groups you mentioned?

Because you mentioned a number of business groups who now appear on the letterhead of the Saskatchewan Alliance for Economic Growth. And they're not much interested in Bill 59 — I can tell you that. I don't think I have to; I think you know that.

I also quoted the CLR. I'm sure you consulted with them, you know, quite a few of the 100 times. They point to instability that's going to come to the industry.

So I'm not questioning the fact that you had a lot of meetings, Minister. I'm not questioning that the officials did, Mr. Chairman. I'm not questioning that other members of your caucus may have had a lot of meetings. But my question is the same question that we asked on this side of the House on so many issues: are you listening? When you asked people for their input, did you listen? Because I don't think you listened, I don't think you listened.

This list would lead us to believe that you didn't listen. The

group that you seem to be appealing doesn't think much good is going to come of this in terms of labour peace in the industry. And so that's the question we had.

Madam Minister, the other thing that you said initially when the member for Redberry Lakes was questioning you about this Bill as it was introduced into the legislature was that, well, it's pretty much the same as there is in every province; there's nothing different here.

Madam Minister, I think you want to stand up today — I hope you'll stand up today — and admit that that is not entirely the case. And in fact the rules of this place prevent me from using any stronger language. Frankly, I'd like to.

We have a list of the jurisdictional comparisons in terms of this area from right across the country. And let's just deal with the issue of the designated or the accredited employer organization — that's what we're talking about right now — and find out what the rest of the country is doing relative to what your Bill would do here in the province of Saskatchewan.

We'll start with Alberta. Employers have freedom to choose employer organizations which must have support of the majority of employers in the trade division.

How about in Manitoba? How about Manitoba? Is Manitoba okay? I wonder for the member for Saskatoon Meewasin will try that. There is no associated business legislation, section 59(1), Labour Relations Act.

What about Ontario? Employers have the right to choose accredited employers associations, employers have the right to choose accredited employers associations that have the support of the majority of employers in the provincial unit. That's section 136(2)(a) Labour Relations Act in that province.

What about New Brunswick? Accredited employers organizations must be chosen and supported by the majority of affected employers, section 46. Also in New Brunswick in section 49, accredited employers organizations can be decertified by a majority of the employers.

Employers in this province don't have that option here. They won't when this Bill receives Royal Assent. You're going to yank that away from them. Just as you won't give workers the right to a secret ballot, you won't give employers the right to choose who bargains on behalf of them.

What about Nova Scotia? Accredited employer organizations must be chosen and supported by a majority of the employers in a geographic area and sector, section 97(3). Accreditation may be revoked by a majority of employers, section 101.

What about Prince Edward Island? Accreditation may be revoked by the majority of employers, section 59; and accredited employer organizations must be chosen and supported by the majority of employers in a geographic area and sector, section 55.

And Newfoundland, accredited employer organizations must be chosen and supported by a majority of the employers in a geographic area and sector. Accreditation may be revoked by a

majority of employers.

How is that the same as what you're going to give this province? What you're going to force on the province? There are so many other differences on this list that deal with matters other than the accredited associations that will bargain on behalf of the employers.

But, Madam Minister, that's when I believe your government started to stumble out of the blocks with this Bill, when your first line of attack on it bore little resemblance to the truth. Because the truth is this Bill is completely different and far more draconian than any other piece of legislation, with the possible exception of British Columbia where the popularity of the NDP there is rivalling the NDP here in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — And so, Madam Minister, and, Mr. Chairman, I'd like you to comment on that. I'd like to give you the chance to stand up and tell us that this is not the same as what every other province in Canada is doing. This is markedly different than what any other province, save British Columbia, is doing in the country.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think what we're seeing here is a reflection of the larger debate the members opposite wish to have. If it was just this Bill that they were raising concerns about, I could be a little more convinced that these details really made a difference.

But during this session, Mr. Chair, they've spoken out against minimum wage, they've spoken out against occupational health and safety regulations, they've spoken out against the Labour Relations Board, they've spoken out against The Trade Union Act, they've spoken out against workers' compensation, they've been in favour of right-to-work legislation. And the member from Redberry Lake who fancies himself the next minister of Labour has called union leaders job killers.

So, Mr. Chair, if I really believed they cared about the finer points of this Bill, it would be a little more worthwhile to have a discussion, and I will get into the jurisdiction by jurisdiction. But I have little belief that what they have at heart is the principles of good industrial relations or the co-operative relationship between employers and employees in a modern economy, Mr. Chair.

I believe what they want is to establish a right-to-work state in which everybody goes back to making the least amount of money possible and worries about being on social security in their old age. And I think that's truly the member's objective.

That being said I will answer the member's question because certainly it's fairly easy to answer them.

You will find that no matter what the legislation, no legislation is identical from province to province. But what you will find is that there are underlying principles that are the same. And in this Bill, one of the principles is that a company cannot be union and non-union at the same time.

The next one is that you have a democratic right to choose to be unionized.

Another one is that unionized employers are at the bargaining table with unionized employees.

And the fact of the matter is every province has a process like that. They may not have a CLR, but in this legislation the unionized employers have the ability, have the ability to draft their own bylaws, their own constitution, to elect their own people to represent them at that bargaining table. And quite frankly I don't see how it gets any fairer than that, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, it can get fairer than that — absolutely it can get fairer than that. It can get fairer than that if you give employers the right that they have almost anywhere else in the country — the right to choose who's going to bargain, their own employer organization . . . (inaudible) . . . Yes, you give them . . . Well the minister chirps from her seat that they get the right to choose. And I guess they do as long as they choose who the government wants them to choose. There's that choice or there's the choice not to have one. And that's a typical NDP choice in this province.

**The Chair:** — Order, order. Now the answer to the previous question was allowed to be heard and I thank hon. members for that. And I ask for the same courtesy as the member for Swift Current puts his next statement and question.

**Mr. Wall:** — That is precisely the problem with this government, is this is a typical NDP choice given to the province of Saskatchewan. You either choose their way — you either choose their way — or there is nowhere to go. So it's a choice of one. That's what this is all about.

And the point that we're making here with respect to other jurisdictions is that employers have the right to choose their own organization. We don't have that here in the province of Saskatchewan.

(1615)

There are several other jurisdictions too that allow — I guess one word you can use is spinoffs. But certainly there's other jurisdictions that aren't forcing unionization in their particular pieces of legislation, as you're doing here in the province of Saskatchewan. New Brunswick, Alberta, Ontario is going to be revamping theirs, we're told, and other provinces in the Maritimes.

There's also no reverse onus clause in so many of these provinces. And you know, Minister, you said in the answer to the last question that you would spend some time answering my question about how you could stand, when this Bill was first introduced, and claim that it's the same legislation as anywhere else in the country when the facts are that it isn't.

You said you were going to stand and address that. You haven't, Madam Minister. You haven't addressed it neither to the members of this Committee of the Whole, nor have you addressed it to the construction workers, and you haven't answered that question for construction employers in the province of Saskatchewan.

And more to the point, on this particular piece of legislation, and on other concerns with our labour legislation here in the province, business groups have said they'd like a meeting. They said they would like to sit down and talk about that issue and other issues.

Not long ago they sat up in the gallery, the Saskatchewan Alliance for Growth, representing literally thousands of families and thousands of small businesses in the province, and told you that they wanted to talk a little bit about it.

And for someone who's based almost her entire argument, or almost all of her rebuttals in this case, on the fact that she's widely consulted on this Bill before it was introduced, we found it passing strange that you didn't have 30 minutes for the members of PIMA (Prairie Implement Manufacturers Association) when they were here, and you appear not to have 30 minutes or 15 minutes for the Alliance for Economic Growth, representing all these business people.

And the Premier himself, the Premier himself, from whom a meeting was requested by these groups, didn't have time. And they simply want to ask the same questions that we're asking. Why did you say things at the beginning of this debate that frankly seem to be contradicted by the facts?

You said you would answer that question in the last answer. You didn't. You sat down before you did.

I invite you to do that again, Minister — to stand up and explain to this House how this Bill is the same as other legislation across the country.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well I have to admit, Mr. Chair, I wasn't totally frank about one thing: in Quebec it is different — it's 100 per cent unionized there by law.

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — The one thing I do want to say is this . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — This Bill, Mr. Chair, makes it possible, if workers choose to unionize, to do that. It makes it possible if employers want to have certain bylaws or certain things in their constitution . . . I imagine if they put forward a resolution, they can even change their name. What's in a name?

The fact of the matter is it doesn't proscribe anything about their organization other than that there will be an organization for collective bargaining. And they elect their members to it; that is totally within their control. It's totally within their choice.

And if the member opposite has some reason for opposing that the owners would have that much choice in what they do, I'm not sure that I can understand that.

The second factor is the reverse onus clause. This clause, which the member objects to, was actually asked for by the employers in the last round of the Bill. Because what it gives them the

ability to do is if they are declared a related employer, it gives them ability to go before the Labour Relations Board and make the case that they didn't spin off for the sake of avoiding their collective bargaining obligations. And this was a clause that those contractors asked for. And so to have the member suggest that we imposed that seems a little unfair, Mr. Chair.

And the fact of the matter is all of the elements of this Bill and even discussions about the CCTA went on for four years. We had a report from Kelleher that recommended some changes to the Bill, some to the CCTA — probably mostly in directions that you would likely not favour. There was an MOU that came very close to resolution, but at the end of the day self-interest prevented some of the players from taking that extra step.

And Mr. Mitchell said in 1998, if they were not able to take that extra step, we would have to do it. And we've done it within the principles of the Canadian Labour Code and the implementation of good collective bargaining in a modern democracy and economy.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister. I think one of the reasons why so many businesses and workers — like the ones I was quoting earlier — have a problem with Bill 59 isn't just with the content of the Bill. I think there's enough there to be concerned about. But I think it also has a lot to do with the attitude of the government and the attitude that they get; these people who are small-business men and women across the province who get attitude from the government.

And the member for Regina Northwest, I think it is, seems to be shocked that I would make that statement. But I can't understand why he would be shocked because I believe he was here in the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, when PIMA . . . when about 12 members of PIMA, the prairie implement manufacturers were in our gallery — concerned about labour issues in the province of Saskatchewan — when we raised those issues on their behalf.

And what was the reaction of the front bench of that member's government? The reaction was to laugh at them. And you know, Mr. Chairman, shortly after that question period I went outside and talked to some of the members of PIMA in the foyer and one of the members . . . Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order, order.

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Chairman, the member from Regina South just did something that the NDP did that very day and they do all too often. He's more worried about votes. They seemingly . . . they only want to respond to people that are going to support them. And if people disagree with them, it's no big deal if they're passing policies that affect their lives in a bad way, Mr. Chairman. That's the problem with this government.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — That's why the people in Wood River said that is enough. But that day . . . and that is exactly the kind of attitude I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman, because they laughed at those members.

And one individual member of PIMA who employs dozens of people in his hometown in his business said to me . . . I asked him what did he think of the proceedings, and he said, well I was disappointed. And I said, well why is that? He said, well I took time off work — I shouldn't be here; I have a lot of things to do — but I took time off work. Maybe I didn't think the government would change its position because of a question period, but he said, I didn't expect to get laughed at. That's what he said, Mr. Chairman.

He saw you laughing. The members of PIMA saw you laughing. Employers across the province see you laughing at them when they come to you with legitimate concerns about legislation that we're supposed to openly discuss. You laughed at them. It's absolutely disrespectful.

The Deputy Premier I believe is the one who said from his chair, well . . . said from his seat, well there's more employees than there is employers. So it just doesn't . . . that's what he said. The Premier doubts it but that's what he said.

And that is entirely the problem, Mr. Chairman, because Bill 59 is further evidence of the fact that they don't understand that without the employers, there are no employees, Mr. Chairman. Without the employers, there are no employees — they don't understand that.

But it's all a matter of votes for the government — it's all a matter of votes for them. The member for Regina South confirmed it today here chirping from his seat. He said well, they don't vote for us anyway. Well, they've got something right, Mr. Chairman — they don't vote for these guys anyway.

