

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, 10 grade 10, 11, and 12 students from Central Collegiate in Moose Jaw. They are here today accompanied by their teacher, Brian Swanson.

And it would be of interest to members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that these students make up a little group called the Government Club at Central Collegiate, and they meet weekly at noon hour to discuss issues of the day, as well as hear from speakers, and debate about the political events going on in Saskatchewan and Canada. It may very well be that some day one or more of these students will take a chair on the floor of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, they will be staying for the proceedings of the Assembly until 3 o'clock, and then taking a tour of the buildings, and I'll be meeting with them at 3:30 for pictures, drinks, and a discussion of the events of the day I would ask all members to join in making very welcome the members of the Government Club from Central Collegiate in Moose Jaw.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add greetings with my colleague from Moose Jaw North to the members of the Government Club. A few weeks ago I had the opportunity to be with the club at one of their noon hour discussions. We discussed privatization. I think the member of the Government Club taught me as much as I taught them, and I hope they find this to be a learning experience this afternoon. Welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the legislature, a distinguished delegation from the People's Republic of China. I had the opportunity to meet these fine people this morning. They represent the Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs, and they're a delegation that is in Canada.

I want to introduce Mr. Chai, the head of the delegation, vice-president of Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs; I want to introduce Mr. Song, executive secretary of China Society for Research on Restructuring the Economic Systems; Mr. Zhu, deputy secretary-general of CPIFA (Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs); and, Mr. Bi, deputy division chief of North American Affairs, and interpreter; and Ms. Cui, staff member of the North American division.

They will be meeting with Agdevco (agricultural development corporation), SaskTel International, the Minister of Science and Technology, various other

departments, as well as the Department of Political Science at the University of Regina.

Please join me in welcoming this delegation to Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — As well, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you, the Albert Elementary School students, 25 students that are in the Speaker's gallery waving at you, Mr. Speaker. Their teachers are Mr. Wayne Tranburg, Mrs. Pamela Goodale and Mrs. Rena Favel.

I would like the legislature to please welcome the students and the teachers here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Premier in welcoming our special guests from Albert School this afternoon. As you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, I have a special interest in this particular group visiting the legislature today. My wife, Pamela, is one of the teachers accompanying the group, along with Mr. Tranburg and Mrs. Favel.

I would like to join with all members in wishing them an enjoyable visit in the legislature — I hope, an educational experience — and I look forward to meeting with them after question period to discuss some of the proceedings in this place and join them for some refreshments.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the official opposition I would like to join with other in extending a greeting and welcome to the grade 6 students from Albert School here in Regina, as well as their teachers.

These students have come from a school in a constituency that was represented for many, many years — I think 27 years — by one of the more distinguished Canadian, Allan Blakeney, who, as they may well know, has retired and is now doing other things. But it's an honour to have them here. We hope that they enjoy their visit, that they will learn a great deal from what happens here, and I'm sure that the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg will assist them afterwards when he meets with them. So, welcome, on behalf of the members of the official opposition.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the official opposition I, too, want to welcome the delegation from the People's Republic of China. I was in the People's Republic of China in 1972, shortly after your country became available for people to visit. I plan on returning to the People's Republic in 1992, twenty years later, and I'm sure that you've made great progress since that time. And we welcome you to Saskatchewan.

Hon Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Privatization of Natural Gas Holdings of SPC

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. Minister, on Friday your government announced the privatization of the natural gas reserves of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. It means, Mr. Minister, that the 232,000 Saskatchewan home owners which benefit from natural gas will have another increase in their natural gas rates.

Mr. Minister, since your government took office, you've already increased the average family's natural gas bill by \$240. Now you've given away enough natural gas reserves to supply each and every household in Saskatchewan for the next 15 years, and you've given those reserves to a privately owned company, 75 per cent owned outside the province of Saskatchewan. Simply put, Mr. Minister, simply put, you've engaged in a process of . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order, order! The hon. member is getting rather lengthy with his preamble. I believe he's had more than enough time to set the question. I now ask him to put it.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, my question is this: in view of the unjustifiable utility rate increases you've imposed on Saskatchewan families, will you confirm here today in the House that your privatizing of natural gas means an increase, a further increase in their natural gas rates?

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is again, and I suppose to be expected, a little fast and loose with his numbers. I want to give you, as I have in this House before, Mr. Speaker, give you the actual numbers as it relates to rate increases in the seven-year period prior to 1982.

Rate increases in the gas utility were 188.5 per cent, Mr. Speaker — 188.5 per cent — for an average of 26.9 per cent per year for that seven-year period, Mr. Speaker. Now for a comparable period, the six and one-half years since April of 1982, gas rate increases, Mr. Speaker, were a total of 5.3 per cent, for an average of 0.8 per cent per year for a comparable period post-'82, Mr. Speaker.

Now to deal with the question, Mr. Speaker, of the sale of the reserves to Saskoil, I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that the reserves were sold to a Saskatchewan-based company. I think it's important, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I don't know why these guys don't like these answers, Mr. Speaker. I think it's good for Saskatchewan, I think it's good for SaskPower, I think it's good for Saskoil that these reserves will now, rather than lie dormant, Mr. Speaker, will now be developed.

It is expected that Saskoil will invest \$100 million over the next five years in the development of those reserves. Mr. Speaker, that will give us additional revenue through transportation of gas at SaskPower. I expect that there will be no significant impact on the rates at the utility. And, Mr. Speaker, this will call for about 6 to 800 new gas wells in this province over the next five years. I think it's a good deal for everybody, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary. Mr. Minister, the numbers that the people of Saskatchewan are interested in are the 58 per cent increase in the natural gas rates since your government took office; the \$240 that you've . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Order, order. I think that we should get off on the right foot, so I'm interrupting early. We had a long question, a long answer, and let's get down to short preambles or no preambles to supplementary, and short answers on the part of ministers.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, in light of the \$240 increase it's cost Saskatchewan families in natural gas increases, Mr. Minister, why is it that you can give tax breaks to corporations? Why is it that you can give away our natural resources? And why is it that every action, your blinded illogical actions, is going to result in a steeper rate increase for Saskatchewan people? Why is it that you're pursuing this course?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, they don't listen, or they don't want to hear. I don't know what it is. We've been through this before. SaskPower has a horrendous debt — \$2.6 billion. This sale, Mr. Speaker — and I'm not going to point fingers as to who rung the debt up — but the fact is, the second unit at Coronach and the Nipawin power project were projects that were committed prior to this administration — and they were necessary projects, I don't deny that — and so we have this debt, Mr. Speaker.

The net effect of selling this resource, Mr. Speaker, is equivalent to having an additional \$30 million of profit in SaskPower. We estimate, Mr. Speaker, before this deal that over the next 10 years we can contain rate increases to at or below the rate of inflation. This deal, Mr. Speaker, helps us to even do better than that.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary to the same minister. Mr. Minister, you can save rate increases for Saskatchewan people by doing away with your billion-dollar boondoggle at shafferty, if you're concerned. But it seems to be that, Mr. Minister, that that rationale is a smoke-screen.

I want to ask you, I want to ask you, sir: why is it, why is it that your corporation president, during a press conference, announced that all of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) is up for sale at the right price, when your own government, including yourself, said that no

utilities in Saskatchewan are for sale? Won't you admit that that course of action will result in nothing but price gouging of Saskatchewan consumer?

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, first, of course he's wrong again. And the president of SPC said nothing like that. I was there; I sat beside him, and I didn't see the hon. member. I didn't see the hon. member in the room. The other thing that he doesn't understand, Mr. Speaker, is that sitting on these reserves is not an option. The method of the NDP . . . I mean, they didn't even know there was natural gas in Saskatchewan; they thought it stopped right at the Alberta border, Mr. Speaker.

Because of incentives of this government, the private sector has found lots and lots of gas, Mr. Speaker, and the gas that we have under contract and the reserves that will be retained guarantee Saskatchewan a 40- to 50-year supply without the reserves that we're selling, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — A new question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the press conference held late on Friday you announced the deal for \$325 million, the sale of the natural gas reserves. You say you're going to take \$125 million in cash, plus another \$125 million or thereabouts in Saskoil shares, based on market valuation. Now when you add that up, it adds up to \$250 million; it seems to be about 75 million short.

Will you table here, Mr. Minister, the deal that you've worked out, with the financial addendum's, so that the people of Saskatchewan can see the kind of arithmetic which is going to cost them literally tens of hundreds of thousands of dollars in rate increases over the next 10 years for the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, that member may well be the only person in all of Saskatchewan that doesn't like this deal. Mr. Speaker, when SaskPower bond — I think issue number five — is issued with the exchangeable feature for Saskoil shares, there are going to be a lot of happy people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And I encourage that member to get on the bandwagon and be one of the happy folks in the province.

Now what does SaskPower get? SaskPower get 325 million in cash and securities, broken down in the following manner, Mr. Speaker: 13 million Saskoil common shares to be issued from the treasury, valued at current market prices and cash — the two together to total \$245 million; 5 million in Saskoil share purchase warrant, valued at \$13 million; and cash flow royalty paid over a period of five years, valued at \$25 million; a promissory note for \$20 million, Mr. Speaker; and a growth overriding royalty valued at \$22 million, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's an excellent deal for Saskoil. It is an excellent deal, Mr. Speaker, for SaskPower. It is an excellent deal for the people of Saskatchewan, and it's supported by fairness opinion by outside independent financial

advisers, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Minister, earlier you said that we should listen to what you were saying and that we should learn something from it. And I've listened to what you've said in response to the question from the member from Rosemont, and I'm rather shocked by the minister's refusal to table this document, but I'm not surprised.

You have publicly announced an agreement — and that's your word — to sell off or give away natural gas reserves on which hundreds of thousands of Saskatchewan families, homes, businesses and farms are dependent. Your press release talks of a sale price of around \$325 million, but the numbers don't add up, Minister. The financial deal you've described is bizarre in that the description is incomplete . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. I think the member should get to his question. He is using up his time.

Mr. Solomon: — My question to the minister is this: what are you trying to hide? If it's such a good deal, why don't you table the document in this House today, and if you don't table it, you must be hiding something. What is it?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, first, I'm not trying to hide anything, but secondly, they should hope that I was, because if their record was exposed prior to 1982 as it relates to the gas development in this province, they . . . well no, they know no shame. I doubt that they would be ashamed, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, in 1982 there were nine gas wells drilled in this province — nine. Is that right — nine in 1982?

