

AFTERNOON SITTING

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, and to other members of the legislature, 21 students, grade 7 and 8 students from the Englefeld School. They are in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon. They are accompanied by their teacher Peter Penrose, chaperons Donald Breker, John Wilger, Barb Gerspracher and Roger Strunk.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to welcome the students, to indicate to them that I had made arrangements to meet with you following question period; however, I will be occupied with the Appropriate Bill. My colleague from Humboldt will in fact . . . I know his name, but I thought I'd be called to order. The member from Humboldt will in fact meet with you and have some drinks, and any questions that you have I'm sure that he will answer them.

So I welcome you here. I thank you for coming. I hope you enjoy the question period.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you, and the other members of the Assembly, 14 grade 4 students from Chaplin Elementary School in Chaplin, Saskatchewan. They are here touring the Legislative Building this afternoon, and they have with them their teacher Mrs. Montgomery, chaperons Mrs. Fjaagesund and Mrs. Hallborg.

I hope that the students enjoy question period. It is probably the essence of our democratic system which you'll view here this afternoon. They're in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker, for your information, and I would be happy afterwards, as we have picture and drinks outside on the lawn, to answer any questions which your students might have about the proceedings of the legislature.

And I would ask all members of the legislature to please help me welcome the students from Chaplin.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Ms. Smart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the legislature, 16 students from the adult basic education program at SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) in Saskatoon. They are here with their teachers Marla Kowalchuk and Robin Stonehouse. In my former life as a public librarian, I had the opportunity to work with the teachers in the adult basic education program with co-operative programs with the former community college and the Saskatoon Public Library. I'm looking forward to meeting with you for coffee and questions after question period.

I would like to ask all members of the legislature to extend a warm welcome to the adult basic education class from Saskatoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Comprehensive Drought Relief Program

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier, and it pertains to what is on everybody's mind in Saskatchewan these days and that is the drought, amongst other things. A lot of people are asking us everywhere that I travel . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Minister of Consumer Affairs says, finally. That's not true. We've been asking this question on drought almost every day.

And I ask the question to the deputy, I ask the question to the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it doesn't matter. But I ask the question to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier please tell the House whether or not the government here, opposite, has a firm agreement with the federal government to announce soon a comprehensive, all-encompassing drought relief program, and if so, will he please tell the details of that program to us and to the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan today so that they at least can have a bit of uncertainty removed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, the provincial government and the Premier and the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance have enjoyed good co-operation with the federal government. Certainly that was the case with the changes that were made to the crop insurance that made sense relative to salvage and reseeding and those kinds of things. Further announcements relative to the livestock sector I think we could expect in the not too distant future, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I guess a supplementary has to go to the minister who answers, although again I ask the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, to give his attention to this. Why is it, Mr. Deputy Premier, or minister in charge, why is it that the people of Saskatchewan have to await further developments? We know what the facts are. We see it every day as we get up, how dry it is, how hot it is. We know the suffering, as far as the farmers are concerned, the cattlemen are concerned. We know the water table problems for our towns and our village and our communities. Why is it that we have to await further developments? Can we not implore you to announce a comprehensive program now so the people of Saskatchewan can at least know this government has a game plan on probably what is the most serious crisis since the Dirty Thirties, if not even greater than that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, this government has had a game plan from day one when it became apparent that there was minimal snow coverage last winter, then obviously followed by large areas of the province with minimal rainfall this spring.

And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because our first response was as the farmers of Saskatchewan asked for and

expected. And their first priority was to ensure water supplies, and the Minister of Environment, the minister in charge of Sask Water Corporation made some substantive announcements that were followed by a package of federal initiatives that topped off the provincial initiatives. The minister in charge of Sask Crop Insurance has made the appropriate announcements in co-operation and consultation with the federal government as the situation dictated, relative to salvaging crops for livestock and helping the grain farmer so that his soil doesn't blow away. And common sense moves, in fact, become policy.

The next stage will be, Mr. Speaker, a livestock policy. This has been managed; there has been a game plan. Obviously some very large sums of money potentially can be involved, and I think we would be negligent if in fact we did not involve the federal government for assistance in dealing with this drought, Mr. Speaker.

Confidence in Minister of Urban Affairs

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, who's here today. Mr. Minister, your reckless and insensitive approach to urban issues has brought a level of protest from urban municipalities never before experienced in the province of Saskatchewan.

Yesterday there was a meeting of region 1 of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) at Carnduff, south-eastern part of the province, and as a result of that meeting, Mr. Minister, a copy of a resolution was delivered to your Premier this morning, the resolution stating that the representatives of those communities attending that regional meeting had lost confidence in you as a minister, and had asked that the Premier replace you with another minister who would be more sensitive to the issues of municipal government in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Minister, in light of all of the evidence that shows that you are so wrong in your approach, will you do the honourable thing and step aside so that the Premier can do the right thing and appoint a minister that the urban municipal governments of this province can relate to?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of resigning.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, another question to the arrogant Minister of Urban Affairs. Mr. Minister, I bring to your attention the fact that there were 28 municipalities represented, 28 communities from south-eastern Saskatchewan, communities from the member from Moosomin and other members. They represented over 200,000 people from the province of Saskatchewan.

They said, Mr. Minister, that you have betrayed the interests of their communities with your proposed changes to store hours and your proposed changes to the ward system legislation. Are you saying to this House that you're going to turn your back on their opinions and their views and ignore their advice and continue on your way?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure this House that all those present in Carnduff yesterday morning had no concern at all with the ward system. Most of them probably didn't understand what it was. That's number one. They don't have the ward . . . Mr. Speaker, they don't have the ward system in Carnduff, they don't have the ward system in Yorkton, they don't have the ward system in Oxbow or in Estevan, so they had no concern with the ward system.

Regarding the store hours, Mr. Speaker, we see yet another example yesterday of the courts, because of the constitution of Canada. Because of the Leader of the Opposition who sits there now, who had an awful lot to do with the constitution, the rights and freedoms of the people regarding store hours have been removed and it is indeed the courts that are dictating.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what our government has said. We have tried and we have tried and we have tried, only to have the issue of store hours resolved by the courts. And yesterday's decision provides one more time that the courts will dictate that, unless it gets to the local level where they indeed can control it. And even by admittance of the Regina solicitor, that is what they're waiting for. This new legislation is ahead of the courts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, I think the comment by your Minister of Urban Affairs, insulting the elected urban officials of our province by saying they don't know what ward systems are, really is indicative of why this resolution was passed at that original meeting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Deputy Premier, what we're talking about here are the elected representatives of the people. The authority for their statements comes from the same authority as your government gets its authority to do what it does.

Mr. Deputy Premier, these same people at the Carnduff meeting proposed another resolution to express their strong feeling. And they said that this Bill 60 that is on the order paper should be split, and that the provisions dealing with the ward system and with the store hours legislation should not be proceeded with in this session of the legislature.

Are you still rejecting outright their request in favour of the narrow political agenda and ego satisfaction of the Minister of Urban Affairs, the member from Regina South?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I expect . . . while I wasn't in Carnduff yesterday, I know that, had I been there, I would have been very much welcomed, and all of the people who would be at that meeting, or the vast

majority of people that would be at that meeting . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and I'll get to that, I'll get to that. But the vast majority of the people that would be at that meeting in Carnduff are friends of mine and constituents of mine.

Three of them phoned me this morning, unsolicited, and they said, you know, we are sorry that SUMA got into this in the way that they did — in the way that they did. They told me that there were 70 people, approximately 70 people at that meeting. This resolution was voted on, Mr. Speaker, and it went 24 to 17 in favour of the resolution. That tells me that there are 24 people in SUMA that would like to see my colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs, resign.

I dare say that I can go to SUMA membership and find at least 24 that would ask any one of those people, or all of them, to resign, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I met with some of those people this morning, Mr. Speaker, as part of the coalition, and I explained to them, Mr. Speaker, that we are trying to get to the same place. They don't — and I think they have a better understanding for it now — but they don't accept or didn't accept that our path to get to where we were getting was one that they would have chosen.

I think it fair to say, Mr. Speaker . . . I'm answering the question.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The minister is giving a good answer, but a little lengthy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Directives to Officials Regarding Hotel Registration

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, moving right along to the Minister of Culture and youth, I'd like to direct a question to him on this path where we're all going.

Mr. Minister, can you tell this House why various groups in the sports, culture, and recreation associations are being told they must always stay at hotels owned by your buddy, John Remail, and always must rent facilities owned by him for any event in communities where he has a facility, and that they must use his name and the name of his company on letterhead and in brochures that they produce?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, this is news to me. I haven't heard of any directive. Certainly no directive went from my office. I'm not aware of any similar directive going from the office of any one of my colleagues, but I'll certainly be checking with all of those organizations. I'll do it this very afternoon.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Perhaps I can have another question for the minister to check with those organizations as well. New question, Mr. Minister. You are the funding body for that organization through the control of lotteries in

Saskatchewan. You must have some control, or at least some input, Mr. Minister, in to the disbursement of moneys by the organization.

Why are these associations being forced by the agreement into acting in such a discriminatory fashion, and who drew up this agreement? Did you satisfy, Mr. Minister . . . you can check to see if your officials, if your officials satisfied themselves that this offer was open, this agreement was open to tender so that other hoteliers could attempt to compete for the business? Would you do that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, we've seen so many examples in the last 70 days of this session of members of the opposition bringing what they regard as facts to this Assembly, to this floor, which turn out to be entirely spurious. So I take it with a grain of salt, anything the member is bringing up today. As I said, it's news to me. I'd be prepared to look into it. I wouldn't be surprised if it turns out to be another mythical highways building that was ripped down in Rosetown.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well while I'm at it, Mr. Speaker, I have some more salt for the minister.

It's a nice deal. It's a nice deal for Mr. Remail. He gets a tax deduction, guaranteed business, and free advertising under this agreement. We have many people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, making charitable donations. They don't insist on that kind of a pay-back.

Breweries sponsor a lot of sporting events in Saskatchewan. Those breweries don't insist that you drink one kind of beer, their kind of beer. Why should John Remail be entitled to these special arrangements?

I want to know also, Mr. Minister, if this is the same John Remail from which we rent eight expensive floors in the Remail towers in Regina, which this government rents?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, the funding arrangements to which the hon. member has referred, in actual fact come through Sask Sport Inc. They take their share of the lottery money and they decide how to split it up: 50 percent from that organization goes to Sask Sport, 40 per cent goes to the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations, and 10 per cent goes to Saskatchewan Parks and Recreation Association.