They won't be voting in the future for this government because of pieces of legislation like Bill 59. And they didn't vote for the government in Wood River because of legislation like Bill 59. And come the next election, if they continue to introduce draconian legislation like this, Wood River is going to happen across the province in the cities and in the towns, Mr. Chairman.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated in one of her answers that after the Bill is passed, after 59 has received its Royal Assent, she's open to discussing improvements. It's a little like . . . I think, the horse is already . . . will be out of the barn by then. But we'll take her at her word that she's prepared to do that.

And I guess that's the question I have for the minister: when, when, when you start these discussions you say you've committed to have with the industry after you pass Bill 59, will you have a better attitude towards the employers of the province of Saskatchewan?

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that having grown all my life in a family where people's fundamental rights were considered very important, I do believe that what this discussion is about is whether people have the right to that choice. And fair labour relations means that people

have a right to choose whether to certify or to decertify union. And I know the members opposite don't like that, but that's what fair is. It's the choice to do one or the other.

And I want to mention a couple of other people who have commented on this whole situation. In December 12, '96, because the discussion was going on there, former Saskatchewan mayor Cliff Wright said:

Wright opposes double-breasting saying "I think you should decide what you want to be and be it. You either walk one side of the fence or the other."

The other quote which I've been given permission to read from Ross Fraser, general manager of Supreme Steel says:

Supreme Steel Ltd. came to Saskatchewan just over 10 years ago and I'm pleased and proud of our work with the members of the International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron-Workers Locals 838 and 771.

I'm opposed to the views expressed in the CLR article in regards to disruption in the industry. I strongly support the government and the proposed legislation, and look forward to working in an environment where there's a level playing field.

Now I just say that there are many people who feel that way. They just don't spend their days organizing themselves into coalitions. They get on with going to work; they get on with working with their employees, and get on with the industry.

The member talked about . . . You know, I'm just going to take everybody on a little trip through memory lane. Some people may remember Henry Ford who — as much of a big industrialist as he was — had this warm and fuzzy notion that his workers should be able to afford the cars that he produced. And I'm not quite sure where the members are coming from in suggesting that workers don't at least have the right to choose whether they want to be involved in that discussion with their employer.

And the member talks about attitude. I tell you nothing strikes more at the heart of the question of attitude than the last copy of *ChamberLink* which has a sign on the front, "Welcome to ALBERTA — Wild Rose Country." And, you know, I doubt if the Alberta Chamber of Commerce would put the US (United States) border sign saying welcome to the United States, because they know better. And they know better than you know.

Mr. Chair, it is very frustrating to have people who are cheerleaders for another province sitting across from you in the legislature.

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — When the chamber did their report, and, Mr. Speaker, the . . .

**The Chair:** — Order. Order. Order.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Now I read the entire chamber of commerce action report, and it mentioned four things in the *Action Sask* chamber report. It talked about the need to be aware of population growth. It talked about no excuses, no finger pointing, no running to big government for solutions. It said that there's much more venture capital in this province than the entrepreneurs that are demanding access to it. It talks about the positive role that the Crowns play in development of our province. And it also talks about a need for more discussions over labour relations and the role that they play.

So what's the first thing they do in terms of all these issues they've identified? Send out a newsletter about Alberta and form a coalition to attack labour laws — that's hardly the co-operative spirit I think in which the action report made its recommendations.

And if we do want to compare population figures for a moment under different governments and their laws, the fact of the matter is, is during the '70s the population of Saskatchewan grew by 50,000, Mr. Chair; during the '80s, it shrank by 5,000; and during the '90s it grew by 20,000. So I don't think I need to tell the members opposite who was in government.

But probably the most discouraging and disruptive thing, Mr. Speaker, is when . . . I have never in all the time I've been elected — and I know it's only eight years so maybe this stuff has gone on and I just didn't know about it — but I have never seen a sitting member solicit donations for his vote in the House on a Bill ever.

And I'm tabling again this letter from Mr. Randy Weekes asking for donations of a thousand dollars, \$5,000, and \$10,000 to support his anti-union tirades in the House. I have never seen this, Mr. Chair, and this is despicable in the history of legislatures in their practices.

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

(1630)

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was listening with great interest in the minister's response to my colleague from Swift Current. It's interesting that you're comparing us to Quebec — 100 per cent unionization. Well there's another comparison you should think about too, is that we're the highest taxed province in the country. We're only second to Quebec in tax rates. I wonder if there's a connection there.

And also your reply to the lists of a hundred meetings that we've been requesting locations and who you had them with. And I understand you're kind of hiding behind some . . . hiding behind some reason that you can't get these lists of names out.

**The Chair:** — Order, order. Order. Members, order. Order on both sides of the Chamber. The hon. member for Redberry Lake is addressing the minister almost directly across the Chair, and I'm having great difficulty hearing the member for Redberry Lake because of the other conversation. And I thank all hon. members on both sides for the anticipated co-operation in allowing the member for Redberry Lake to put his question.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's interesting to note

that you are having trouble coming up with the list of a hundred meetings. We understand that your officials are busy phoning around the province trying to find someone that you could say that you met with to make up this hundred meetings. I don't believe you ever did meet with a hundred different groups, and that's probably the reason why you can't come up with their names.

The Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and Saskatchewan Construction Association have made a request to have their names taken off your list of groups to be consulted with. And the reason is because they didn't want to be dictated to; they wanted to sit down and have a discussion with you concerning this Bill. And that was not the case and so they asked to take their names off.

Madam Minister, you recently said that this legislation will not affect the mom-and-pop businesses in this province. Madam Minister, will you resign the day that your legislation will far transcend the big construction companies and impact on the mom-and-pop operations in Saskatchewan?

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well I guess the first comment I would make is I don't decide who unionizes, Mr. Chair, the workers decide who unionizes. And a mom-and-pop would only be affected if their workers decided to unionize. And I'm not a union organizer. I don't go out there and do that. That's totally up to those employees, whether they choose to do that.

And the only people who would be affected is people who have been unionized, who have a certification order, and have tried to avoid meeting their obligations.

**The Chair:** — Order. Why is the member for Saskatoon Meewasin on her feet?

**Ms. Jones:** — To join debate.

**The Chair:** — The hon. member from Meewasin wishes to enter the debate. The member for Redberry Lake has the floor now, but certainly I'll recognize you when the hon. member for Redberry Lake is finished.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, you're dreaming technicolor when you say that union workers in this province have the choice of unionization. This whole Bill is about forcing them into a union. Where do you come up with this stuff? I mean this Bill is forced unionization and you know very well that's the case.

Madam Minister, a couple of questions concerning . . . could you tell us how many employers does the CLR represent in this province?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Chair, first of all, I'll say that, yes, I do like to dream in technicolor as opposed to the members opposite who like to dream in black and white.

But the other comment I will make is that we have no way of knowing those figures. The industry has not shared them with us. We have asked them for those figures before. But we have

no way of knowing what the numbers are or how many workers that represents. We just don't know.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. For the record once again, is it your view this Bill is necessary to bring about greater harmony in the construction industry, and if so, can you point out examples of disharmony in this province as far as work slowages and strike action in the last 20 years?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Speaker, disharmony is not only labour conflict. And I have to say that our government and our labour relations department have a very good record of intervening early where there's conflict, and I think that our rate of settlement of any kind of conflict is second in Canada. So certainly we don't generally have a history of the kind of concern that the member is speaking about. So I don't think that we can compare it to an environment that normally is kind of 95 per cent peaceful in the labour relations area.

But what I will say to the member is that he would be blissfully unaware of the tensions because he hasn't been part of the hundred meetings that have gone on to try to resolve these issues. I can tell you that it has been very heated. I can tell you that people are very dug in in their positions.

And at the end of the day, as Minister of Labour, it's my responsibility to come down on the fundamental principles of good industrial relations and the ability for people to effect the choice to unionize and the ability for people to know that if they're part of a union company, that it's a union company, and if they're part of a non-union company, it's a non-union company.

And this has got to do with the same law, so any of the companies you're talking about that would go anywhere else in Canada would work under the same kinds of laws, because although the dots and t's and whatnot might be a little bit different, the fact of the matter is fundamentally these laws are the same everywhere in Canada.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. In your news release announcing the amendments to the CCTA and so on and so forth, you made a big deal about instability and tension in the workplace. And you just have to show some proof of any instability and tension, any concern out there at all. There was none whatsoever. None whatsoever.

I mean, and I said this before, the only instability and tension was created by your spin doctors, and really we don't see any justification in making that statement.

And, Madam Minister, when the current Act was passed your government thought it wise to grandfather those companies that spin off companies. Now you think it's bad. What's changed between 1992 and today that makes you believe that you have to pull the rug out from under construction companies in this province by changing rules they have lived under for nearly two decades.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well, one of the reasons why this Act was reopened was to resolve the issue of the REO (representative employer organization), which is something that the non-unionized and potentially unionized contractors wanted

very much because they wanted to be able to be sure that were they to be unionized, that they would be represented at the bargaining table. So that is one of the reasons why this Act was reopened.

The other one is, as you know, subsequent to the Act in '92, the Crown Construction Tendering Agreement was put in place to make up for the fact that some companies had the right to — under the grandfathering clauses — to exist both union and non-union, and it was creating an unlevel playing field for the post-'92 contractors and for the contractors who never did the spin-off within their companies.

So there was two reasons for doing that and we could not contemplate ending the CCTA without restoring the basic fairness that necessitated the CCTA. And certainly it was the comment of the employers that if we intended to continue the CCTA, that there would be war.

Well apparently no compromise works in this environment, they're determined to fight no matter what; and the fact of the matter is, just because you've had the benefit of 17 years of having it all your way, does not mean that it isn't time for a little justice.

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Minister, incredible answer. Is it your view that these companies are not playing by the rules you set down in 1992?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I'm sorry, I must be a little deaf; I didn't hear that question.

**Mr. Weekes:** — My question's concerning the so called spinoff companies. Were they not playing by the rules set down in 1992?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I think the belief was then that there would be a limited number of spinoffs and over time this problem would take care of itself.

But I want to . . . just a second, I have a document here that'll help clarify the situation. Here it is here.

What happened, in Ontario in 1995, there was a case of a major company that revealed that they had 32 different spinoffs operating under one company.

And I would guess I would ask the member opposite what logical and legitimate reason can he think of that a construction company would need to have 32 spinoffs to conduct its business, if their objective, if their objective wasn't to avoid either liability or collective bargaining obligations.

And what we found out was a problem that we thought would take care of itself because there would be a limited number of spinoffs, turned out to be untrue. There was an unlimited number of spinoffs. So there was an endless ability to run away from your obligations on a, on a . . . on just spinning further and further out.

So I would say to the member, this is why the grandfathering

didn't work.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Well for the record again, Madam Minister: how many new spinoff companies have been created since 1992 that were contrary to the provisions of the current Act?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I'll just be very clear about this, Mr. Deputy Chair. They haven't been allowed since '92 to create more spinoffs, but there was a whole bunch of spinoffs sitting on the shelf, so to speak, that became part of the grandfathered spinoffs.

And nobody ever knew how many companies were on that shelf. But apparently a great deal of effort was put into storing away for the winter a number of numbered companies that could be used for spinoff purposes.

And to this day, we don't know how many are on that shelf. But the case in Ontario in 1995 by one of the same companies revealed that there was 32 spinoffs on that shelf.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Mr. Chair, Madam Minister, how many complaints have been filed with the Labour Relations Board regarding the illegal establishment of spinoff companies?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I'm not sure what the member's speaking to because there hasn't been illegal spinning off. What there has been is spinning off with the intent of avoiding collective bargaining obligations. And because it's legal has not made it right.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Well then how many were there that did that?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — We would have to check with the Labour Relations Board to get that information.

Now if what you're talking about is cases involving related employer, there have been a few related employer cases. But no cases specifically on the question that you asked that I know of. We would have to ask that question.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister, Mr. Chair. How many certification applications have been made relating to these non-union spinoffs since 1992?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Again, that would be the same as asking me what happens on the court docket. I don't keep data on what happens at the Labour Relations Board. But certainly where data is available, we can seek to get it for the member.