Because of the policies of this government and deregulation, Mr. Speaker, we have developed, or at least the private sector has developed, the gas resource in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, to the point where we are able to back out of some agreements with our neighbour, Alberta. I think we are now two-thirds . . . two-thirds of our gas supply is now supply is now supplied from within Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Over the next five years, we're going to see 6 to 800 new wells drilled in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I think that he would hope that I would hide those figures, Mr. Speaker. Now as it relates to . . .

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister responsible for SPC. Mr. Minister, you claim this is a good deal, but you refuse to table that deal in this House and, frankly, we on this side don't believe you. You claim to have sold those assets, 40 per cent of Saskatchewan Power's natural gas utility, at fair market value, and my question is this, Mr. Minister: did you obtain an independent appraisal of these assets, and will you at least table this appraisal in this House today?

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know where he was for the first 15 minutes of question period. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did have an appraisal and evaluation done of the reserves. That evaluation was done by Coles, Nikiforuk, Pennell Associates Ltd. They are recognized as leaders in the industry and, Mr. Speaker, I saw the appraisal. I think it's about 26 volumes — I think it's about 26 volumes. I'm sure they would want to read every last page of it, Mr. Speaker.

In the normal course of event, Mr. Speaker — and that member knows it; he's been around here since 1975 with one brief little interruption where the people of Regina decided he ought not to be here, and they're going to think that way again — but in the normal course of events, Mr. Speaker, he knows that you don't table documents in question period, number one. And number two, Mr. Speaker, these kinds of questions are raised in the Crown Corporations Committee. That's the proper course to take, and it's one that I recommend to him, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Contingency Plans for Drought Conditions

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Premier in his capacity as Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Premier, today for the fourth time I want to raise the question of potential drought or at least very dry moisture conditions across much of southern and western Saskatchewan this spring. I first raised this matter with you in early February, but to date I do not get the feeling that the government is taking this issue seriously.

And I wonder, Mr. Premier, in the light of last week's announcement of a \$20 million emergency water program by the province of Alberta to help combat the driest spring conditions since 1889, will the Premier now acknowledge that Saskatchewan is facing a serious problem in this regard too, and will he announce a specific contingency plan to help farmers, ranchers, and rural communities to cope with this impending crisis?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I share with the hon. member his concern about drought and the lack of water, particularly in southern Saskatchewan. It's something that has been plaguing southern Saskatchewan for about the last 10 years, as we've noticed the water table go down and down.

One of the reasons that we established the water corporation was to co-ordinate activities federally and provincially and with municipal governments, so that we could have programs in place for water development, for drilling, for irrigation, to work with communities to make sure that we can have adequate water supplies.

The water corporation works on an ongoing basis with the public, both farmers, ranchers, and municipalities. We are now in the process of putting together the programs with any new ideas that are coming forward from the municipal councils, and farmer, and ranchers,

and the PFRA (Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration).

And the ongoing operations that we have here today are certainly helping and working if we need to move either livestock or we need to move feed because we're going to leave some livestock where there is water, or a combination of things.

If we need more money for drilling an exploration for water, we're prepared to do that. We have got literally millions of dollars working now, and we are prepared to look at more. And hopefully the kind of programs that we can do with the federal government in co-operation with PFRA, our water corporation, and municipal government, we can address it as best we can here in the province, knowing that obviously you can't make it snow or rain.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Speaker, from what the Premier has just said, I gather that there is now beginning to be some movement toward a special contingency plan for this year. And I wonder if the premier could tell us specifically when he might be in a position to announce the full shape of that contingency plan for 1988, because the problem is serious and it's getting worse.

And in that contingency plan, will the government specifically provide that the province will cover the cost of acquiring pumps and pipes for community and farm use in moving water where that's required? At present there is a fee for that service, and I wonder if the government would specifically include that as an item to be covered by the government, in the face of very serious circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the kind of thing that we are discussing with municipalities and municipal councillors across southern Saskatchewan. They're giving us their advice in dealing with the water corporation as well as with the Department of Agriculture and the federal government. So if we need to provide more assistance because of the particular problem, then we are prepared to look at that and work with the recommendations of the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities).

Privatization of Essential Utilities

Ms. Atkinson: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the minister of privatization.

Mr. Minister, your Premier and your government said your privatization ideology would not lead to the privatization of health care, but it did. You claimed that your privatization ideology would never lead to the privatization of Saskatchewan essential public services and utilities like SaskTel and SaskPower, but it has. You've already privatized SaskPower's coal reserves through Manalta Coal of Alberta, and now you're privatizing SaskPower's natural gas reserves.

Mr. Minister, will you admit that you are indeed privatizing Saskatchewan's essential utilities? Will you admit that?

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — No. Mr. Speaker, I don't see any indication of that at all. I listened with interest to my colleague, the Minister of SaskPower, who indicated that from this sale and the development of the reserves that are here, the ones that I remember when I came in this House, the leader, now departed, the opposition wanted to keep for I don't know when, kept it locked in the ground. We're looking at developing 800 new wells and, as I heard the minister say just moments ago in this House, he feels that prior to this, with the actions that have been taken by SaskPower, that rates could be held near inflation or perhaps below. And with this other development, I think they will see that the utilities of this province, both in power and electricity, will be well served by this type of venture.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister of privatization. Mr. Minister, you privatized the highway workers and privatized the highways' equipment and our taxes went up and our roads got worse. You privatized the provincial parks and our taxes went up, our park fees went up and the services got worse. You attacked the prescription drug plan and privatized the children's dental plan and our taxes went up and the health care services for Saskatchewan families got worse. Now you're privatizing still more of SaskPower, and our taxes and our utilities are still going up. Mr. Minister, will you stop this ideology of privatization, and will you stop destroying the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, most certainly, Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the statements of the member opposite about increases and services deteriorating. I think — and I'll take the Department of Parks, for example. Having just been in the portfolio of Tourism, I can tell you fair well, Mr. Speaker, that if there had not been . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. Order. The minister is attempting to answer the question but isn't getting much co-operation, and so I ask for your co-operation.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was indicating as an example that having been the Minister of Tourism in the last year or so in Saskatchewan, I can tell you, without the initiatives in the parks where we have seen brand-new, state of the art, four-season resorts developed in the major parks of Saskatchewan, that that type of development would not have taken place.

The member opposite likes to indicate park fees and so on, and I remember last week in this House when the Minister of parks and renewable resources indicated that the only reason that the park fees had gone up is that we were dragging far behind comparable park fees in other parts of western Canada.

So I just want to reinforce, Mr. Speaker, for you and for the people of Saskatchewan, that without that infusion of

private capital into the parks, we would not have the fine facilities that we have now in Duck Mountain, we have in Cypress hills, and we have in Kenosee.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — New question to the minister of privatization. Mr. Minister, you claimed you weren't going to attack health care, but you did. You attacked the prescription drug plan and you destroyed the school-based children's plan. That's what your PC privatization ideology has meant so far — an attach on health care, higher taxes, and fewer services.

Now you're privatizing our public utilities, and you can't deny that, Mr. Minister. The facts are clear. You've announced the privatization of SaskPower's natural gas reserves, a deal that amounts to a sell-off of more than 40 per cent of the total value of Saskatchewan Power's natural gas utility.

My question is this: will you now admit that your privatization plans include everything in this province will you now admit that?

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, that is a great exaggeration. And I would just like to remind this House, as I mentioned earlier, about the natural gas policy that the departed leader of the NDP had, which I didn't agree with.

I'd also like to remind the members opposite that the departed leader said, not too long before he left this House, that he felt some of the aspects of the Crown corporations — it was timely that they be seen to be certainly candidates for public participation. So when she tries to stand up here and say that everything is going to be privatized, the short answer is, it is not.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Ruling on a Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: — On April 21 before orders of the day, the member for Regina North East raised a point of order that the Minister of Education twice answered a question by making the response on the date he took as notice, and then making a further response in oral question period. At that time I agreed to review the record.

On April 20 the member for prince Albert asked a specific question which the Minister of Education took as notice. The minister took notice directly, with few comments. The member for Prince Albert then asked a supplementary, but before doing so alluded to the minister's competence for not having an answer at that particular moment. This of course provoked the minister into giving a response that went beyond simply taking notice of the supplementary. In no way, however, can that response be construed as answering the question.

On April 21 the minister had the opportunity to answer both the question and supplementary. I found that he did so directly and to the point. This was the only time he

answered the question, therefore I find the member for Regina North East's point of order not well taken.

Before leaving this issue, I would like to take the opportunity to address the practice of ministers taking notice and then being asked supplementaries. Over the last decade it has become a practice of this House to permit a supplementary to a question that has been taken as notice. I have made an effort to ensure and, indeed, have ruled that ministers should not abuse question period by responding to a question at the same time as taking notice. This, in effect, is answering the same question twice. To enforce this principle, I found it necessary on April 21 to ask the Minister of Health to discontinue his remarks after he took notice.

By the same token, however, supplementaries in such a situation should be without a preamble and narrowly worded for the purpose of eliciting further information. The case raised in the point of order shows what happens when members add provocative comments to their supplementaries. I find it an abuse which can only cause a degeneration of question period.

Furthermore, members should not use a new question as a pretext to ask a supplementary question on the same issue. This happened on April 21 when the member for Regina Lakeview asked a series of questions on one particular case. If a minister is to be limited in his response after taking notice, it is only reasonable that the member asking a further question should also be limited.

Finally, I ask that all members try to adhere to these accepted principles. And also I invite any members, who would like to discuss this issue further, to my office. My door is always open.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that Bill No. 2 — **An Act respecting the Use of the French and English Languages in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to continue my comments in the debate which I terminated on Thursday, I believe.

At the onset, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my considered opinion about one rather narrow legal question which relates to this Bill. I believe there was a second and valid argument that section 1(10) of the North-West Territories Act in effect meant that the laws of Saskatchewan needed only to be in English.

I understand the position that the Department of Justice of the provincial government took on that question in essence, adopting that proposition — and I don't propose to criticise them for it — while that may or may not have been a sound and valid legal point of view, it was not the

position adopted by the Supreme Court, and that has made all the difference.

Today circumstances are different because today we must act in the wake of the Supreme Court's decision. We must face forward; we must address the future. Today Saskatchewan is a multicultural mosaic, a rich and varied tapestry of many cultures. In Saskatchewan, multiculturalism is not merely an abstract idea, it is an indisputable social fact, and we are stronger for it. Therein lies much of our dignity, therein lies much of our diversity, and therein lies our promise. I submit, Mr. Speaker, therein lies the future.