I do not direct that. I do not interfere with that. And I certainly don't tell Sask Sport Inc. where they may tell any of their employees or any of their clients where they may stay when they're travelling in the province, or indeed where they may eat food, or what lodgings they're going to take. And I certainly don't interfere with their internal workings.

Contract of CEO of Develcon

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for SEDCO, and it concerns the employment contract with Mr. MacPherson of Develcon, a contract which your government approved.

Can you confirm that the \$50,000 relocation allowance, which was paid to Mr. MacPherson, was used to move his family from Hackensack, New Jersey, to Toronto, where they remain? And who pays to fly Mr. MacPherson to Toronto each week to visit his family, and who pays for his accommodation in Saskatoon?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the third time that this question has been asked, and I would indicate to the member from Saskatoon that first, management salaries are an internal matter for the company, and not something that SEDCO would normally be aware of, or would want to be aware of.

Ms. Smart: — Mr. Speaker, new question, and there are many, Madam Minister. You, by your own admission, by the admission of the Minister of Science and Technology, your government gave approval to that very rich contract when you approved the funding agreement between Fairfax and SEDCO, Madam Minister. And that's an agreement that you would want to know the details of, Madam Minister, and one that we would like very much to have an opportunity to question you on.

You gave \$7 million of taxpayers money to Fairfax. You gave your blessing to Fairfax to fire as many as 25 per cent of the work-force at Develcon. You gave your approval for a chief executive officer who won't even move to Saskatchewan. And I ask you: why should Saskatchewan taxpayers pay so handsomely to relocate an executive's family from New Jersey to Toronto, while Saskatchewan families have to go on unemployment insurance, Madam Minister. That's what's happening in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Speaker, the member stands up here, foaming at the mouth, not knowing what she is talking about SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) did not approve the pay package to the person in question.

However I would say, Mr. Speaker, after taking a company that three years ago was a viable company operating in the black and in three years that company, under the former management, lost sixteen and a half million dollars, was on the verge of bankruptcy, I think Saskatchewan and Develcon is fortunate to get someone of Mr. MacPherson's background.

He happened to have left one of the Fortune 10 companies at a 30 per cent — and I repeat — a 30 per cent decrease in salary to take up the challenge, because he knows the potential of a company like Develcon, managed properly, can become one of Canada's, if not the world's, biggest, most profitable high-tech companies.

Diversion of Water from Rafferty-Alameda Project

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. Mr. Minister,

time after time in this House you have stood here and denied that there were any plans to divert water in regards to the Rafferty-Alameda project.

Mr. Minister, in light of condition number 9 on the federal licence which granted approval for the construction of that boondoggle . . . And I want to read to you that condition:

The licensee shall not divert water from outside the Souris River drainage basin if such diverted waters would increase the annual flow of the Souris River at the international boundary above that which would have occurred in the state of nature.

In light of that condition, and in light of what the Premier of this province said on the 23rd of this month here in the House in Executive Council estimates, in which he specifically stated that he is going to sell water to the United States along with hydro power or natural gas or any other kind of energy — in light of those statements, Mr. Minister, won't you come clean and tell the people that you're planning to divert Saskatchewan water and export it to the United States of America?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that the hon. member is certainly reading something into that contract that's not there. This government is not intending to divert any water from any other basin into the Souris to fill up the Rafferty. The Rafferty will fill on its own in due course, and we're just waiting for that to happen. We have no intention of abrogating section 9, which says that we are not to sell water to the United States by increased flows through the Souris, and we had no intention at any time of doing that. I've advised the hon. member of that several times. Perhaps this time he'll listen and hear.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I noticed you said you're not going to divert water or sell water through increased flows. You have not specifically said to the people of this province that you will not divert water from any other basin into the Souris. Every time you say and give an answer, it's got the weasel words, it's got the twisty, slippery words attached to it. Will you stand there in your place and say that you will not now, or nor in the future, divert water from any other basin through the Souris River Basin? Will you make that commitment to the people of this province?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Mr. Speaker, I've told the hon. member very clearly that we're not going to divert water into the Souris. He's been following this same line of thought and trying to bring up new details day after day, but he hasn't brought anything forward yet that would indicate that there's been a change. There's no change from this government.

Now if there is going to be any water sold to the United States, perhaps it'll be those bottles of water that come out of the Quill Lakes region that are being sold to the United

States, and maybe that's what's worrying the hon. member.

Flood Control in Weyburn

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. In view of his previous response, I want to see how he laughs this one off.

Mr. Minister, could you confirm today that your corporation recently awarded a \$120,000 contract to Jerry Mainil Ltd. of Weyburn for flood control work in that city, which is a contract worth about 5 or \$6,000 each day. And could you confirm that this is the same Jerry Mainil who was a former Progressive Conservative Party president for the Weyburn constituency association?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm the amount or the name of the contract that the member is raising. I'll take notice of that and bring back the information to the House.

As you're aware, the Saskatchewan Water Corporation awards many contracts.

Mr. Solomon: — A new question, Mr. Minister. Perhaps he should, in his review, take a look at the newspaper, the *Weyburn Review*, where they do announce the contract, and they do announce it to the tune of the amount that I've indicated, and to Jerry Mainil Ltd.

But, Mr. Minister, when you're taking notice, would you assure the House today that Mr. Mainil won that contract through the fair tendering process; and would you table in this House, or provide to the members of this Assembly, all the tenders received by the water corporation, so that the people of Saskatchewan can see it was they, and not another friend of the PC Party, who got the good deal here?

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. member that all of the contracts that are let by Sask Water are done by tender, and unless there are some very extenuating circumstances, the low tender is always taken. We have, I believe, once in the last two years taken one contract that was not low tender, and in that circumstance the bidder had not really the necessary equipment to fulfil the terms of the contract on time.

So yes, I can be very comfortable in advising the hon. member that all contracts that we let are done by tender, and in most cases the low tender will be the one that gets the successful bid.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Supply

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Chairman:

Resolved that towards making good the supply

granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, the sum of \$106,410,800 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1989, the sum of \$2,725,809,800 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, the sum of \$2,065,100 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1989, the sum of \$378,279,000 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I move that the resolutions be now read the first and second time.

Motion agreed to and the resolutions read a first and second time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. Mr. Lane: — By leave of the Assembly, I move:

That Bill No. 104, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending Respectively March 31, 1988, and March 31, 1989, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — By leave of the Assembly and under rule 48(2), I move that the Bill be now read a second and third time.

Leave granted.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I wish to discuss the government's priorities, this government's fiscal management, and I want to discuss the issues that arise as a result of this last budget. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could indeed be positive in that approach, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I fear that the facts do not support optimism or hope for the future as a result of the last budget.

Mr. Speaker, when this government took office in 1982 there was a positive net equity in this province, of \$1.1 billion. That means that all of the assets exceeded the liabilities by \$1.1 billion. And seven years later, Mr. Speaker, this province is drowning in a sea of red ink, courtesy of the disastrous fiscal policies of the present government. In 1982, we had a positive equity of \$1.1 billion, and today we have a net debt of 2.8 billion, almost \$2.9 billion.

At the same time, the total provincial debt of this province has risen from \$3.5 billion in 1982 to \$11.684 billion in 1989. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite had been running a business like this since 1982, they would have been bankrupt today. Unfortunately, they're running the province, and running it they are, Mr. Speaker — right into the ground.

Let us put their performance into perspective. In just seven years they have built up three times the total debt of all previous governments had accumulated over the entire 77-year history of this province, Mr. Speaker, in 77 years, from the time of confederation until 1982, including the years of the great depression, Saskatchewan had only \$3.5 billion of debt. And during those period of years, Saskatchewan built — they built schools and they built roads and hospitals, rural electrification, power dams, coal-fired generator plants, natural gas systems, highways, and the best health care, educational system in all of North America. And they built an enormous infrastructure and they did all that with a total debt of \$3.5 billion.

The Conservatives have tripled that debt in the past seven years, Mr. Speaker. At the same time, they have placed an accumulated debt on the backs of every man, woman, and child in the total of \$10,871. And as a result, they have squandered our provincial equity in a series of deals with their friends in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, there are two kinds of public debts that I want to look at: the one incurred between 1905 and 1982; and the one that is incurred between 1982 and the present. The one between 1905 and 1982 was incurred to build the future economic growth of this province. And growth there was. The present debt was born on waste and mismanagement and incompetence. And the great tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Saskatchewan, not the members opposite and their corporate friends, will bear the burden of once more restoring Saskatchewan's financial integrity.

Mr. Speaker, debt and deficit has become a characteristic of this government. In the last seven years this government has shown through its mismanagement and incompetence, record deficits. In each and every year that they brought down a budget we've had a deficit. In

1982-83, \$227 million; in 1983-84, \$331 million; in 1984-85, 380 million; in '85-86, \$579 million — a cumulative deficit of \$1.5 billion in their first term of office.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, they promised to do better, and they brought in the new Mr. Hack'n'Slash as the Minister of Finance, or was it Mr. Pound-the-Poor? I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the name shall remain nameless, but I say to you, he shall not remain blameless.

In three years as Minister of Finance we have astronomical deficits. In 1986-87, going into the election we accumulated \$1.23 billion debt. In '87-88, \$568 million, and in '88-89, a further \$328 million, which means, Mr. Speaker, the total cumulative PC deficit since he took office is \$3.7 billion. And if you take into account the discrepancy of the auditor, it's \$3.9 billion.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that the government office, it has placed out of the consolidated debt alone, a debt of \$3,700 on the backs of every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan, or a debt of \$14,400 for a family of four living in Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what happens when a government loses control of its finances? Well, Michael Wilson, the federal Minister of Finance, I think sums it up very well when he said:

When government loses control of its finances, everyone is affected. It leads to higher interest rates for mortgages, business and consumer loans. It means declining economic confidence, less economic growth, and fewer jobs. It threatens our ability to provide the kinds of government programs and services Canadians want.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the members opposite to listen carefully to what Michael Wilson concluded by saying:

I believe (he said) that this generation of Canadians want to leave our children and our grandchildren a legacy of opportunities and optimism, not one of crushing debt and crushed hopes.

