

The Assembly met at 13:30.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Elhard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the communities of southwest Saskatchewan, those particularly in the constituency of Cypress Hills, have expressed their concern that should recommendations from the EMS (emergency medical services) report released last fall be implemented, that those communities believe they would suffer significantly in the loss of their community-based ambulance services. And so I would like to present this petition on behalf of the people of Richmond, Saskatchewan. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to not implement the consolidation and centralization of ambulance services as recommended in the EMS report and to affirm its intent to work to improve community-based ambulance services.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

I so present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present on behalf of residents in and around the Assiniboine Valley district. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary steps to ensure that health care services in the Kamsack Hospital be maintained at its current level of service at minimum, with 24-hour acute care, emergency, and doctoral services available.

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

Mr. Speaker, signatures on these petitions come primarily from the community of Kamsack, but they're also communities in my constituency, namely Veregin and Pelly.

I so present.

Mr. Hermanson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by citizens of the province of Saskatchewan regarding the provincial government's report, the *Saskatchewan EMS Development Project*, which calls for provincially run and centrally operated ambulance services. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to not implement the consolidation and centralization of ambulance services as recommended in the EMS report and affirm its intent to work to improve community-based ambulance services.

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

Mr. Speaker, the signatures are from Lucky Lake, Beechy, Demaine, and Kyle, Saskatchewan.

I'm pleased to present the petition on their behalf.

Mr. Gantfoer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too rise on behalf of citizens today concerned about the high cost of energy. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to use a portion of its windfall oil and gas revenues to provide a more substantial energy rate rebate to Saskatchewan consumers.

The signatures on this petition, Mr. Speaker, in addition to my home community of Melfort, are from Spalding and Semans, Saskatchewan.

I so present on their behalf.

Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition signed by citizens concerned with the condition of Highway 339, and the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to repair Highway 339 in order to facilitate economic development initiatives.

And the petition is signed by individuals from the communities of Moose Jaw and Briercrest.

I so present.

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on behalf of petitioners concerned about the state of the Swift Current hospital, Mr. Speaker, 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 carefully consider Swift Current's request for a new hospital.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition today is signed by residents of the city of Swift Current, of Abbey, of Hodgeville, of Shaunavon, and of Kyle.

I so present.

Ms. Bakken: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of the citizens of Weyburn-Big Muddy who are concerned about their ambulance service, and the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to not implement the consolidation and centralization of ambulance services as recommended in the EMS report and

affirm its intent to work to improve community-based ambulance services.

And the petition is signed by residents of Lake Alma, Radville, and Trossachs.

I so present.

Mr. Weekes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition concerning improved cellular telephone coverage. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to provide reliable cellular telephone service in the districts of Rabbit Lake, Hafford, Blaine Lake, Leask, Radisson, Borden, Perdue, Maymont, Mistawasis, and Muskeg Lake.

Signed by the good citizens of Blaine Lake and Shell Lake. Thank you.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition opposed to the possible reduction of health services in Kamsack. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary steps to ensure that health care services in the Kamsack Hospital be maintained at its current level of service at minimum, with 24-hour acute care, emergency, and doctoral services available.

The petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are all from the community of Kamsack.

Mr. Hart: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of citizens concerned with the centralization of ambulance services. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to not implement the consolidation and centralization of ambulance services as recommended in the EMS report and to affirm its intent to improve community-based ambulance services.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And signatures to this petition, Mr. Speaker, come from the communities of Wynyard, Mozart, Saskatoon, and Dalmeny.

I so present.

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in Assembly today to bring forth a petition regarding improved cellular telephone services.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to provide reliable cellular telephone service in the districts of Spiritwood, Medstead, Glaslyn, Leoville, Chitek Lake, Big River, Canwood, Debden, Shellbrook, Parkside, Shell Lake, Duck Lake, and Macdowall.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, the signatures on this petition are from Spiritwood, Rabbit Lake, Prince Albert, and Chitek.

I so present.

Mr. Peters: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition undersigned by citizens of the province and they're concerned with the Pioneer Lodge in Assiniboia. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to ensure that, at very least, current levels of service and care are maintained at Pioneer Lodge in Assiniboia.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by folks from Assiniboia.

I so present.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again with a petition from concerned citizens who are getting further and further concerned with reference to the Assiniboia Pioneer Lodge. And the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to ensure that, at the very least, current levels of services and care are maintained at Pioneer Lodge in Assiniboia.

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

And, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed in total by members of the Eastside Court in Assiniboia.

I so present.

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

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary steps to ensure that the Redvers Health Centre be maintained at its current level of service at minimum, with 24-hour acute care, emergency, and doctoral services available, as well as laboratory, physiotherapy, public health, home care, and long-term care services available to users from our district, southeast Saskatchewan and southwest Manitoba, and beyond.

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

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, come from the Redvers, Antler, and Fairlight areas.

I so present.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order the following new petitions have

been reviewed and pursuant to rule 12(7) they are hereby read and received.

Of citizens requesting the government to repair Highway 339 in order to facilitate economic development;

Causing the government to include tow trucks in their description of emergency vehicles;

Providing reliable cellular service in Shellbrook-Spiritwood;

Reversing its decision to raise the price of fishing licences; and

Other petitions that are addendum to previous sessional papers nos. 3, 4, 10, 58, 110, 121, 136, and 146.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Allchurch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 42 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Finance: how are the municipal and education taxes on forest fringe land determined; who is responsible for collecting them; and whom is it payable to?

And, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I have another one. I give notice that I shall on day no. 42 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of SERM: how many land grazing permits were issued to users of forest fringe land by SERM in the year 1999 and 2000?

And the third one. I give notice that I shall on day no. 42 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of SERM: how many land grazing permits have been issued to users of forest fringe land by SERM so far in the year 2001-2002?

I so present.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly 26 grade 4 students from Westview Elementary School from Estevan, Saskatchewan. They're seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by teachers, Ms. Linda Henderson and Ms. Susan Husband.

Mr. Speaker, when the former Speaker — and the member from Melville will notice that I said former Speaker, not old Speaker — when him and I did the Speaker's tour last January we did visit these grade 4 students at Westview School and they were very gracious to us and I thank them for that.

And later on I will be meeting with them. We'll have our photo taken and have some refreshments, and I'm sure they'll have lots of questions to ask. So I would like all members to join me in welcoming them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With full appreciation — it's nice to be recognized by the opposition as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, 19 grade 3 and 4 students from Ross School in Moose Jaw, who are seated in the west gallery. Mr. Speaker, they're accompanied today by their teacher Ms. Leisa Johnson-Neufeld and their chaperone, Ms. Guylaine Locours.

Earlier this day, Mr. Speaker, the students visited the Royal Saskatchewan Museum and then they are now, of course, in the midst of making their first ever visit to this, their Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. I met with them earlier and we had a chance for photo and visits. I enjoyed their questions and look forward to having a chance to visit with them again before the end of the school year.

I'll ask, Mr. Speaker, if all the members of the Assembly would welcome these bright young students from Ross School in Moose Jaw.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seated up in the east gallery today — way, way up there in the back row — is a visitor from Ottawa, Nicole Beaudoin is joining us today. She's here from Ottawa visiting friends. Although during her day job I understand she spends her time worrying about Elections Canada.

So I'd ask all members to join with me in welcoming her here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, seated in the west gallery is a constituent of mine who has been in the Assembly a number of times. Ms. Isabelle Muzichuk is from the Canora-Pelly constituency and has been a strong advocate for her concerns around air and water quality and the whole work around the intensive livestock operations.

But, Mr. Speaker, more importantly, I think, I want to wish Isabelle as a grandmother well, because in the last two weeks she's spent most of her time here in Regina with her daughter, very concerned about her granddaughter who is in the Regina General Hospital recovering from a very serious vehicle accident. And I want to wish Isabelle, and most importantly her granddaughter, Krystal Chicilo, well.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(13:45)

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Shellbrook Credit Union

Mr. Yates: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise before the House to speak about more good news for the province of

Saskatchewan, in particular the Shellbrook Credit Union, Mr. Speaker.

It was payday for members of the Shellbrook Credit Union on Wednesday, April 25. This was a record payday with \$335,000 in equity payments being distributed to its members. This distribution of cheques represented 10 per cent of the interest earned on deposits and a 10 per cent rebate on loan interest.

This record distribution goes hand in hand with the credit union's best financial year ever. Besides the main branch in Shellbrook, Mr. Speaker, equity payments were also distributed in Canwood, Leask, and Marcelin branches.

The success of the rural credit unions and co-ops throughout Saskatchewan are a mirror image of the success of this government. We along with all people of Saskatchewan will be ready and able for the shift into the future, a future that is deemed prosperous for all those who reside in the Land of the Living Skies.

I'd like to congratulate General Manager Larry Herman and the staff at the Shellbrook Credit Union for proving that our province is on the road to success with a partnership of government, business, and community, Mr. Speaker. By working together, we will ensure that we all have a prosperous future in our province, Mr. Speaker. The strength of our community is working together. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Musical Production at Birch Hills School

Mr. Wiberg: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to rise in our honoured Assembly so that I can bring recognition to Birch Hills high school.

During the first week of May, almost 100 people were involved in the performance of the hit musical *Godspell*.

Mr. Speaker, for four days 2,000 people had the opportunity to witness this marvellous production presented entirely by the staff and the students of Birch Hills high school.

Thirteen different schools afforded their children the opportunity to witness the coming together of Jesus Christ and his disciples.

The trials and tribulations that each disciple must overcome, reached their finality at the Last Supper as Jesus declares each disciple is now ready to carry out his role.

Darcy Sander, the principal of Birch Hills School, was the director and prime promoter of *Godspell*, Mr. Speaker. And Darcy is still overwhelmed by the remarkable achievement of the cast and crew in the performance of this 90-minute musical.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all members of this Assembly join me in paying tribute to Mr. Darcy Sander, all the staff at Birch Hills who helped out with the musical, and especially to the students for their fantastic performance of *Godspell*.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

New Extended Care Centre for Weyburn

Ms. Jones: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we heard from both sides of the Assembly about the planned long-term care facility in Melfort.

Also on Friday there was similar good news for the city of Weyburn. The Minister of Health, the deputy mayor, and the Chair of the South Central District Health Board took part in a sod turning ceremony for a new Souris Valley extended care centre.

This new facility, to be known as Tatagwa View, will replace the current outdated centre and will offer long-term care services to residents from across the district. When completed the project will provide 135 long-term care beds, 20 adult day spaces, district offices, support services, physiotherapy, administration, and child care.

This government has worked very closely with the South Central Health District because we're committed to accessible, quality health care services and to supporting the needs of our most vulnerable residents.

Like the Melfort project this centre will be cost-shared by the province and local governments on a 75 per cent/25 per cent basis. The total cost will be \$19.7 million.