Let me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, make a brief comment on the process, the public policy process, that has culminated in the consideration of these issues here today. All across Saskatchewan no values are felt more deeply by the Saskatchewan families, no values are cherished more dearly, than those associated with religion, language and culture.

That cultural heritage and those cultural values are absolutely fundamental in the home, in the family, in the community. They help shape and define who we are. They are a powerful and positive force binding us together, in a way that enriches, to our family and our community.

It is therefore regrettable that the government policy now before us in the legislature today has not been developed by a process of consultation with the Saskatchewan people. I'm aware, of course, that the government has undertaken some degree of consultation and discussion with the media in Toronto, with the Prime Minister in Ottawa, Premier Bourassa of Quebec. Unfortunately, the government has failed to consult with Saskatchewan people, failed to consult adequately, and in some cases failed to consult at all with those here in Saskatchewan who are most interested in, and affected by, this government's policy. By its failure of consultation, this government has failed to recognize and respect the multicultural nature of Saskatchewan. I believe that the government's failure of consultation has produced a flawed policy process, Mr. Speaker, and that flawed process has produced the flawed and regrettable government policy we see here today.

I would like to turn, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, to a subject that I touched on for a few moments last week, to expand on what I believe is the really central and the fundamental issue before this Assembly today — the multicultural nature of Saskatchewan society and the government's failure to acknowledge and respect Saskatchewan multiculturalism.

There are some members of government opposite, Mr. Speaker, who appear to view the United States as a model society in which Saskatchewan should emulate. I certainly do not share that point of view. While there is much to respect about the United States, their traditions, their cultural pattern, and their social and cultural practices have all been different than ours, and I prefer the Canadian.

Americans have often described their society, with a

positive connotation, as a melting pot, and they say it proudly. And I think that's an accurate and fair description of the American experience. But Canada has not been a melting pot with one homogenized product end result. Canada has been not so much a melting pot as a stew, contribute to the richness of the final product, but each retains its separate identity in a rich and varied mosaic, a tapestry woven of cultural diversity, a tapestry woven of strong and distinctive cultural threads, each one vibrant and resilient. The multicultural mosaic — that is the Canadian way, and that is the Saskatchewan way. I am proud of that multicultural mosaic, Mr. Speaker. Regrettably, the government's policy fails either to recognize it or to respect it.

In his remarks yesterday in this Assembly, the minister spoke about a bilingual Canada and a unilingual Saskatchewan. He spoke of Saskatchewan's history as though the only culture, the only language, the only reality, had always been English, and English alone. But I submit to you, the minister's view is at variance with the multicultural heritage and the multicultural history of Saskatchewan. His view is at variance with the multicultural nature of Saskatchewan today, for that view fails to acknowledge the hundreds of thousands of men and women of wide and varying ethnic backgrounds who came from the four corners of the globe to settle Saskatchewan, and who have contributed so much to this province.

(1445)

They came to Canada and to Saskatchewan with determination, with courage, with strength of purpose, and noble goals. They came for hope, for freedom, for community, for opportunity, and for dignity. They came to build their future. They built the only province in Canada where both the French and English, taken together, do not constitute 50 per cent of Saskatchewan's population. They built a province richer because of their contribution, and, because they retained their culture, a province richer because of our mosaic.

I am therefore disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the government's policy has failed to recognize and respect that multiculturalism, and I'm disappointed that the government's Bill and the government's policy here before us today failed to make any commitment whatsoever to protect and enhance multiculturalism in Saskatchewan.

It's a source of considerable pride to me, Mr. Speaker, that it was a New Democratic government in Saskatchewan that introduced Saskatchewan's and Canada's first human rights code 16 years ago. And one of the duties explicitly assigned to the Human Rights Commission, by law, — it's in section 25 of the Act — is to forward the principle that cultural diversity is a basic human right and a fundamental human value. That is the position of the New Democrats, and I am proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's important for all members of the Assembly, and all Saskatchewan people, to acknowledge that our history as a province has placed us within a common boundary and under a common law. All of us

share in one precious possession — we are residents of Saskatchewan. And to a large extent, to live in Saskatchewan means to have initially been a stranger and to have left behind the familiar for the new. But as long as the policy of the provincial government, in the form advanced by the minister, continues to deny that stranger within us, continues to deny Saskatchewan's multiculturalism, that policy is denying Saskatchewan.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the legislation. The government has failed to consult adequately with the Bill before us, and I will not support the policy on which it's based. The government's policy itself fails to acknowledge and enhance the multicultural nature of Saskatchewan.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina North East, that all the words after "That" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

That this Bill not now be read a second time because, *inter alia*:

- (a) the provincial government has failed to consult adequately with Saskatchewan people regarding the consequences of the Bill; and
- (b) the provincial government, as a collateral policy, has failed to enunciate new multicultural programs in recognition and support of Saskatchewan's multicultural mosaic.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate then continues on the amendment and the main motion and will continue concurrently.

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. as I begin to address a few remarks this afternoon to the subject of Bill 2, an Act respecting the Use of the English and French Languages in Saskatchewan, I want to start with an appeal, Mr. Speaker, to all members of this Assembly for reason and for tolerance and for statesmanship in dealing with this very important and very sensitive matter.

This is an occasion, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to put partisan considerations aside. A very important element of Canadian unity and Canadian life, indeed Saskatchewan unity and Saskatchewan life, Mr. Speaker, is involved in this debate, and it seems to me that it demands of all of us that we rise above the normal scenario of "politics as usual."

In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks today by commending some of the members of the government for the rhetorical commitment which they have made in the last number of weeks to the principle of Canadian unity and to the issue of minority language rights. Inside and outside of this Assembly, the Premier and the Minister of Justice, other members of the cabinet, other members of the government, have said that they intend to move and to respect and to give effect to those principles of minority language rights. They have not, Mr. Speaker, said how they intend to do that, nor have they said when they intend to do that, but they are, at

least, rhetorically committed to the principle, and sometimes, sometimes those statements on the part of members of the government have been expressed in very clear and unequivocal terms.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, would be that those expressions of good intentions which have been made from time to time on the part of some members of the government have been expressed in speeches in this House or speeches outside this House, in press conferences and news interviews and so forth, but those expressions of good intentions, Mr. Speaker, do not appear in the legal language of the Bill itself that we are discussing this afternoon, and I think that is a serious defect.

Mr. Speaker, by the Meech Lake accord the government of Saskatchewan is committed to the preservation and the protection of minority language rights in our province. By the accord, that is the obligation of the Government of Saskatchewan, together with all other governments in this country.

In the *Mercure* decision in the Supreme Court of Canada, the court has ruled that certain minority language rights exist in Saskatchewan by virtue of previous statutory law. The court ruled that Saskatchewan has two basic courses available to it now as we meet to discuss this issue in the spring of 1988. On the one hand the province of Saskatchewan could move to give some effect to those rights which the court ruled did exist, or on the other hand the government could move to abolish those rights.

It would appear on the face of the legal language in the legislation, Mr. Speaker, that the government has chosen the latter course, effectively to abolish the rights. And I must say that I am disappointed in that narrow and legalistic approach.

They have taken certain rights as defined by the Supreme Court of Canada and they have transformed those rights into discretionary privileges that may or may not be granted from time to time into the future by this and subsequent governments. In my view, Mr. Speaker, that approach is neither adequate nor appropriate in the circumstances.

The abolition, effectively, of minority language rights, in my view is not consistent with the spirit of the Meech Lake accord. The legislation, it seems to me, should have indicated some acknowledgement of those rights, and it should have provided some schedule or timetable or framework of some kind, Mr. Speaker, for giving some effect to those rights. And of course the nature of that effect and the timing of that effect is something that should have been worked out in some considerable detail by the government, in consultation with the francophone association in the province of Saskatchewan and the general population of the province of Saskatchewan who are interested in this subject.

We must, of course, Mr. Speaker, take into account the realities of what makes up Saskatchewan's population mixture. We must be mindful and respectful of our unique Saskatchewan patterns of original exploration and settlement and migration and immigration and

population development. All of those factors must be taken into account.

We must pay attention to our multicultural heritage and the deep roots in our province of wide variety of ethnic and cultural groupings. We must be careful about timing and pacing, and also about the cost involved. All of these things, Mr. Speaker, are important, and they are relevant considerations.

But with reason and judgement and goodwill and constructive leadership, it should have been possible, Mr. Speaker; in my opinion, it should still be possible, to respect minority language rights in Saskatchewan and to have a plan for giving them some life and some effect, instead of taking the legalistic approach that is proposed in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know this issue is a sensitive one. If it is mishandled, it can spark strong emotions and it can do great damage. And that damage can potentially extend far beyond the four boundaries of Saskatchewan. It can have national repercussions and impair the delicate fabric of Canadian unity.

Mr. Speaker, to most other nations on the face of the earth, our Canada is still a very young country. We're still in the relatively early stages of nation building if you compare us to most other countries in the world. And we must always be acutely aware of what a fragile thing Canadian unity really is. We can't afford to abuse it; we can't afford to take it for granted. We must constantly work at it, Mr. Speaker, for nation building, in the Canadian context, is a never-ending and a very human effort.

Mr. Speaker, if you were to sit down one day and just list on a piece of paper all of the things that would make nation building and national unity difficult and unlikely challenges to conquer, I think that you would come up with a list of factors that would pretty closely resemble an accurate description of Canada.

We have a huge geographic land mass, the second biggest in the world, from ocean to ocean to ocean, east and west and north. We have some of the most formidable geophysical terrain you'll find anywhere on the globe. We have a challenging climate and sometimes bizarre weather patterns. We have a land of dramatic regional diversity. We have a small but complicated population — first our aboriginal peoples, and then the French and the English explorers and settlers, and then wave after wave of international immigration.

We have in our country, Mr. Speaker, every ethnic origin, every colour, every religion, every political point of view to be found anywhere on the face of the earth — and all of that mixed together unevenly, mixed together at different times in our history, and strung out sparsely along 4,000 miles of American boundary.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have all of our natural physical features on the North American continent running north and south, while we try to pull our country together east and west.

You could hardly imagine a more difficult set of circumstances from which to try to forge a country. But in fact, Mr. Speaker, we have forged one. To my mind, it's the very best in the world. And how, in the face of all of these difficult circumstances, have we done that? How have we accomplished this remarkable achievement that we call Canada?