But I know in general terms how many certifications and decertifications there is per year, but I can't sort them out by industry.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Could you also find out how many unfair labour practices have been filed by employees of these companies since 1992?

And if I could go on, you've talked a lot about the hundred meetings that you've had, and again, we're asking who you had these meetings with.

But on two occasions now, your government has an opportunity

to discuss with the industry and the public: one is the debate that the North Saskatoon Business Association invited you to as well as the Saskatchewan Party, which you declined; and again, the Alliance for Economic Growth invited the Premier to a meeting to sit down and discuss this Bill.

Is there any way that you, as the representative of the government, could put off this Bill for six months or a year until you've fully informed the business community of what's going on?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Deputy Chair, there's no question that people can pretend whatever they want about the discussions that have been going on for the last four years.

But there have been intensive, extensive discussions that my deputy's been involved in, that special consultants have been involved in, that I've met with people. And the fact of the matter is just because, just because you don't do what someone wants you to do, does not mean you haven't heard them.

(1645)

I have said to the member opposite, I'm aware of what the competitive issues are, I'm aware why people are reluctant to give up this slightly advantageous position that they have over some of their colleagues in the industry — I understand all of that.

But the fact of the matter is they were given many opportunities. As Mr. McLachlan says, they were close to signing an MOU. They didn't make it down the home stretch and so today we are doing what we're doing. And there is no further debate that's needed because extensive consultation and discussion was held.

And we're debating today in the House and if people want to tune in — they've all got TV sets — I'm sure they can do that. But the fact of the matter is, is there was probably more patience and effort put into trying to get the parties together around this. And I urge you to not be part of creating division, but to encourage those employers to get real about sitting down and discussing these issues in a realistic way with the workers that are affected in this industry.

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister, Mr. Deputy Chair. I'd like to go back to the spinoffs. Could you provide us with documents that would demonstrate the example of unlimited spinoffs, that you so confidently declare, that takes place in Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — We don't know the exact number. I only know the number from the case that went through the Labour Relations Board in Ontario.

But I will give you an estimate from former Saskatoon mayor, Cliff Wright, who is also head of his own unionized construction company, who says that spinoff companies hold more than half of the total construction market in Saskatchewan. And that's as much as I can really venture, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Minister, but if you're throwing out the number 32 you must have some proof or some documentation to warrant that number. Could you provide us with that?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well I would say that that isn't the issue. The issue is whether or not people have the choice whether to unionize or not and whether a company can operate both union and non-union at the same time. Those are the issues.

I think that the research involved in the case in Ontario cost over a million dollars, and it's very complicated to look through a complex corporate web of spinoffs and shell companies and whatnot. And certainly we haven't undertaken that research.

But the fact of the matter is that . . . I guess if we had stronger laws for corporate disclosure, it would be a little easier to know these things. And certainly if the member would like to propose such a Bill that would be a very useful thing to do.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Minister, you've just introduced a Bill which is based on spinoffs and everything around spinoffs. You don't know how many there are. How can you introduce this Bill on information that you don't know or don't have? Or you just made this up or what?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I'm not sure with knowing how many of anything has to do with anything. It's about whether you've got . . . it's about whether you've got the right to unionize or not. And it's about whether a company can be union and non-union at the same time? And if there are no spinoffs as the member is suggesting, then I guess no one has a problem.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Well you keep bringing up the right to unionize, and it's incredible . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** — Order, order. Members on both sides of the Assembly, I know there are very strong feelings on this Bill. But we are getting into a dynamic in which when the member of the official opposition speaks, there is interruption from the government side. And when the Minister of Labour is speaking, there is interruption from the opposition side. And I just want to urge all hon. members to give the speaker the opportunity to be heard on the floor and also by those listening in the gallery.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. You keep making the comment about the right to unionize or the right . . . what about the right not to unionize? You've kind of missed that in the whole equation. Workers should have rights. We believe they should have rights. And you've got this . . . you've brought this law in to take away the rights of workers, whether they want to belong to a union or not. That's the issue that we're discussing.

If workers want to unionize. and they are given a secret ballot and vote they wanted to join the union, that's great — but they have the right to make that choice. So I'm not sure where you come from when you keep talking about the rights of workers. You've taken the rights of employers away. You've taken the rights of workers away with this Bill.

They have no right not only not to have a secret ballot with this Bill, but they're not even allowed to sign a certification card,

which is under the present rules. They have no rights. You are forcing them into a union whether they like it or not. And on what pretence? That there are all these spinoff companies and these bad, bad companies are having these spinoffs and hurting their workers. It's all nonsense. You don't even know how many spinoffs there are, let alone make some statement that just because they're non-unionized that they're bad in some way.

Madam Minister, was your Bill reviewed by the Economic Development department for comment about the economic damage it is going to do, and if so, can you table any comments made by the Economic Development department about the effects this Bill is going to have on the construction industry in Saskatchewan or the economy as a whole?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll try to go through — or, I mean, Mr. Chair — these things in an orderly way.

There is the same right to unionize that there is to de-unionize. The right to certify requires exactly the same number of votes as the de-certification. Exactly the same number. That's the law and if the member can't read it for himself, I guess I could come over and read it to him. But the fact of the matter is, the same rule exists . . . I'm sure that would be a rather sociable encounter.

Now the next thing I would say, Mr. Chair, is that this affects only workers that are in a company that has been unionized. And I take the member back to the example, Mr. Deputy Chair, if you signed a contract with a person and then they subsequently moved all of their finances and whatnot over to a separate company to avoid obligations that they had with you under the first contract, I don't think the member would agree with it. And I'm not sure why he agrees with it in this situation.

On the question of forced unionization, I'll take the example of IPSCO. That's a unionized company. If you go to work at IPSCO, it's a unionized company. If you work at IPSCO, you become a union member. IPSCO accepts that, the steelworkers accept that, most people accept that. That's been the law in Canada for . . . probably since 1944 or earlier in terms of the Canadian Labour Code.

And if the issue of how many spinoffs there are or aren't is such an issue, then I invite the member opposite to tell me how many there are, because that number seems to be very important to him.

But the fact of the matter is, it isn't about how many there are, it's about whether you can be union and non-union at the same time, and it's whether workers have a right to choose to join a union or to choose to decertify their union. And certainly the member is very much in support of the rights to decertify, but he seems to be less in support of the rights to certify.

And I really don't know what else I can say to you on this because it's fundamental to industrial relations in this country.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Well the point about certification and decertification, I don't know where you're getting your information. You should know this information.

When a group wants to decertify a union, even if there's a 100 per cent of them has written a statement wanting to decertify, they still have to vote. When you certify a union, they are not given the opportunity to vote. It's just sign the card and take it for granted that it was done without coercion. They don't have the right to vote when they certify.

That's our point. They should have the right for a secret ballot to vote whether to join a union or not.

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — And it really brings up the question is why these spinoff companies have not been unionized. Well I suggest that there's been an attempt to unionize them. The reason they're not unionized right now, because the workers in those spinoff companies don't want a union. What other reason could it be?

The union has total access to the employees. If they want to certify they . . . I'm sure they will try. That's their right. And it's also the right of the worker not to unionize, but the problem with this law is that they said no to unionization so you're going to force unionization down their throat.

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

**Mr. Weekes:** — Now, Madam Minister, do you still contend that only the three large construction companies in Saskatchewan will be affected by provisions of Bill 59?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I've never speculated, Mr. Chair, on a number.

And I will remind the member opposite that when he's talking about whomever these companies are — and they know who they are much more than I do, Mr. Speaker — the fact of the matter is you are talking about companies that were already certified. A vote already took place amongst their employees. And these were certified companies, just in the same way that the health sector is a certified unionized work environment.

Now the fact of the matter is, is that some of these spinoffs don't even have workers because they were created simply as a legal entity to avoid collective bargaining obligations, and as soon as there was any attempt made to unionize that entity, people simply moved operations to a new entity.

So in fact there's an unlimited number of these entities who have no useful purpose. I do ask the member to be fair about this and explain to me why any legitimate company needs 32 spinoffs to do construction?

**Mr. Weekes:** — Well, Madam Minister, if those workers at those so-called spinoff companies want to unionize, what's to stop them? I'm just saying the reason they're not unionized is because they don't want to be unionized. That's the basic principle in the work force — if they want to unionize, they have the right. I don't agree with the rules that exist but today they have the right to do it if they want. But they're not being unionized. That's the point.

Will you acknowledge that the terms of several, province-wide,

collective bargaining agreements in the construction industry for subcontracts are delivered by terms of those agreements?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — There would be a very limited number of situations where what you're describing would apply. Now, if a non-union subcontractor was part of a work project where there was such a provision, the only requirement would be that for that project itself they would be required to pay the same level of wages and benefits. But there would be no requirement for their company to become unionized, nor for their workers to become unionized. And after that project ended, they would go back to doing what they do however they do it.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. As these three companies employ the vast majority of subcontractors who will now be subject to terms of the collective bargaining agreements, how can you say these small independent mom and pop companies will not be affected?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well what the member is implying, Mr. Speaker, by his comments, is that these companies have been indulging in spinning off, and that in fact they do believe that they have collective bargaining obligations and that they do believe it will affect their contracts.

That being said, I'm not sure what the member would like me to do about the fact that people will have to meet their obligations. And there are only three trades areas where there's any requirements on subs — that's electrical, sheet metal, and iron workers.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, this Bill states that the minister shall designate the representative employer's organization. How does the minister go about making this decision?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Currently, the REOs are designated in legislation but there can be application for designation of new REOs. But there has to be substantive reasons to fragment the bargaining in the industry.

And sometimes if a new trade comes on board, a trade that hasn't really been prominent before due to perhaps changes in technology, changes in what's considered a trade — then there would certainly be consideration of a new REO. But certainly the goal is to minimize the number of REOs that multiply in the trades area.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, I would like to come back and ask questions later, but at this point give other members an opportunity to speak.

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. Mr. Chair, I have a few remarks to make and a few questions for the Minister of Labour on this very important Bill.

Mr. Chairman, it's important to clarify this issue because after all the incorrect information that we've heard from the opposition benches, it's time to state again for the record, the intent of and the necessity for this very important piece of legislation.

First I want to go through a little bit of history, because we've

heard such a jumbled variance of stories that I'd like to see if I've got it straight. And I'll ask the minister to confirm that.

Saskatchewan introduced construction-specific legislation in 1979 when 75 per cent of the construction work was performed by unionized contractors. At the time it was thought that legislation was needed to counterbalance the influence that a highly unionized industry had.

(1700)

In 1983 the Devine government repealed the entire construction industry Act with the effect that collective bargaining effectively disappeared, Mr. Deputy Chair. Each time the union attempted to bargain, the company would spin off into a non-union firm to avoid their obligations. If the union successfully organized the spinoff, they would spin off again, creating a moving target.

And it's interesting that the member across the way keeps on saying, well if they want to be union why don't they unionize? Well they had, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, organized many spinoffs, only to be left with another spin and a moving target.

The other effect was that spinoffs would bid on the same job as the union parent company. Not paying union wages allowed a lower bid, and we can all guess which firm got the job and at whose expense, Mr. Deputy Chair.

Workers were forced to leave the province to find decent work. Union membership dropped to an all-time low, and where that might please the members across the way, that meant that many of those workers were no longer in this province and there was no construction workers to be had.

And perhaps most importantly, the valuable work done co-operatively by unions, employers, and government in-training apprenticeship and journey person programs nearly came to a halt.

The exodus of skilled tradespeople had a huge negative effect on the economy of the province, as did the reduced purchasing power of those who remained. Now that our economy is booming, and some would even describe it as sizzling, the lack of skilled tradespeople from the '80s is still very apparent. And it's very alarming.

In 1992 the government acted on recommendations of the Construction Industry Advisory Committee, which was made up of members from the Saskatchewan building trades unions and unionized contractors, and passed legislation governing the unionized construction industry.

Spinoffs that occurred prior to 1992 were left in place, so that although further spinoffs were prevented, companies were still free to place two bids on the same project — union and non-union — with virtually the same effect as before. Today less than 25 per cent of construction work is unionized.