This is good news for Weyburn, Mr. Speaker, and one comment in particular by health board Chair Ernest Elder captures the importance of this new facility. He said that:

I look forward to working together with our partners . . . to provide a new, home-like environment for our residents.

Not just a facility or a project, Mr. Speaker, but a home environment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

National Mining Week

Mr. Stewart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues some information about National Mining Week, which we are currently in the midst of.

Mr. Speaker, our country's rich, natural resources are many and this week allows us the chance to recognize this and to look ahead to what opportunities are in front of us in terms of mining development.

Mr. Speaker, statistics show Canadian mining exports earn an astonishing \$45 billion a year. That equals 13 per cent of all Canadian exports. This industry also employs close to half a million people across the country. Mr. Speaker, 400,000 people are making a living thanks to the mining industry helping to grow the economy.

As the Saskatchewan Party critic for Energy and Mines, Mr. Speaker, I realize and appreciate the value and importance of the mining industry and the contribution it makes to the Canadian economy. I should add as well that I commend the

environmentally sound practices that the industry follows and it is my hope that this business continues to grow.

Mr. Speaker, related to this, Saskatchewan Mining Week is fast approaching and that will give me another opportunity to talk about this industry and the unfortunacy of red tape, regressive taxation, and unfair royalties the mining industry has to face in Saskatchewan thanks to this NDP (New Democratic Party) government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Cumberland Gallery Display

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a brighter note, tomorrow morning in this building, but not in this Assembly, I'm going to deliver one of the better, most heartfelt, and shortest speeches of my career, and I invite all the members to attend.

I'll be speaking in the newly opened Cumberland Gallery, the gallery on the lower floor officially opened by Prince Charles, and my audience will be the artists, parents, staff, and volunteers of the Regina Early Learning Centre.

The artists are three to five years old and they're students of the centre, which is in my constituency of Regina Centre. What these young artists have done is create a display which, frankly, is quite remarkable for any age. If you must miss my speech, at least go to see their display.

The children from the green room recently visited the MacKenzie Art Gallery Mi'kmaq basket display and while they were there they walked through the Café Guerbois which was part of the Impressionist masterworks on display from the National Gallery of Canada, and a fine show it was.

The kids were fascinated by the tables in the café and how they were decorated so they set about to make their own tables and plan their own café. The result is what they call the Scyther Café, named after a TV cartoon character.

The Scyther Café is their exhibit and it is remarkable. They worked in teams to design their tables. They made Playdoh food — it's not too fattening — and a menu for their café. And some people say that art is a solitary affair, but in this case teamwork paid off.

Mr. Speaker, the Regina Early Learning Centre has been doing excellent work for city kids since 1977, and I'm proud to represent it and especially proud of this exhibit. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

International Day of the Families

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today, May 15, marks the International Day of the Families, a day that the United Nations has set aside to promote the awareness of issues relating to families as basic units of society, as well as to promote appropriate action.

Mr. Speaker, every member of this House knows what it's like

to be a member of a family. It is this family unit that nurtured us, challenged us, and made us who we are today. It is the family unit that taught us tolerance, attitudes, and acceptable patterns of behaviour. Without our families, Mr. Speaker, who would we be?

Mr. Speaker, all members of this House know that the family unit has seen some dramatic changes in the past few years. Differing values, beliefs, and norms have forced the family unit to adapt as best as it could. We have all seen the effects that those changes have made — changes like increased divorce rates and single-parent families.

External factors have also had a significant impact on families — factors like unemployment, crime, and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the family unit remains one of society's most cherished institutions. It is up to all of us to do what we can to ensure that it does not suffer any further destruction. Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of this House to acknowledge the importance and significance of today, the International Day of Families. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Lester B. Pearson United World College Scholarship

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure to inform the Assembly that one of my constituents has been chosen to attend the Lester B. Pearson United World College in British Columbia.

Nigel Francis from Carpenter High School in Meadow Lake will be attending the college this fall, enrolled in the two-year International Baccalaureate Program. Nigel has received a \$54,000 scholarship from the Saskatchewan government and from Pearson College.

Lester B. Pearson is a school that promotes through education a greater understanding between the peoples of the world. And they subscribe to the philosophy that international understanding cannot be created in the classroom alone. Therefore pupils attending the school will take part in community service activities and outdoor expeditions.

One of the goals that these students have managed to achieve should impress and inspire all of us. They have managed to raise enough funds to build a school in Ecuador. Over 200 students from 80 countries attend this school.

I also want to mention that two other students, Sarah-Marie Gross of LeBoldus High School here in Regina, and Réal Carrière from Cumberland House, will be returning to complete their program this fall.

On behalf of all of the members of the Assembly I want to congratulate and wish Nigel, Réal, and Sarah-Marie luck as they continue on the path of education at the Lester B. Pearson United World College.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

100th Birthday Congratulations

Mr. Gantefoer: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and members, it gives me great pleasure to extend warm congratulations to Mrs. Doris Kinne in celebrating a young hundredth birthday.

Doris is a remarkable lady who at a hundred years old complained because, I quote, “I used to read a lot, but I just don’t have time to any more.” The reason, she said, is because her life is so full of social outings enriched with friends to visit.

Mrs. Kinne was born in Leeds, England and arrived in Harding, Manitoba three years later with the rest of her family to join with her father. She married Bill Kinne in 1925 and shortly after, moved with him to the Golburn area where Doris was very active on the farm and as a volunteer in the agricultural community until they retired in Tisdale in 1960. Doris raised two daughters of her own and has been a foster parent to children in numerous countries for the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a quote from a reporter who recently interviewed her:

This feeling of contentment with her family and of being at peace with the world illuminates her gentle and modest personality.

Mr. Speaker, it is with delight that I ask the Assembly to join me in congratulating this very special lady on her hundredth birthday.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Sex Offender Registry

Mr. Hermanson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. The Saskatchewan Party has been asking the provincial government to establish a provincial sex offender registry for some time. The member from Humboldt has introduced private members’ legislation that would do just that. The Minister of Justice has stated he wants to wait for a national sex offender registry to be set up even though the federal government is moving at what could be described as snail’s pace.

Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta has been waiting as well for a national system, but in light of the devastating murder of five-year-old Jessica Koopmans, the Alberta Premier has announced that they will move to set up a provincial registry.

Mr. Speaker, to the minister . . . Mr. Speaker, the minister of Ontario and British Columbia have already set up national sex offender registries. Alberta is now taking the action. My question to the minister is will he and the NDP government support our private members’ legislation and establish a provincial sex offender registry right here in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first I’m sure I speak for all members of the Assembly when I pass on our concerns and sympathies to the family of Jessica Koopmans,

and indeed to the people of Lethbridge who cannot be unaffected by such a tragedy.

What I would say in response to the member is indeed that Premier Klein has a very similar view to this government in regards to a sex offender registry. He’s talked about, as you know, the preference to have a national registry, and he is now talking about considering setting up a registry — a provincial registry in Alberta.

I would only say to the member that officials have been working on this . . . provincial, federal, and territorial officials have been working on this. We anticipate a response from the federal government shortly. If we don’t get one by the next ministers’ meeting in the fall, then we will act here in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it looks like we’re making a little progress, but Saskatchewan is still standing with . . . the government is still standing with their hands in their pockets, while the Premier of Alberta and the Solicitor General there are taking some steps to move this issue forward. Believing that a national sex offender registry would be the best is not, in case . . . the result that we’re seeing.

Mr. Speaker, it took a tragedy — the death of a child — for the Alberta government to decide that a provincial registry was at least a start. Mr. Speaker, we could join Ontario and BC (British Columbia), and now it looks like Alberta as well, in leading the country in this initiative. We too could provide provincial enforcement officials with a valuable crime-fighting tool.

How would any of us feel if we neglected this opportunity to establish a registry, and one of our children were taken from us.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, will Saskatchewan residents have to wait for a tragedy before this government will act to establish a sex offender registry?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(14:00)

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Mr. Speaker, the issue here is what can we do in our various areas of responsibility to protect our children from repeat sex offenders. And, Mr. Speaker, a registry, in particular a national registry, would have some component to this.

Mr. Speaker, it’s not clear that a registry would have made any difference in this particular case. As the member will know, registries are designed to inform the police not to inform the public of the presence of a pedophile in the community because it is the police who are responsible for keeping order.

The member will also know that from time to time public disclosure is made when it’s regarded to be in the public interest by a committee of citizens to advise the members of a community that there is a dangerous offender in their community — one of the other vehicles for addressing this

concern, Mr. Speaker.

But I say we're looking at this properly, thoroughly. We're taking the time to do a job that needs to be done. It's not clear that these registries work well so we want to make sure that we get it right when we do introduce it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Repeat Sex Offender Living in Nipawin

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also for the Minister of Justice.

My constituency office is receiving a tremendous number of calls this week since people in Nipawin learned a convicted sex offender is now living in their community. What they are most alarmed about is the warning by Provincial Court Judge Stephen Carter that this individual is, quote:

... at an extremely high risk to reoffend. It is not a matter of if, but when that will happen.

Mr. Speaker, the judge said the failing is not the court system, it is the provincial government. He said, and I quote again:

There are no facilities in Saskatchewan that can treat or take in this repeat offender.

Mr. Speaker, this man is a multiple sex offender with a number of serious disorders. The judge believes it is only a matter of time before he reoffends. How does the minister explain the gaps in the system that allow a high-risk, repeat sex offender to be released into a Saskatchewan community?

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Mr. Speaker, of course when an offender finishes his or her sentence, he or she will be released, and the authorities ensure that there is close surveillance of those people.

And in regards to Mr. Young, the member should be aware that Health department officials are working with both Prince Albert and North-East Health Districts looking into treatment options for Mr. Young. But the member should also be aware that there are significant controls placed on Mr. Young's activity under the peace bond, which has been issued under section 8(10) of the Criminal Code.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister is quite right when he indicates that there are numerous different agencies involved with this particular individual. But all of those agencies, Mr. Speaker, agree that this individual requires long-term, in-house care. But there are no such facilities in this province.

And since he has completed his sentence for two previous sex offences, Corrections Canada has no control over him. He hasn't been declared a dangerous offender and he can't be until he reoffends.

Mr. Speaker, the judge raised alarm bells about the release of

this individual. The people of Nipawin are very concerned about his presence in their community, and all of the release conditions in the world are not going to ease their concerns. This situation is clearly the responsibility of the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, what is the minister doing to correct the problems with the justice system and protect the people of Nipawin?

Hon. Mr. Axworthy: — Mr. Speaker, the member seems to be suggesting that this particular offender and indeed offenders like this should stay in jail for the rest of their lives. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's the view of the majority of the people of Canada, and certainly it is not the view of anybody who would consider how we might deal with these cases in an effective way.