First of all, with a lot of hard work. Secondly, with a little good luck. And thirdly, with the consistent and reliable application of some fundamental and typically Canadian characteristics.

(1500)

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to characteristics like fairness and generosity and compassion and tolerance and a keen and active sense of justice. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to our willingness to reach out to each other, to reach over our differences and our diversity, to join hands. I refer to our willingness to listen to each other and to understand one another.

And having listen and understood, Mr. Speaker, we have a common Canadian characteristic that is a willingness to take action. To act, Mr. Speaker, not because the action we might take is necessarily in the sole interest of some comfortable majority, but because the action is right for the decent, tolerant, fair, and generous Canada that we want to have. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that's what Canada is all about.

That's what Canadian unity is all about. If it were just a numbers game, if Canada were nothing more than some mathematical computation, we would have severed Newfoundland long ago, Mr. Speaker. Nothing but Ontario and Quebec would really count. And our own Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, with a mere 4 per cent of Canada's national population, our own Saskatchewan would have been cut adrift with no serious consideration.

But Canada is, Mr. Speaker, substantially more than just arithmetic. It has a heart and a soul and a quality and a destiny that is larger than just the sum of its individual parts. And part of that intangible greatness of our nation, part of the essence of Canada, is our attitude toward minorities and our preparedness, Mr. Speaker, to treat minority issues with openness and with generosity.

And I think that is at least in part because we are, all of us in this country, Mr. Speaker, we are in reality a nation of minorities. Because of our complexity and our diversity, we are all, in one way or another, part of some minority group. It may be a linguistic minority; it may be a cultural minority; it may be a regional minority; it may be an economic minority. Whatever it may be, Mr. Speaker, I think we all have a little bit of that sense that in one way or another we are all part of some minority.

And Canadians realize, Mr. Speaker, that when we are in the majority on some issues, it is part of Canada's wisdom and heritage that we respect the rights and the interests of the other side, the minority side. Because on some other occasion, in some other circumstances, we shall surely find ourselves on the minority side of the equation where we will want to find ourselves respected and treated with

justice and with fairness.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of those factors that I am not satisfied with the legalistic approach that the government has taken in respect of the legislation that is presently before us. And I would like to suggest to the minister, with the greatest of sincerity, that there are at least two suggestions for changes in that legislation that he ought to take very seriously into account.

The first change that I recommend to the minister for consideration would be this: to take the spirit of what he and the Premier and other members of the government have said about the language rights issue — what they have said in this Chamber, what they have said outside this Chamber — and to embody that in some kind of preamble or some kind of statement of purpose to be included within the Bill itself.

On other occasions, apart from the Bill, they have made on behalf of the government some strong statements with respect to Canadian unity, with respect to minority language rights. They have said that they have, in connection with this matter, the very best of intentions and they do have some long-term plan in mind.

It would be in my view, Mr. Speaker, a substantial improvement in the Bill if those expressions of good intentions could be included within the craftsmanship of the Bill so that they become a part of the Bill itself, rather than just to be left to be read from time to time in the dusty copies of *Hansard* or in the newspaper clippings that might be accumulating somewhere.

I would seriously suggest that the minister consider that point and to take what he has said, what the Premier and others have said, and incorporate some of that language and some of those good intentions into the Bill itself.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, my second suggestion to the government would be that they not leave this process as open-ended or non-ended, as the process is described in the legal language of the legislation. Surely it should be possible for the government, with all of the resources available to the government and in consultation with the minority language rights groups in the province of Saskatchewan, to come up with some mechanism for providing a timetable for the action which the government says it is the government's intention to take.

The intentions may be expressed with the very best of goodwill, Mr. Speaker, and the time frame that the premier and the Minister of Justice might have in mind may be a very specific and clear-cut time frame in their minds. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that none of that appears in any way, shape, or form in the legislation that we have before us. And surely it must be possible for the government to be somewhat more specific than just this open-ended, perhaps never ending kind of process that has been included in the Bill itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say again to the Minister of Justice and to the premier that I would hope that serious, responsible, and constructive suggestions, like the ones that I have just made, will still be possible for them to take into account and to include in the legislation before a final vote on this

matter is taken.

And to repeat for the purposes of emphasis, Mr. Speaker, again some form of preamble or statement of purpose ought to be included in the legislation, consistent with the rhetorical comments which the Minister of Justice and the Premier himself has made; and secondly, some mechanism for defining what the long-term timetable is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is still time in this debate for the government to think about these suggestions and to take them seriously. I think there is still time for the government to reconsider what view to be a narrow and legalistic approach on the part of the government, an opportunity for the government to be more generous and more realistic in dealing with this situation.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, there is still time for the government to do better than it has done in the legislation tabled; to do better, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of statesmanship, setting aside partisan politics on this very sensitive and very important issue, and rising above what we might otherwise consider in this place to be a "politics as usual" type of event.

I think the issue we are discussing today requires that statesmanship. It requires that we do better than just politics as usual, and I hope that in the discussion we will have today and on other occasions about this legislation, we can do as our ancestors and forefathers have done; that is, rise above our differences, reach over our diversity, join hands in common cause for the continuing building of a greater and better Saskatchewan and a greater and better Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is an honour to rise in this House in support of this Bill No. 2 as presented by the Minister of Justice. It is an honour for me for two reasons, to speak on this Bill. First, because I am a Ukrainian and very proud of it, and secondly, because my constituency is basically made up of Slavic people. And I know I stand before you today expressing the views of the majority of the people of that constituency.

It is an honour, Mr. Speaker, because this Bill is a reflection of the courage, the considered judgement, and the genuine concern that this government has, not only for the people of our province, but for the very idea that is Canada.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the minority rights in the media and much has been said by the member of the opposition. I think, Mr. Speaker, that much of what has been said has been inaccurate, inarticulate, or simply unfair.

I will not be overly partisan on this issue because it is an issue that truly should transcend parties. But let me just point out that while the member for Saskatoon Riversdale and the member for Regina Centre have been saying that this government has been breaking the law for the past six years by not having a fully bilingual legislature, their party

broke the law for over 40 years without ever taking the necessary steps to remedy the situation.

Let me point out further, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Riversdale was the deputy premier in charge of the intergovernmental affairs and constitutional matters. If he is so sincere today that the language rights of our French minority should be fully protected, why did it take a decision of the Supreme Court to force him to publicly state so? Why did he not enact the necessary legislation and pass necessary policies when he had the unquestioned right to do so? It is because, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he is not sincere. He is in favour of whatever strikes the moment. And I do not think that that is the kind of attitude we want to see in a future premier.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I will preface those remarks I just made by saying possibly the future premier, and I might add, maybe never.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the first observation that I think should in fairness be made is that this government has supported the rights of minorities across Canada in a very vigorous and active way. It should not be forgotten that this government has been funding French immersion education for years, and the growth in the number of our citizens who can speak both official languages fluently is a testament to the fairness of the government policy.

It is also important to ask the question, Mr. Speaker, about which is truly more important to our French-speaking minority: is it more important that every law that was ever passed be translated into French as a statute of the Northwest Territories stated, or is it more important that the environment that our French minority operates in, that that environment include as many people as possible who can share their language?

Mr. Speaker, let it be remembered that it was no court ruling that required, or to this day requires that the government provide French education or any French services. That is done as a matter of policy because it is right. Because this government respects the spirit of the law, it respects the Meech lake accord, and indeed it respects the law that was passed by the Territorial Council so many decades ago . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I would remind the member from Quill Lakes that he'll get his opportunity to speak just as soon as I'm done, and I will listen to you with the same interest that you are showing towards my remarks.

I think it is most important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is done because this government respects minorities, it respects all minorities, Mr. Speaker. As a representative of one of those minorities, the Ukrainian minority, let me say how appreciative and supportive I am of the position of the government, and as I stated earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of my constituency.

(1515)

As a Ukrainian Canadian I recognize, accept, and endorse the fact that Canada is a bilingual nation. And I

am also grateful that the constitution of our country recognizes that we are also a multicultural nation. Due respect is to be paid the Ukrainians, the Germans the Italians, indeed all of our ethnic minorities. Special measures have to be taken to ensure the respect and dignity of our native peoples, and they too have a special place in the constitution of this nation.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let it not be said that concern for any one, and indeed all of these minorities, represents any insult to, or dilution of the rights of, any other minority. We must recognize that the protection of each is the protection of all.

In discussion this particular Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is important to look at the broadest picture and to understand the implications of voting against it. To vote against this Bill, one must subscribe to one of two opinions. Either one will vote against it because one believes it does not go far enough, and that all of the laws should be immediately translated; or one will vote against it because one believes it goes too far and none of the laws should be translated.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me deal with these two positions and dispose of them. In the first instance, every person in this Assembly must recognize that while this nation is bilingual, in practice very few of our people speak French. The number is growing, the progress is there, and that is a very good thing. My own family, Mr. Speaker, I have four young ladies that all have taken French right through high school, and I have a daughter that is completely bilingual in French.

I think the fact is that translating all of those laws will not increase the number of people who speak French, and it will do almost nothing to preserve the ability of those who now speak French to continue to do so. Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. If anyone can explain to me how having every law translated into French, how that will actually preserve the French language in the towns and cities of our province, then I will reconsider. But it just isn't there.

So we have to consider how do we accomplish this important objective of maintaining the language and culture of our French minority. If we try to move too quickly, we will lose control over the situation, we will frighten people needlessly, and create social disruption instead of harmony. We will, Mr. Speaker, ultimately lose the objective we hope to gain, if we try to gain it too quickly. But let it be done as it has been done with the French language education; let it be done without compulsion, without loud vitriol; let it be done in a measured, managed way, and we will achieve greater successes.

I think one only needs to look at the kind of rancorous acrimony that occurred in Manitoba to know how not to go about protecting minorities. And, Mr. Speaker, the laws will be translated as time goes on. They will be translated according to the importance to the people in their lives. And is that not a reasonable and fair approach?

Ultimately, I think it would be a real plus to have the laws translated into many languages. And perhaps some day

we ought to look at a private institute, or something, to do that job on behalf of our non-official language minorities. But right now, it is important for us to respond to the French-speaking people of our province and indeed to the people of Canada.