The government, however, wanted to ensure that employees were treated fairly on Crown work sites and negotiated a contractual agreement between seven Crown corporations, the employers' representative organization, and the Building Trades

Council.

Although it was a negotiated agreement between the parties, the CCTA met with a great deal of criticism. It wasn't good enough for some of the industry to get their fair share of work; they wanted it all.

In addition, the non-unionized employer systematically set about to undermine and infiltrate the CLR. Two unionized contractors, who also operated non-union spinoffs, challenged the provision which prevented their membership in the REO on account of their non-union interests.

Now tell me what could be more unfair than non-union employers having sway in the bargaining process of unionized construction firms. In addition, there were attempts to raid the REO and have the SCLRC designated as the REO.

Mr. Chairman, clearly something had to be done, and so it is being done in a fair and responsible way.

Now, Madam Minister, is my history in this correct, and is the reason for this Bill to level the playing field and restore stability and fairness to the system?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I thank the member for her question and for the, I guess, the historical reminder. I would say that you're right — in about 1984 is when these changes really started to take place.

And I do say to the member that asked the question, as well as the members opposite, that this comes out of the history in the corporate world of trying to avoid liability. And what occurred, Mr. Chair, is that this principle of avoiding liability by creating shell companies or spinoffs was transferred into the labour world to avoid collective bargaining obligations.

And certainly you did have the situation where a spinoff could bid against themselves. Of course that would be unfair competition because you would have knowledge of what monies you had to pay under a union contract and therefore would be in a very good position to underbid yourself because you would have full knowledge of what the costs would be under a unionized bidding environment.

In fact some of the employers who have complained to me about this Bill have complained about that very fact. I had actually forgotten about that. They complained about the fact that the people with the spinoffs are able to underbid because they know what the figures are that the unionized contractors have to put into their bid packages.

And certainly this issue of the lack of the journeymen has been brought to my attention. In fact one of the things that was interesting to me in discussion with the trades that they raised is that Aboriginal people haven't done very well in this non-unionized environment, because one of the things the union shop does is that make sure — and I guess I would have to hope that the members opposite would be legitimately interested in this answer — they make sure that a tradesperson moves around to enough different jobs to get all the parts of their ticket that are required for the experiential parts of their journeymen's ticket.

When a tradesperson gets locked in with one employer, they aren't moved in an organized way through the various jobs in the various trades in order to get their ticket. Because in this kind of profession, on-the-job training and apprenticeship has always been very much part of the tradition throughout history of how the trades made sure that skilled people got trained and developed in the industry. So it was a matter of great pride amongst the trade unions that they made sure that their apprentices moved in a smooth way through the process of getting all the stuff they needed for their ticket. So I thank the member for reminding me of those things.

And certainly the employers who have not had the ability to spinoff and the employers that had a close enough relationship with their unionized workers to feel it was unethical to spinoff have certainly been at a competitive disadvantage.

**Ms. Jones:** —Thank you, Madam Minister. Now the members opposite have been doing quite a number this session, Mr. Chairman. They've taken a piece of legislation that affects only the construction industry, and they've used it as launching pad for the most heinous attack on working men and women that this province has ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the Assembly of some of the remarks made recorded for all time in *Hansard*. The member from Redberry Lake on June 12, 2000, and I quote:

... Why don't you pick up the phone and talk to them instead of your union leader friends who are job killers.

Job killers, Mr. Chairman, that's a pretty awful thing to say.

The Leader of the Opposition on May 30, 2000, and I'm quoting him:

... Why are you trying to turn Saskatchewan into Cuba North, a labour dictatorship?

What a hateful thing to say, a dictatorship indeed.

And it might help, although I doubt it, if the member from Redberry Lake informs himself, in fact I think I'll do that for him. That the pension funds of unionized workers amount to hundreds of billions of dollars, and the vast majority is invested in Saskatchewan in Canadian companies that employ Saskatchewan and Canadian workers.

There are also 26 labour-sponsored venture capital corporations in Canada. Far from being job killers, Mr. Chairman, they are job creators.

Mr. Chairman, the members opposite have adopted into their vocabulary the liberal use of "f" words. First we have the "f" word forced. Days and days and days on end we hear about forced, forced amalgamation which was never the intent of this government. I see I must have thrown a stone in the dark and I hit a whole pack of dogs which is never the intent of this government or the discussion of this government or of the task force.

And then the opposition carries on in the same vein with the catch phrase of forced unionization which is not the effect of

this Bill or the intent.

Another little "f" word they like to use describes the opposition tactics. I like to use is fearmongering, fearmongering, Mr. Chairman. They pepper their speeches well with threats of businesses moving. We've all listened to them chirping over there, really hitting a chord with these people — chirp, chirp.

They pepper their speeches well with threats of businesses moving with innuendo and the possible effect, and you should listen up to this because the way you've been treating our First Nations people, you'd want to know about this. The innuendo — innuendo — on the possible effects . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** — Order, order. Order.

**Ms. Jones:** — I'd like to remind the Assembly that unions have been at the forefront in supporting self-government for First Nations people, for negotiating provisions in their collective agreements to include and provide job opportunities for Aboriginal workers in the North and in other workplaces, and have diligently worked against racism and for equal opportunity and harassment-free workplaces.

And the Leader of the Opposition on May 24, this year, has the nerve to say, and I quote:

... now they're also attacking business in Saskatchewan  
... they're attacking the workers in these businesses ...  
they are attacking First Nations people in this province . . .

I say shame on you for your fearmongering.

It's worth mentioning here, Mr. Chairman, that the party which claims to be the defender of First Nations people is the same party whose leader just two weeks ago in Saskatoon called them, "an economic liability." Shame.

And here's a new one, Mr. Chairman. The member from Humboldt now wants construction workers — and I assume young people too, trying to pay for their education — to work for less than minimum wage. Is there no end to their attack on working people?

Now I can understand it if none of them have any firsthand knowledge of the labour movement and what it's like to go to work every day. I have no control over your life or your terms and conditions of employment. And I can understand if they've never tried to imagine what it's like to live in a body covered with a skin that isn't white. But I can't understand — I can't understand — why they'd be opposed to governments and to organizations who try to do something to give these workers some control and some dignity.

This is a democracy, Mr. Chairman, and those who own the means of production and those who sell their labour coexist in this democracy and each one of them have their rights.

But not according to the member from Redberry. According to him, only employers have rights. And not only that, to maintain those rights, the member says that they should donate \$10,000 and that'll help them maintain their rights.

Bill 59 is about a level playing field for all construction firms in Saskatchewan.

**The Chair:** — Order. Order, order, order. Order, order. Members on both sides will come to order. Order. I thank you, members.

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bill 59 is about a level playing field for all construction firms in Saskatchewan. It does not mean that companies cannot operate non-union. It does not mean that companies cannot operate as union companies.

What it says is, you can't do both at the same time. And that's fair, Mr. Chairman, because you should have learned at an early age that you can't have your cake and eat it too.

Mr. Chairman, this government has done much to turn this province around since '91. The free-spending, freewheeling, right wing policies of the previous administration left us with a crippling debt and an economy in a terrible state of depression. We have worked very hard to restore confidence in the economy, and it shows.

We must continue to invest our energy and our resources in this great province and encourage employers and workers to work not against each other, but with each other, co-operatively, to keep this province the best possible place in which to live and to work.

Madam Minister, is there anything in this Bill that would prevent the parties from co-operating in that fashion?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I thank the member for her question.

And for the benefit of all the members, I'd just like to tell you that in my discussions with the fellow I mentioned who's the president of one of the major companies from Alberta, I did make a commitment with him that we would bring players from the industry together to talk about the real and practical issues facing the industry today. And I would hope that we would be able to get the kind of factual and open discussion in those meetings that will make sure that we're all working in the best interest of the economy.

But I have made that commitment also to the tradespeople in regards of making a peaceful transition through whatever discussions will take place following the legislation.

But certainly I think there's a willingness by many members to do that, and to bring examples from other areas of how this can work. And we're certainly interested in sitting down and discussing that together.

**Ms. Higgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Madam Minister, over the last just about three months that we've been sitting in this legislature through the session, we've been subjected to countless uninformed speeches, incorrect representation of facts, and seemingly endless tirades by the members of the opposition as to the evils of working people and unions in this province.

These opposition members have little or no understanding of the history of unions or the work that they undertake on a daily

basis — not only to ensure workers in this province achieve a liveable wage to support their families, but to do so in a safe, hazard-free workplace. That lack of knowledge and understanding by the opposition has been obvious, not only in their remarks concerning Bill 59, but it's also been glaringly obvious in the anti-worker legislation that's been tabled by the opposition in this session.

Now a lack of knowledge I can understand, and that can be corrected through information. But even more frightening is the thought that this is a direct attack and a guided attack on the workers of Saskatchewan.

(1715)

I've been a union member for the last 20 years. I've been on organizing drives to help facilitate educational programs, taken union-sponsored educational and developmental programs, and held many offices within the union. And, yes, I have walked the picket line in support of unionized workers. Mr. Chair, I make no apologies for supporting workers, nor for being supported by workers — both union and non-union — because, Mr. Chair, that's who I am and that's where I'm from.

Working people built this province and they will continue to make a huge contribution. Working people — they are the backbone of our society and each makes their own valuable contribution.

In the anti-worker legislation tabled by the members opposite, they talk about wanting a secret ballot for certification votes. When we join a union we already vote. We vote by signing a card. Signing a card, Mr. Chair, putting your name on a card, takes a great deal of conviction. It's a serious decision that's not taken lightly by anyone.

Throughout the discussions on Bill 59, the members opposite talk about life being just fine in the construction trades as it is, that we don't need our legislation to be the same in Saskatchewan as it is throughout the rest of Canada. They've made statements referring to 1983 when the Devine government began allowing construction companies to operate both union and non-union arms.

Labour harmony during those years was how it was referred to by the member opposite. And to give a little more proof of that statement, he said that there hadn't been a strike in the construction industry for about 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I was active in the labour movement during those years, and I'm not sure what he considers labour harmony, but it sure wasn't evident from where I stood. There's a lot more to workers, unions, and labour harmony than whether or not there's a strike in progress.

Occupational health and safety, quality of work, job security, pensions, apprenticeship, on-the-job training, and just your basic being treated fairly, are naming but a few concerns.

Mr. Chair, over 96 per cent of all contracts negotiated are settled amicably in a negotiated process. Less than 4 per cent will ever see drastic strike action.

Mr. Chair, workers across Saskatchewan that I've spoken to are in favour of this legislation. With the passing of Bill 59, they look forward to fair and consistent working conditions, legislation that is comparable to other Canadian provinces, and an end to double-breasting.

Madam Minister, we've heard members opposite state that non-union workers within the construction industry earn higher wages than unionized workers. What effect will the amendments have on them?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — That's a very good question, Mr. Chair, because certainly, although it's not the only factor that causes people either to join or to decertify a union, it's certainly clear that wages and benefits are part of the package.

What I will say is those choices are in the hands of the employer and the employees, whether that's in a non-union environment where the employer makes their offer of wages and the employee decides whether they want to accept it or not, or in the unionized environment where they sit down at a table and negotiate that.

But certainly if an employer that has been non-union becomes union, and wants to pay his employees those higher wages that he's got, certainly nothing would prevent him from offering to do that.

**Mr. Yates:** — Mr. Speaker, many of the members on this side of the House, for the last number of weeks, listened to the members opposite talk about this government's relationship with the working people in the province and their relationship with unions, Mr. Speaker, and so on and so forth. I'd like today to talk about some of the comments that the members opposite have made.

I'm reading from the April 26, 2000, *Hansard*, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the member from Redberry Lake says:

Clearly this government and this Labour minister doesn't realize the chilling effects its labour laws has on the new investment in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Indian Head-Milestone on June 12, 2000, says:

... one of the hardest things to keep business going and improving in our province is some of the labour legislation that we have in our province (that we have to endure) ...