Mr. Speaker, the legacy of this previous minister of Finance and this current Minister of Finance surely is one of crushing debt, crushed hopes, crushing despair, and quiet desperation.

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn to the area of taxation and tax reform. When they were first elected, they talked about tax reform and tax cuts. But, Mr. Speaker, some people got major tax cuts. Big business was taken care of. They received excellent return on their investment, and they weren't even promised tax cuts, at least not in the election material published by the PC Party.

The only people that were promised tax cuts were those ordinary Saskatchewan citizens. And what happened to them, Mr. Speaker? While in 1982-83 personal income tax generated something like \$683 million; by 1987-88 it is estimated to be \$752 million collected out of personal income tax; and in 1988-89 it's estimated at \$831 million

— almost \$200 million a year more taken out of the pockets of ordinary people of Saskatchewan.

And what about the sales tax. Well they promised and they pledged to the people of this province that in their first term of office that they would abolish the E & H tax. But in 1988 the tax they promised to abolish was not abolished, Mr. Speaker; it was raised. It was raised 40 per cent, from 5 per cent to 7 per cent. yes, Mr. Speaker, another \$476 million extorted from ordinary people in Saskatchewan.

(1445)

And let me take some comparison, Mr. Speaker, from 1983-84 to '88-89. Corporate income tax has increased 1 per cent, for the grand total of \$1.7 million from '84 to '89. At the same time, the personal income tax has increased 47 per cent, for the grand total of \$266 million. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, sales tax revenue increased by \$136 million.

Mr. Speaker, when this government talks about partners in progress and we see \$402 million in income tax and sales tax increases, and only \$1.7 million in corporate tax increases, we know where their priorities are. And in this budget, Mr. Speaker, what they propose to do is to cut the corporate income tax a further 2 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take too much thought to figure out who the senior partners with this government is. But they haven't finished yet. Once they had survived the election, they increased the sales tax, they increased the flat tax, and they reimposed the gasoline tax. Tax breaks for big business, give-away for the resource sector. And that has been the story and the legacy of this government.

Mr. Speaker, let's look very quickly at the resource sector, keeping in mind the enormous tax burden this government has placed on ordinary people. If we look in 1981 on the value of oil that was produced in this province, we find that the total value of oil produced was \$821 million. And you realize that the revenues to the people of this province from that production of 821 million was \$533 million to the people of Saskatchewan to provide health care, education, and services to the people of Saskatchewan.

The total collected was approximately 66 per cent of the total value of oil produced when this government took office, and in 1985 the value of oil was at \$2.4 billion. And do you know what the provincial revenue from that enormous production of oil was? — \$674 million, or 28 per cent of the total value of production, during the same time as the provincial government was increasing provincial income tax on ordinary people of 47 per cent. It reduced the taxes on oil companies in Saskatchewan by over 50 per cent. And so much for equity, Mr. Speaker, and so much for the fairness of this government to ordinary Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, I have examined the government's record; a record of debt, of deficits, and increased taxation. It has been a sorry record of incompetence, mismanagement, and deceit.

But surely, Mr. Speaker, they have something to show for this massive burden of taxation, deficits and debts that they have loaded on the backs of ordinary people here in Saskatchewan. Surely this enormous burden had a purpose. Surely it meant the creation of jobs and economic activity and the general well-being of our people in our province. Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the record of this government in its fiscal and monetary areas have carried over into the management of the economy.

I want to look at some of the indicators as to see how stagnant this economy is under the present government. Housing starts, always a key indicator in the economic activity, reached an all time low in Saskatchewan. In 1987, 4,895 housing starts; 10 years ago, 12,825 housing starts — 7,000 fewer housing starts. It means fewer jobs for construction trades, for plumbers and electricians, less sales for our service sector, less growth in our towns and villages, fewer opportunities for young people.

And let us examine a second area, the value of manufacturing shipments. The members opposite like to talk a lot about diversification, but the record shows that between 1981 and 1987 the total value of Saskatchewan manufacturing shipments actually declined in real terms after taking inflation into account. Between 1981 and '87 there was a 9 per cent decline in the real value of Saskatchewan manufacturing shipment after taking inflation into account.

A third area of significance in the provincial economy, Mr. Speaker, is that of public and private investment. In real terms, taking inflation into account, there has been a 22 per cent decline between 1981 and '87 in the total investment spending in the Saskatchewan economy. Even in current dollars, from 1983 to '87, there has been a decline in the investment in agriculture, mining, and utilities.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, even this government has declared Saskatchewan open for business. And even though this government has opened the taxpayers' pocket for this . . . for big business, business investment in Saskatchewan has declined. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, one day the members opposite might want to sit down and quietly examine that in spite of the fact that they have created the perfect business climate, why business investment has actually declined.

I think the answer is obvious, Mr. Speaker, obvious to everyone but the members opposite. But as someone said, you must keep in mind the definition of a Conservative: the group of the unwilling, picked from the unfit, to do the unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the fourth economic indicator, that of retail sales. I want to say that in 1987 the total value of retail sales increased by only 4.7 per cent compared to the national average of 9.8 per cent. And when we take into account inflation in Saskatchewan was 4.5 per cent in 1987, that figure is even worse.

Mr. Speaker, these previous statistics were just that. Let me turn to one that has even more meaning for ordinary people — jobs, employment in Saskatchewan. In 1981

when this government assumed office, Saskatchewan had 110,000 jobs for young people — 110,000 jobs for young people age 15 to 24. By 1987 that figure had fallen to 95,000. Mr. Speaker, six years, 15,000 jobs for young people were gone — gone somewhere, Mr. Speaker.

And where the jobs went, so did the young people, an exodus of youth, the best and the brightest citizens of Saskatchewan, driven from this province by this government; or worse still, driven onto social welfare with lost hopes, lost opportunities — 15,000 shattered dreams. Optimism replaced by despair, 15,000 less partners in progress, Mr. Speaker. Now that's an accomplishment; now that's real performance.

But there's more, Mr. Speaker. It gets worse despite all of the government's talk about manufacturing and diversification, despite all the government's advertisements in radio and TV, in our newspapers, and when you look at the real story, Mr. Speaker, what do you find? You find that in April of 1985 there were 27,000 employed in manufacturing — in 1985; in April 1988 there were 25,000 employed in manufacturing — 2,000 less partners in progress.

But not everything has gone down in this province, not everything, Mr. Speaker. Bankruptcies are up; bankruptcies are up in Saskatchewan. In 1987, the level of bankruptcies was 9 per cent higher than in 1986. There were 992 business and consumer bankruptcies in 1987 — 992 less partners for progress.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to examine the poverty rate for Saskatchewan. In 1986, Saskatchewan had the second worst poverty rate per families in Canada; the Saskatchewan rate was 16.4 per cent; the Canadian rate was 12.3. And worse still, Mr. Speaker, 64,600 children were considered to be living in poverty in Saskatchewan in 1988 — 64,600 children who will never have the opportunities to be partners in progress.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most cutting indictment of the economic policies of this present government. For one child in four here in Saskatchewan, there's really no future as long as this present government continues its economic policies.

Mr. Speaker, I have examined here this afternoon this government's incompetence, its waste, its mismanagement, and what it has given to the people of this province, and I want to summarize. First of all, Mr. Speaker, this government, as I have said, has placed on the backs of the people of this province a massive debt of \$11.6 billion. And do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that servicing that debt costs the taxpayers \$330 million a year. That means that almost a million dollars a day has to be raised in Saskatchewan just to pay the interest of servicing the debt created by members opposite.

When they assumed office, Saskatchewan had the lowest per capita debt in all of Canada. Today we're number one, Mr. Speaker — Saskatchewan has the highest per capita debt in all of Canada. Seven consecutive deficits, and this minister in his three budgets has a debt exceeding \$2.3 billion, or any average of \$700 million per year. In the previous administration, Mr. Speaker, under the Blakeney

administration, there had been 11 balanced budgets and a surplus of \$139 million when the minister assumed office.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that from 1947 up till 1982, there had only been two small deficits during that whole period, in 1961 and 1962, and the combined debt was not exceeding much over \$5 million between the two.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've seen massive debt, we have seen consecutive deficits, and also we have seen massive personal taxes increase — increases in personal income tax, the imposition of that vicious flat tax. This year, Mr. Speaker, in this budget they imposed and increased the flat tax by thirty-three and one-third per cent. And as I said, they cut the corporate income tax by 2 percentage points.

Yes, for a family earning a net income of \$25,000, the flat tax seeks and extracts from the pockets of the taxpayers \$500 just with that tax, this from a government, Mr. Speaker, that promised to decrease personal income tax by 10 per cent. That was the pledge that they gave to the people of this province when they were electioneering, and what they have done is now cast on the people of Saskatchewan the second highest personal income tax rate in all of Canada, second only to Quebec.

Even worse, they promised to eliminate the E&H tax, but what did they do? They increased it by 40 per cent, from 5 to 7 per cent. And they pledged to the people of this province, when they ran in '82, that they would eliminate that tax in the first term of office.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they removed the gas tax. And I remember the Premier in this House indicating that as long as a Tory government sat opposite, that the gas tax which they had removed would never be reimposed on the people of this province.

(1500)

Well I'll tell you, they reimposed it. And they imposed it on the business community, the small-business community in Saskatchewan, with no rebate. Oh, they said, there would be a rebate to the ordinary driver, 7 per cent rebate. And when we analyzed that the other night, we find that an estimated \$39 million was budgeted for the fuel rebate program, and they now estimate that the pay-out will be \$26 million.

Do you know what that means, Mr. Speaker? It means that \$13 million has been confiscated from the people of this province, which is even worse. They use our money, interest free, for a whole entire year, draw interest or use it interest free, and in the end they refuse to rebate the full amount to the people of Saskatchewan who are entitled to it.

But I want to say that this is not all they have done. They go even further, Mr. Speaker. They cut and slash programs that are most needed by the people of this province. Gone and destroyed is the best school-based dental program in North America. Gone and destroyed is the best prescription drug program in Canada. I ask, Mr. Speaker, how callous and how heartless can a

government be to deny the children of this province proper dental care. I ask, Mr. speaker, how heartless and how callous can a government be that will withdraw needed prescription drugs from the senior citizens who built this province.