Now the second argument, Mr. Speaker, one that is not represented by any member of this Assembly, but which has been heard in some extreme quarters, is that the law goes too far. And because it is not a credible position, I will devote little comment to it. But let me say this: even under this moderate legislation, if it is possible to have extremists arguing against it, then how much more activity would we have with legislation that incurred the large costs and the impossible time lines that some have advocated.

I think we need to consider the nature of our province, the nature of our country, and the nature of our political system. We must respect the Meech Lake accord, and that accord sets out clearly the responsibilities of this legislature to act on behalf of its people in this matter. It provides that we should seek to protect our minorities, and I think this Bill does that, Mr. Speaker. It does it better than a more extreme approach could do.

Meech Lake is also the symbol for co-operation and conciliation, Mr. Speaker, and in part, that means cultivating the co-operation of all of our people. It does not mean imposing a set of policies that you know will cause strong and unnecessary reaction. It does not mean pretending to attain a perfection that is not possible. It means to move forward with awareness and consideration of all segments of our society. It means a measured approach to linguistic development. And it means, Mr. Speaker, that we must have the ability to manage that development through the political process.

It is clear to me, as I believe it should be clear to every member of this Assembly, that this Bill is consistent with those principles, and that it deserves the unanimous support of this legislature. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion and voting against the amendment. Thank you.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. Let me respond to the observations by my hon. friend from Regina Centre and the observations by the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, first of all dealing with the comments made by the member from Regina Centre.

What he has asked this assembly to do, Mr. Speaker, is to delay the passage of this Bill for six months which is commonly referred to as the six-month hoist . . .

An Hon. Member: — Effectively killing the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That effectively kills the Bill. And that's the nature and the tradition of that type of an amendment, and that's what that amendment is advanced to, Mr. Speaker.

Let me pose the following questions to all members of this Assembly. If we are to support, or this Assembly was to support that amendment, the net result is that we would not proceed with this Bill, and this Bill would ineffectively be killed. What are we then left with, Mr. Speaker? Should that type of amendment pass?

We are left in the untenable position, as I indicated in my opening remarks and second reading of Bill 2, with the following situation: one, any legislation introduced into this Assembly would require and need to be in both official languages. We have indicated on many occasions we do not have the capacity to do that.

Let me give you an example. We will be soon introducing a Bill relating to the securities Commission, that is some 200 pages long. In order for us to introduce that Bill, we would have to have it translated. And the net result would be that that amendment would backlog all of the legislation and the legislative agenda to be pursued in this spring session, other than the ones that we can have translated, Mr. Speaker.

But it would go farther than that because the Assembly would be speaking to it. It would go further than that in this sense, Mr. Speaker. If one is to read the Supreme Court decision in the *Mercure* case, one would find — and certainly the legal opinion that we have had both inside and outside our department — would be that all laws are now in existence would be invalid because it has to, at the earliest possible opportunity, to speak to it.

And so the hoist, as proposed by the member from Regina Centre, would have the effect of invalidating all legislation we have today, and invalidating all the rights or privileges or services arising out of those statutes, and that legislation that has been passed by this Assembly over the last 80-some years. And that's what it would mean, Mr. Speaker. So it would totally handcuff the legislature.

Now I know it's not always safe to read what you hear in the media or believe what you see in the media, but I was sure that I had read the media last Thursday wherein the member from Regina Centre said, we have no intention of holding this Bill up; we have not intention of somehow causing havoc to the way that this House functions. That's what he said. And I understand the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying exactly the same thing this morning in Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps that is not what they meant to say, or perhaps the media quoted them wrong, and on this issue the media has, I would suggest, done a less than adequate job of reporting what this issue is about. But the member opposite, if he believes what he said on Thursday, if he was properly quoted on Thursday, then I ask him: how does he square that with a motion that says, handcuff this Assembly for the next six months till we have an opportunity to deal with it further. That point number one, Mr. Speaker.

Point number two, the motion goes on to talk about failure to consult with the people of Saskatchewan, and I assume what the hon. member was referring to there is failure to consult with the francophone community. And I

can advise the hon. member that I have met on several occasions with the members of that francophone community.

They have stated their position very strongly, perhaps reflected by the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg who tend to in some degree reflect their view. And that's fair enough; he represents the largest part of them in this province. But the member opposite would somehow suggest that you cannot pass legislation (a) without consultation, or (b) that there has been no consultation. And that consultation has been there, Mr. Speaker.

Let me make two observations with regard to that consultation that I find somewhat inconsistent with what has been said in the House today. First, in all the consultation with the francophone community, in all consultation with them, Mr. Speaker, they wish to speak only to the rights of the French minority. And each time, whether it was myself or the Premier were to raise a question — well what about further education of the anglophone; what about further promoting of bilingualism in Saskatchewan — their observation always was, that is not at issue here, that is not at issue here.

And when in that consultation we posed the question to them: is it not, or would it not in fact be true that if more non-French-speaking people in our province became bilingual, would that not help your lot or your rights, or would you not feel more comfortable being able to communicate to them in your language? Their answer was, we are not interested in anglophone rights, we are interested in the rights of francophones, and we are concerned that our society is going to be assimilated. Protect us from assimilation, they said, protect us from assimilation. That is our interest, that is what is fundamental. And if you want to have more English-speaking people learn French, well, good for you.

That, I found difficult. I will also say, Mr. Speaker, in those conversations I spoke about the multicultural and multilingual nature of a province like Saskatchewan. As I said in my opening remarks, there are other first languages than French and they are in a greater majority than is the French language.

So I talked to the francophone community with regards to other languages. And the response to move further, as would be suggested by the member from Regina Centre, dealing with other languages would be a further insult to the French-speaking people of this province.

Their argument to us would be as follows. If you were to put German and Ukrainian or Cree into the same bag or rules with French, that would be tantamount to saying French is not an official language of Canada. That would be tantamount to saying, you are taking further rights away from us. That's not me speaking, Mr. Speaker, that is the francophone community of this province.

(1530)

So do not confuse, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite with the easy argument of saying, well we will cover all languages; we should speak to all languages; we should

speak to all minorities and all people that have come to our province.

This country does have two official languages. That is what this debate is about, Mr. Speaker. This is not a debate about the Ukrainian language. Whether one would like to do that or deal with that or not, I think I accept what the francophones say, that to mix that in with French, you are taking away and turning back the meaning of two official languages in this country.

The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg presents his argument, Mr. Speaker, in what I will refer to, for the sake of trying to denote it, as a federalist response.

And I just wish to reassert the point I made last week when I introduced this Bill, and that is, in 1905 when The Saskatchewan Act was being debated in the parliament of Canada, and a motion was put forward by a member of the parliament of Canada to add to The Saskatchewan Act what we could call the Manitoba clause, that says both languages shall be the official language of the province of Manitoba, they wanted that clause into The Saskatchewan Act. And the Parliament of Canada said no.

And that debate, Mr. Speaker, and that argument was led by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. And what Sir Wilfrid Laurier said was the following: he did not believe there was enough French-speaking people in Saskatchewan to warrant then to have the right to use French. That is not us speaking, Mr. Speaker, that is Wilfrid Laurier's words of 1905.

Now when all the great champions, or so-called champions, of rights, why did they not refer to that? One could hardly say Wilfrid Laurier, the first francophone-speaking prime minister of this country, did not have an interest in the rights of French-speaking minorities across this country, but he said no. He said that should be left to this legislature to determine, that it must be left to this legislature to determine.

So I say to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg when he talks about the meaning of this country, that he should not look at this from the eyes of a federalist, he must also look at this from the eyes of who we are and what the constitution assigns to us to determine.

And he should also look at the last 83 years of history in this province where many people of francophone ancestry represented seats in this Assembly and held positions of authority in this legislature during times when the language issue was far more heated than it is today. Not once was that matter raised. Not once was the idea debated in this Assembly. And that, Mr. Speaker, tells me something about the custom and the tradition and the history of this Assembly.

I say to the members opposite, and speaking specifically now to the amendment of the member from Regina Centre, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all members of this House not to support this amendment. To do so we might as well . . . and if it was to pass, Mr. Speaker, we might as well pack up and go home for six months because there wouldn't be a great deal that we could do

in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be seen for what it is, and what it is nothing more than a delay tactic, a tactic to stall this, a tactic not to have to deal with it. Mr. Speaker, I say we must deal with this, and we must deal with this in a proper way.

I wish to make one further point before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, and that is the question on Meech Lake. As I indicated last week, but for Meech Lake, Mr. Speaker, we would not have Bill 2. If it was only for the decision of the Supreme Court, which I believe used a loophole to get to its decision . . . clearly gave back to the province though, in no uncertain terms, that it was for each local jurisdiction to determine whether or not that was a relevant policy for that particular province.

This Bill, and our commitment to a greater use of French in the courts, Mr. Speaker, is because of Meech Lake. The fact that we are going to introduce . . . translate into statute both languages, Mr. Speaker, is because of our commitment to Meech Lake — the fact that we will soon be introducing a motion into this Assembly, allowing for the translation of French speeches in this House, or speeches in the French language to be translated, and for the rules that judge us or guard us or determine us in this Assembly to be translated, along with the rules of court and many others.

And when this Bill is passed, we will undertake to provide in regulation the number of statutes that we propose to do in the near term, in our first round, if you like, at this particular issue. I ask all members to think before they vote on this question, Mr. Speaker.

I also throw this challenge to the members of this Assembly. I think all members should stand in their place and vote on this, and I'm encouraged to see the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. I would hope we would also see the member from Riversdale stand in his place — the Leader of the Opposition — and state where he stands, Mr. Speaker, state where he stands by standing in his place and voting, which is the ultimate thing you do in this Assembly.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that all support this Bill and vote against the amendment, the member from Regina Centre.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

(1547)

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 15

Prebble	Shillington
Tchorzewski	Koskie
Simard	Koenker
Atkinson	Hagel
Lyons	Calvert
Lautermilch	Trew
Smart	Goodale

Goulet

Nays — 28

Devine	Duncan
McLeod	Andrew
Berntson	Taylor
Smith	Swan
Maxwell	Schmidt
Hodgins	Gerich
Hepworth	Hardy
Klein	Pickering
Martin	Toth
Johnson	McLaren
Hopfner	Swenson
Martens	Baker
Gleim	Gardner
Kopelchuk	Britton

(1551)

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 28

Devine	Duncan
McLeod	Andrew
Berntson	Taylor
Smith	Swan
Maxwell	Schmidt
Hodgins	Gerich
Hepworth	Hardy
Klein	Pickering
Martin	Toth
Johnson	McLaren
Hopfner	Swenson
Martens	Baker
Gleim	Gardner
Kopelchuk	Britton

Nays — 15

Prebble	Shillington
Tchorzewski	Koskie
Simard	Koenker
Atkinson	Goulet
Hagel	Lyons
Calvert	Lautermilch
Trew	Smart
Goodale	

The Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a Committee of the Whole later this day.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 2 — An Act respecting the Use of the English and French Languages in Saskatchewan

Clause 1

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker — Minister — only a little premature, I say to the member from Moosomin. Just a couple of years.