Mr. Speaker, clearly, clearly, against not just The Construction Industry Labour Relations Act, 1992 but clearly against all labour legislation that creates a fair and equal playing field for working people in this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the comments on May 24, 2000, made by the member from Rosetown-Biggar, the Leader of the Opposition:

... that's the last thing we need in Saskatchewan is for this minister to chase more businesses and more people out of the province of Saskatchewan. And yet that's what Bill 59 would do. It would encourage more businesses and their

workers to leave the province of Saskatchewan ...

Mr. Speaker, referring to Bill 59; it will do just the opposite, Mr. Speaker — create an environment of good jobs for young people in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just make reference to a couple of other comments made by the member from Redberry Lake:

I'd like to remind the minister that the alliance (the Saskatchewan Alliance for Economic Growth he refers to) represents three-quarters of all businesses in Saskatchewan. They are all job creators. Why don't you (pick up and phone) pick the phone up and talk to them instead of your union-leader friends who are job killers.

Mr. Speaker, they have no interest in creating a fair environment for working people. They have only one interest and that's to advance the agenda of big business in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one other comment before ... it's from the member from Swift Current:

Businessmen and women who simply could not abide the labour environment in the province of Saskatchewan under the NDP government. This Bill and all the attendant issues and red tape and regulations that have been foisted onto the business community by this government, be it through Workers' Compensation, occupational health and safety, or other various pieces of labour legislation (has driven) too (many) businesses ... out ... of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, they don't just dislike this piece of legislation, they dislike any labour laws that are fair to working people in this province.

And last but not least, the member from Humboldt:

I have been informed by Kirsch Construction of Middle Lake that they have approximately 15 to 18 men on their payroll. They have 20 to 30 men waiting to work. These people are willing to work for less than minimum wage as long as they work. If it were not for labour legislation put in by your government, we could have construction firms (doing the work at lower wages).

Mr. Speaker, what's this about? It's about not wanting working people to get ahead. It's about wanting businesses to make greater profit.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read into the official record what I found most disgusting about this last two and a half months of debate on this issue. It's a letter, a letter from the member from Redberry Lake. And I'm going to read the entire letter into the record, Mr. Speaker:

The non-unionized construction industry in this province is under siege (it says). It is time for you to stand up and be counted in defence of your business.

As you are no doubt well aware, the Liberal/NDP coalition government has brought in dramatic changes to provincial

labour legislation that will affect your business. For years non-unionized construction firms have been penalized by the NDP's union preference Crown Construction Tendering Agreement. Now they have pushed ahead with amendments to The Construction Industry Labour Relations Act that will force a vast segment of the non-unionized construction industry to unionize — whether they want to or not!

The Saskatchewan Party has taken a firm stand in opposition to this. In his May 9, 2000 press release, Saskatchewan Party Leader Elwin Hermanson noted the incestuous (I note the word incestuous) nature of the government's relations with the union executives.

The NDP got about \$300,000 from the unions to fund their election campaign last year," Hermanson said. "Now the NDP is paying the unions back, no matter how many workers and families they hurt. Forced unionization equals more union members equals more union dues equals more money for the NDP. It's as simple as that."

The Saskatchewan Party is committed to fighting . . . (it's not a very clear word, Mr. Speaker) for fighting these changes. But we cannot win this fight alone. We need your help to stop the destruction of the non-unionized construction industry. We need you to be just as determined and just as committed to this political battle as the union executives who are pushing the other side of the agenda are.

Your generous donation to the Saskatchewan Party will have a direct and measurable impact towards bringing down this government that has been so hostile to you and your interests. I urge you to take a moment now to consider what you are willing to do to contribute to this fight.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Randy Weekes, Saskatchewan Party Labour Critic.

And it goes on to say:

Please find enclosed my contribution to getting rid of the Liberal/NDP union-preference policies.

And they're asking for contributions of 1,000, 5,000, or \$10,000, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the middle . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** — Order, order. Order. Members on both sides, now . . . Order. I don't know exactly how to say this so . . . I don't know exactly how to say this. We have guests who have been in the galleries for, in some instances, four hours on very hard benches. Guests . . . guests . . . Order. Guests who have taken the time to see democracy and see both sides of this debate, as is their right, and I think that all members should allow these people the opportunity to hear what is going on as well.

**Mr. Yates:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have seen and heard over the years many, many debates between political parties on

philosophy, but never once have I ever heard of a fundraising technique where you drive a wedge between working people and their employers to try to defeat a government while you're debating a Bill before the House.

You have every right to go out and raise money outside the House but to use the issues in the House to raise money, to fundraise, to drive wedges between working people and their families is the most despicable — the most despicable — act I've ever seen in my political life.

(1730)

And, Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Labour is: Madam Minister, could you please explain to the members opposite why this Bill creates a sensation or a feeling of fairness among workers and among employers in this province, and how it helps young people get jobs in this province?

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll try to do this quickly because I know the time is passing but I do want to go back to a little bit of history.

You know there was a time, there was a time in this country when people actually took up arms against each other in these kinds of discussions. And I have to say that the most right-wing governments in the United States and other places eventually decided that fair labour laws were needed in order that people could have a democratic and peaceful resolution of the issues and the economy so that we could have a successful economy and get on with the business of having jobs, making money, and going to the beach on the weekend for those that could afford it.

And these were not people who ideologically believed in unions. These were people who understood that that fundamental right was important to be able to create peace in the workplace and that people did have a right to a say in their working conditions, their safety, their training, and their conditions of employment.

Now what is particularly chilling to me is, the member who is saying that this Bill will create discontent and disruption is busy sending faxes out creating that and manufacturing that discontent. Even to the point of sending it to people who it will not affect at all. And if the member wants to know where the division is coming from, he can look at no further than himself if that disruption occurs.

And, Mr. Speaker, he can sit there and smile about how humorous it is that he's creating this unnecessary conflict. But the fact of the matter is, is people of good intent in this province who have always co-operated, I think will get together, and we may have to bypass the troublemakers who hope that this will create disruption.

I will point out, just again from a historical perspective, that our labour laws were more or less the same in the '70s. At that time the economy was hotter than it's ever been and the province grew by 50,000 people. During the '80s — I don't need to remind you who was government — the economy went flat as a pancake and 5,000 people left the province.

Again since the rebuilding has occurred, we've gone back to an A credit rating. The fact of the matter is we've grown by 20,000 again. And I think that history speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, in terms of where labour law fits into growth of the economy.

I want to read a quote, Mr. Chair. This is from a clothing plant that just recently opened up. It's actually an Alberta garment manufacturing plant that is adding 50 jobs to Saskatoon. And what Adrian Bussoli, the vice-president and partner in this company, said is:

"One of the benefits here is that the plant is unionized . . ." (He said) "Taxes are competitive, and we looked at that as well."

Now this is an outside person, an outside company from Alberta who, despite the doom and gloom and the negative cheerleading from the members opposite, has still decided to overcome all that and still come to Saskatchewan because the taxes are competitive and they are enjoying the benefit of having a unionized plant here.

And I have a question, I guess, for the members opposite, is: why is it that this employer seems to be comfortable with this and you aren't? It's a very difficult question.

The other thing that I'm going to mention is that the member, in his preamble to his question, he mentioned the member from Humboldt. And I have to say I was particularly alarmed that that particular member raised that. Because again the small history lesson — the original reason for the minimum wage . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The minimum wage didn't used to apply to men — it used to only apply to women. And the reason it only applied to women, it was considered the minimum amount of money to keep a woman from living off the avails of the street.

And to have the very member who claims to be concerned about these things speak against a minimum wage being a proper standard, I would be happier to hear her speaking for an increase in the minimum wage — not for removal of the minimum wage. And so I have to be more than a little bit upset with someone who doesn't understand the relationship between poverty and the things that people do to survive.

And I just want to end in my responding to the question, Mr. Chair, with . . . First of all I want to talk a little bit about . . . The member that was speaking previously, talked about our interest in economic development. And I want to talk about this for a minute because we have put a great deal of taxpayers' money, including unionized taxpayers, into the diversification of rural Saskatchewan.

The fact of the matter is in regards to manufacturing labour, the costs in Canada and in Saskatchewan are 30 per cent less than in the United States. We have higher productivity and dedication in our workers.

**The Chair:** — Order. Order. Why is the Opposition House Leader on his feet?

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Chair:** — Please state your point of order.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe it's inappropriate in this House to have a beverage container that clearly identifies a customer or a company. If that could be removed, please.

**The Chair:** — It's gone now? Okay, I'm unaware . . . I'll assume that . . . Order, order. Order. Thank you.

The Opposition House Leader raised a point of order about a beverage container, and it is in the rules of the Assembly as recently passed that discreet beverage containers are allowed. If the hon. member saw some advertising, that's inappropriate, and the matter has been taken care of.

So I thank the Hon. Opposition House Leader.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was worried that Z99 had become verboten.

But anyway what I would like to continue talking about is, the fact is that Saskatchewan's manufacturing corporate tax rate is 10 per cent compared to the United States federal rate of 34 and Canada's average rate of 22 per cent. We offer a 15 per cent research and development income tax credit. Many of our municipal governments offer rebates on municipal taxes. There has been literally hundreds of thousands in loans to this industry. They get an investment tax credit of 6 per cent for manufacturing and processing. We provided legislation to protect the small manufacturers from the large equipment companies. We passed that before Christmas.

Since 1996, there's been over \$2 million in government dollars spent on training grants with over a thousand people trained. There has been over 300,000 recently to develop export opportunities.

And I would think, Mr. Chair, that that speaks volumes to our commitment to diversification. And to suggest that the absence of a second vote on certification destroys the merit of all that effort on diversification, I find cheap in the extreme.

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I welcome the opportunity to put some questions to the Minister of Labour. And may I say that in my brief political career I started out as the seatmate of the hon. member for Humboldt, and I've now after a few peregrinations around the Assembly, I seem to have landed beside the Minister of Labour.

And while I don't entirely understand everything that's going on my life, may I say that if I have to choose between being the seatmate of someone who does not believe in the minimum wage and someone who does believe in the minimum wage, I'm pleased with my new digs.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — As you know, the Liberal Party has not always agreed on labour matters with the New Democratic Party. However, we also find ourselves very much distinguished from hon. members opposite when they tell us that they are opposed to any unions and they are opposed to a minimum wage.

So while I must confess that I don't always find myself in 100 per cent agreement on all labour issues with the NDP, on the other hand when I hear hon. members opposite saying that they're offended at the concept of minimum wage, well like I say, it gives me a lot more comfort about sitting beside the Hon. Minister of Labour, and I just wanted to tell you that. I knew that would make you feel so much better. How you feel about sitting beside me is something I won't ask you, Mr. Chairman.

However, if I may pose a question to the Minister of Labour. As you said, there are faxes going around the province suggesting that the legislation before us today is radical and a departure from the norm in this province and across Canada.

So I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Labour, as I understand it, the prime purpose of the present legislation is to end double breasting, which is defined as companies which simultaneously run unionized and non-unionized branches.

And my question to the Minister of Labour is in what other provinces of Canada is double breasting allowed? Is this a radical departure from Canadian practice that we say that you will not be allowed to have union and non-union branches of the same company. Do other provinces in Canada allow this practice or do they not?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I'm very pleased to answer this question, and I would say I've had considerable legal counsel on it, and the fact of the matter is that, in law, there is no place else in Canada that allows this. There is one jurisdiction that's silent on it and that's New Brunswick. But there's nowhere else in law that double breasting is legal, including Ontario.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Now the next question I have, Minister of Labour, is that these faxes that are floating around the province at present also suggest that this legislation not merely ends double breasting for the large general contractors who have union and non-union branches operating simultaneously, but that this will also force unionization on all the other construction companies in the province which are not double breasted, which do not have a union . . . a union branch.

So I want to ask the Minister of Labour, what does this legislation . . . how does it affect companies which are not double breasted, how does it affect unionization of those companies beyond the normal rights of certification which have existed in this province for at least 60 years?

So does the passing of this legislation have a direct impact on those companies which are not double breasted?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you for your question. Mr. Chair, the only companies that would be affected by this legislation, and that's only if someone takes forward a case on this, is companies that have existing certification orders. If a company is an independent company, it affects them not at all unless they were to be part of a certification drive, and their employees decided to be unionized, which is the normal process for every business in the province.