Mr. Speaker, today our citizens are denied needed medical care, medical treatment, caused by the huge backlog and waiting lists at our major hospitals throughout this province. And this is caused again, Mr. Speaker, by a major underfunding of the health care system and of the lack of a commitment to health care by this government opposite.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, today, as never before, our young people are being denied access to higher education. For the first time, qualified students wanting entrance into the university of this province have had the doors of opportunity closed to them. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, is this government's lack of funding and commitment to education.

Mr. Speaker, they who profess to be the friend of the farmer, and let us take a look at what they have done. They instituted the production loan, a \$1.2 billion production loan, and they said it was cash without hassle. And you know what? That was in 1985-86 that they put out the production loan of \$25 per acre. And today when the farmers of this province are on their knees as a result of huge debt, low commodity prices, and drought, what does this government do? They increase the rate from six to nine and three-quarters per cent. Contrast that, Mr. Speaker, with what they did to their corporate friend Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington, who took over PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) pulp mill in P.A.

There they said, as long as you make no profit, no interest. But to the farmers of Saskatchewan, when they're on their knees, hurt by low commodity prices and drought, they increase the interest rate. Whose do you think they are friends of?

And I say again in respect to the farmers, they fail to address the farm debt crisis. Thirty to 40 per cent was confirmed by a wheat pool representative; 30 or 40 per cent of the farmers are in serious financial problems. And we have asked and we have urged this government to bring in a program of debt restructuring to meet the crisis of debt placed upon the farmers of Saskatchewan, but there has been no help and no assistance and no co-operation from the federal government.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they allege to be the friends of the farmers, but truly they're the friends of the multinational corporations.

I say, Mr. Speaker, also in respect to farmers, we have, raging across this province, a major drought. Our caucus took a tour. We went through Pangman and over to Gravelbourg and Vanguard, and over to Ponteix and back to Swift Current, and over to Rosetown. And we went up to Kindersley and to Lloydminster and over to North Battleford. And during that tour, we witnessed the devastation of the drought and the anxiety in the faces of farmers and small-business men across this south-western part of the province.

Mr. Speaker, we have urged the government to bring in a comprehensive drought program, and they have sat idly by. They say that they have an agreement with the federal government, but no announcement. And I say to the farmers of Saskatchewan that this drought program should have been announced far before now. It's too late, much too late, because the farmers of Saskatchewan, ridden by the drought, need to know what the program is in order to make good business decisions.

How does the farmer know whether he should get rid of all his cattle? And what about the farmer who doesn't have the cash at hand to move his cattle, which costs up to \$90 a head? If the government is going to put in place a program, that program is needed now. And we urge the government to come forward.

Mr. Speaker, what is as bad, that they have attacked working people across this province. Yes, gone are hundreds of highway workers — an opportunity to work in the private sector. Dismissed were approximately 400 qualified health care workers. Gone are some 200 more jobs, and the security of families as a result of the government's decision to close down Cory mine. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they miss no one.

They are now attacking small-business community in both city and small town Saskatchewan with their store hour legislation. The small-business community across this province is indicating that they want the provincial government to set aside one day of shopping, closing on Sunday. That's what they say. And this government disregards the voice of small business both here in the city and across the province.

And they go on in their undemocratic way destroying the democratic process by eliminating the ward system, against the opposition of the council here in Regina, the city council over in Saskatoon, in Moose Jaw and Prince Albert, and the urban association.

Mr. Speaker, this government has undermined the security of our young people. They have undermined the security of our seniors. They have failed to meet the problems of the farmers. They have attacked the workers by dismissals. Our small-business community they won't listen to. They miss no one.

Mr. Speaker, this government no longer governs for ordinary people of Saskatchewan. It is a government characterized by incompetence, waste, mismanagement, and wrong priorities. It is a government totally out of touch with the real aspirations of Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, it is a government that must be defeated. It is a government that will be defeated. Mr. Speaker, this budget and this session illustrates the true Tory agenda, and the people of Saskatchewan don't like what they see.

No, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan don't like what they see, and I'll tell you, the people of Saskatoon Eastview and Elphinstone sent a message clear and loud

to this government. In Saskatoon Eastview, where the government opposite had won the seat overwhelmingly in 1982 by over 3,000 votes and rewon it again in 1986, the people of Saskatchewan spoke. And in Saskatoon Eastview, the Tory candidate lost her deposit.

And over in Regina Elphinstone, the people of Elphinstone spoke, and they sent a message. And the member from Elphinstone received over 77 per cent of the total vote — almost 80 per cent of the vote. Yes, the people of Saskatchewan will indeed have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with a few remarks in respect to where this government is going in respect to its economic policy of privatization. And I say, Mr. Speaker, when our pioneers came and they built this province, they were not the captives of their own doubts; they were not the prisoners of their own price tags. Their motives were not every man for himself, what's in it for me attitude; their motive was for a common cause, to seek out a life for themselves and their family and for their neighbours. And those same pioneers, they survived the drought, the depression, the grasshoppers, the exploitation of the open market. They survived the Premier Anderson, the last Tory government from 1929 to '34 — they survived that government which never loomed its head on the horizon for another 50 years. And all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that history will repeat itself.

But I want to say that in 1944, Mr. Speaker, when conditions in Saskatchewan were almost as bad as they are today, filled with hope for the future and secure in their belief that they will be able to serve . . . would be well served, they elected a premier by the name of Thomas Clement Douglas as premier.

While the members opposite like to talk about Tommy Douglas — and I want to say that only last week the Premier said that if Tommy were alive he'd support the Tory policy of privatization. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know why they'd say that. They wouldn't say it, I'll tell you, and get away with it if Tommy Douglas was alive.

Well perhaps they say it simply to make those who respected Mr. Douglas so much, rather angry and irritated. Or perhaps in some pervert way they might even believe it. But as George Orwell said once, that Conservatives' mind was a perfect example of a double-think, or the power of having two contradictory ideas in one mind and accepting them both.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Tommy is no longer with us, but I want to say that his words remain.

And I would like to look at the new Tory buzz-word, the new Tory slogan, that of privatization, and the policies that it has justified, as Tommy would have seen them. The thrust of privatization has been that benefits will accrue to the people of Saskatchewan if we take assets from the public sector and privatize them by direct sale to private corporations or by stock and bond offerings. What we have here is what has been called peoples' capitalism. Well in a speech that he gave entitled, "That Freedom May Flourish," Mr. Douglas addressed this idea of peoples' capitalism, and this is what he had to say. he

said:

During the 20th century, laissez-faire capitalism has developed into corporation or monopoly capitalism in which ownership has been separated from control. Yet just because some workers and farmers are in possession of a few industrial stocks or bonds . . . (Yes, stocks or bonds) . . . the fact remains, (he says) that these thousands of small shareholders have nothing whatsoever to say about the management of the companies in which they have invested.

Yes (Mr. Douglas went on to say), it is still as true today as it has ever been that he who controls the means by which I live controls me. (He said), we hear much from the newspaper columnists, the radio commentators about the danger of government controlling business. But . . .

He went on to say:

. . . but what about the danger of a society in which business controls government?

(1515)

And let's not fool ourselves, that's the main thrust of privatization in this province, is to turn over as many functions of government as possible to the private sector. This government is trying to undo everything that Tommy Douglas, the CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation), and the New Democratic Party ever achieved in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is more than ironic when the members opposite claim Tommy Douglas would support them in their endeavours. How, Mr. Speaker, can members opposite claim that their policies of shifting the tax burden from corporations to ordinary people is in keeping with Tommy Douglas' philosophy, when he said:

That they who are strong ought to help bear the burdens of the weak. For after all, we are thy brother's keepers, he said.

How can they claim that Tommy Douglas would stand up and support the destruction of the children dental care program — the privatization of that valuable program? How could they possibly claim that Tommy Douglas would support the destruction of the prescription drug plan and the firing of hundreds of health care workers and hundreds of instructors from technical schools and major cuts in the funding for education.

Mr. Speaker, Tommy Douglas said it all for us when he said:

The philosophy of our movement is humanity first. We believe that the measure of any community is the amount of social and economic security which it provides for even its humblest citizens.

No, Mr. Speaker, Tommy Douglas would not support those policies. They are in opposition for everything for

which he fought, and you know, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier says Tommy Douglas would be supportive of his endeavours, he not only deludes himself, but he is seen by many to be rather ridiculous.

Does he really believe that Mr. Douglas would ever hand over a cheque of \$21 million to Peter Pocklington? Does he really believe that Tommy Douglas would give \$1.7 billion in tax breaks to the oil industry while increasing the tax burden on ordinary Saskatchewan people? If the Premier really believes that, then I think he should read the history of Saskatchewan and, more particularly, the accomplishments of T.C. Douglas.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and in case they do not find time to do so, let me conclude by giving you the words of T.C. Douglas, some free and unsolicited advice, when he said:

Never be afraid of something new just because it is new. All history demonstrates that the human race has advanced on the shoulders of those who have seen beyond the lean horizons of their years. (And as he said), a leading political figure once said to me, you're 25 years ahead of your time, Mr. Douglas, and my reply (Mr. Douglas' reply) was the real tragedy for me would be if I were 25 years behind my time.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the tragedy of this government here today. They are trapped by an ideology that was discredited by the Great Depression, but which has never again, which has emerged again to wreak havoc on ordinary people of this province. But let me continue, Mr. Speaker. Tommy's second precept was, and I quote:

Never discard something just because it is old. In our eagerness to discard what is redundant and irrelevant, we must take care not to throw overboard the moral and social values without which human society would become a ruthless jungle.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite would do well to hold with Tommy's dictum:

To test all things but to hold fast to that which is good, or we will become a sick society living in a moral waste land, bereft of those things that make life worth living.

Yes, Tommy's third proposition is perhaps the most important, and is the one that surely divorces him from the philosophy and the practices of the members opposite, when he said:

Measure your life not by what you get, but by what you give. Wealth and power do not always bring peace of mind and a sense of personal satisfaction. Some of the most radiant personalities I've ever known have been teachers, doctors, social workers, and others in humble walks of life who have given of themselves in the dedicated service to their fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close in the words of the poet great, Frank Scott, who dedicated this poem to Tommy

Douglas, and let him have the last words when he wrote:

From those condemned to labour
For the profits of another,
We take our new endeavour
Till power is brought to polling
And outcasts share in ruling
There will not be an ending
Nor any peace for spending

Mr. Speaker, this government will find no support from the memory or from the works of Tommy Douglas. We're still for you. You will find no support — no support from the hundreds of thousands of people, ordinary people in Saskatchewan, who you have hurt, who you've betrayed, and who you've deceived.