Mr. Speaker, I can't refer specifically to the case in question, but much of it has been made public. But people in this situation are subject to significant conditions on their activity.

For example, they might be required to stay away from young women, from young children, from schoolyards. They'll have a curfew. They're required to stay away from drugs and alcohol and to report to psychiatrists and probation officers and police, Mr. Speaker — significant constraints to ensure that some unforeseen event does not take place.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Use of Government Aircraft by Cabinet Ministers

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. The Canadian Taxpayers Federation has released information acquired through the freedom of information Act. This information shows NDP cabinet ministers' use of government airplanes is increasing.

And while it's appropriate for cabinet ministers to use aircraft in carrying out Saskatchewan business, it's definitely not appropriate for cabinet ministers to use government airplanes for NDP political purposes. And that is exactly what appears to have happened during the NDP's leadership campaign.

Government records show that three NDP cabinet ministers used government planes to fly to NDP leadership forums last December.

Mr. Speaker, does the Premier approve of the use of taxpayer-funded government aircraft for NDP political purposes?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Richard Truscott and the Taxpayers Association may not know, but I'm sure the government . . . opposition members would know that government is not just for the people in Regina.

There is increased demand by groups across the province that require government ministers and officials to travel to consult on local issues.

Mr. Speaker, it's not uncommon for a minister to travel several kilometres in one day, covering hundreds . . . or travel to several communities. Several hundred kilometres might be covered in one day in order to meet with local organizations and business organizations.

Mr. Speaker, to the member's question about government airline for political purposes. That information is very clear. The policy of air transportation services is that the aircraft are not to be used for political party purposes — only for government business, such as stakeholder meetings, cabinet meetings, Treasury Board meetings. Not that of a political party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well indeed government is not just in Regina. That's why the Premier was going to get a bus.

Mr. Speaker, according to the government's own records the Environment minister, the Culture minister, and the Crown Investments minister all used government planes to get to NDP leadership debates last December.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote from a news release issued this morning from the Canadian Taxpayers Federation. And I quote:

On December 4 there was an NDP leadership forum in Meadow Lake. The next morning . . . a government plane picked up Belanger and Crofford in Meadow Lake and took them to Regina.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, my question. Other than the NDP's leadership campaign meeting, what government business in Meadow Lake required both the Environment minister and the Culture minister on December 4?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Hamilton: — Mr. Speaker, I believe I was very clear on the use of government aircraft for government business. Each individual minister is responsible to book those flights to meet with local organizations, to meet with cabinet meetings, officials that would take stakeholder meetings into consideration.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that also use of SPMC's (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) transportation services has increased for two reasons. The first reason is that during a legislative session the opposition MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) who live more than 350 kilometres from the Legislative Building are able to travel by government aircraft.

And the second one, Mr. Speaker, would be that we're utilizing government aircraft now for some of those out-of-province trips that would have significant savings and also provide flexibility for those ministers who need to have some additional time for meetings and also need to be back very quickly to attend meetings at home, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, these meetings were just in the province.

But it seems that the Premier isn't too concerned about the apparent misuse of government aircraft by his own NDP cabinet ministers, or he can't be bothered to investigate.

Maybe the Premier would be interested in a little more evidence. Mr. Speaker, I'm quoting again from this morning's news release. I quote:

On December 5, there was a forum in the Battlefords. The next morning . . . a plane flew Belanger from North Battleford to a day-time forum in La Ronge.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment used an aircraft, government aircraft, to fly from an NDP leadership campaign meeting in North Battleford to another NDP leadership campaign meeting in La Ronge.

Does the Premier support the minister's use of the government's aircraft to attend the NDP campaign forums? Will the Premier investigate this apparent violation of the rules of the use of government aircraft for NDP purposes?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to answer on behalf of the government, and the answer is this, Mr. Speaker. The policy is clear. The members have logged their flights and they book them in the regular fashion. They've been public knowledge. They've been released as public knowledge, and this government and these ministers, sir, have nothing to hide.

What I want to ask that member is: on whose payroll is his researcher from the Saskatchewan taxpayer's federation? Former chief of staff to that Leader of the Opposition.

Do they not get paid enough from their caucus funds to do their own in-house research, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it seems that when the NDP start getting dirty, they have to get dirty.

Mr. Speaker, the rule clearly established that ministers cannot use government planes for political purposes. But the government's own record show that the cabinet ministers were using . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order.

Mr. D'Autremont: — That the use of government planes to fly to and from NDP leadership campaign meetings. Yet the Premier sits there and does nothing.

Mr. Speaker, maybe he needs some more evidence. I'd like to quote again from the taxpayers' news release, and I quote:

The next morning (Dec 6) a plane flew Belanger from

North Battleford to a day-time forum in La Ronge. Later that evening there was another forum in Prince Albert. The next . . . (day) (Dec 7) a plane flew Belanger, Crofford, and Sonntag from Prince Albert to Regina, where there was forum on the evening of December 7.

Mr. Speaker, once again, does the Premier support those ministers use of government aircraft to attend NDP leadership forums?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, this government has nothing to hide with respect to ministerial travel. And I want to tell you why, sir.

We are accessible to the people of this province. There are executive aircraft available to members for government business, and that is what they're used for, Mr. Speaker. The same as they are used to take members opposite home on the weekend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there's anyone has anything to be embarrassed about, perhaps it's the fact that their researcher sits downtown in Regina under the guise of the Canadian Taxpayer's Federation; the former chief of staff to the Leader of the Opposition, who won't admit who pays his wages, who won't admit who pays his salary of his staff, who won't admit who pays the rent for the office building that he's in, Mr. Speaker.

I ask them, the public, the financial statements of the Canadian Taxpayer's Federation, their research office downtown — table those documents, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the minister says he has nothing to hide, yet they're only accessible to the public during an NDP leadership campaign.

Mr. Speaker, government records appear to expose the misuse of government aircraft by at least three ministers during last year's NDP leadership campaign. Will the Premier investigate this apparent misuse of taxpayers' dollars by three of his cabinet ministers?

And if the Premier's investigation confirms that the NDP ministers were using the airplanes to fly to, from, and between NDP leadership forums at taxpayers' expenses, will the Premier instruct the ministers to repay taxpayers for all of the costs of the plane trips?

And will the Premier ask for the immediate resignation of all three of those ministers?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(14:15)

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, as I've said earlier, all of that information will be made clear to the media shortly after question period. It's all there. It's all public record.

Now what I want to do is I want to ask the Leader of the Opposition if he will ask his former chief of staff who indicates in the letter:

We do not have annual general meetings. In fact, unlike other organizations like unions, chambers of commerce, we don't have members, per se, who pay annual fees. We have supporters who make voluntary non-receiptable contributions to us when they can.

I ask that member if he's going to investigate as to whether or not he's funded through that political party or the PC (Progressive Conservative) metro fund. That what I . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SaskTel Investments

Mr. Wall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier of the province. Mr. Speaker, we have more evidence that the NDP Crowns are completely out of control. The NDP now say they asked SaskTel if its purchase of Ag Dealer would put them in competition with any Saskatchewan company. SaskTel said no. Even though it is clear — it is very clear — that there is a Saskatchewan company in exactly the same business. SaskTel is now admitting that they weren't aware they would be competing with IRON Solutions of Outlook.

Mr. Speaker, where is the due diligence? One phone call to any implement dealer in the province, a 30-second search on any Internet search engine, would have told them . . . that SaskTel would have found out about IRON Solutions. Anybody with a pulse and a PalmPilot could have found out about IRON Solutions, Mr. Speaker.

SaskTel just spent \$8.3 million without doing even the most basic due diligence. How long is the Premier going to tolerate this incompetence in his Crown corporations?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Well, Mr. Speaker, again I'm going to repeat my answer from yesterday. SaskTel through Ag Dealer is not in direct competition, Mr. Speaker, with IRON Solutions, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, IRON Solutions is a software and technology company. Ag Dealer publishes magazines and sells advertising.

Mr. Speaker, by that member's definition of what competition is, it also puts *The Leader-Post*, *The StarPhoenix*, *The Western Producer*, and every other print media that sells classified advertising and has a Web site in direct competition, Mr. Speaker, with IRON Solutions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, we just heard it again from the minister. We heard that these two companies don't compete at all. Yesterday he said, mind you, Mr. Speaker, that there was, quote: "some overlap." Well, Mr. Speaker, let's find out what the Canada West Equipment Dealers were saying this morning. They said, and I quote:

What we have seen in the past is salesmen for Ag Dealer out calling on dealers, saying they should be doing business with Ag Dealer instead of IRON Solutions because they have this used-equipment database.

So we have Ag Dealer telling implement dealers, don't use IRON Solutions, use us. Well, Mr. Speaker, we understand there's not a lot of captains of industry on the other side of the House, but let's just point out to them and assure to them that that's competition. Anywhere you go, any day of the week, that's competition with a Saskatchewan business.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP made a huge mistake when they . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Would the member go directly to his question.

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, it's not too late. Will the minister simply admit that they made a huge mistake when they spent \$8 million to buy an Ontario company that clearly is competing with a Saskatchewan company in Outlook, Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll tell you who made a huge mistake. It's that member who says that we're always in competition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to quote from *The Leader-Post* of May 15, 2001, and here's a letter that talks about "SaskTel criticism unfair."

I quote, and here's from the president, Robert Freberg, president of Brigadier Security Systems, who says:

Our totally independent firm, Brigadier Security Systems, was started in 1985, but in the past few years found it increasingly more difficult to compete with many of the large U.S. and out-of-province security companies who provide security systems on a monthly payment option (security) rather than a retail sale.

SecurTek has more than 16 dealers in Saskatchewan and is providing a much-needed service to Saskatchewan people, protecting lives and personal property and all the while creating jobs and profits that stay (right here) in Saskatchewan.

End of quote, Mr. Speaker. That's what they say.

Mr. Wall: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the cabinet . . . two different cabinet ministers admitted that SaskTel did not answer their question as to whether these two companies compete with each other. They admitted that.

Well maybe they don't mind, maybe they don't mind the Crown corporations making fools out of them, but I think the taxpayers of this province mind, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is these companies do compete with each other. But when cabinet asked SaskTel the question, will they be competing with the company at Outlook, SaskTel said no. So

either SaskTel isn't doing its research or they were lying to cabinet. Either way it's unacceptable.

Cabinet is making decisions based on either incomplete or inaccurate information by their own admission. And now, Saskatchewan taxpayers are on the hook for \$8.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, how can the Premier put up with this? How can he allow SaskTel to recommend decisions to cabinet based on either incomplete or inaccurate information?

Hon. Mr. Sonntag: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we're always concerned when there is issues of competition with the private sector here in Saskatchewan. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, we're meeting with the individuals tomorrow. And I quote again from yesterday's paper *The Leader-Post*, from the president and CEO (chief executive officer) Merlyn Friesen who says, and I quote:

At this point we're getting great support from both sides of government . . .