So there would not be anything unusual happening in regards to

those businesses.

Just to give a little further comment because I have a bit of a quote here from the Ontario labour board. It just speaks to the case I mentioned earlier from 1995. It says:

Ontario labour law prohibits unionized companies from setting up new non-union companies in order to get out of their collective bargaining obligations.

And I just say that as another affirmation of the laws being the same. And during their recent review of their legislation, they did not change this provision.

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, if this legislation does not affect companies which are not double breasted, which truly are stand alone and independent as opposed to sidebar operations of a company which is already under certification order, then can I ask how will this legislation affect — or does it affect non-unionized companies to bid on subcontracts?

(1745)

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — No, it would not affect their ability to bid on subcontracts. If there is a clause in one of the three union agreements I mentioned, they may in fact have to pay at the same level of benefits that are at the standard for that job. And one of the reasons why that's done, Mr. Chair, is to create harmony in the workplace, because it's very difficult to have people working side by side doing the same work, that aren't paid at the same level.

As you will understand, that was one of the issues when the many different workplaces were brought together in the health sector, to bring all of the employees at the various levels up to a common standard within their bargaining units.

So these companies would not become unionized for a particular contract. There might be a situation, but that would then be reflected in the money they received for doing that work. And they would not become union nor would their employees become union, and their status would remain the same after the project and they could bid on that project as well.

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Labour. Simultaneous with the announcement of this amendment, which is before the House this afternoon, was an announcement that the Crown Construction Tendering Agreement was being terminated and would not be renewed after December 1, 2000. And I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if that commitment is renewed this afternoon and what was the necessity of the six-month time lag between this amendment and the end of the CCTA?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Because this legislation, Mr. Deputy Chair, doesn't directly predict the outcome of the legislation, it was thought that a transition period was needed for the legislation to take effect because there will be a question of whether certifications are brought forward and how that affects the competitiveness. Because the primary purpose of this Bill is to deal with competitiveness and fairness issues, there has to be time for that to take effect before the more artificial mechanism of the CCTA that was put in place is terminated.

So certainly it would be our hope that six months is adequate. We're not sure that it is. A longer period might have been better. But we're hoping that this would be adequate to the transition.

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Mr. Chairman, in my other role, I am aware from my own department, that there are many projections which say that this country and this province are likely to face labour shortage, especially in areas of skilled labour, within this decade.

And so of course what we all want for this province is that workers, whether they have asked for the protection of a union or not, that they are working, they are earning money in a prosperous environment and a strong and healthy work environment, which we are told there is every reason to expect we will have in this province in this next 10 years.

And of course some of our friends opposite claim that this will throw the construction industry into chaos and turmoil and, I believe, shut down the province; I think the word World War III was even used.

And so I wanted to ask you in regard these hysterical comments from people who can't reconcile themselves to minimum wage laws, I wanted to ask the Minister of Labour, what in your view will this legislation do or what impact will it have on the primary function, which is simply having this province working, having business doing business and workers working, and skilled tradespeople remaining and earning good livings in this province?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well first of all, Mr. Deputy Chair, I'd like to commend the members of the construction industry as there are many un-unionized firms who have — or non-unionized firms — who have been taking a very active role in apprenticeship in the province and have a good program in place for bringing Aboriginal workers into apprenticeship.

And on the other hand, so have there many unionized, as I mentioned earlier in my example, have been meeting and setting up a project with 15 trades for Aboriginal workers and apprenticeship as well.

But it would be my hope that all construction companies are committed to the development and maintenance of a skilled workforce because everybody benefits. Those workers are going to be working in a number of environments.

Now most of the trade unions set aside a portion of the member's union dues to pay for apprenticeship programs, and unionized employers also contribute to apprenticeship programs.

The construction labour relations association, which is the representative employer organization, sets aside part of the fees it collects from its members to fund training programs for construction workers. So we have examples in the non-union sector of people doing training for apprentices, and we have examples in the unionized sector.

And we of course last . . . was it last year? Oh, it must have been the year before because I was minister of Post-Secondary

then — we did set up an apprenticeship commission which has representatives of labour, of business, of all the players in the industry. And certainly their common goal is apprenticeship and we don't see no reason why that spirit of co-operation wouldn't continue.

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister of Labour for that question. And as she knows, one of my particular responsibilities is to make sure that we as a province do a better job than we have in the past at ending the marginalization of our Aboriginal people and making sure that they will be full participants in our workforce and in our economy.

Now some of the hysterical facts as going around this province suggest that this legislation will compromise the ability of Aboriginals to access workforce placements in this province. And I would like to ask the minister if there is anything in this legislation which should deter Aboriginal people from finding their proper place in our work environment and in our economy.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Because of the importance of this question, Mr. Deputy Chair, I'm going to read a fairly detailed answer in because I think it is one of the most important questions that we have to deal with in Saskatchewan today.

And there's really two scenarios. If a general . . . and I would hope the members are interested in the answer because it does affect Aboriginal people greatly. A general contractor hires northern or First Nations subcontractors. If the general contractor is non-union, it can hire any individual or subcontractor and be subject only to the terms of the lease or management agreement or the human resource development agreement. And we do stipulate in many of those agreements that there must be attention to Aboriginal employment in business development.

If the general is a union contractor, individual workers would then be required, as you would in a health district or anywhere else, to become a union member within 30 days of starting the job and the subcontractor would abide by the terms of that agreement, applicable to that trade, for the duration of that project.

The construction collective agreements contain a provision that require all subcontractors directly or indirectly hired by a contractor to perform work within that jurisdiction and scope of the agreement. Now no individual or subcontractor is prevented from working on a project as long as they meet the terms of the project.

There's nothing in the surface lease agreements or human resource development agreements through which northern preference is subordinated to union contracts and hiring provisions within those contracts.

Now if a construction company enters into a joint venture with a northern or First Nations construction company, as some companies do to assist in accessing the work, the non-Aboriginal company is typically the major partner in the joint venture and manages the project. The capital input of the Aboriginal company is limited, but it shares the profits. The objective of these joint ventures is job creation and training for

northern or Aboriginal people.

A separate company may be contracted to hire employees for the project. The obligations are contained in the project agreement such as surface lease agreements or forest management agreements.

The workers are employees of the joint venture and the status of such companies is a little bit unclear at the moment because, as I mentioned earlier, they can be exempted from ITA provisions because of their affirmative action efforts.

But I would just repeat again that none of this is embedded in legislation in Canada. It tends to be effected through surface lease agreements, contracting and tendering, and other types of management agreements that exist for the purposes of development in Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — One thing that puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, and I don't know if the Minister of Labour can speculate here or help me out, but my understanding is that Mike Harris of Ontario has this same legislation that we are bringing in this afternoon.

Now my understanding is that Premier Harris did a review of the legislation and decided it should remain in place. Now from my reading, Premier Harris has not been known to lead a fanatic, left-wing, socialist, pinko, Bolshevik government. His reputation has been somewhat on the other end of the spectrum.

Now I realize that the new member for Wood River has compared this government unfavourably to the now deceased, unlamented, former dictator of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu. Now I can see his understanding that he considers that we are running a brutal Trotskyite dictatorship. I understand that that's where he's coming from. But I don't think he would say Mike Harris is another Nicolae Ceausescu clone.

So my question to you is, if this legislation is acceptable in Mike Harris's Ontario, why is it so far-out and radical and Bolshevik in this province?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. I'm happy actually to be able to refer to the press release of the Ontario government on this matter. This is a press release directly from the communications department of the Ontario government. It says:

Legislation which would improve competitiveness in the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional construction (ICI) sector and lead to stronger economic growth and job creation in Ontario was introduced today by Labour Minister Chris Stockwell.

I know you like that name.

The reforms contained in the Labour Relations Amendment Act . . . fulfil a Throne Speech commitment to improve and modernize labour relations . . .

It goes on to say that:

"Everyone in the construction industry agrees that something needs to be done to make the industry more competitive, flexible, and responsive to local needs," . . . "The solution developed by industry is reasonable and realistic, and is in the interest of both . . . (union and non-union) employers. I am very pleased that we have been able to come up with a consensus that is reflected in today's legislation."

Now, the one thing I want to remind you of is the quote I read from this, and then I will make a further comment because I know what the members are getting at. It says:

Generally, Ontario labour law prohibits unionized (employees) . . . from setting up new non-union companies in order to get out of their collective bargaining obligations.

But what they agreed to at the table, when they had a process that worked out a little better than ours did, is they agreed that if there was a competitive issue in a particular agreement, they could go back and decide to suspend some of their agreements for the term of that project.

Now that is an issue that can certainly be worked out at bargaining tables if the parties agree that there is a true necessity. There have been instances of that. But fundamentally, they just decided not to change their labour law in order to accomplish that and they decided to keep in place the prohibition for unionized companies from setting up new non-union companies in order to get out of their collective bargaining obligations.

And why did they do that, Mr. Deputy Chair? They did it in the interests of both unionized workers and unionized employers and non-union as well. So this was a consensus that was reached. I think it was a very mature decision from the point of view of labour relations in Ontario, and I wish the members here could find it in their hearts to be as progressive.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Mr. Chairman, the suggestion that the Saskatchewan Party should move far to the left so they can catch up with Mike Harris is certainly an interesting concept, but maybe one they can take to heart.

I want to thank the minister and her officials for their answers this afternoon, and I think I've had some inquiries and I'll pleased to relay these messages to the people who have contacted me. And may I say that I think the minister has very clearly and carefully answered all questions I put to her except the one about whether she appreciated being my desk mate.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and Madam Minister. I'm happy to be able to stand and ask some questions regarding the Bill.

And my first question is the president of the Building and Construction Trade Council is Mr. John MacLeod, and I would like you to tell the Assembly what is your relationship to Mr. John MacLeod.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. John MacLeod and I aren't related.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — I didn't ask if you were related. I asked what your relationship to him was.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I discussed it with his wife and we agreed that John and I wouldn't have a relationship.

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

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Mr. Chair, Madam Minister, is Mr. MacLeod an adviser or resource person in the department?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. MacLeod is a frequent visitor to the gallery. But no, he in no official way advises me any more than Manley or any one else does. He is simply one of the people who is involved in the industry.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Madam Minister, why would the minister introduce Mr. MacLeod as a resource person to the media at the department March 14, 2000 media event?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I would have to say that I introduced no one to the media. So whoever it was making introductions, it certainly wasn't me, and I certainly wouldn't have used that term.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Madam Minister, Mr. Chair, I understand you did at that meeting. And my final question is what makes you think, Madam Minister, that workers inside a union are the only people working? What does that say for the rest of the people in Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Deputy Chair, even though I've taken great pains to explain that my role as minister is to create a fair bargaining environment for good industrial relations in the province, where people have a choice to be unionized or a choice not be unionized much as they do in Mike Harris's Ontario, I do not know why the members are trying to paint me as being only in favour of the one. I have said repeatedly I am in favour of people having the right to a choice.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to just respond to the member from North Battleford when he's comparing Saskatchewan to Ontario and so on and so forth. I have some information right in front of me here.

Ontario has an associated or related business of legislation, section 1 of the Labour Relations Act, no reverse onus clause. Employers have the right to choose accredited employer association that have the support of a majority of employers in the provincial unit, section 136 of the Labour Relations Act. And accreditation can be revoked by the majority of employers in provincial unit, section 139. And also Ontario allows a vote for certification of a union.

Madam Minister, as I have said before, this Bill states that the minister shall designate the representative employers organization. In fact you have struck from the current Act, section 5(1), 5(2) and 5(3). Can you tell us what the particular section is entitled in the current Act and what your amendments

will do?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Could the member repeat his last question. I really couldn't hear it. I maybe should get a headset from the . . .

**Mr. Weekes:** — I will, Madam Minister. You have struck from the current Act, section 5(1), 5(2) and 5(3). Can you tell us what the particular section is entitled in the current Act and what your amendment will do?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I'll just start with the first question now. I did mention earlier, so I'll just repeat that the reverse onus clause was requested by the employers. This was not something that we decided to put in there. So this was something they saw as an additional protection for them to the arguments they could make before the Labour Relations Board. And that was in the Bill in '92 as well.