Yes, I say to you members opposite, the people of this province will have their turn. Their turn shall come, and their judgement will be, in my view it will be nasty, brutish, and short.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons and for many more if time would allow, we will not be supporting the Appropriation Bill. We cannot support the budget. We cannot support the priorities of this government, which has wreaked havoc on ordinary people of Saskatchewan. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if, with leave of the Assembly, I may introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the members of the opposition for granting me leave.

Seated in the west gallery today, Mr. Speaker, are two wee fellows I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly. They've come all the way from Dublin, Ireland, and they're here on vacation. They are Damon and Conor Barrett. Conor is 12 years old and Damon is 10 years old. And I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, they made the journey entirely unaccompanied, came all by themselves and were met here in Regina by friends and relatives.

They're accompanied in the gallery by my son Brig, and my wife Cheryl, who are escorting them around the legislature this afternoon. If the boys would like to stand and be acknowledged, I'd just like to say that we all hope, here in the Assembly, that you have a very good summer and a good vacation. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

APPROPRIATION BILL (continued)

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you. I found it somewhat fitting listening to the opposition Finance critic that he spent about the last half-hour of his remarks talking about the

old days. And he certainly talked about Tommy Douglas and what Tommy wouldn't have done. And he expressed the fact that he was very upset that the Premier alluded to the former premier, Tommy Douglas.

I'll tell you what Tommy Douglas wouldn't have done and didn't do during the years that he was premier of this province. Tommy Douglas didn't buy farm land to keep farmers as serfs of the government of this province, Mr. Speaker. Not once did he ever advocate that, not once did he ever do it. Tommy Douglas never nationalized a potash mine or the potash industry, Mr. Speaker — never once. Never advocated it, and never did it, Mr. Speaker. Tommy Douglas never bought a pulp mill, Mr. Speaker. Never advocated it, and never did it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that wasn't referred to by the member from Quill Lakes because he knows full well, Mr. Speaker, that Tommy Douglas was a populist and not a socialist, and he was a CCF and he was not a New Democratic Party member, Mr. Speaker. When the NDP formed up in this province, Mr. Speaker, Tommy Douglas left and went to British Columbia, Mr. Speaker. That's what he did, and that's what he thought of the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I found it somewhat humorous when I heard the opposition finance critic talk about building hospitals. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province laugh when they hear an NDP talk about building hospitals. Did they build that expansion to the University Hospital? No, they did not. Did they build the new City Hospital in Saskatoon? No, they did not. Did they build the Wascana rehabilitation hospital in Regina? No, they did not. Did they build a new hospital in Lloydminster? No, they didn't. Did they build a new hospital in Melfort? No, they didn't.

Mr. Speaker, would they build nursing home? No, they wouldn't. They are the only part and the only government that ever lived and existed in Canada that passed a moratorium in writing to build no more nursing homes in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, they are the only party in Canada, the New Democratic Party that's populated by the remnants of that government that are still controlling it in the front benches, that have to their legacy, Mr. Speaker, they built more liquor stores than they ever built nursing homes, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — And I can take you to my riding — more liquor stores than nursing homes. My riding, the community of Fort Qu'Appelle, tried for years to get a nursing home, Mr. Speaker, and an expansion. Not done by the NDP; done by the Progressive Conservatives. But they built a new liquor board store before the 1982 election, Mr. Speaker. That's where their priorities were, Mr. Speaker, and that's what the legacy was.

Government office building were built — the Sturdy Stone Building, the SaskTel building, the SGI building, McIntosh centre. Mr. Speaker, all over this province there

were government office buildings, and there was a moratorium on nursing homes, Mr. Speaker. When they talk about building, Mr. Speaker, their legacy was a shameful one, and still remembered by the people of this province today.

Mr. Speaker, they talked about homes, in passing. Did they talk about protecting home owners against high interest rates? Not a word. Did they talk about protecting farmers, Mr. Speaker? Not a word. Did they talk about protecting the home quarter, Mr. Speaker? Not a word. No.

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the hon. member, the hon. member brought home a fundamental fact of this session and a fundamental fact of the new leadership of the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, the thing is, and the key issue is, and the issue that the people of this province will well remember, is that they haven't changed, Mr. Speaker.

(1530)

They still oppose building hospitals. They still oppose record expenditures on health care. They still oppose helping the farmer on protecting the home quarter, Mr. Speaker. They still oppose the government's efforts to diversify this economy. They still oppose a Meadow Lake pulp mill. They still oppose a new paper mill in, say, in Prince Albert. They still oppose a heavy oil plant in the city of Regina. They just reiterated again today that they still oppose expansions to the meat packing industry in the city of North Battleford. They still oppose Vanguard mobile homes in North Battleford. Mr. Speaker, they oppose and they oppose and they oppose, and stand for absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, opposition parties have been doomed to failure for the last 100 years, Mr. Speaker, when all they do is oppose and stand for nothing and support nothing. And, Mr. Speaker, when you have an opposition party that can only oppose, you have an opposition party that's doomed to failure, Mr. Speaker, and doomed to opposition for a long period of time. And, Mr. speaker, that is being seen by the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I want to talk, Mr. Speaker, about what the hon. member didn't talk about as well. Did he talk about seniors? No, he didn't talk about seniors. They haven't talked about seniors this whole session, Mr. Speaker. The NDP didn't talk about seniors. They wouldn't let the word "seniors" pass through their lips during this session, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that more time was spent on the NDP defending the ward system than they ever spent talking about seniors.

Mr. Speaker, you can check the record in *Hansard* that more words came from the opposition opposing changes to the ward system, defending the old ward system, than they ever spent talking about farmers, Mr. Speaker. More questions in question period opposing changes to the ward system than defending farmers and helping farmers in a drought.

Mr. Speaker, more time was spent by the NDP defending the ward system than they spent talking about education in this session, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what happened to their attack on SIAST is now receiving the support of educators around this province. Where was their support for distance education? None, Mr. Speaker, because they're more concerned about their political organization in the cities than they were concerned about education.

Mr. Speaker, more time was spent by the NDP in this session defending the old ward system than talked about welfare reform, Mr. Speaker, which is creating opportunities for those on welfare and jobs for people on welfare, Mr. Speaker, and yet they wanted to talk about the ward system.

Mr. Speaker, a drought — the most serious drought in the history of this province, Mr. Speaker, and more time spent talking about the ward system than about the drought.

Mr. Speaker, it tells you, it tells you where their priorities are, Mr. Speaker. It tells you, Mr. Speaker where fundamentally they're coming from. And it tells you fundamentally what's more important to them, Mr. Speaker, their organization in Saskatoon, Regina, and Prince Albert, than the farmers of this province, Mr. Speaker. And the farmers of this province know it.

Mr. Speaker, they talked about the deficit. And they didn't talk, Mr. Speaker, that if they hadn't have taken and robbed, robbed the Heritage Fund of this province when there were record oil prices and potash prices and wheat prices, when they stole that money and robbed that money and took it away, Mr. Speaker, and they put it into buying potash mines that were already here, Mr. Speaker. If they hadn't bought the potash mines, Mr. Speaker, as I said, by 1986 there would have been no deficit in this province, Mr. Speaker.

They made a choice. They made a choice, Mr. Speaker; they were going to take that money away, Mr. Speaker, and put it into buying what was already there. And one of the great tragedies of the NDP government, Mr. Speaker, was when they had that opportunity, when they had that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to take the wealth from potash and the wealth from oil and the wealth from uranium, to create something new, Mr. Speaker, to build something new, to diversify the economy, they chose, Mr. Speaker, to buy what was already there, Mr. Speaker.

And all we heard today from the Finance critic of the New Democratic Party was that he would do it all over again. He said it was the right thing to do, and that's what he said from his seat this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. He stood up and reiterated their belief that government ownership and government acquisitions of farm land and the economy was the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I said it once, and I'll say it again, the speech in this House today, the debate throughout this session shows again that they haven't changed. And, Mr. Speaker, they stand for the same old thing of government ownership of farm land, government ownership of resources, and government ownership of the economy of this province. Mr. Speaker, they were wrong then, and I

say that they're wrong today, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — And notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, what the opposition said, this government, in spite of a drought, the worst drought in the history of this province, we will continue to build, Mr. Speaker. We will continue to build pulp mills, and we will continue to build paper mills, and we will continue to build upgraders, and we will continue to build manufacturing plants, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that every action of this government to build and diversify the economy is stalled and opposed by the new Democratic party and its leadership, Mr. Speaker.

They are against the Meadow Lake pulp mill. They have been against the P.A. paper mill since the day the shovel was turned to build that project, Mr. Speaker. They have opposed this government co-operating with the co-operative movement to build the largest heavy oil upgrader in Canada. They wouldn't do it when they were government; they wouldn't do it today, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this province know that.

Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous opportunity, in diversifying our economy, to take and walk through that open door of opportunity on free trade, Mr. Speaker. There's a market below the province of Saskatchewan that we can access. No province trades more per capita than the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. We are world traders, and we will continue to be world traders, Mr. Speaker, and this government, under the leadership of our Premier, takes a leadership role in promoting free trade and the opportunities that it gives to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — And it's not only free trade with our neighbours to the south, Mr. Speaker — our neighbours to the south hated by the members opposite — but it's freer trade around the world because, for the first time, Saskatchewan government members attend the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade meetings, Mr. Speaker. For the first time, this province, this government, and these people attend and participate in the efforts to lower the barriers to trade around the world.

Mr. Speaker, they have opposed because they fundamentally disagree with it, the efforts of this government, and the members of our party, to let the people of this province have a direct participation in the economic development of this province, Mr. Speaker. They oppose privatization and public participation, Mr. Speaker, because they still believe, and they said it today, that the only way the NDP have is government ownership, not people ownership, Mr. Speaker, and that's a fundamental difference, and that shows up in the debate and the comments of the members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I've indicated what the tenor of the debate has been throughout. And there are some fundamental differences. Mr. Speaker, there are

differences in who should own the economy. We believe the people should own it; the NDP say the government should own it.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that farmers have to be helped in this difficult time, not . . . Drought shouldn't be seen, Mr. Speaker, as just an opportunity to buy cheap farm land. And that's what the NDP stand for. We believe, Mr. Speaker, in trying to help the farmers and not take advantage, and not look upon drought as just an opportunity to grab land for the land bank, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what we're really seeing, the NDP have a bit of a Christopher Columbus syndrome, Mr. Speaker. They don't know where they're going; they don't know where they are when they get there; they don't know where they've been when they get back home, and they're upset to find out they were financed by foreign money, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, that sums up, that sums up the NDP. They have shown no leadership, Mr. Speaker. They have not shown one positive proposal through 70 days, Mr. Speaker. They haven't shown one change from the Blakeney years, Mr. Speaker, of government ownership.