Mr. Speaker, that's what the president and CEO of ironworks said.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this question though. The members talk about investments. I want to say to the members opposite, they made an investment, Mr. Speaker, as well that I want to talk about. The investment was in a gentleman by the name of Stockwell Day who was going to be prime minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask them, Mr. Speaker, I ask them did they do due diligence, Mr. Speaker? How do they feel about their investment today, Mr. Speaker? How well is your stock doing, Mr. Speaker? And, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask one last question. Is due diligence a guarantee of success? I think not.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Yates: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased today to stand and table questions 176 through 182 inclusive.

The Speaker: — Responses to questions 176 to 182 inclusive have been tabled.

SEVENTY-FIVE MINUTE DEBATE

Improvements to Drinking Water

Ms. Junor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following the tragic events in Walkerton last year, clarification of roles and responsibilities for all government departments that had overlapping or complementary responsibility for water safety was done. Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management, SERM, led all departments in preparing information and coordinating interdepartmental efforts to deal with the issue of safe drinking water in the province.

This undertaking was started in May of 2000 and initiatives to track and improve our processes are ongoing. Drinking water from properly equipped and operated treatment plants is safe to drink, which is the case for the majority of Saskatchewan's almost 1,000 cities, towns, villages, resort villages, rural municipalities, and organized hamlets. However without appropriate treatment and monitoring, the safety of drinking water cannot be guaranteed.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the Walkerton tragedy, existing SERM resources have been redirected to set up drinking water inspection, monitoring and compliance activities — that is making sure all communities are following the rules — and the response time to issues such as water contamination has been reduced.

Mr. Speaker, SERM's role in regard to drinking water safety is to regulate municipal water and waste water treatment systems, to set requirements for monitoring and treatments, to licence the operation of waterworks, to conduct compliance inspections, and to set qualifications for water treatment plant operators. Mandatory certification for water treatment operators was made law in July of 2000.

Mr. Speaker, the water facility operators regularly submit water samples to environmental protection in Regina, which is located at the provincial lab. If a test result indicates the possibility of a problem, the SERM staff in the region are alerted. They then immediately contact the plant operator to conduct additional testing. If these follow-up tests continue to indicate a problem, SERM's regional officer goes to the site and works with the operator to find the source.

SERM works with Sask Health and the local health districts whenever there is a potential health concern related to drinking water.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, this process is dependent on many people doing very important jobs. In this year's budget we provided for ten and a half more jobs in SERM to do this very important work. We're investing in the human resources that are crucial to the process of maintaining clean drinking water.

The members opposite voted against this budget.

Mr. Speaker, the provincial lab does the actual testing of water samples sent in by communities. Since Walkerton, additional staff in the lab has permitted the laboratory to process almost 80 per cent more tests. The increased demand for testing is a result of several factors. There's greater compliance by licensed communities under regulations that are enforced by SERM. There's an increased submission of water samples from public water supplies under the jurisdiction of Sask Health. And there's greater public awareness of drinking water quality issues.

The turnaround time at the lab for testing has also been improved. Mr. Speaker, test results are given to SERM and if there is a problem, the local medical health officer is also notified by the provincial lab. Further testing is done and a judgment is made whether to alert the community by issuing a precautionary boil-water advisory which advises residents that there may be a problem with their water and until the problem

has been identified water should be boiled, or by issuing a boil-water order which tells people that they must boil their water for their own safety.

The health district staff, including senior public health inspectors and medical health officers, work with the SERM eco-region staff at various stages of the monitoring and investigation protocol to determine if risks to public health exist.

The health district staff will discuss the issuance of the emergency boil-water orders or the precautionary drinking water advisories. They'll discuss that with the eco-region staff of SERM.

The health district staff also attend meetings with waterwork owners and operators to discuss the required actions associated with these boil-water advisories or orders. And the health district staff work in consultation with the region staff when considering rescinding the orders.

Mr. Speaker, precautionary drinking water advisories have been issued to those communities whose treatment systems don't meet SERM's minimum requirements. This does not mean that the water is contaminated but it does mean that the systems do not meet the approved standards.

Water samples taken from a number of municipal water treatment systems in the province may show the presence of bacteria from time to time. Positive bacteriological samples in many cases do not necessarily mean that there's a serious problem with the drinking water. It can be an isolated event caused by such a thing as a sampling problem.

However, when a test result indicates the presence of bacteria, action should be taken to ensure the drinking water is safe for consumption. And that is what happens, Mr. Speaker, with SERM, Health, and municipalities all involved in the process as I've outlined.

Mr. Speaker, the 28 communities that have been issued boil-water advisories have been aware of their water treatment deficiencies since December of 2000. SERM is working with each community to resolve the issues on a case-by-case basis. There's not a cookie-cutter solution for all communities. Each has unique problems and SERM has been in each community working with the on-site people to put in place the most effective and appropriate solution to that community's water treatment needs.

(14:30)

Mr. Speaker, there's been some suggestion that those 28 communities have been outed by the leaked document of last week. Nothing could be further from the truth. As I've said before, each community has had ongoing assessment, consultation, and support from SERM for several months as they work through the best fix for that individual community.

The citizens of each community have been aware of the boil-water advisories that have been in effect for the last few months. There's been no hidden agenda in dealing with these communities. Boil-water advisories are a very public alert about

the safety of drinking water in a community.

Mr. Speaker, the 2001/2002 budget increased jobs at the provincial lab to deal with increased testing and shorter turnaround time for reporting results. The budget also included money for the lab to attain national accreditation. Funding was put in place to acquire a new laboratory information management system. The members opposite voted against the budget.

Mr. Speaker, municipalities have responsibility for ensuring safe water for their residents, safe water that meets SERM's quality objectives. This is done through sound operation and maintenance of their water treatment plants and distribution systems and through the collection and submission of samples as required by SERM.

SERM requires municipalities to submit samples to the provincial lab to test, and the number of samples and the frequency of submission depends on the population served by the system.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government has made significant investments in municipal infrastructure. We have also partnered with the federal government and municipalities to make money available for more water treatment and sewage initiatives. We'll elaborate on this, including investments in the North, in a few moments. Again the opposition voted against this budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sask Water was asked to undertake an assessment of the more than 500 water treatment plants in the province to provide government with an overview of the issues and an estimate of the cost to ensure safe drinking water.

Sask Water is working with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) and SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and has sent surveys to all communities with questions about their plants and their concerns for their operations.

Sask Water is currently undertaking a technical assessment of Saskatchewan municipal drinking water systems. The study will provide a ranking and assessment of all 560 Saskatchewan municipal drinking water systems.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sask Water has a rural water quality program designed to assist individual rural water users to ensure their water is safe to drink. This year's budget added money to expand this program to provide advice on the suitability of drinking water and how it can be treated.

Money was also added for collaboration with Sask Research Council to provide scientific testing of private water treatment technology and equipment. The members opposite voted against this budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this overview of the extensive initiatives undertaken by our government underscores how seriously we view the issue of safe drinking water.

After Walkerton, we quickly mobilized the appropriate government departments to gather information and make assessments for immediate action and recommendations for

longer-term strategies. Many initiatives were started using existing resources last year, but more needed to be done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this year's budget started to address the most pressing of the problems. Strategic investments in increased manpower for testing and follow-up shows that our commitment is to provide safe and high quality drinking water to the people of Saskatchewan. Investments into accreditation and a water information system, as well as support for individuals with privately owned water systems, were also part of this year's budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I have said repeatedly, the opposition voted against all of these initiatives that would provide safe and high quality drinking water by voting against the budget. Apparently their solution for everything is a tax cut.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as my colleague from Saskatoon Northwest pointed out in the House the other day, the opposition recently argued that we should amend legislation to give municipalities the freedom to deliver local services with a minimum of provincial government interference.

Apparently our testing of water is seen as government interference, and yet the opposition continues to say we have not done anything to address the issue of safe water.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will close by saying that we may not have done enough, but we are making significant progress in an open and responsible way. This progress will be aided by the new initiatives in this year's budget. So it is with all of this in mind that I am compelled to move the motion to:

... condemn the opposition for voting against the provincial budget which contained important actions to improve Saskatchewan's drinking water.

The motion is seconded by the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Junor: —

That this Assembly condemn the opposition for voting against the provincial budget which contained actions to improve Saskatchewan's drinking water.

I so move.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very important motion that we are here to debate this afternoon. We all are guilty, I am sure, of taking our water for granted. We turn on a tap, use whatever we need, and don't give it a second thought.

We live in a province that can boast over 90,000 freshwater lakes, and we hear talk often in the media about exporting our plentiful water supplies to other countries. Water is essential to

our very existence. An element, Mr. Speaker, that we simply cannot do without. An element that our province cannot do without.

And as I rise to enter this debate . . . And, Mr. Speaker, this isn't really a debate because what I rise to do is to help inform the members opposite with the facts on the many projects and programs that this government has researched, developed, and implemented to provide safe, clean water to communities throughout our province.

Mr. Speaker, this government's commitment to providing clean, safe water to our municipalities really goes back to a program that began in the early 1990s and continued until 1998 when the federal and provincial governments participated in a tripartite infrastructure program. Over \$167 million was provided over the life of that infrastructure program to Saskatchewan municipalities.

During the same period of time, Sask Water utility development program was intensified. Sask Water investigated improvements to water supply and treatment systems for communities throughout the province, resort communities, and for industrial users. Sewage treatment facilities were investigated and were completed for a number of communities. They provided . . . This government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, provided ongoing support and technical advice.

In 1999-2000 this government funded the provincial-municipal infrastructure program on its own. Mr. Speaker, \$10 million was provided to upgrade municipal infrastructure each of these years.

Also, Mr. Speaker, add to that the 2000-2001 commitment by our government to the municipal component of the Centenary Fund to provide \$5 million per year over a four-year period, again for municipal infrastructure programs.

What I have given here are only a few examples of the programs and inputs into municipalities that have been ongoing over the last decade. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a clear indication of our government's commitment to clean water supplies for Saskatchewan residents.

In May of 2000, as we all are well aware, the tragedy at Walkerton, Ontario was in the news. This government acted quickly to guard against such an occurrence here and to reinforce existing regulations.

Mr. Speaker, many steps were taken by SERM. In May 2000 all communities were advised of the importance of conducting regular, bacteriological monitoring and proper operation of waterworks. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an increase in submissions at the provincial lab was seen as a result of this notification.

Over the summer, SERM, Sask Health, and Sask Water gathered detailed information to identify areas requiring improvements or attention regarding drinking water management and short- and long-term actions to address these areas.

Mr. Speaker, this report identified all areas of possible concern.