I want to ask the minister for your timetable and your schedule for translating laws into French. What do you plan to translate into French, and over what period of time do you plan to do it?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Bill indicates that there is not a schedule *per se* in the sense of what is going to be done over an extended period of time, let me say to the hon. member the following: what I've indicated in the past is that the first area of translation will involve translating laws as it relates to the court system; and shortly, when the minister or some of the assistants arrive, some of the people from the department, I can give you an idea of the type of legislation we're looking at.

Suffice it to say that if you were to read the decision, primarily it related to also due process, and therefore it would be our intention to translate in the areas it relates to the courts, the various laws that apply to the court, and they're about 40 or 50 in number. And those are the ones that we are set about to do in the first brush.

And when I say first brush, the intention would be as follows: that as you introduce Bills or amendments into the House in this session that relate to the legal process, those would be introduced in both languages. Translators will then identify the Bills. We will then set about translating those and then bring them in a block and pass them in this House, as has been done in some of the other assemblies.

I can't give you the specifics of that, because what I've undertaken to do to the francophone community is to give them a copy of the proposed Bills that we would do, get their comment back before we pass them into regulation.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that silent recognition, yes. Mr. Minister, do you intend to translate the rules of court also in a bilingual form?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — It is our intention — I have communicated this to the francophone community — is that the rules of court is the one that will be translated first. We've undertaken to do that, and we are in the process of trying to begin that process right now.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, you were, I may say, relatively forthcoming in your response to my question as to what you intend to translate. You intend to translate statutes relating to the court and the way the court functions. You didn't however, answer my question as to over what period of time you expected to translate them.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think what we would seek to do is to do the justice ones first, then to proceed from there with the education statutes, and then we will see from there how it unfolds and how it goes. And whether it will take us five years or 10 years or whatever, that is certainly something that we have not made a decision yet.

We're going to see (a) how much is involved in the process, number one — how much it cost, how much time is involved, etc. — and then we'll be able to give you a better idea a year from now when we go through that process. That's number one.

Number two, I think where the hon. member has to understand is that how far do you go with the regulations on this particular statutes. And let me give you an example. If one is to translate The Highway Traffic Act or The Vehicles Act, which we have identified as ones that would be done, then do you also have to, if you're doing both the Act and regulations — and as we all know, contained in those regulations are the form of a traffic ticket, of a summons that you would . . . if you're stopped for speeding — and so if you're translating that, do you also translate the speeding summons, and therefore do you have to have that in both languages?

(1600)

And those are questions yet that are still being grappled with and wrestled with. So it's one thing to say legislation must be in French, but also everything arising out of legislation, does that also have to be in French, or do you have the right to do some of it only in French or some in both languages and some only in English?

And so that's the thing that I suppose we yet have to deal with. And my guess is this may be . . . ultimately going to be the court that will tell us whether we have to or do not have to do that. And so I hope the hon. member could understand if that applied to the courts, does it also apply to, let's say, the health care field, where you would have to have all your documents and forms again in both languages? And that would create a great deal of costs as well, and I think a great deal of perhaps increased administration.

So I think those are the things that we have to overcome in the first year as we proceed to deal with that to get a better idea of how long this will take.

Mr. Shillington: — What I understand the minister to be saying is that not very much is going to be done until after the next election. I think that's a fair summary of what you're saying, and certainly nothing the public will ever see.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could expand a bit on the institute coming in at, I think, \$10 million, some tens of millions of dollars, and the expansion to French language education coming in at some hundreds of millions of dollars that the Premier referred to. I wonder if you could just expand a bit on those programs.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I will try to give you an overall view, and until the officials get here, I can't give you the total details of what we're talking about, but I will when we get them. With regard to education, what we were referring to is the following. In Saskatchewan today, roughly 40 per cent of the students, 40 per cent of the students in the K to 12 system study core French — 40 per cent — and that's up significantly from where it was two and three and four years ago.

Now if we were to make an effort that says that we will allow or provide additional funding to school boards to provide core French; if you were to take that to the full 100 per cent of children in K to 12 taking at least one class in French, or the core French, what is involved there is the

number of teachers that would have to (a) be trained to be able to teach it, or (b) recruited. Over a 10-year period one is talking about \$425 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you talked to me about the question of French language.

In the area of French immersion, if you are to increase the number of schools that are taking or are French immersion schools, obviously you have to retrain more teachers for that. Number one, if you are to give more rights to the francophones to run their own schools and their own school boards, that's obviously going to cost more money as well.

With regard to the institute, what we indicated to the federal government — to get to your question on the institute — was the following. Twenty and 25 years ago in the province of Quebec, when bilingualism became the rule, there was many, many people in Quebec that could only speak French. They complained loud and long about having been denied the right to have access to jobs in the federal public service, access to jobs in the RCMP, access to jobs in the Canadian military, and various other opportunities, whether in the world of business or the world of government.

And the response of the government of Canada, at that time, primarily the government of Canada, was to put a French immersion school in Quebec that allowed adult Quebecers to go to that school, at no cost, to learn to speak English and become bilingual. And in so being able to speak English, they then qualified for various jobs.

What happened in the Canadian civil service, as well, is they started then to impose quotas or rules with regard to bilingualism, or bilingual skills, in order for promotions, etc. We've all heard those stories.

What we indicated to the federal government was the following, is that we think if that was good enough for the people of Quebec 20 years ago, perhaps a similar institution in the West would also be valid today. So that if you have a young chap wanting to go to the RCMP, graduation from Wynyard High School, perhaps in not fluently bilingual, from what we can gather, if he then applies for entrance into the RCMP and he stands with equal qualifications to somebody that is bilingual, the bilingual person is going to get the job ahead of the young chap from Wynyard.

Now should that be the case, there or in the military or in the public service, it seems to us that we are not being fairly dealt with. And that was the basis of our decision to the federal government is that you might consider putting that type of an institution in Saskatchewan; or to put it more succinctly, that you pay for it, but because it's a dimension of education, we in Saskatchewan would run it because we have the constitutional jurisdiction to run it.

And that, quite frankly, is the cost of that could run in the neighbourhood of 70 to \$75 million over the 10-year period that we would be talking about. And that's roughly the cost we're talking about; that's roughly the concept we're talking about, in our view, is it should be financed primarily by the federal government, not by the provincial government.

Mr. Shillington: — What assistance was offered by the federal government in translating statutes? There were reports, both from Ottawa . . . emanating both from Ottawa and from the French community that there were offers of assistance. What were those offers, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — They were two in number, to the hon. member. One, they have sent to Saskatchewan some people skilled in translation of statutes. They are here now working on statutes, both ones to be presented and the ones that are in existence today, translating them so we can be in position, hopefully, or later this session, to bring in the ones that are done and pass them through this Assembly. They are doing that.

Number two, we are also still in the process of negotiating with the federal government a framework agreement by which the federal government would assist in that particular job, financially. Those framework agreements have not been completed. There is a number of them; they have not yet been completed, but suffice it to say that the federal government have been prepared to pony up a significant part of the money as it relates to translation.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I gather you have fine tuned, to some degree at least, the list of statutes that you're going to translate. Would you undertake to give me at least a preliminary list of those statutes so far as you have now ascertained them?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The ones that we have identified to look at — and you have to understand that I undertook to the francophone community that we would submit the list to them for their recommendations as to whether it's valid or not valid ones to do. But the type of thing we're talking about is the Provincial Court Act, The Court of Queen's Bench Act, The Court of Appeal Act, The Surrogate Court Act, The Small claims Enforcement Act, The Justices of the Peace Act, The Jury Act, that type of thing. And as you know in having been here as long as you have that there is a large number of those that are specifically related to the courts and the legal process in the province, and that's the ones that we would identify and be prepared to deal with this year.

Mr. Shillington: — You made that clear earlier, Mr. Minister. I was wondering if you could give me the list.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I will not give you the list for the following reason: the list as . . . I undertook to the francophone community before we passed into regulations that we would send the list to them. We're in the process right now of compiling that list along with the translators to determine how long approximately it would take, that we would hope to have that very soon after this Bill is passed, made public — but prior to it being made public, that we would send it to their community, to their group, Rupert Baudais, for their comments on it before we officially pass it by regulation.

Now when that is ready, and I would suggest it to be ready within the next 10 days, I undertook to send that to Mr. Baudais; I would undertake to send it to you as well at that point in time, but not before.

Mr. Shillington: — Okay. I'll accept that undertaking.

Clause 1 agree to.

Clause 2

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . or Mr. Chairman, there are several amendments to be advanced to the Bill — all of them in the French version, all of them spelling mistakes identified by people that we have in our employ in Saskatchewan, all of them translated initially by people that we contracted from the federal government, all of them spelling mistakes, I am advised. But someone more capable in the French language will have to tell you what they are. So I would undertake that the . . . perhaps the chairman could read the various amendments out, and we'll take it from there.

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, with respect to all of these amendments, I will be listening attentively for the chairman when he reads them. I may say that I note that they were all grammatical . . . all typos in a sense, and I have no intention of making any comment on any of these amendments on this list, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: —

Amend section 2 of the French version of the printed Bill by striking out “de tribunaux visées au paragraphe 11(a) ou” in the definition of “règlements” and substituting . . .

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, I have heard all I wanted. Let's just . . . (inaudible) . . . Out of respect for the beauty of the French language . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I'm sorry. I thought I was doing fairly well . . . (inaudible) . . .

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — You'll have to excuse me, I've got to initial two different copies. I also have to inform this House that the amendments are available in the French version.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 6

Mr. Goodale: — I have one question I would like to put to the minister which relates to a number of the sections of the Bill, section 6 being one of them, but the question could be asked with respect to a number of other sections in the Bill.

Where the legislation proposes that the lieutenant Governor in Council may by regulation designate certain things to be done in both languages, I wonder if the minister could indicate what criteria the government of Saskatchewan will use to decide when to issue such a designation. I wonder what factors are in the minister's mind in terms of whether a particular Act or regulation or other instrument ought to be designated as requiring enactment or publication in both languages, and in what circumstances would such a designation be issued.