It's the same old gang giving the same old tune, singing the same old song with the same old people with the same old idea. Mr. Speaker, it's been a disappointment this session, Mr. Speaker, to see that they've had the opportunity as they have new leadership to make some changes and all we've seen are the same old people moved up to the front, Mr. Speaker. Any possibility of new ideas are shunted to the back, Mr. Speaker. Nothing new for anyone, Mr. Speaker. I urge all hon. members to support this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on division and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill read a second and third time and passed under its title.

TABLING OF PAPER

Mr. Speaker: — Before we move on to further business of the House, I beg to inform the Assembly that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly has received from the Chief Electoral Officer a certificate of the following elections and returns: of Dwain Lingenfelter as member for the constituency of Regina Elphinstone; of Bob Pringle, as member for the constituency of Saskatoon Eastview.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

(1545)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 81 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes I would, Mr. Chairman. Seated beside me is Dan Kuss, the legislation adviser, corporate law department, SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance); and seated beside me, to my right, is Byron Hindle, assistant vice-president of customer services.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Minister, I don't expect to take much time with this Bill this afternoon, but I would be interested in your clarifying for me the need to add to subsection 5 (1), the subsection (1.1) please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Basically, this amendment is to allow us to deal with unique circumstances. That would be different kinds of models that we don't traditionally list. There's a lot of different types of mobile homes, for example. There's new imported . . . different kinds of import cars come on the market. I believe there are also some types of cars built from kits, things of this nature, and this allows us to deal with those type of things rather than having to wait for regulations every time something new would come along.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, this is highly unusual, as I understand it from some of my colleagues who have been in this legislature for a good deal longer than I have and you have, that it's unusual for the government to give itself the authority to make regulations retroactively to a one-year period.

And, Mr. Minister, I'm interested in knowing what little bind you're in right now that you need this legislative authority. What regulations have you . . . or what fee increases or something to that effect have you introduced that you now need the legislative authority to take these regulations back one year?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — This is to allow us to assess rating points for high-risk drivers, bad drivers, and so on that we can assess these rating points to them. As I said, problems arise with new vehicle models that don't fit into the classification. So if you look at the Act, it pertains to both vehicles and drivers. So the best way for me to explain it is for new and different type of vehicles that weren't traditionally registered before, they will be able to be registered under this section of the Act, and also for the driver rating points, where we would be able to put other charges on high-risk drivers.

Ms. Atkinson: — Okay, Mr. Minister, as of January 1 of this year, I understand it, your government, through the SGI, brought in a change to drivers' licences where you would go back a period of time and assess what a driver should be rated at as a result of driving infractions that they may have had, highway traffic infractions, speeding tickets, seat-belt infractions, that sort of thing.

I guess my question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: did you have the legislative authority through The Automobile Accident Insurance Act to do that? And is this legislation and this provision that allows you to make regulation retroactively to one year, is this really there because of the changes that you made in January of this year?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm informed that this allows us to

assess the points to high-risk drivers, and I wanted to point out to you that really 90 per cent of the drivers in Saskatchewan this wouldn't affect at all, and previously they would be subsidizing these type of people. So what we're able to do with this change in the legislation is to assess those points to high-risk drivers so that the good drivers are not subsidizing them.

Ms. Atkinson: — Just so I'm clear, Mr. Minister. I am advised by some people who are drivers in this province that they may have had a driving while impaired charge several years ago. They paid their fine at the time. They had their licence suspended, and for many of the drivers that I've spoken to and there are — I shouldn't say many; there are some — they are no longer involved with alcohol; they are part of the AA program, and they were quite shocked this year when they saw a huge assessment to their driver's licence because of the changes that you've made that go back some time, and you're now assessing people or you're penalizing people for poor driving records, driving while impaired, that sort of thing.

And you didn't answer my question, Mr. Minister. I asked you specifically: did you have the legislative authority to introduce those changes when they were introduced a few months ago?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The officials indicated to me that the system of assessing points hasn't changed, but the number of points has changed — that was changed.

In your question about the legislation, yes, this legislation will permit the regulations for the assessment of these points on bad drivers.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think what you've got yourself into is a bit of a pickle, and you're trying to get out of it with this legislation.

Now I just want to make it very clear to you, in terms of what I have had in terms of feedback from people who open up their driver's licence and discover that they have a great deal of money to pay out this year in order to obtain a driver's licence from SGI.

And I'm thinking specifically of a few examples of people who had impaired driving charges several years ago, had paid the price — they lost their licences, they had to pay a high fee for their driver's licence. They then revert back to what the rest of us, good drivers, pay for our licences, our driver's licence, and all of a sudden they get a real shock in the mail when you apparently changed the way you assess points for driving.

Mr. Minister, you didn't have the legislative authority to do that, and what you've just brought in here today is a piece of legislation that allows you to make regulations retroactively. I'd be interested in knowing, Mr. Minister, when you changed this way that you assessed points, and when did it come into effect?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — It was changed January 1. And you're asking about the people who had had an impaired charge, or whatever it may be. The period of when the penalty would be imposed is the same as it previously was, except we've got tougher on the bad driver.

And I think if you . . . And I'd be willing to share these statistics with you if you're not aware of them. But it's about two to four times — I think four times more prevalent for the bad driver to have continuing accidents. And I don't think, and I assume probably you are a good driver, that you should be subsidizing someone who has that kind of a record.

So yes we have got tougher on the bad driver; and yes we did bring it into effect as of January 1. And yes, this is the legislation that will put that in place.

Ms. Atkinson: — So, Mr. Minister, is this legislation to give you the authority to do what you've already done?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, that's correct.

Ms. Atkinson: Well, Mr. Minister, so then really what we're in is a situation where a number of people have been assessed additional . . . not additional points, but the point structure has changed and their driver's licences have increased significantly, and they've done so when you haven't had the authority to do it. And now you bring some legislation in through the back door to try and make a policy decision of yours legal, when it wasn't legal when you introduced it in January.

Mr. Minister, I have nothing further to say about this other than there are a lot of drivers in this province that realize that they have made mistakes; they realize that they've made mistakes; that they've had an impaired driving charge, for instance. They feel as though they've paid the penalty, Mr. Minister. They paid the penalty by having to go to a course. They've paid the penalty by losing their licence; they've paid the penalty in terms of having an embarrassment in terms of being caught drinking and driving. It's socially unacceptable behaviour. They've paid the penalty in terms of having to pay for a driver's licence that is at a significantly increased rate.

And they thought they'd finished paying the penalty. But that's not the case. Mr. Minister. You've just changed the system without any kind of forewarning.

And, Mr. Minister, I just want to put on record that I think that that's a real sad state of affairs for yourself as minister responsible for Saskatchewan Government Insurance, and I guess I'll just leave it at that. I've just put my remarks on the record and I guess we can now vote on this Bill.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1600)

Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Along with Garnet Garven, who's the chairman, is John McLean, senior vice-president, and Ted Thiessen, director of finance.

Item 1

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to give notice at this point that I will be moving amendments to sections 15 and section 19 of the Bill, and I would ask a page to give a copy of those proposed amendments to both the Clerk and to the minister so as to provide opportunity to review them before we get to that section.

I anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that the minister will see them as very reasonable amendments. He will notice that both of these amendments relate directly to benefits provided for widows of workers who are killed on the job, and I want to provide him the opportunity to be able to review that in advance, and I anticipate he will see them as consistent with the intentions of the Bill.

Mr. Chairman, just to put this Bill into context, basically the Bill brings about a number of what I would consider positive changes — I made those remarks in the second reading debate — and changes that are forthcoming from recommendations made by the committee of review.

Mr. Chairman, the minister will be aware, of course, that back in 1985, in December of 1985, the previous minister of Labour appointed a committee of review to provide for public input into The Workers' Compensation Act, and that that committee, in September of 1986, then filed its report, entitled Report of the Workers' Compensation Act Review Committee. I would also point out, Mr. Chairman, that with those recommendations that came forth from that committee, it was a unanimous report, unanimously endorsed by Judge Muir who chaired that committee, as well as all of the employer and employee representatives on the committee.

And so what the committee brought forth in summary then was a series of recommendations that were believed by Judge Muir, by employee representatives, and by employer representatives, to be good changes in the interests of The Workers' Compensation Act in the administration of it.

It's significant to note as well, Mr. Chairman, that the costs related to The Workers' Compensation Act, to the implementation of it, are borne by employers. And so it is a very, very significant thing to note that those recommendations were endorsed unanimously by employers, who saw the recommendations as being improvements for the systems and for protection of workers, and ultimately for their own protection, consistent with the basic principle of workers' compensation, by which an injured worker is denied the right to appeal to court for compensation when experiencing an injury on the job.

Related to that then, Mr. Chairman, my questions today, and my proposed amendments, are consistent with the recommendations made unanimously by that review committee. And I will focus my attention on some recommendations that the committee made which were

not . . . which we do not find in this legislation before us now, as well as some . . . I will be proposing some amendments to bring the changes within this Bill, in light of the reading of the spirit of the recommendations as I understand them. And so it's clearly in that context that I approach the committee consideration of this Bill, Mr. Chairman.

Let me begin then. There are three major recommendations that were put forth by the unanimous recommendation of the committee that are not found in this Bill, and I would appreciate some explanation from the minister as to why they're not found in this Bill and also would be most receptive, Mr. Chairman, for the minister to bring forth some changes to the Bill to bring it in line with the recommendations of the committee.

First of all, I refer to the report, recommendation No. 56, and I would anticipate that the minister and the officials would have that recommendation there. When I'm making reference to the report, I'll advise you as to where I'm speaking from so as to provide for you the opportunity to review it for yourself.