Mandatory certification for operators was implemented at this time by SERM along with new protocol to allow quicker response and action when water samples with bacteriological contamination were detected.

The case of North Battleford is a perfect example of how the new protocol implemented by SERM allowed for a very quick response and action when water samples with bacteriological contamination were detected. This government takes pride in the quick action taken in regards to North Battleford, Mr. Speaker. We acted, Mr. Speaker, while the opposition played politics in front of this Hon. Assembly, putting their own interests in front of those interests of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, opposition members have said that this government was trying to hide the threat to public health as a result of deteriorating infrastructure. One word comes to mind when I hear such allegations, Mr. Speaker, and it's definitely not accountable, but instead, opportunistic.

Not once, Mr. Speaker, before May 4 did the opposition ever raise the question of water or water quality. What that tells me, Mr. Speaker, is that the members on that side of the floor are opportunistic and do not care about the well-being of the people of Saskatchewan.

In 2000, SERM issued 69 precautionary drinking water advisories and 10 emergency boil-water orders because of its increased testing and investigations, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, relayed this information to the communities involved.

Now the opposition can say we're trying to hide but it's very hard to hide when you're offering public advisories and boil-water orders. We issued public orders. We relayed the information to the affected communities and worked with those communities to correct the situation.

As well in March, this government announced an investment of \$720,000 for ten and a half full-time positions devoted to improving drinking water management. We also announced an increase of \$520,000 and 4.5 positions for the provincial lab to allow quicker turnaround for water-quality tests.

These are examples of a government that is proactive and not reactive like the members opposite are even displaying now as we speak.

We voted for a budget that contained all of the new programs and funding for safe drinking water, while the opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, voted against it.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the opposition introduced a motion in this very House, to eliminate 570 new positions created in this year's budget to improve services to Saskatchewan residents. What they wanted to eliminate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was also the 50 new positions that were created to enhance water quality in this province.

In March of 2001, the provincial budget addressed a number of drinking water concerns raised during the previous months. An increase in ongoing and one-time funding, and an increase in staffing to enable environmental sciences section of the provincial lab to attain national accreditation to ensure that

quality standards and protocols for drinking water testing meets nationally acceptable standards. Also funding for acquisition of new laboratory information management systems to support water quality sample tracking — they voted against it, Mr. Speaker.

The budget also announced that Sask Water, rural water advisory program, would expand to provide advise on the suitability of drinking water and how it can be treated. Additional funding will also be used to promote the service. There was also dollars designated to provide scientific testing for private water treatment technology and equipment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, over \$650,000 was designated in SERM's budget to develop a compliance review schedule for water treatment facilities and to develop drinking water standards.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, leading up to the March budget, the province successfully negotiated with the federal government to bring back the provincial/federal agreement that would support municipal infrastructure renewal. The agreement was signed at a provincial-municipal roundtable with SUMA and SARM present. This program emphasizes local input and involvement.

SUMA and SARM have had significant input into the program criteria and guidelines. This program was announced in the March budget. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this program will provide over 113 million federal and provincial dollars to municipal infrastructure over the next five years.

This year the province will match the federal contributions providing 24 million to infrastructure investment in communities. Green infrastructure which includes water and waste water systems, water management, solid waste management, and recycling will be the first priority of this program and will receive 50 per cent of available funding.

(14:45)

The highest priority for project approval was given to applicants from communities that had received precautionary drinking water advisories. Every community that has applied in this fiscal year, with precautionary drinking water advisory, has had its project approved.

Safe drinking water, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is definitely a priority with this government. Capital investments to improve water treatment facilities in these communities will help to enhance the quality of local water. It will also continue the good work that this government has done and will continue to do in coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to support our government's March 2000 budget — a budget that enhanced services to all areas of Saskatchewan's population. I am pleased to second the motion put forward by the member from Saskatoon Eastview.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I rise to debate the motion as proposed and presented by the member from Saskatoon Eastview, I would like to indicate that at the conclusion of my remarks I will be amending the motion

to more accurately reflect the concerns of Saskatchewan people and the manner in which this government has attempted to deceive them about the state of drinking water supplies in this province.

And what is that reality, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Well all you have to do is look at the headlines:

Government knew of bad water for years. Leaked documents suggest coverup.

And a little further into the column, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

Despite knowing for nine years that 121 communities lacked adequate water treatment, a leaked cabinet document told government officials to reassure people their drinking water was safe.

That same document also advised cabinet to "avoid criticism of former cuts to program(s) and lack of provincial action" . . .

Another headline, Mr. Deputy Speaker, "Another Walkerton feared."

And why, why did we have these headlines, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Because we have another example of this government deliberately trying to blame others for its own incompetence and deception — typical of this government over the course of its entire tenure in office. Blame others. Blame someone else. Find anyone. Just blame somebody.

The blatant hypocrisy that we see in this motion just about sets one back on your heels. The motion they should be putting forward today is an apology. An apology for their own incompetence and an attempt at deception.

The information contained in the documents we brought to the attention of the public goes back to 1992, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And in these documents, as we now have learned, there was a strategy to tell the public that everything was fine with their water when that government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, according to their very own document, knew very well that there were very, very serious problems.

And what was the Minister of Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management's response when the Leader of the Opposition asked him if cabinet had been warned about a possible Walkerton-type situation occurring in Saskatchewan? His first response, once again, was to deny. And even though it was there in black and white, his first response was to deny and say no. Even denying existence of the very document that we tabled that very same day, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Then that same minister had the audacity to stand over and over again in this House and talk about how he and his government were going to be open and transparent. If it wasn't such a serious situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would almost be laughable. And on one occasion in question period, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I actually remember the minister, in response to a question, indicating that he was going to only be open and transparent on some of the strategies of the government.

There's no doubt that the government had no intention whatsoever of coming clean with the Saskatchewan public, and it was only because the Saskatchewan Party was able to bring the information forward to this House that the people of this province found out the truth and found out how this government tried to deceive them in terms of the state of the water supply in this province.

And it's interesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have a number of backbenchers over there howling and complaining about the fact that a cabinet document that they themselves were never privy to, they should probably be aware of the fact that cabinet intended to keep it secret from them as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Some really interesting information in this document, Mr. Deputy Speaker. According to some of the statistics that are part of the document, it's indicated in here that there's an approximate cost to the province, to the Department of Health, of \$8 million per year related to poor quality water. Now if the government has known for 10 years — remember they've known about these difficulties since 1992 and they've known about these difficulties for 10 years — and there was an annual cost to the health care system of \$8 million because of poor water quality in this province, that is \$80 million. Mr. Speaker, \$80 million that could have gone a long ways to helping clean up the mess and in the end saving health care costs in the long run.

I find it absolutely amazing that this government would accept a situation where it cost the health care system in this province annually \$8 million because of poor quality drinking water.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention a bit to the budget, as was referred to by the member from Saskatoon Eastview. And I think it's interesting that this new-found interest in water quality that we see on the opposite side translated in the last budget into a lower budget for the environmental protection branch and SERM. This is the branch that regularly monitors water; that does regulate water quality in this province. That budget this year, Mr. Speaker, was reduced by \$92,000.

And perhaps while we're talking about budgets, I would like to point out to the members opposite that this budget did pass. They are quite correct in that the members of the official opposition did not support it. But at the end of the day it did pass. It passed, and yet what happened? Water quality has gotten worse and they've deliberately tried to hide that fact from the public.

The Speaker: — Order. I would ask the member to be very careful about the phrases he uses. He's bordering on being unparliamentary when he talks about a member or the government deliberately misleading or deliberately hiding. It's rather unparliamentary and I would just caution the member on those phrases.

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very quickly, I would like to move on to the issue of water inspection. This CDI (cabinet decision item) cabinet document also speaks about that and what happens here in Saskatchewan compared to Alberta.

In Alberta, there is an annual inspection of plants. As well, inspectors provide technical assistance for the safe operation of those plants.

In Saskatchewan, in the cabinet decision item, Mr. Speaker, it indicates that inspectors rarely visit plants and that they offer very little technical assistance. So if one was to actually follow through and hire more water quality inspectors there, you can't stop at that, Mr. Speaker. Because it's clear from this cabinet document that the water inspectors we currently have aren't providing much in the way of guidance and protection for the citizens of the province.

Let's look at the comparison of the document from the drinking water standards as they are in Alberta. In Alberta, the latest edition of the Canadian drinking water quality guidelines has been legislated. In Saskatchewan, the minister is given the discretion to set water quality standards, and according to the cabinet decision item once again, the minister has not specified any standards to date.

We also see in this document the disturbing contemplation of getting rid of this legal problem by downloading on to the municipalities again. And at the very same time, what were they doing? They were hacking and slashing the revenue sharing of those very same local government budgets and municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen municipal budgets cut over the last 10 years. Once again in this last budget, again not one single penny for revenue sharing. Is it any surprise that the municipalities themselves have had difficulty in keeping up with the demands around water quality over the last 10 years?

And now what we see is the members opposite riding in with a last minute band-aid solution to try and mitigate political damage. Well, it's too little a little too late and people are starting to pay the price, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to move the amendment as seconded by the member from Canora-Pelly, and the amendment would be:

That all words after "condemned" be deleted and the following be substituted:

That the government be condemned for its deliberate strategy to deceive the general public about the state of water safety in Saskatchewan as outlined in the communication strategy contained in the cabinet document brought to the attention of this Assembly by the official opposition.

The Speaker: — I'll just pause for a moment to allow the member to reword his motion, because the motion that's been submitted is out of order.

I would ask the member to read the amendment into the record.

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment would read as follows:

That all words after "condemned" be deleted and the following substituted:

the government for its planned strategy to keep information from the general public about the state of water safety in Saskatchewan as outlined in the communication strategy contained in the cabinet document brought to the attention of this Assembly by the official opposition.

Hon. Mr. Hagel: — Point of order.

The Speaker: — I recognize the member for Moose Jaw North. What is your point of order?

(15:00)

Hon. Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to find the amendment out of order. When we look at the amendment that is before us, I suppose it can be debatable as to whether the most germane topic of the amendment is the action of the opposition or if it has to do with the provincial budget.

But in the amendment that the hon. member has moved, Mr. Speaker, he has made reference to neither and it is not in order to move an amendment which is not germane to the original motion. And I would ask you to find that the amendment is simply out of order. Debate should proceed on the original motion.

The Speaker: — Members of the Assembly, I have read the original motion and the motion. And we've always allowed a great deal of latitude in the debate in this legislature and I find that what is . . . Order, order. And I find that the, to me, the essence of the first motion was about Saskatchewan's drinking water with relation to the provincial budget. This amendment also deals with the state of the water safety in Saskatchewan.