The second one, we're unclear about whether you were asking about certification. We're just unclear what your question was.

And the third one was . . . the reason why 5(1) and 5(2) were removed is because they were no longer needed because the REOs are designated in the Act.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, you were striking out the section entitled the "Rights of unionized employers." For the record, can you give us the gist of what rights this section gives to those unionized employees?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I think there's some confusion. These provisions are about employers, not employees . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well that being clear that this is about the employers. Because the REOs have been designated in legislation, this provision just isn't needed.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Section 5(1)(b), I find particularly interesting. It states: ". . . employers have the right to bargain collectively through an employers' organization of their own choosing."

Why do you see fit to take this right of association away from employers in this province?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I think the best answer I can give to the member is the main complaint of the non-unionized contractors was that they wanted to have the right to be in this organization. And so now that the legislation clears up who's union and non-union, given the processes that will subsequently take place if people so choose, then the fact of the matter is, is the representative employer organization is open now, as they wished, to all unionized employers. And that's what they wanted and that's what they've got.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. I think the point is, after the court case it was ruled that these non-unionized employers could join this bargaining group. So you've taken the approach that you unionize everybody in sight instead of just allowing them the right to appoint their own representative.

Under this legislation you have the power to appoint any organization you see fit regardless of what a majority of the

employers or any employers think. Is that true?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — In the case of where there's a request for a designation, we certainly have contact with the employers and with the representatives who have been representing that trade before and get their opinions on whether there should be a new REO. And again, there has to be sufficient reason for splintering the representation provided in order to set up a new representative employer organization.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister, Mr. Chair. The CLRA is now codified within the legislation as a permanent body. This is the first time organizations have actually been written into the legislation. Does this simply mean that the employers have absolutely no ability, if this Bill passes, to alter their representative organization without you, the minister's approval? And why do you feel taking away this freedom of employers to choose their own employee representative is in the best interest of Saskatchewan public?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Maybe it would help if I was a little more specific with the member about what these REOs are. For example, the Boilermaker Contractors Association of Saskatchewan bargains with the boilermakers. The Canadian Automatic Sprinkler Association bargains with the sprinkler-fitters.

The Construction Labour Relations Association of Saskatchewan Inc. bargains with bricklayers/tilesetters, carpenters, cement mason/plasterers, electrical, elevator constructor, glazier, insulator, ironworker, labourer, millwright, operating engineer, painter, plumber/pipefitter, roofer-labourer, roofer-sheet metal, sheet metal, and teamster. And in that particular REO the employers appoint their representatives as they do in all others, but I just want to make that clear.

Then there's the pipeline contractors, which is the labourer-pipeline operating engineer-pipeline, plumber/pipefitter-pipeline, and teamster-pipeline. And then the Saskatchewan powerline transmission contractors, who bargain with the electrical-powerline transmission workers.

So those are the five different REOs and who they bargain with.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Can you tell us if any of these provisions in this Bill would have an effect on the situation which brought about the lawsuit between PCL and the CLRA and a lawsuit which PCL won?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I think this solves the problem and is in compliance with what the court directed and the outcome of that.

**Mr. Weekes:** — So you're saying, Madam Minister, that this law, this Bill will really circumvent that judgment and will have no effect on it then?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — No. This provision implements that judgment and confirms and puts it into effect.

**Mr. Weekes:** — By unionized ... and all the companies associated with it.

I understand that the PCL wanted to join the association even though it was a non-unionized company, so if you've unionized everyone that's the way of compliance?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — No. What it specifies is that any unionized company would be eligible for membership as part of the organization that bargains with unionized employees. And certainly if it is determined that they are unionized, they would certainly have a seat at that table.

And it is not up to the organization to decide if they're unionized or not. That would happen in the course of whether their certification is in effect.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, will the workers at the companies which the Labour Relations Board finds to be double-breasted companies be given the usual choice to the certification rules whether or not they become a part of a union?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Companies that have already been certified but spun off to avoid collective bargaining obligations, if it is confirmed that they are a related company and they are in fact certified, then they would be unionized because they always were unionized. They simply were avoiding their obligations under that.

If in fact there is no relationship then they would not become unionized, and if there's no certification order they would not be unionized. And so this is no different than the process that exists for any other unionized workplace in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Minister, can you explain your statement that this Bill will not force workers to unionize — only the companies they work for?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — This is very straightforward. If you're a health worker and you work for a hospital that has a union, and you go to work for that hospital where there's a union, you become a member of the union there unless the employees in that workplace take a vote and decide to decertify. And this is no different.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Minister, will workers who freely choose not to become union members be required to pay union dues?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Again as the workers in the health sector, if they become part of a unionized workplace, pay union dues, then yes everybody who's part of sharing the benefits that have been achieved by that workplace certainly are contributing members within that context.

But this is not anything that the Bill imposes. This has to do with whether there's a certification order and whether the employees choose to remain certified and not to decertify.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Will workers who are laid off, even for a short time, be forced to join a union if they want to go back to work?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — In the same way that if you want to work for the hospital and that hospital is unionized, yes. If you work for a private care home and it's not unionized, the answer

is no. And I use these examples because people have experience with them and they're easy to understand.

And so they do have the choice to work for a unionized or non-unionized contractor. But if they work for a unionized contractor, part of the rules is you become part of the organization that you've joined. And if a sufficient number of people join who wish to be certified, they certainly have that right as well.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister, Mr. Chair. In a given year, what percentage of construction workers would you say are laid off for short periods of time?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — That's impossible, Mr. Deputy Chair, to answer because some projects last two years, some last two weeks, some last three months. The important thing is that people are part of a process that moves them back into another job, and so that there can be as much continuity of employment as possible.

And I think aside from that, there's just no way of knowing because every project is specific to the needs of that project.

(1815)

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister, Mr. Chair. How many workers do you estimate will be added to the union rolls in the first year of this legislation, the first two years, and over five years?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — We would have no way of knowing that, Mr. Deputy Chair. That's up to whether the company is certified and how many employees that company has. That company may have some employees, no employees — it depends what that company has.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair, Madam Minister. So basically if an employee wants his job back, he's forced to join the union. Would you call this a voluntary choice, other than the choice to make a living?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — It has been a long-standing tradition everywhere in Canada that if you become a member of a unionized workforce, you then become a union member.

However, if you and your other colleagues who have joined a unionized workplace — understanding that it's unionized — choose to decertify, you also have that right because this is a choice that people have. And people can also choose to go into business for themselves. They can choose to go work for a non-union employer. And this was a choice that many unionized employees had to make when they lost their right to be unionized. They had to decide whether they were prepared to work non-union in order to work.

So this is a choice that employees have traditionally had to make ever since the beginning of labour law in Canada.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. So if a person decides they will not join the union under your forced unionization provisions, how can you deny that you as minister, the author of this Bill, is denying that person the right to earn a

living in this province?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I will reaffirm again and again and again for the member that this Bill is about choice, it's about democracy in the workplace, it's about democracy in the economy. And it is no different than a hospital worker, a schoolteacher, a firefighter — whatever you choose to mention. All of these groups have a requirement that when you become part of their profession in a certain workplace that you follow the pre-existing conditions in that workplace. And this is no different.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Regarding new section 18(2), what is the purpose of this section?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — This basically says that if your employer was to become unionized while you are working for them, but you had joined them while you weren't unionized, you wouldn't be penalized and lose your job as a result. So this is actually in support of that employee that perhaps you're talking about who finds it unbearable to think that they might be unionized.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Minister, in fact it basically takes away the employer's right to run his or her firm as they see necessary. It precludes any layoffs caused by increased costs brought on by this Bill. Is that correct?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Again, the only employer that would be affected is one who had a certification order. So this should be no surprise to that employer. And in fact, they have not incurred any of those costs during all of the time that they have avoided these obligations.

And certainly they can still lay people off by whatever method they have done before, which is totally arbitrarily. But the fact of the matter is this will not change that till they come to the end of that particular contract.

**Mr. Weekes:** — So, Madam Minister, do you foresee greater costs for companies under this provision then?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — The only way that one could see greater costs is if their suppliers who supply the equipment that they use raise their costs, much as farmers complain about with fertilizer and whatnot.

It might happen if they negotiate an agreement that improves some benefits for their employees. But that's certainly legitimate. It might happen if they had bad weather during a project and it ended up adding to their costs.

I mean there's many ways that people's costs can be added to, but none of them are predictable. But if you're in a unionized environment, they are certainly negotiable.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. We have obtained figures from the construction industry. I'd just like to read some of them into the record, Madam Minister. It shows that many of the open shop rates pay higher wages than the union rates.

I'd like to start with the trade carpenters probationary

apprentice receiving 8.25 an hour; open shop, average of 13.21. The journeymen — union rate, 18.59; open shop, 18.71. Metal sheet probationary apprentice — union 9.50; and the open shop, up to 13.29 is the average.

And electricians probationary apprentice — 8.85, union hour rates; open shop, \$12 average. Labour, unskilled — 8.98, union hour rates; open shop, 10.30 an hour. Operator, probationary apprentice — 12.06, union rates; open shop rates, \$25 an hour. Journeymen — union hour rates, 24.12; open shop rates, \$34 an hour.

Then it goes on to include pensions, benefits, so on and so forth. Under the carpenter — union, they pay \$1.40 for the pension; open shop, 1 to 3 per cent with an additional 3 per cent paid by the employer.

Benefit package — union, 70 cents, and in most cases paid by the employer . . . I'm sorry, in the open shop, most cases are paid by the employer to a maximum of 18 cents per hour.

Apprenticeship training — union, 15 cents; open shop, paid by the employer. And so on and so forth.

Madam Minister, not only the wages are more in the open shop, or at least equal to, and by suggesting this is not the case you've been calling the employers liars, which I certainly do not believe they . . . the case to be.

In fact, the increased costs stem from the onerous employee terms brought on by union rules; costs stemming from the time lost due to onerous, and in fact the silly rules that are placed in some union agreements. Do you believe these types of things will add great costs to the bottom line of employers?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well I guess I'll just spend a little bit of time on the member opposite's logic. If in fact the non-union employers are paying such higher rates, then in fact with the elimination of the CCTA, the cost of doing projects should go up because they're paying so much more. And so when they don't have to use union firms, perhaps the costs will increase for tendering projects because the wages are so darn good.

But the other point I will make is — as hard as the member works at putting words in my mouth — the fact of the matter is it is always up to employees to choose whether they want to be certified, to be decertified. Certainly wages would be part of their consideration but it's really up to the employer and the employee to come to that determination, and it is not the role of the minister to either sit in judgment on it or to advise them to do one or the other.

**Mr. Weekes:** — I think the point has to be made, Madam Minister, that it's . . . under the union rules it's a lot of inflexibility, inefficiencies because of the silly rules that they have to abide by.

You believe these employers should not have the right to try to keep their companies solvent by cutting costs, including the costs of staff. You force these costs on the employers and you magically expect them to make up for them within thin air. Isn't that what you're basically saying, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Deputy Chair, we missed the thin air part of the question. But I will say that all of the matters that the member is raising are really matters between the employer and the employee, and matters for the bargaining table.

And if people are not satisfied with those rules, certainly the changes to the legislation which gives the employers representation at the bargaining table, certainly gives them the ability — and I presume the fact that they wanted representation at that bargaining table — suggests that they anticipate being at a bargaining table otherwise they wouldn't need it. Suggests that they will have an opportunity to have those discussions and hopefully everybody is going to go to those tables concerned about economic development, concerned about keeping jobs in Saskatchewan, and keeping everybody employed.