Recommendation 56, as can be seen, and I think can be stated no more simply or briefly, Mr. Chairman, than as written in the recommendation, reads as such, and I'll quote two paragraphs preceding recommendation 56, entitled, "Composition of the Workers' Compensation Board." And it reads as follows:

The legislation stipulates that the Workers' Compensation Board is to consist of at least three members, one of whom is to be appointed as chairman of the Board. Traditionally, the Board has consisted of a chairman and two other members: one representative of labour, the other of management.

This system is based on a balance between labour and management in order to ensure that both sides have confidence in the Board's ability to function as a fair adjudicative mechanism. The committee contends that this system should be enshrined in law.

Now I simply want to underline that sentiment, Mr. Chairman, because the committee in its recommendation spells out very clearly the importance of having a board of the Workers' Compensation Board that is composed with equal representation by both management and labour to ensure the confidence of both of those parties in the Saskatchewan economic system.

And I would ask, then, Mr. Minister, in light of the . . . this is not just the theoretical question, because, as you're aware, your government has had at one time four members on the board and has broken that balance of representation between labour and management. And I would appreciate an explanation as to why it was not seen fit, in light of the committee's unanimous recommendation, to enshrine in law that the board should have equal representation of both management and labour.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, what in fact exists

now, as I'm advised, is that the board, the make-up of the board, which is consistent with all boards across Canada — a representative of labour, a representative of the employer, and a chairman appointed by government. And that's what we believe to be a fair balance; the rest of the provinces believe that to be a fair balance, and that's where we will stay.

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Minister, I share that sentiment, and that's the exact point that I was making. It hasn't always been the practice of your government to honour that principle in the composition of the board. And the committee is recommending . . . Like, let me quote again: "The committee contends that this system should be enshrined in law."

It had, until you placed the fourth member on the board some years ago, it had been the consistent practice. But that precedent had been broken, and the committee recognized the significance of that and is recommending that it "should be enshrined in law." I quote those words.

Mr. Minister, why was it not seen appropriate, in light of your support for that principle, to enshrine that principle in law with these amendments?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I simply say that, you know, we're back to the situation where there is the two sides and the government-appointed chairman, and it is the view of this government that we will continue on that path without needing it enshrined in legislation.

Mr. Hagel: — Well I hear what you're saying; I hear it's agreeing on the principle. It still doesn't answer my question as to why you specifically decided not to enshrine it. If it's a good idea and if the concern was raised because that precedent had been broken and the committee unanimously was recommending it, again I hear you saying that's your intention to continue that practice.

And let me ask just the last time. I suppose we can repeat this over and over again, but I would appreciate an explanation — I don't think I've heard one — as to why you specifically decided not to enshrine it in law with these amendments.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I understand it's not enshrined in law in other jurisdictions, so we will stay with where it is in other jurisdictions, stay with that course.

Mr. Hagel: — Well moving along then, Mr. Minister, I would simply point out that the Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Act is really a model Act that has been reviewed and in many cases adopted, and most recently just in Ontario some days ago, the principles of The Workers' Compensation Act of Saskatchewan, and I would see it as being most appropriate that we would provide in this province again some leadership in protecting the principles of fairness, both in practice and in appearance, by enshrining that in legislation. And I would certainly ask that the next time the review is undertaken, that consideration be given to that recommendation of the committee because I suspect it will come forth again.

If I can refer you to recommendation no. 62, Mr. Minister, and I'll quote that recommendation; it's just one simple sentence:

Full-time domestics (those working for one employer for more than 24 hours a week) should be included under the scope of The Workers' Compensation Act.

Again that recommendation was given unanimously by the committee, represented by both employers and employees, and again that recommendation is not found within the Bill before us. Can you explain why that recommendation was omitted from the legislative changes?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Again, I guess this debate has been around. The two jurisdictions that have the mandatory coverage here are Ontario and Manitoba. Manitoba have had some problems with it, and to date they only have 38 people registered under that. Now as that particular clause that you referred to there you wish to make mandatory, and our view is that clearly that's . . . there would not be more than that likely in Saskatchewan, and therefore it doesn't seem to us that that pressure is perhaps there yet, and would create additional work.

Mr. Hagel: — Well again, Mr. Minister, that's strikes me as being a bit of a weak explanation, again in light of the fact that this was a unanimous recommendation of the committee. I raised this point with the Minister of Labour in Labour estimates earlier in this session, and he made some reference to dealing with it through legislation, although it was unclear to me to what he was referring, and again I would hope that the committee's recommendation will give serious consideration next time round.

Finally, the section that was recommended for change and again excluded from the legislative changes before us, Mr. Minister, was recommendation no. 71. Recommendation no. 71, and again let me just read that to make it clear as to what it refers to. It says, and I quote:

Section 162 of the Act should be amended by adding a provision requiring the Board to file each year with the Minister a report to be tabled in the Legislature showing the progress made by the Board towards implementing the recommendations of the present and subsequent committees in so far as it is within the power of the Board to implement such recommendations. The report should also include an explanation for any delay in implementing the recommendations. This report should be submitted to the Minister before the anniversary date on which the review committee's report is made public.

Again this is not a recommendation, Mr. Minister, that was made lightly. Again I reinforce that it's a unanimous recommendation by the review committee. Before you respond as well, let me point out that I do recognize that there was such a report made this year. Although I point out that the committee is recommending that this report . . . the requirement to do this should again be enshrined in law, not just as a matter of practice or when convenient,

but enshrined in law. And it also says that this report should be submitted to the minister before the anniversary date on which the review committee's report is made public, which would have required that report to be tabled in the legislature, Mr. Minister, by September of 1988. As a matter of fact it was received about one or two months ago ... sorry, September of '87, and wasn't received until just a couple of months ago.

So although part of the spirit was honoured, in fact it wasn't completely. And it's also significant, Mr. Minister, because the review committee ... if you look through all the recommendations, the bulk of the recommendations, as a matter of fact, were not for legislative change, they were for procedural change within the operations of the board.

And so therefore in terms of public accountability and confidence of both employers and employees, it does become significant that that report be made annually and completely, with explanation as to why changes of the committee were not honoured. Again I point out that this is again a unanimous recommendation.

Could you please tell me, Mr. Minister, why that recommendation was not included in the legislative changes?

(1615)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well I'm advised, and I think the hon. member mentioned, that in fact it was included in this year's annual report; that it's the intention to include it in each annual report hereafter. I'm further advised that the board in fact met with Judge Muir and some of the people, and he suggested that this was a satisfactory way of proceeding with it. So even Judge Muir acknowledged that this process here was satisfactory. That's the advice that he gave back to the board.

Mr. Hagel: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm satisfied with these as questions and, number one, I have some specific questions as we proceed through the Bill and a couple of amendments that I'd like to propose. So prepare to start moving through the Bill, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 10

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Related to clause 10, which has to do with section 73 of the Act, it has to do with setting the review period for injured workers, for review of their loss of earnings capacity, and so on. I understand, through the explanatory notes, that the current practice is to do that annually. And what it's recommending here is that it would be done on some basis other than annually — I think at the discretion of the board, is how it looks to me.

Could you please be a little more definite as to how frequently it's intended to hold those reviews. I'm assuming not more frequently than annually, but I'm assuming there's also the other end of the time period. Are

we talking one to three years, or some time period in which those reviews will be held. And could you also explain what the impact of this would have on employees, of changing the review time?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised the one to three years would be, as you indicate, one to three years is the time period that would be, I'm further advised, less disquietening for the employees, and for that reason the one to three year review.

Mr. Hagel: — And the second part of my question is: what do you see as the beneficial impact for injured workers by moving it from one year to the one to three, with discretion of the board?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well you can set the rate for the three-year period. If they're back to work, they've got that rate set. You don't then have to come back to them each year and say, what are you earning now, and go through that process. That's why it's designed in the interests of that employee.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 agreed to.

Clause 12

Mr. Chairman: — There's a House amendment to clause 12 of the printed Bill, moved by the Minister of Justice. Is the amendment agreed?

Mr. Hagel: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I just received this when we began. I haven't had a chance to read it over. Would the minister just please explain for me the impact of the proposed amendment.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised the following: that this amendment here would clarify the recommendation of the committee and put it the following is that ... clarify the ability to purchase an annuity — and I'm going here from just my advice — is the balance is \$5,000 or less, it can be paid out, otherwise you can get into the annuity pay-out.

Mr. Hagel: — And how is that different from the section 12, the impact of section 12 as it is printed in the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The committee recommendation, as I understand, was the following: if it's under \$5,000, the worker can just have his money paid out to him; if it's over 5,000, you can opt to the annuity. That is what the commission recommended, and this just simply clarifies that in the manner of drafting to get that intent that the committee has recommended.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 12 as amended agreed to.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clause 14

Mr. Hagel: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, clause 14 refers to

moneys provided for funeral expenses and simply amends it by changing it from 3,000 to 3,500. I would ask the minister how you concluded — I recognize that the committee recommended a figure, but in recommending a figure the committee said that they really weren't all that certain as to whether it was the right figure or not, but just that it should be something higher than the previous 3,000. Mr. Minister, how did you conclude, or how did the Minister of Labour conclude, that \$3,500 is the right figure to cover the costs of a funeral?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The officials advise that their reading of the report indicated that they believe the recommendation of that committee was to raise it to \$3,500. That was a recommendation, a solid recommendation, and that recommendation was followed.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Clause 15

Mr. Chairman: — House amendment to clause 15 of the printed Bill, moved by the member from Moose Jaw North. Would the members take the amendment as read?

Mr. Hagel: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, just for the record so that it can be known what the amendment is, if I may just read that for the record:

Amend section 15 of the printed Bill:

(a) In clause 83(4)(b) as being enacted therein, by adding immediately after the words “capable of earning” the following words:

“after the board has made reasonable efforts to provide for vocational rehabilitation, appropriate training and assistance”; and

(b) In subsection 83(5) as being enacted therein, by striking out all the words after “pursuant to subsection (4)” and substituting the following:

for a period exceeding 24 consecutive months from the date of the fatality, the board shall set aside an amount equal to 10 per cent of all compensation paid to the dependent spouse on and from January 1, 1989, and of that compensation as it is paid, and that amount, together with accrued interest, shall be used to provide an annuity for the spouse at age 65.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the section 15 and taking a look at the recommendations of the committee — and this refers to committee's recommendations, number 3 and 5, Mr. Chairman — let me summarize . . . the shortest way of doing that is to simply read those, and I see the amendment consistent with the committee's recommendation. Recommendation 3, and I'll read it in part, the significant part:

The spouse's income at the expiration of the initial period of benefits is to be compared to the entitlement the deceased spouse would have had had he or she been totally disabled (updated for

inflation). Continuing benefits are to be based on the difference between the spouse's income at that time and (in) the deceased spouse's entitlement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, that recommendation does really not imply the deeming will take place in determining widow's benefits. However, I do recommend . . . I do recognize that the final phrase before that, the committee made the reference to, a more equitable system would see the spouse treated in the same way as an injured worker after the expiration of the initial period of entitlement, which does imply the use of deeming to some regard.