I find the motion in order.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to enter into the debate on both of the . . . not only the motion, but the amendment as well. And I'm going to limit my remarks to the Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program that the member for Moose Jaw raised, as far as the amounts of money that are being expended; but more specifically, Mr. Speaker, the budget that has been presented and how it deals with the budget for Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management and more specifically, what it puts in place for the environmental protection.

Mr. Speaker, last week the document that was presented to the cabinet as a working document was released to the public, and I want to read into the record again, very clearly, the response of the minister when asked the following question.

The question that was asked, and I'm quoting now from *Hansard* of May 10, says:

Prior to the current crisis in North Battleford, was cabinet ever warned that there is a high potential for a Walkerton-type crisis here in Saskatchewan? And was cabinet ever given a specific action plan to prevent this from happening in Saskatchewan?

The response:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, that document was a working document that was presented to cabinet. It was discussed by cabinet, and it had a number of recommendations about how we should deal with the problems facing people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated, the conditions are not new; those conditions have been related to this government for the entire decade of the '90s. In fact as early as 1992 it was pointed out that there were deficiencies, and that there have been over the course of time a need to deal with those deficiencies.

How did this government respond, Mr. Speaker? By reducing the amount of municipal revenue sharing, by reducing that now to the point where the revenue-sharing pool for urban municipalities sits at a low of \$27 million.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the urban municipal group began with a slogan in their campaign prior to this budget that said, sharing the gain after sharing the pain. They made presentations to the cabinet, they made presentations to the Minister of Finance where they said, we simply cannot exist as a body involving urban municipalities and function properly, being able to provide the correct services that are necessary.

So, Mr. Speaker, those concerns were brought to this government's attention. They were brought to this government's attention by the president of SUMA, by villages, by cities that said, we need to deal with this.

Mr. Speaker, last fall a number of communities received a boil-water order — small communities who had received the boil-water order after having their supplies tested and checked. Mr. Speaker, two of those communities are in the Canora-Pelly constituency, and they are struggling.

Not only those two communities that specifically have been given the boil-water order, but many other communities around — Good Spirit Lake, the farm families that exist between Canora and Mikado, and Canora and Rama, — all of those communities, Mr. Speaker, are very concerned about their water supply. They need to address the provision of better quality water.

So there have been attempts not only to address this concern with the province, but also to address this concern with the federal government. And you know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting how in the budget the Minister of Finance announced that there was going to be an expenditure of \$170 million for infrastructure, almost suggesting that that 170 million is a provincial commitment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a document that breaks down the Canada-Saskatchewan infrastructure allocations, and it is a five-year plan, Mr. Speaker — 170 million over the course of five years.

The current provincial commitment, according to the Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program, is that the provincial government will commit \$12 million for this fiscal year — 12 million out of the total of 36 million. The other 24 million, Mr. Speaker, come from the communities themselves

and the federal government on an equal share. Many communities have responded by saying, you know it's fine to look at the Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program but you have to remember that we still must commit one-third of the responsibility for a particular project.

And I'll use an example, Mr. Speaker, of a pipeline project proposed in the Canora-Pelly constituency. The initial estimates are that we might be looking at a cost of somewhere around \$2.4 million. And there are many such projects, as the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow identified. In fact, hundreds of projects have been put forward to try to get their share of the \$36 million that is not just for water enhancement and water quality projects, but it's for transportation projects and it's a whole host of things under this particular program.

So as a result, the local municipalities are now wondering how they're going to fund it. They can't come up with nearly a million dollars to be able to fund their particular portion of the project.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other startling things about today's motion made by the government members and the actual information contained in the budget document, their response is that — as we've heard from the minister — we're moving forward, we're putting forward a plan.

I want to share with the people of Saskatchewan, the actual numbers that are contained in the budget document. And I refer to page 55 under the section entitled, environmental protection, vote (ER11). I'm going to read the first paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and it says this:

Provides environmental protection and upholds environmental standards by monitoring compliance with environmental regulations in various sectors concerning air and water quality.

And then there's a number of other responsibilities as well. It very specifically says that this department is responsible for water quality.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the budget contains as far as the amount of money that this government has committed to dealing with water quality? In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is a reduction. And I'm going to share those numbers with you. Last year, the year 2000-2001, for environmental protection and support for environmental programs the government has indicated that they spent \$2.932 million — just a little over 2.9 million.

This year's budget, Mr. Speaker, for dealing with water quality, for dealing with the Walkerton-type crisis that has been raised to this cabinet, the cabinet is now going to spend — through this budget — is going to spend 2.738 million. It has reduced the amount of money it is spending on dealing with water quality by nearly \$200,000.

Isn't that ironic, Mr. Speaker? That the government would state right now that the budget is something that was going to be in place to deal with water quality, when in fact they have reduced the amount of money that they are putting forward to dealing with water quality by \$200,000.

Now, members opposite, Mr. Speaker, chirp from their chairs by indicating that we would now, you know, fire the people, etc. No, the question that has to be understood — and it's understood by the people in the province — is that this government is putting in place numerous employees in all kinds of departments.

And I'll deal with one, Mr. Speaker. You know, the Executive Council is increasing by four people. A staff of over 80 people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the province's population is declining, when we are in fact getting smaller.

You know, Mr. Speaker, instead of transferring people, they should have transferred funds. They should have transferred the funds where they've allocated people to non-needed areas like Executive Council, and put in place additional funding for water quality. That's what was needed.

It's not a matter of saying, were 500 employees needed? The question that has to be asked by the cabinet ministers opposite is whether or not existing staffs are there, existing positions, and existing monies. Because that's the way to deal with it.

It's not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of suddenly looking at the budget and saying, well, we're not going to deal with water quality even though we've been informed for the last decade that there are problems, that there are 121 communities in the province of Saskatchewan that have systems that are in need of improvement, need of repair; that we have 38 boil-water orders that were issued that are still in effect, and they have been in effect since last fall, Mr. Speaker.

So the question has to be asked: how is this government providing assistance to these communities? Well it's providing assistance by repeating the same numbers, by repeating the fact that 170 million is going to be suddenly the answer, when in fact this is municipal funding on a third share, this is federal funding on a third share, and in fact, yes, over five years, it is provincial funding.

But it is only \$12 million for this year that is supposed to be taking care of all of the problems of the province of Saskatchewan. Whereas the members opposite try to indicate that this is a huge amount of money.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the house was informed that they spent \$15 million on two dot-com companies. And today they are telling us . . .

The Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to get into the debate today and to vote against the amendment. And also, to support the original motion which basically talks about condemning the opposition for voting against the provincial budget which contains action to improve Saskatchewan's drinking water.

Now those members across are, of course, getting worried about the truth that I will be speaking in regards to the debate.

Number one, I would say this. I was listening to the words used

by the member from Carrot River Valley, and I heard the member from Canora in regards to the words that were used originally, that there should be an apology as well, as the word that they used was deception.

And I must say that it's strange to hear those words coming from those people when I looked at the history of this legislature and when I was in opposition and I saw that Grant Devine people work as a government, and seeing what they did in regards to the province of Saskatchewan and the tremendous mess that they made in regards to this whole province including the lack of sewer and water in this province as well as the North.

I'd like to focus my remarks in regards to the North because one of the things that's very important of the Grant Devine and the right-wing mentality, and that's the fact that they will simply never deal with the North except in regards to not doing anything in the North and having at that period in history, the Devine neglect.

Now when I looked at the record therefore in my debate, I will be dealing about the North as well as dealing with the budget and what's included in the budget.

Now for the North, it is very important to look at the history. It's very true what the member from Carrot River Valley talks about when he talks about the report that came out in 1992. But that was not a condemnation of the NDP government. That was a condemnation of the Grant Devine government for the neglect, the nine years of neglect, that they did in rural communities and in northern communities.

When I looked at the northern communities, they did nothing or very little in regards to the northern development. So what they did was absolutely nothing in regards to jobs that come in regards to the sewer and water development, nothing in regards to the training.

And when we come into government, Mr. Speaker, this is what happened. As we come in, we looked at the report in 1992 and we started making some decisions as to where the critical areas were. And in regards to my debate, I will stick to my comments on the North.

We looked at the northern area and in our first two terms we put in approximately \$22 million. And it was not only a question of putting \$22 million helping the communities, over 20 communities in the North; what it was, was a respect for the people of the North.

(15:15)

I remember the time when Grant Devine was around and I was in opposition. Not only did they not do anything in regards to the North, they had complete disrespect for the people of the North. They didn't even bother meeting with the people of the North.

I noticed one time they went flying around for a period of two days. And I remember the Grant Devine government going there, doing a big expenditure to try and do fundraising where hardly anybody showed up in regards to La Ronge. But they did

very little, and many times when I talk to the members from across, they wonder why they get no support politically in regards to northern development. It was because of the Devine neglect.

When I look at the North, we had an organization called the Saskatchewan Association for Northern Local Governments. And by the leaders over there, they talked to the Grant Devine government that something needed to be done in regards to sewer and water and housing. And do you know what? Nothing was done.

Not only did Grant Devine do nothing in regards to that, they did not do anything in regards to meeting with the people of the North. They did not respect the people from the North. They didn't even meet with the political organizations that democratically elected leaders of the North. They just bypassed them and did what they wanted to do from their control element here in Regina.

And I might say this, Mr. Speaker. This question is therefore not only in regards to the respect of the people of the province and in this particular instance the North, but it's also the action that needs to be taken.

So the first thing was, yes we did action as a government. Starting in 1992 and after, we put \$22 million in regards to improving sewer and water right in the North. We helped out in regards to the housing issue because there was houses needed. We had 7 million, our first program, 8 million, and then 9 million, for \$24 million in regards to housing.

But the big, important thing was that we still were as a government concerned on the sewer and water question in the North, so we commissioned a study. And the study did come in, and it was called the Northern Water and Sewer Infrastructure Study. This was done by the steering committee, the final report of which was in March 2000. This was last year, Mr. Speaker, last spring, when this report came out.

Guess what? This government paid due respect to the leaders of the New North. We sat with the New North. We had done the joint study with UMA Engineering from Saskatoon. And we sat with the people on the needs in regards to the issue of sewer and water and the issue in regards to the housing.

When the report came down, it came to recommendations saying that approximately 25 places in the North needed to be improved, plus 9 communities that required . . . because of Devine neglect, they had no sewer and water. We needed to build on the 9 communities.

Now what happened is this, from March when the report came out to July, we had an action plan. We did a news release on July 13 on the year 2000 as a response to this report.

And I might say this, that the Northerners were very, very happy not only with the respect that we gave them and to their leadership, they were very happy of the concrete action that we took. The concrete action is this, that we will have in northern Saskatchewan 25 communities that will have their sewer and water upgraded. We will also have 9 communities that will have sewer and water in the Far North for the first time. That is very

important in terms of a historic record.