(1615)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I indicated to the hon. member from Regina Centre that the way we would approach this would be, initially, to deal with legislation that relates to the court, or would have a direct bearing on the court. That means the rules of court, as you see in the Bill, is going to be translated probably long in advance of 1993.

We will do the various court Acts — The Court of appeal Act, Court of Queen's Bench Act, The Provincial court Act, those types of things — probably The Saskatchewan Evidence Act, various things that would have a bearing on court. Because if you look and think about the practical application of this Bill, is it the place where you're going to see the French community having the rights initially to use their language which will be in our courts of law. They already have the right now as it relates to criminal trials. They will have the rights as it relates to quasi-criminal trials. And then we will deal with some civil trials as well.

What we will do then is in the . . . Primarily we're dealing here with the quasi-criminal trials. Well, then we would have those — at least the statute in French so that they could not argue that this was undue hardship on them.

When we've completed that, we would then move into the area of education, because education we would see is probably the next priority. As well there's ongoing negotiations today with the francophone community with regards to their desire to have francophone school boards in Saskatchewan, and you know the problems associated with that particular issue. So we would see dealing with education next.

Then we have to determine whether or not, or what in fact would mean — as I indicated in The Vehicles Act — do you have to then, in regulation, make them bilingual? Does an individual then have the right to have a speeding ticket issued to him in both languages?

Now if we're to look at other jurisdictions. In the province of New Brunswick, the way it works would be the following way: if an individual is stopped, he is given a ticket in both languages. If the officer is unable to communicate with him in French, then they have a bilingual person at the depot that can in fact speak to him in French.

Now what I'm saying is that if we were to adopt that type of system or the courts superimpose that type of system upon us, then it's going to take a lot longer to implement this than it would otherwise. If it's just statutes in the house passed in this Assembly, quite frankly, I don't see it taking a long time.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would be in a position sometime fairly soon to issue a statement that would list the criteria or the various factor upon which the government will be making its decision in these matters. I think it would be helpful for all concerned to know what factors the government considers to be relevant in any language decisions it is making now or into the future. And I would just ask the

minister, would it be possible for him to make those factors public, if not today, then at some reasonable time in the near future.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well as I indicated before to the hon. member, that in our view would be that we would deal with stuff related to the court, and then move from there to education. I also indicated to the hon. members of this House that we would . . . once we prepared the list that would be then included in regulation, we would consult with the francophone community to get their observations.

Now I think from a criteria point of view, the thing that I would see as a criteria would be: what would have the most relevance today? Now if you want to translate the Securities Commission . . . or the new Securities Act, that (a) the only people that are likely to read it is some security dealers and very few other people. Do we want to go through the expense of doing that? I've referred that to the francophone community, and quite frankly, their answer was: well we're not terribly interested in that.

So I think from a . . . really from a practical point of view is: what type of, you know, the extension of it, are you going to in fact use? The courts would be obviously one; the schools are obviously two. And after that, I suppose, it's going to be a matter of further discussion as to what we would do.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Chairman, in terms of this further discussion that the minister talks about, I think it might be useful for him and for the legislature to pursue a comment from Mr. Baudais which is widely quoted in the media today. I won't read all of the text of what Mr. Baudais is quoted as saying, but one small portion of it reads as follows:

We don't want to make the province officially bilingual.
We don't want to force people to speak French. We want something more practical.

I think in the elaboration of the answer to the question I've been putting to the minister, it might be instructive for all of us to know exactly the meaning of that quotation that is attributed today to Mr. Baudais, and I presume the minister would want to follow up a comment of that kind which might be instructive to all of us.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, let me make two observations with regard to Mr. Baudais. I find it somewhat strange that he would not endorse the idea of us creating an environment where more and more anglophones could become bilingual. He's not terribly interested in that, quite frankly, and if you had met with him, as I have met with him, that's one of the first things they are going to tell you, because they are not interested terribly in that. They're interested in preserving their culture and their language in Saskatchewan. So that whether more and more anglophones want to learn French, that's not terribly relevant.

What they want is all statutes in French. They want to be able to speak French in this House, translation of it. They want all trials, including civil trials, to be bilingual trials.

I simply say to Mr. Baudais, and to yourself, it seems to me it's one thing to say that if an accused is charged with a crime the people that are prosecuting it is the government, or the Crown, and that person clearly requires due process to be able to speak in his own language to have a fair trial. I have no objection to that.

That can apply equally to a quasi-criminal trial, I suppose, given that it's not abused. When you come to civil trials, it strikes me it's a little different because now it's an individual versus an individual, and the additional cost associated with that, it strikes me there should be different rules. And I think the supreme Court in the Mercure case said exactly that. But it's a different type of situation there, and really it needs translation. Or in other words, they said, no different than what you would provide to somebody, let's say, that could only speak Ukrainian or Polish or whatever, would also be entitled to that in our courts of law.

So that tends to be what he has said, other than the fact that we've undertaken to provide those pieces of legislation that we intend to do. He's going to have an opportunity to review that. His only hang-up, so he says, is that he wants it guaranteed that they will all be translated — all of them — and he wants them all translated in five years.

And the other question as well, he says publicly he does not want services in French. You know and I know, as lawyers, that that's the natural extension as to what the court is going to say, and so I think he's being less than straight up on that particular issue.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clause 8

Mr. Chairman: — We have an amendment to item 8. Will the members take it as read? Item 8 as amended agreed?

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 9 and 10 agreed to.

Clause 11

Mr. Chairman: — We have an amendment to item no. 11. Will the members take it as read?

Clause 11 as amended agreed to.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clause 13

Mr. Chairman: — There's an amendment to item no. 13. Will the members take it as read?

Clause 13 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I make one . . . I

make only one comment, and I think it's this: is that when we pass Bills in two languages, they have equal force in effect of law, and therefore if they have a different meaning, they create different laws, depending on which language you seek to use.

And while that is a situation that exists in other provinces where there is bilingual Assemblies and bilingual laws passed, I think we also must be mindful in this Assembly that we are relying totally upon the interpretation in advance by a particular draftsman as to whether they are in fact the same. And I think that that, I guess, is part of growing up with this particular question.

But it can provide some uneasiness perhaps in very sensitive areas of drafting, when very few people of this Assembly comprehend or understand that second official language.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

(1630)

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 2 — An Act respecting the Use of the English and French Languages in Saskatchewan

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Economic Development and Tourism Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 45

Mr. Chairman: — I'd like to ask the minister to introduce her officials, please.

Hon Mrs. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have with me this afternoon, Dr. David Rothwell, deputy minister. Dr. Rothwell is fairly new to our province and to this department, and this is his first experience with Committee of Finance, so I'm sure he'll find it interesting. I also have with me the assistant deputy minister, Ken McNabb. Seated behind me are Bob Folk, assistant deputy minister and Harvey Murchison, director of administration. Thank you.

Item 1

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to welcome the minister's officials to the estimates and the proceedings, and I hope that we will be able to go through the Estimates in a timely fashion and draw out the information that I'm sure the public, the people of Saskatchewan, would like to know about this

particular department.

I would like to start by indicating my disappointment, first of all, with the way the government has treated parts of our society and parts of our economic base in this province, and I would want to say, Madam Minister, that I refer to the small-business sector that has been, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many others in this province, completely abandoned by this government.

Small business, at a time when the economy is tough, needs some assistance and some direction from government, and clearly this administration has avoided its responsibility in that regard. It's made it harder for small business to function by increasing the tax load through funding cuts to municipal government and to school boards and, as I said, it's created a heavier tax burden on the business community, and I frankly don't find it acceptable, and I believe that the business community in this province find it in the same light that I do.

And I say there's been cut-backs and there's been indication that this government wants some fiscal responsibility for municipal governments, and I think that's fine, I think that's fair. But I would want to remind the minister that the municipalities aren't the governments with seven consecutive deficits; this government is. And they're not known for their mismanagement; this government is.

Your government, Madam Minister, has become famous for wasteful spending and financial mismanagement, when the government has caused, through the mismanagement, increases in business taxes, it's caused increases in school board taxes, and I say once again this year you've turned your back on the small-business sector.

This provincial government should be accepting responsibility for the fact that small-business owners are having tough times. And during the course of these estimates, Madam Minister, I'm going to be sharing with you some statistics that will show clearly the problems that they're facing. The bankruptcies, the business closures, the out-migration of our young people, have been caused by this government.

I see in this department and in this government no long-range planning, programs announced and never implemented — programs that sound good, that look good on paper, but that never happened. And it's been consistent, Madam Minister, with this department and the rest of your government since 1982, since you were first elected.

And the programs that are in place, I would suggest, Madam Minister, and I think we'll see this during the course of the estimates, have not been directed to Saskatchewan business people, families who have made their living in this province and in our communities over the years, but they've been directed to others — others whose interests, others whose fortunes, are from outside of this province and not with Saskatchewan people.

I note as well in Tourism, programs announced — the

same as it is with the small-business sector in the Economic Development portion of this department — programs announced, but when it comes time for the implementation of those programs, we get nothing but more announcements, and the programs don't happen. And I will be citing some examples of these to you, Madam Minister, during the course of these events.

What sounded like programs to benefit tourism, the tourism industry in this province, became nothing but political jargon — programs announced in 1986, prior to the election.

We've gone through estimates with the former minister, we've asked him where these programs are; he says, later, later. We ask how much later? He doesn't know. Now that minister's responsibilities have shifted to you, and I'm hoping today that we're not going to get the same kind of answers that we had in last year's estimates, I'm hoping that you will be more responsible than was your predecessor.

And I say the kind of government, Madam Minister, that you're delivering is squandering opportunities for Saskatchewan's business people, because what could be a bright future for this province is being decimated by the massive deficit budgeting that you've perpetrated — and I say massive deficit budgeting. When you add up and look at the cost of just servicing that deficit, it tells me that there are going to be some tax increases on home owners and on business owners and would-be entrepreneurs to pay for your mismanagement of the 1980s.

I say, along with many, many people in this province, that the sooner we remove you from office and start budgeting properly in this province and start doing some long-range planning, planning with a vision to the future and future generation, the easier it will be down the road.