So I think if all of us work in that common effort to encourage people to go to that table — which they have argued they have a right to be at — then those issues will be dealt with. But that is not up to me to determine.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister, Mr. Chair. So in one fell swoop in this Bill you've taken away employers' rights of free association through free choice of the representative organization, and the choice of workers whether or not to support a certification drive. Do you believe this is fair?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Most of these REOs have been around forever; the CLR only since 1992. But I have to say that they have their own right to their own bylaws, their own constitution, their own choice of the members at that table. And I'm sure at some point if they chose to they could change the name and we would be supportive of that. But the fact of the matter is, is this is just a name for an umbrella that they have total determination and control over, and I'm really not sure what their problem is.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Madam Speaker, many believe this is just a punitive action on the part of your government to get back at the industry for the pressure they have placed on you by strongly opposing your unfair CCTA policy. Can you give us some evidence to suggest otherwise?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I think I explained to the member early on that there was two things that . . . well three things actually that prompted arriving at this point. One of them was knowing that the CCTA was about to terminate and that there was still unresolved issues that had caused the CCTA to exist in the first place.

The fact that under the basic principles of labour relations in Canada we had a situation of unfairness, both in terms of the choice to belong or not to belong to a union but also the competitiveness issues of employers who didn't have the ability to spin off because they were past the grandfathering clauses. So there was a level playing field issue.

And in my view, in order to solve the related problems of the CCTA and the other problems in terms of unfairness and an unlevel playing field, it was my determination that it was my responsibility — as Bob Mitchell indicated in '98 — that given that the industry couldn't, as they did in Ontario, get sensible and get to the table, that we would in fact have to deal with

making a decision on this ourselves.

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chair, in closing I'd just like to sum up the points that have been made and the points that construction industry — and workers I might add — have been making to us that this is an unnecessary forced unionization. That not only have you forced unionization on the employees, but you also forced association on the employers of this province.

Forced unionization, not only you still don't give them a right for a secret ballot, but even the right under today's regulations, to sign a certification card to join a union. They will be forced to join a union. And when they're not part of the union, you will still make them pay their union dues. When they're laid off and come back to work in the new season, they'll be forced to join the union or else they'll have to get employment elsewhere.

And unfortunately you've left the door wide open for other companies from out of province to come in and take the jobs from Saskatchewan workers — unionized or non-unionized — because of this policy. And unfortunately more people will be leaving this province, going to provinces like Alberta when they can . . . Those companies come back to this province, bid on jobs, and get contracts because of the less cost of their open-shop policies, and take more jobs away from Saskatchewan people as well as the loss in tax revenue because of this situation.

And unfortunately you haven't proven to me or anyone on this side of the House that this isn't anything other than a fundraising campaign on your party's policy . . . position to pay off the unions and to get their support for the next provincial election.

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the member for his questions. I do wish that he may have shown more leadership in the consensus that's going to be needed following this process. Because of course one always has a choice whether to be a leader of co-operation or a leader of division.

And I would just say that he's on very shaky ground on the fundraising proposition, given the letter that was tabled that he sent out.

(1830)

And with that in mind, I will just say that under this Bill, of which I received many more letters from workers regarding their desire to have this legislation than I did from workers who were concerned about it — and I guess it was a lot harder for the employers to get their employees to write those letters — but I would just have to say, Mr. Deputy Chair, that I've done my best to, within the principles of industrial relations, to answer these questions. And I thank the members for their questions.

The division bells rang from 6:31 p.m. until 6:41 p.m.

Clause 1 agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 27

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

#### Nays — 23

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Draude	Boyd
Stewart	Eagles	Wall
Bakken	Bjornerud	D'Autremont
McMorris	Weekes	Kwiatkowski
Brkich	Harpauer	Wakefield
Wiberg	Hart	Allchurch
Peters	Huyghebaert	

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

The division bells rang from 6:43 p.m. until 6:53 p.m.

Clause 2 agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 27

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

#### Nays — 23

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Draude	Boyd
Stewart	Eagles	Wall
Bakken	Bjornerud	D'Autremont
McMorris	Weekes	Kwiatkowski
Brkich	Harpauer	Wakefield
Wiberg	Hart	Allchurch
Peters	Huyghebaert	

#### Clause 3

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to propose an amendment. My amendment . . .

**The Chair:** — I'm sorry. I had a second conversation going on. I simply want to thank members . . . our guests in the gallery for honouring the parliamentary rule of non-participation that has been honoured almost without fault all day. I just wish to ask for your continued co-operation in not participating in the proceedings here, and that includes non-applause and

non-voice.

Again, I do want to thank the gallery for their co-operation and continued co-operation.

Now the hon. member for Redberry Lake, would you please repeat or whatever . . .

**Mr. Weekes:** — I'd like to propose a — like to thank you, Mr. Chair — I'd like to propose an amendment. My amendment goes to the heart of clause 3 where the minister has taken all the power as far as designating a representative for the construction industry. And I believe that this amendment will give back some democracy to the employers. And our amendment speaks to allowing the employers to have a majority vote whether . . . to determine who they would like to bargain on their behalf.

And I'd like to move this amendment, clause 3 of the printed Bill. It reads:

Amend Clause 3 of the printed Bill by repealing clause 2(m) as being enacted by *The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000* and substituting the following:

“(m) ‘**representative employers’ organization**’ means an employers’ organization that is:  
 (i) recommended to the minister by a majority of all employers who are parties to province-wide agreements for the respective trade division; and  
 (ii) designated by the minister”.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Yes, Mr. Chair, I'd like to speak against this amendment.

Essentially the right that the member opposite is referring to exists within every trade division and so there would really be no substantial effect of the amendment he's proposing.

**The Chair:** — Order, order.

The division bells rang from 6:58 p.m. until 7 p.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 23**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Draude	Boyd
Stewart	Eagles	Wall
Bakken	Bjornerud	D'Autremont
McMorris	Weekes	Kwiatkowski
Brkich	Harpauer	Wakefield
Wiberg	Hart	Allchurch
Peters	Huyghebaert	

**Nays — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford

Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

The division bells rang from 7:02 p.m. until 7:02 p.m.

Clause 3 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 23**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Draude	Boyd
Stewart	Eagles	Wall
Bakken	Bjornerud	D'Autremont
McMorris	Weekes	Kwiatkowski
Brkich	Harpauer	Wakefield
Wiberg	Hart	Allchurch
Peters	Huyghebaert	

The division bells rang from 7:05 p.m. until 7:07 p.m.

Clause 4 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 23**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Draude	Boyd
Stewart	Eagles	Wall
Bakken	Bjornerud	D'Autremont
McMorris	Weekes	Kwiatkowski
Brkich	Harpauer	Wakefield
Wiberg	Hart	Allchurch
Peters	Huyghebaert	

The division bells rang from 7:09 p.m. until 7:09 p.m.

Clause 5 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 23**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Draude	Boyd
Stewart	Eagles	Wall
Bakken	Bjornerud	D'Autremont
McMorris	Weekes	Kwiatkowski
Brkich	Harpauer	Wakefield
Wiberg	Hart	Allchurch
Peters	Huyghebaert	

**Clause 6**

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also have an amendment. And this amendment also speaks to the right of employers, by a majority, to pick their own representative employers association. And again this will take the power out of the minister's hand.

Amend Clause 6 of the printed Bill as being enacted by section 10.1 of *The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000* by striking out "designated pursuant to section 9.1, or designated by the minister pursuant to section 10,"

I so move.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Yes I'm going to speak against the amendment and it's not merely out of being disagreeable, Mr. Deputy Chair. But the fact is that we have given effect in this provision to what the employers requested in their court case.

They requested to be at the table and they now have that right. They have the ability to do their own constitution, their own bylaws. They just have to submit it to the department.

They elect their own people. They elect who represents them. Everything that they wanted in that particular situation is in this Bill.

The division bells rang from 7:14 p.m. to 7:24 p.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes

Kwiatkowski
Wakefield
Allchurch

Brkich
Wiberg
Peters

Harpauer
Hart
Huyghebaert

**Nays — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

The division bells rang from 7:26 p.m. until 7:26 p.m.

Clause 6 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 7:29 p.m. until 7:29 p.m.

Clause 7 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude

Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 7:31 p.m. until 7:31 p.m.

Clause 8 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 7:34 p.m. until 7:36 p.m.

Clause 9 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 7:38 p.m. until 7:38 p.m.

Clause 10 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

**Clause 11**

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have an amendment. This amendment really speaks to the heart of this Bill. It's concerning how . . . basically concerning forced unionization.

The minister has hidden behind the comments that the companies are unionized not the employees. And this amendment deals with the proper way of certifying workers if they choose to form a union. But right now they're not even allowed to vote to join a union, but also with this Bill 59 they've even taken away their right of signing a certification clause.

And I'd like to move this amendment:

Amend Clause 11 of the printed Bill:

(a) in subsection (1), by repealing subsection 18(1) as being enacted by *The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000* and substituting the following:

“(1) On the application of an employer or a trade union affected, the board may declare a company unionized only after a proper certification proceedings are followed and no union organization may take place without a vote by the employees affected”; and

(b) in subsection (2), by repealing clause 18(4)(b) as being enacted by *The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000* and substituting the following:

“(b) are bound by a designation of a representative employers' organization designated by the minister pursuant to subsection 10”.

I so move.

The division bells rang from 7:42 p.m. until 7:42 p.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

**Nays — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

The division bells rang from 7:44 p.m. until 7:54 p.m.

Clause 11 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 7:56 p.m. until 7:56 p.m.

Clause 12 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch

Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 7:58 p.m. until 7:58 p.m.

Clause 13 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 7:59 p.m. until 7:59 p.m.

Clause 14 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner	Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Julé	Krawetz	Draude	Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles	Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud	Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes	Higgins	Yates	Harper
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer	Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart			
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert			

**Nays — 24**

The division bells rang from 8:01 p.m. until 8:01 p.m.

Clause 15 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

**Clause 16**

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — To move an amendment to Clause 16. I want to move to:

Amend Column 2 of the Schedule to *The Construction Industry Labour Relations Act, 1992*, as being enacted by Clause 16 of the printed Bill, by striking out “Glazier”.

**Mr. Weekes:** — I'd like to ask the minister why she wants glaziers stricken?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — This isn't a trade division. It was inappropriately placed in the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

The division bells rang from 8:05 p.m. until 8:05 p.m.

Clause 16 as amended agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

The division bells rang from 8:07 p.m. until 8:07 p.m.

Clause 17 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lorje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

**Clause 18**

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to propose an amendment. This amendment speaks to the fact that this government hasn't spoke to the public in the construction industry of the consequences of this Bill in any great detail.

They have turned down a debate sponsored by the North Saskatoon Business Association and the Premier has refused to meet with the Alliance for Economic Growth to discuss this Bill saying there isn't enough time to discuss the matter. And we're now giving the government an opportunity to discuss this with the people of Saskatchewan.

Clause 18 of the printed Bill is amended by striking out “proclamation” and substituting “July 1, 2001”.

I so move.

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

**The Chair:** — Order, order.

The division bells rang from 8:11 p.m. until 8:11 p.m.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

**Nays — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lotje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

The division bells rang from 8:13 p.m. until 8:23 p.m.

Clause 18 agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 27**

Romanow	Hagel	Van Mulligen
MacKinnon	Lingenfelter	Melenchuk
Atkinson	Goulet	Lautermilch
Thomson	Lotje	Serby
Belanger	Nilson	Crofford
Hillson	Kowalsky	Sonntag
Hamilton	Prebble	Jones
Higgins	Yates	Harper
Axworthy	Junor	Kasperski

**Nays — 24**

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Krawetz	Draude
Boyd	Stewart	Eagles
Wall	Bakken	Bjornerud
D'Autremont	McMorris	Weekes
Kwiatkowski	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Hart
Allchurch	Peters	Huyghebaert

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

**The Chair:** — Why is the Minister of Labour on her feet?

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I could have waited for you to ask me,

Mr. Chair, but I was going to move the committee report the Bill.

**The Chair:** — Why is the member for Redberry . . .

**Mr. Weekes:** — I'd just like to take this opportunity to thank the minister and her staff for today's debate.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

**THIRD READINGS**

**Bill No. 59 — The Construction Industry Labour Relations Amendment Act, 2000**

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — By leave of the Assembly, I move that Bill No. 59 be now read the third time and passed under its title.

**The Speaker:** — Leave has not been granted. Third reading of this Bill will be at the next sitting.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:29 p.m.