I went to a meeting in Labrador earlier on . . . well later on last fall and when they were talking about the sewer and water problems in northern Ontario, northern Quebec, and northern Alberta, and all through northern BC, they were very impressed with the strategy that we laid out in regards to sewer and water.

They said you have probably done more than anybody else, you know, across Canada. That indeed the action you're taking in making sure that the people of the North are not left out, you know, other decision making has now come to reality, not only in regards to the sewer and water but in regards to economic development.

And I might say that this strong action by the NDP coalition Liberal government is that we had got a study. Sometimes when there's a study, a person says is the government going to do something about it? And yes, we acted immediately to get that action going.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — I would like to say in conclusion, that I would like to put on the record those communities that will now have sewer and water for the first time, something that the Grant Devine never knew anything about in the North when they were around. Because I know that right-wing mentality is this, whereas social democrats balance taxation and also bringing down the debt and also getting programs out to people, all we hear from there is that the Truscott message was all we do is cut taxes.

Well how are you going to deliver programs if all you do is cut taxes? You have to do . . . cutting taxes, but you got to get the programs as well so it's got to be a sustainable taxation strategy, which is what our government does.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the records improved for the communities of the sewer and water: Stony Rapids — you've heard it on the news quite a bit — Brabant Lake, Sled Lake, Southend, Camsell Portage, Black Point, Bear Creek, Descharme Lake, and Garson Lake.

These communities were very, very happy with the provincial government in the fact that the provincial government took action to make sure that indeed their sewer and water problems and their housing problems were taken care of. And they were very proud as well that we took time to give them the respect, the respect where we sat with them as fellow leaders and we made the decision jointly.

It was a good day on July 13, the year 2000 when we made that decision. We took a leadership, you know, across Canada, and that's the essence of it.

And when I look at the budget 2000, that's the same thing. And my other member will be talking about that.

The Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'm glad to have the opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the 75-minute debate.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that I've been involved in a lot of 75-minute debates since I've been elected. Without a doubt, this is the most ridiculous motion that I have ever had the opportunity to speak to.

But I'd also like to comment on some of the comments made by the member for Cumberland.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we've heard this government in the last 10 years — since they've been elected — blame Grant Devine. How many times we've heard it's Grant Devine's fault. In fact, they're still stuck in that rut. I think the member for Cumberland used Grant Devine's name three times that I heard, and maybe even more. It's still Grant Devine's fault.

Then other times we've heard them blame the federal government. It's the federal government's fault. And then the last month, you know who they're blaming now, Mr. Speaker? It's the official opposition's fault that this problem is in . . . province is in such bad shape, including our water problems.

And I wonder about the member for Cumberland, Mr. Speaker, when he talks about what this government, the NDP government has done for the North. If they've done so much for the North, why do we still have so many problems with water in the North? Why do we have health care problems in the North? Why are all the problems in the North still there as they were when they came to power as they said?

Mr. Speaker, this motion that is presented today, if it wasn't such a serious problem in this province, would be laughable.

Mr. Speaker, we're here today to talk about the budget that was presented this year and the problems we have with water in Saskatchewan. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to a few things.

The priorities of this government, rather than give the municipalities in this province dollars to fix the infrastructure, including water and sewer, they saw fit to hire 570 more government workers. That's their priority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, SERM alone is going to hire I believe, if my numbers are right, in excess of 100 more employees. Now what would be better, Mr. Speaker — giving that money to municipalities to spend on infrastructure or to hire another 103 government workers. And possibly, I think the minister had said they'd hired 10 more people to sample water. And we're not arguing with that, Mr. Speaker. They may have been needed.

But why can't they do what every business does in this province, every municipality does in this province, is when they need people in one area and you can't afford to hire them, you restructure. You move them from this area, put them in that area. I'm sure at the size of that government workforce over there, they could find people in one area to move, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, also let's look at the problems North Battleford had. And you know what the biggest problem North

Battleford's had in the last 10 years? I'm going to tell you what the problem is, Mr. Speaker. The funding, the revenue sharing that North Battleford got in 1991 . . . and I hope the members opposite will listen to this. That was when Grant Devine got removed from power. But revenue sharing for the city of North Battleford was \$1.199 million. That was under Grant Devine.

Well let's see where we've gone since then. 1992 — oh, oh, it was cut back \$200,000. Oh, oh, 1993, cut back another 60,000; 1994, another 100,000 less. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this is all for just the city of North Battleford. 1995, down we go again. Every year it keeps . . . 1997 we go down another \$110,000.

I added it up, Mr. Speaker. You know, actually if this government had to come in and not increase 1 cent for the city of North Battleford, if they'd have froze the revenue sharing, do you know how many more dollars the city of North Battleford would have had in the last 10 years? — \$5.4 million in revenue sharing.

Can you imagine what they could have done for their water system? Can you imagine what they could have done for their sewer system? Mr. Speaker, do you think we'd have a problem? Do you think we'd have a problem in North Battleford? I don't think so.

These municipal officials out there, had they of had the luxury of spending these dollars, probably would have had one of the first-rate systems in this country, Mr. Speaker. You know . . . And I think what it boils down to, and again as I said, Mr. Speaker, it's priorities of this government. What do we want to do? Do we want to grow government? Do we want to make government bigger? Or do we want to do what's right and build the infrastructure for the people of Saskatchewan?

What this government seems to have lost sight of, Mr. Speaker, is that the reason governments are put in place is to provide the basic necessities of residents of Saskatchewan, being possibly health care. And what have they done in health care? Well they closed 53 hospitals.

Providing education for our kids in Saskatchewan. And what have we seen in education? We see a number of schools closing every year, Mr. Speaker.

Another basic necessity is roads and highways. And what have we seen in this province, under this NDP government? We see the worst highways in Canada. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. We see the worst road system in Canada, Mr. Speaker, because this government has its priorities all backwards.

Mr. Speaker, another priority we have is to provide the social fabric for the people of Saskatchewan. Instead, what we see this government doing is trying to play entrepreneurs and business people which they have no idea what they're doing. What they like to do is make foreign investments, buy companies in Ontario, to compete with Saskatchewan business and try and run them out so that the public sector can override the private sector and replace them, and then everybody can work for the government, Mr. Speaker. And that seems to be the agenda of this government.

Isn't it time, Mr. Speaker, this government called an election,

got the intestinal fortitude to call an election? And I would say, Mr. Speaker, they will be exactly where the BC NDP are going to be at the end of this week.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — We will now commence with the 10-minute period of questions to the debate participants.

Ms. Junor: — Mr. Speaker, I have a comment. When the member from Carrot River stood up and read the headlines around the water situation, it disturbed me that the headlines, the media headlines, are going to determine the truth of the matter.

And when the other member from . . . sorry, was talking about boil-water advisories and boil-water orders, there are only two boil-water orders in the province. They seem to be using them interchangeably.

And the answers were tabled today of the communities that do have boil-water advisories and boil-water orders. So I'd like to actually have people realize that there are only two communities that are under boil-water orders. The rest are under boil-water advisories, and there is a difference. I think we should try and keep our facts straight.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(15:30)

Mr. Thomson: — Question to the member for Carrot River, Mr. Speaker. I'd like him to stand up and tell his constituents why he would not support, why he would not support the additional \$20 million that this government put into the Centenary Capital Fund, why he would not support the additional 10 people that we are going to hire to look after water quality. I'd like him to defend that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomson: — Since the member for Carrot River seems unable to say that, I'd like to ask the member for Canora, who had a great deal to say in this debate. Why will he not pay credit where credit is due, for the \$20 million that this government is putting into the Centenary Capital projects which will go to help, go to help communities increase and improve their water system? Why will he not give credit for the 10 additional people that we have hired to look after water quality? Why is that member so stuck on fixing the blame and not fixing the problem?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I was using the budget document in my remarks, I'll refer to the budget document for the member's benefit.

On page 55, Mr. Speaker, it very clearly states that for water quality, for dealing with water quality in this province, the government has reduced last year's budget to this year's budget by nearly \$200,000 — they've reduced it.

So I'm not sure whether the members realized that when they put this motion forward, because I bet the members opposite wouldn't have supported this budget if they really would have known what is contained on page 55.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomson: — Mr. Speaker, my question is for the member for Saltcoats. My question is, why will he not give credit where credit is due when we have increased the revenue sharing to the city of North Battleford by \$181,317 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sorry, not revenue sharing, but the overall grants — overall grants to the city of North Battleford which will address, which will help address water quality issues.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd be delighted to answer that. The minister of Municipal Government has been talking for the last two weeks about all the infrastructure money; I believe it's 200-and-some thousand dollars they put in for North Battleford. But unless the member was dozing, he would have caught my numbers for North Battleford.

That's a far cry less than if your government, that government, Mr. Speaker, had of just froze the revenue-sharing money in 1991, because the city of North Battleford would have \$5.4 million more than they've received from your government because, Mr. Speaker, because your cutbacks have caused many of the problems that are out there in Saskatchewan.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Would you just rephrase that, please, through the Chair, member for Saltcoats?

Mr. Bjornerud: — I'd be delighted, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, many of these problems are caused because of the cutbacks of that government, Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years. Had these cutbacks have not continued on the backs of municipal government, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we'd see the problem with our water and sewer works that we have today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomson: — I'm amazed by the nonsense I hear from the member for Saltcoats.

The question I have to ask very clearly is how can that member — that member who supported Grant Devine — how can that member vote against the budget? A budget that increased the number of water quality officers by 10. A budget that, yes, unfortunately, has to continue to pay \$2 million a day for the debt that those members opposite built up. How could he vote against this budget?

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the member's information — and I know I look a little older than I probably am — I'm not sure I was even born when Grant Devine was in power. I know I wasn't political, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

my question is to the member for Cumberland. Mr. Speaker, the member . . .

The Speaker: — Order.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the member from Cumberland. Mr. Speaker, the member from Cumberland talked about Grant Devine ignoring northern Saskatchewan and the problems that arose from there.

I'd like to read a list for you. This is a list of water-advisory and boil-water orders from northern Saskatchewan — Deschambault Lake, Garson Lake, Sled Lake, Spruce Lake, Bear Creek, and Black Point dated May 6, 2001.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the member, is how can he continue to support a government that continues to ignore the plight of northern Saskatchewan in his constituency and in the constituency of Athabasca? Mr. Speaker, his government is the same government as Grant Devine's.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, this is the same member who worked with Grant Devine, and all those people worked for Grant Devine. And I think that it is outrageous for him to say so.

When Grant Devine was around, Mr. Speaker, he did absolutely nothing in the North. When we come into government, that study, that 1992 study was a direct aspect of saying how terrible Grant Devine was in his government. We improved it by \$22 million as direct action, Mr. Speaker. Over 20 communities were involved.

This latest study, he quotes from the May term figure. The study itself was done in March; he talks about May. July 16 we did a strong report and action with \$25 million. And the \$25 million impacts this year and they will continue to do the work in regards to all of the northern communities. Twenty-five communities, nine . . .