I've mentioned increased taxes. We also know that services have been cut back and that business growth has been stifled. And figures, not my figures, Madam Minister, your government's own figures, statistics from the federal government, clearly indicate what you've done to the business sector in this province. And I would suggest to you, Madam Minister, that if you have no more of a vision for the future of this province, if you have no more of direction in terms of changing the kind of government you've been delivering, that you're going to be a disaster as a minister for this department the same as was your predecessor and his predecessor.

The reorganization of this department was a disappointment to me and others. No longer is there any mention of a small-business department in this province. No longer is there a department of co-operatives in this province, and I say to you that it places and tells me clearly, clearly where your priorities are.

I look through the programs that have been implemented by this government since 1982 — looking for a program to stimulate the economy by using small business and helping this province grow economically, using small business as one of the tools and one of the vehicles. And when I see the programs implemented, they always appear to me to be geared to out-of-province

corporations, or your friends. And I say to you that we find it unfair on this side of the House, and I would suggest that the majority of the business community in the province do as well.

Madam Minister, I'm going to ask today what your vision for this province is. What do you see for the future in terms of economic development and in terms of development through tourism? I'm going to ask you what you see in the future and how you plan to see this future growth achieved. And I said before, and I indicated before, that I'm hoping that you don't disappoint us, but I'm afraid you will, like so many of your colleagues have disappointed the people of this province.

And I would say, Madam Minister, if you don't have a workable vision for the future of the province, then the Premier has betrayed the people as well, because clearly it's his decision as to who sits in these chairs and who is developing programs and policy. And I want to say to you that I have little faith, but I'm willing to go through the process to see if in fact you know where you're taking this department and where this government is taking the province.

So I ask you, Madam Minister — I know and I understand you're new in your role — I ask you what you see, what you envision for Saskatchewan, how you see this province develop. And I would like to know specifically what vehicles you see as being used.

Are you willing to turn about and start using the small-business, or is your government in your department still hell-bent on throwing millions at Peter Pocklington and his kind? I say, Madam Minister, if that's your vision, then you'll be a disappointment as a minister of this department.

And I'll ask you now if you would share with us, with the people of the province and the members of the opposition, just exactly what's your vision for this particular department and for the future of Saskatchewan entrepreneurs might be?

(1645)

Hon Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to some of the outlandish statements made by the member opposite. And his statements are pure rhetoric, which is the only thing that we've come to expect from members opposite, because the members opposite never, ever deal in fact, Mr. Chairman. In fact, never deal in fact, purely fiction.

Mr. Chairman, 1987 was actually a good year for Saskatchewan, and 1987 was also a good year for economic performance in our province. And I would like to share some facts with the member opposite, should he care to listen and perhaps jot them down.

In 1987 our unemployment rate fell to 7.3 per cent from 7.7 in '86. New capital investment in the province was 4,324 million, one of the highest levels of investment in the 1980s to date. And I should repeat that in case the

member opposite did not get that. last year in Saskatchewan we had total investment of \$4324 million.

Another interesting fact . . . I mean, you listen to the members opposite, every one of them dealing in their fiction, and they like to indicate to the people of Saskatchewan that somehow, since 1982, the people have been fleeing the province, the businesses have been pulling out of the province. Well that is just not true.

I might also, before I get into these statistics, say to the member — he said, well I have talked to many business men — well I can tell the member opposite that over 1,400 business people joined the Premier for dinner last Friday night and clearly enjoyed them, and I understand 134 showed up at wherever the Leader of the Opposition was speaking.

We had 3,208 incorporations of Saskatchewan-based businesses, and that's a net increase of 640 Saskatchewan businesses; 33,000 jobs have been created since 1982 — 33,000 new jobs created, Mr. Chairman, since 1982; the cumulative investment . . . new capital investment between 1982 and 1987, Mr. Chairman, is \$23.54 billion, hardly what I would call small change. Since 1982 we've had 6,023 more businesses registered with the workmans' compensation, and I might say that in 1987 the values of building permits, in the commercial sector only, rose by 70 per cent.

I think if you look at what happened in the province in 1987 it is not just the doom and gloom — even though we are dealing with some fairly significant problems in the area of some of the resource sectors and our agriculture sector — but the province saw significant new industrial projects being built in 1987.

These included: Gainers bacon plant in North Battleford; Canada Packers poultry processing plant in Saskatoon; expansions at Thomson Meats in Melfort; Canada Packers expanded into Moose Jaw; Intercontinental Packers of Saskatoon announced an expansion: we saw the Vanguard recreational vehicles plant at North Battleford come in; a liquid phosphate plant was announced in Moose Jaw; the Co-op heavy oil upgrader is being built here in Saskatchewan, right here in Regina, Mr. Chairman; we've seen an expansion of a pulp mill in Prince Albert, and the construction of a new paper plant under way in that city.

The member asked for my vision. I think the future is very bright for Saskatchewan. We look at what is going on in northern Saskatchewan in the area of mining resources, that type of thing. I think we have three mines today producing or refining ore, or gold from ore.

The department's 12 business resource centres last year responded to 36,000 requests for information. That's a record, Mr. Chairman. That's more than four times the level of inquiries that we had in 1984. We had 36 new venture capital corporations form in 1987-88, and that brings to 151 the number of venture capital corporations that have been created since the inception of the program; 151 VCCs (venture capital corporations) have net capitalization of over 73 millions of dollars and over \$58 million of that have been invested in those small

businesses which are eligible. This is new investment equity capital, I might add.

The industrial incentive program has had a major impact on the manufacturing and processing sector. We paid out approximately twelve and a half million dollars to date on 294 projects, representing almost \$84 million worth of new investments and approximately 770 new jobs.

Last year we had 60 new co-operatives incorporated within the department, and that exceeded the five-year average of 54.4. And yet the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake stands up there in his place dealing in fiction rather than fact, and saying there is nothing for co-operatives, there is nothing for small business, and, Mr. Chairman, that is totally inaccurate and, I would say, somewhat misleading.

As a department, Mr. Chairman, we are building on the strengths that the department has brought forward. We have done a lot of consolidation in the last number of years, and the department was reorganized last January.

And really what has happened, Mr. Chairman, it's really become an even stronger business department. It is a department which continues to provide very, very effective services to small businesses. It has a major role to play in industrial development of our province. It encourages new and existing co-operatives. And on that fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the member that the number of co-operatives formed since 1982, I believe, is more than three times the total of co-operatives incorporated under an NDP government from the early '70s till that infamous night, April 26, 1982.

The department continues to nurture the industry that I would classify as probably the most dynamic, fastest growing industry, not only here in the province but world-wide, and that of course is the tourism industry. We're working very closely with various organizations — TISASK (Tourism Industry Association of Saskatchewan) and the likes — to really come up with a strategy, which I will share with the member later, on how to make Saskatchewan a key destination point, not only for other Canadians but for the international market.

Basically I would say that my department has the major government responsibility for economic development activities in the province. We serve businesses, and these businesses are recognized as what could be described as an essential component or an essential cog in the development of our province. We do place special emphasis on tourism because of the enormous potential in that area for economic diversification, either through the tourism industry itself or the related service sectors.

My new department is a consolidated, expanded version of the former department of tourism, small business and co-operatives. And the member opposite decried the fact that nowhere in the department's title do we refer to small business or co-operatives. Well we believe that small business and co-operatives really stand for economic development.

So we basically remain a very client-oriented department. We are very attentive to the grass roots

concerns of business that they bring to us, and we will continue to provide that type of leadership and help as we are called on.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Madam Minister, as I suspected, you talk about rhetoric, and I want to indicate to you that we're going to get into the numbers here in the course of these estimates. We're going to talk about unemployment. We're going to talk about cut-backs. We're going to talk about the lack of economic growth in the province; the business closures we'll talk about; program cuts, I think I've mentioned.

I think we'll talk a little bit about unemployment, and as you share with us the bright picture of 1987, you neglect to mention the 45,000 unemployed in this province and the number of business bankruptcies that happened in that particular year. And I want to say to you, that we're going to talk about those as well.

But before I get into the business portion — and I see we're running close to 5 o'clock, Madam Minister — I want to give you some food for thought prior to supper. And I want to, if I can, talk about tourism a little bit. And I'd like to refer specifically, Madam Minister, to the Fort Carlton-Batoche destination area study that was promised to be completed last year in these estimates. And I'm asking, Madam Minister, where that study is and how far along that has come; or why we haven't had that tabled as was promised.

And I'd like to as well indicate to you, Madam Minister, that that was a commitment made to the people of the Duck Lake area prior to 1986 election, and we've asked you for this, and it hasn't been coming. I see you're sending it across, and if that in fact is the case, then let me ask you, Madam Minister, since we haven't had a chance to have a look at this study, I want to know what you're going to now do with the study. Can the people of Duck Lake and the Fort Carlton-Batoche area expect more study of the study; or can they expect some concrete action in terms of what's going to happen in that area?

Hon Mrs. Duncan: — I received that document a couple of weeks ago. It's very, very interesting and it really puts the focus on our cultural heritage and things that we can use to build a strong tourism base here in Saskatchewan.

What we will be doing with that report is beginning May 9 there will be a series of . . . the book will be distributed to interested groups and organizations, and beginning May 9 we will be beginning a round of public hearings for their reaction on that particular report.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Madam Minister, I would suggest to you that the people of that area are very familiar with their heritage and the history of that particular area. They've been waiting for this study. I ask two questions: when did you receive this document? And the other question . . .

An Hon. Member: — She said two weeks ago.

Mr. Lautermilch: — I never heard, sir, and if you want to get involved in the estimates, you get involved; but other than that, I would suggest you let the minister and I continue our dialogue. That's what this is all about, and I

think we can handle it ourselves.

I would like to know how long these hearings and these little tours throughout out the area will be going on. I'd like to know when they're starting, where they're going to be held and who will be asked to participate.

Hon Mrs. Duncan: — The meetings that take place on May 9 — we will be sharing that proposal because there are a lot of recommendations in it. And I know the people in that area are very familiar with the history of that area. I happen to come from that area myself, so I'm familiar with it.

But to develop a long-term, forceful tourism strategy, you can't do that at the drop of a hat or overnight. You say, well good heavens, you've been doing this since 1986 or 1987. There has never been a focus to develop a strategy to capture that tourism dollar — the dollar that is most sought after world-wide. This government is going to do that, but we're going to do it in a well thought out way. When we get the responses from the meetings held in May, I would hope to have a proposal to cabinet some time in June.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Being near 5 o'clock this assembly stands recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.