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when the member, the minister for the Environment, was sitting on this side of the House, he used to complain bitterly about the lack of inaction of that government in supporting the North.

Again I read, Mr. Speaker, from the list: Deschambault Lake, Garson Lake, Sled Lake, Spruce Lake, Bear Creek, and Black Point. While the Minister of Northern Affairs complains, Mr. Speaker, about the inaction of the previous government, he is responsible for this area of the province. And again, Mr. Speaker, we have nothing but boil-water orders in those communities and the government failed to do anything.

Mr. Minister, when will you do something about the water in these communities?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomson: — Mr. Speaker, my question is again to the member for Saltcoats. I would have to . . . well I can't speak to whether he was born while Devine was here. I know many thought he may have been born yesterday. Because he is not giving any credit whatsoever to this government for the amount of money that we're putting into infrastructure.

The question I have for him is, why did he vote against a budget that provided almost an additional \$10 million in the Canada-Saskatchewan Infrastructure Program that will assist communities, assist communities in terms of dealing with water quality?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the information — and we know it to be true now — that this government, Mr. Speaker, knew September 22, last fall, that there was a problem with a number of areas in this province with the water systems . . . In fact, Mr. Speaker, it even goes back as far as 1992, when it was brought to this government's attention that there was problems with the water in this province. What did this government do, Mr. Speaker? Absolutely . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order. Order, please. Order, please. Order. The mike is having difficulty distinguishing which speaker they are supposed to pick up. I think the mike would like to recognize the member from Saltcoats.

Mr. Bjornerud: — I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, this government knew from the documents we received September 22 last fall, that there was problems in this province with the water systems in this province. They also knew in 1992 that there was problems if they weren't addressed.

Mr. Speaker, no one has to accept responsibility for what's gone wrong with our infrastructure except this NDP government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Time has expired.

PRIVATE BILLS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 301 — The International Bible College Amendment Act, 2001

Clause 1

Mr. Elhard: — Mr. Deputy Chair, I have some questions I would like to ask pertaining to this particular Bill. Having friends and acquaintances who have attended the International Bible College that exists in Moose Jaw, I'm wondering if the mover of this particular Bill could tell us what is different about this particular amendment from what existed as a result of legislation brought forward in 1948?

I'm assuming at one time they were able to offer diplomas, but is this going to extend their ability to offer university degrees that are accredited?

Ms. Higgins: — I'd like to thank the member for his question. I was approached by the International Bible College, and their intent of this private members' Bill was to bring their charter in line with their mandate, which allows them to award diplomas, certificates, and theological degrees only.

Mr. Elhard: — So may I take it, Mr. Deputy Chair, from the response, that the element of theological degrees is the change that is being addressed by this particular Bill?

Ms. Higgins: — Yes, that's the only change.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(15:45)

Bill No. 302 — The Our Lady of the Prairies Foundation Act, 2001

Clauses 1 to 25 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 303 — The Providence Hospital, Moose Jaw Repeal Act

Clause 1

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. I just have a couple of questions. I wonder if the member from Moose Jaw Wakamow can really tell me the purpose of this Bill. I can't seem to find much in it which really caused the Bill to come into effect. So I'm wondering if the member can give me a quick explanation as to the rationale for this Bill being proposed.

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. This Act and also Bill No. 305 are tied together in that in Moose Jaw, as you may be aware, there was two facilities, St. Anthony's Home and also the Providence Hospital, that were run by the Sisters of Charity. Now both facilities closed down in 1994 and were amalgamated into one facility that is now the Providence Place for Holistic Health Inc.

So what this does is basically clean up the last details of those two facilities that are either closed or transferred into private hands.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again a question. I guess I'm putting both of these Bills together as you suggested. Will they be incorporated into one Bill? And I

guess one of my fundamental questions is who generated this? Was it from the hospital — St. Anthony's Home — themselves, or what was the drive to have this particular Bill enacted?

Ms. Higgins: — Part of the problem with these facilities now being defunct, it has to deal also with bequeaths. These were initiated by the Providence Place itself through their lawyer so that any bequeaths that were left in wills or through whatever means to Providence Place or St. Anthony's Home or the Providence Hospital would now be transferred to Providence Place.

Mr. Huyghebaert: — So I take it then that any monies for either one of these facilities then are now going to be amalgamated into the new facility and that's what both of these Bills are going to do. So my questions are basically the same for both Bills and so the answers will be the same then I gather?

Ms. Higgins: — Yes, they are the same but what these Bills do is repeal the Act so that it brings to a close those two facilities and moves everything to the new facility.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 304 — The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities Amendment Act, 2001

Clause 1

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just only have a couple of questions, Mr. Chair. I just wonder if the member would explain what we're trying to change, from what to what here, and what is the purpose of the Bill?

Mr. Wartman: — Thank you. SARM was limited in its ability to invest and this just broadens the scope where they can invest, but is limited by where any prudent investor would invest. They were earlier restricted in what they could invest in.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Well thank you. I just maybe have one caution here, Mr. Chair, is that if the member could inform me as to a prudent investor could also go out and buy farmland and farm. Is this part of what we're doing here is allowing them to do this?

Mr. Wartman: — A prudent investor cannot go out and invest in farmland. This is primarily in investments that would be regulated by exchange.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 305 — The St. Anthony's Home Repeal Act

Clause 1

Ms. Higgins: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair of Committees. It's actually with a wee bit of sadness that I sponsor this Bill. The Sisters of Charity and St. Anthony's Home has provided a wonderful service in Moose Jaw for Moose Jaw and the surrounding areas for a number of years. It is indeed a landmark in Moose Jaw. It sits up on the hill above the Wakamow Valley.

So it is with a little bit of sadness that we repeal this Act and end the service of St. Anthony's Home. But I just would like to say that the service to Moose Jaw was appreciated and it will be a memorial and landmark in Moose Jaw for a number of years to come.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 306 — The St. Thomas More College Act, 2001

Clause 1

Mr. Gantfoer: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair of Committees. A few questions. I realize in this proposed legislation there is a replacement of a prior bit of legislation to incorporate St. Thomas More College with this new Act that is cited The St. Thomas More College Act, 2001. Can the member sponsoring this legislation outline the main differences between these two pieces of legislation?

(16:00)

Mr. Addley: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. St. Thomas More College is a federated college with the University of Saskatchewan and it provides generally liberal arts education. And this has not been changed for many, many years.

And so what the St. Thomas More College had been doing was going a little bit beyond what was in the Act. And so this is generally housekeeping amendments that bring it up to the standard of what it's actually been doing for the last number of years. So there's not any major changes; it's just generally housekeeping.

And I'm very pleased to be sponsoring the Bill as I attended the University of Saskatchewan and St. Thomas More College as well, and it's a fine college.

Mr. Gantfoer: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I certainly agree it's a fine college and has provided a very significant contribution not only to the University of Saskatchewan's milieu, but also towards the whole of the province.

Are there any structural changes in the members of the corporation? I see that they're outlined, very detailed. Is there any structural changes that deviates from the past structure of

the membership compared to what's outlined now?

Mr. Addley: — Could the member be more specific in what he's referring to as to structure and . . .

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Under Part III, the "Members of the Corporation," the members are listed under section 5 and includes people from the congregation that the college serves; the Roman Catholic diocese, the eparchy of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, etc. Have any of that membership structure been changed?

Mr. Addley: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Unfortunately I'm not familiar with what the original, the Bill was. I was approached by the college to sponsor this particular Bill. So I basically have been studying this Bill. I've not gone back to the 1940s, what the legislation was there.

So I don't have an answer as to what was done in the previous one. I was looking at specifically the Bill that's being presented in the House today. And I think it matches very closely or matches exactly with what the aims and objectives of the college is today and so that's basically what we've been concentrating on. So I'm very happy to sponsor this Bill.

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you, Chair. Member, you know, I am surprised that there wouldn't be some comparison or at least that the leadership of St. Thomas More College might not have outlined to you in requesting that you sponsor this Bill, what the motivation is for them to require the new legislation.

If everything is the same as it was before, it would strike me as you don't need to change anything. But there must be some changes or alterations to the membership or to the powers or to the transitional factors or things of that nature that motivated the college to request this renewal of their legislation. And that's why I asked the question: what are the substantial changes between the two bits of legislation?

Mr. Addley: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I did not say that what is being done today is what was proposed in the original Bill, but the Bill that is being proposed today matches with what is being done today. Now if the member would like a detailed analysis of the comparing and the contrast, I'm sure we could provide that for him.

Unfortunately there was no questions raised in the committee while we brought . . . the president and the Chair actually took a specific trip to be in Regina just last week to answer these types of questions. So I guess it's unfortunate that we were not asking the people that were actually presenting the Bill and presented to the committee to answer these very specific questions. But if the member would like me to bring back those specific analysis, I'm sure the president and the Chair would be more than happy to do so at St. Thomas More College.

Mr. Gantefer: — Thank you, Mr. Chair, and member. I think it would be useful if there was at least a bit of an explanation by the governor or whatever of St. Thomas More College who has requested this change to outline the need for it.

I am certain that there is very suitably drafted in terms of meeting the current needs of the college and in a go-forward

basis. So we'd be pleased to allow this legislation to go forward. We have no problem with it, but it would be helpful to understand what the changes are.

Mr. Addley: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I will ensure that the St. Thomas More College will receive a *Hansard* of these proceedings so that they can answer these questions. And if there are any additional questions that the member would like answered, I would suggest that he put them on record in writing. And I'll ensure that they are answered in due course. So I thank the member for his questions.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Thomson): — Members, I note that there are, if my knowledge of Roman numerals serves me correctly, eight parts to this Bill. And I would seek leave to vote this Bill by part.

Leave granted.

Clauses 3 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

The committee reported progress.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 301 -- The International Bible College Amendment Act, 2001

Ms. Higgins: — I move the Bill No. 301, The International Bible College Amendment Act, 2001 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 302 — The Our Lady of the Prairies Foundation Act, 2001

Mr. Addley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 302, Our Lady of the Prairies Foundation Act, 2001 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 303 — The Providence Hospital, Moose Jaw Repeal Act

Ms. Higgins: — I move that Bill No. 303, The Providence Hospital, Moose Jaw Repeal Act be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

**Bill No. 304 — The Saskatchewan Association of Rural
Municipalities Amendment Act, 2001**

Mr. Wartman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 304, The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities Amendment Act, 2001 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 305 — The St. Anthony's Home Repeal Act

Ms. Higgins: — I move that Bill No. 305, The St. Anthony's Home Repeal Act be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 306 — The St. Thomas More College Act, 2001

Mr. Addley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 306, The St. Thomas More College Act, 2001 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

The Assembly adjourned at 16:14.