However, when I read section 15 of the Bill, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to impose deeming then on the benefits that a widow receives, but in a way that is different from deeming as it's applied to an injured worker. An injured worker who is deemed does have the opportunity to have rehabilitation or training for occupation that the worker is capable of doing with the limitations of the injury.

And what it seems to me is that section 15 proposes that deeming will be applied to — in most cases we're talking widows — would be applied to widows without there being any opportunity for that widow to have some occupational training to enter the work-force. So the first part of the amendment is an attempt to address that, to provide the assurance for the widow that when deeming is being done, that she will have opportunity for occupational training.

The second part of the proposed section 15 of the Bill, Mr. Minister, seems to me, when I read it, to say that annuities will only apply to benefits that a widow receives after the five-year or 18-year statutory period. And again the recommendation is to be consistent . . . I'm sorry, the amendment that I put forth is to be consistent with recommendation number 5, which I will read verbatim:

When benefits have been paid to a surviving spouse for a period exceeding 24 consecutive months from the date of the fatality, an amount equal to 10 per cent of the payments that have been made and are being made should be set aside by the Board, to provide an annuity for the spouse at age 65.

So I'm simply wanting to ensure, with the second half of that amendment, that that annuity being set aside for the widowed spouse will apply to benefits from the very beginning of the claim for any spouse who's had a claim of more than 24 months, that they won't just start for benefits earned after the five-year or 18-year statutory period.

That's the rationale for the amendments, Mr. Minister, and I would appreciate your consideration of that amendment.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Okay, I will read to the hon. member as to what is provided now, with the rationale being that the widow would be . . . or the survivor would be treated the same as the injured worker and that they would receive the same type of treatment.

The spouse will receive full non-taxable benefits for a minimum of five years, and a maximum of 18 years with children; full vocational rehabilitation assistance; dependant children will continue to receive all costs of tuition, books, etc. while in post-secondary education; dependant children will also continue to receive \$200 per month between 18 and 21 while in school.

Following the five- to 18-year statutory periods, spouse will receive the same earning loss benefit as the injured worker. Following the five- to 18-year statutory period, the spouse will receive the same earnings loss benefits as injured workers. These earning loss benefits will be indexed annually and paid until age 65. The additional 10 per cent of the earning loss payment will be set aside and paid as an annuity at age 65.

(While referring to an incoming amendment 19) Spouses will also be able to retain the employee's benefit of Canada Pension survivor benefits. Spouses currently receiving undue hardship benefits can continue under the current program or elect for benefits under the new program. Current Act, spouses not receiving undue hardship benefits will also be eligible to apply for the new program.

So I'm advised that the reason why the amendment as you propose would be difficult, is it could find us in a position where the surviving spouse could end up receiving more than the injured worker would have received. And that was the recommendation of the committee, that they should become level and equal.

And so I would recommend against the amendment as proposed.

(1630)

Mr. Hagel: — Again, Mr. Minister, it's not clear to me how the amendment would put the surviving spouse, the widow, in a better position than the injured worker, should the injured worker still be alive. All I'm suggesting is that the surviving spouse be provided opportunity for training, and that the annuity being set aside applies for the whole period of the receipt of benefits, not just that period beginning after the five- or 18-year statutory period. That's not clear to me.

Or are you assuring me that the intent that I'm proposing in the amendment is currently being honoured and will be honoured with this legislation, by the board.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised that the situation could exist in the following way, that for the 18 years without reductions in the benefit that would go to that surviving spouse, a new job could be obtained at a higher salary, or you could continue working at your existing job at the same salary. You could remarry and that could put you in a different position as well. So those three, one of those three could in some way contribute to a higher amount.

Mr. Hagel: — Well, I hear your response and I assume

that that means that the amendment will not receive with approval. I would simply point out that the reason for the 18-year statutory period is to recognize that for that period, it only applies for a time in which the child is at home and going to school.

And respecting the intent of workers' compensation, Mr. Minister, I don't think there's anything about my amendment that contradicts the ability of the widow to still raise the family and then after the family has reached the 18-year age to then get out and look for work in the market-place.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm further advised that the amendment as proposed . . . or the amendment as contained in the Act will put Saskatchewan in a position where the surviving spouse will receive higher benefits in Saskatchewan than any other place in the world under this. So from that point of view, I think that is commendable. I would suggest . . . number one.

And number two, you asked, to perhaps add to that a little bit more, I simply say that I think if we're the highest in the world, perhaps, that's pretty good.

Amendment negated on division.

Clause 15 agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 19

Mr. Chairman: — House amendment to Clause 19. Moved by the member from Moose Jaw North.

Amend Section 19 of the printed Bill by striking out all of the words after "is amended by" and substituting the following:

striking out all the words after "the injury", and substituting the following:

one-half of any disability benefits relative to the injury that a worker is receiving under the Canada Pension Plan or the Quebec Pension Plan, as amended from time to time, shall be considered as wages that the worker is capable of earning in calculating the compensation to be paid by the board for loss of earning capacity.

Mr. Hagel: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I bring forth this amendment in recognition of the relationship between the recommendation of the committee and the proposal in the Bill. The committee recommended that widows should be entitled to retain all, 100 per cent of Canada Pension Plan benefits. The committee also recommended that injured workers should be given the option of taking those benefits or not, but if they did take them that they would lose an equivalent amount from their workers' compensation payments.

However, what comes forth in the Bill is a bit of a variation from that. In order to provide an incentive to injured workers, section 19 of the Bill allows workers to retain half of the Canada Pension Plan benefits. However,

it also only allows widows to retain half of Canada Pension Plan benefits, and that clearly was in direct contradiction to the recommendation of the committee, which recommended that widows should be allowed to maintain all of the benefits.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, would mean that it would honour the spirit of both the Bill and the committee, the Bill allowing workers to retain half of Canada Pension Plan benefits, but with this amendment, for the widow of a worker to maintain all of the Canada Pension Plan benefits.

I simply would like to read into the record very briefly and quickly, Mr. Chairman, some indications of support for this initiative. A letter delivered to the Minister of Labour on June 22, signed by Dave Kjersem, president of the Saskatchewan Strip Miners Union, and he says in part:

I have been instructed by our membership to urge that you change the Worker's Compensation Board Law so that the widows of workers who have died on the job get to keep their full Canada Pension Plan without any deductions from the Workers Compensation Payments.

We are told that you have a bill in the House, but on this point it is only going halfway.

We respectfully urge that you go all the way on this amendment. There is no one that would begrudge seeing our widows getting their full entitlement to both plans.

We have lost two Brothers at our mine. We do not want their widows to be two-bitted in this area. We are coal miners and are constantly aware that any of us could be next.

Please change the bill to make it full for our surviving spouses.

Another letter delivered the same day to the Minister of Labour signed by Randy Marchard, president of the Roche Percee Coal Miners Union, and again I'll read in part:

I am instructed by the June membership meeting of the union to write to you and urge, yet again, that your government enact legislation that permits the surviving spouse to keep benefits received from Canada Pension Plan without suffering any financial cutbacks from the Workers' Compensation Board entitlements.

We are advised that you have proposed an amendment which begins to recognize this principle, but that you have only gone halfway. No one would object to surviving spouses receiving the benefit of this payment in full.

You will be aware that the review committee was unanimous in their recommendation and the employer with whom we negotiate has no objections.

I also read into the record a letter from that employer, Mr. Minister, a letter dated May 5 and directed to the Workers' Compensation Board regarding the appeal by a Mona Ganje, and it reads in part:

As employer of the late Lester Ganje, we wish to indicate our support for the unreduced continuation of Mrs. Mona Ganjes' survivors benefits provided her under the Workers Compensation Act of Saskatchewan.

In view of the unanimous recommendation of the Workers Compensation Act Review Committee which reads as follows:

And I'll just quote one sentence that's related:

The committee disagrees with the practice of deducting fatality benefits awarded to a surviving spouse under the Canada Pension Plan because it believes that benefits received by surviving spouses should not be subject to deduction . . .

We respectfully request that until such time as the Minister has dealt with this recommendation, a moratorium be placed on such reduction.

And it's signed by K.D. Mahoney, manager of human resources for Prairie Coal Ltd.

And finally I'd like to read into the record in support of this amendment as well, Mr. Minister, a letter from Mona Ganje dated January 22 of this year to the Premier. And in part she says:

The purpose of my meeting with you is to yet again request that your government bring in amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act to amend (the) legislation so that the widow's benefits I currently receive from the Workers' Compensation Board are not reduced because of the \$284.46 I receive as a widow's benefit from (the) Canada Pension Plan.

She goes on to say:

In September of 1986, the Workers' Compensation Board, Committee of Review filed a report with the Minister of Labour which made a number of recommendations. One of the recommendations was that a surviving spouse in my circumstance should not lose widow's benefits from Workers' Compensation Board simply because I am also receiving surviving spouses' benefits from the Canada Pension Plan.

My information is that to carry out this recommendation requires legislative changes and, while your government has had the report from some 16 months now and while there have been no amendments to improve my lot or the lot of other surviving spouses, I'm increasingly encountering financial hardship and really need this money. You may not appreciate this but when you are widowed and have three children, there are increased costs for me in raising my family that

one would not encounter if our family were still full.

She later concludes by saying:

In the year that my husband died, so did 28 others; most of them were likely men leaving widows such as myself. Under the circumstances, we think we have a right to expect that your government would implement changes that have been recommended by a Committee established under your government.

Mr. Minister, these people explain the rationale for the amendment more effectively than I could.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I make a couple of observations. Number one, I think the hon. member would have to admit that Saskatchewan benefits under these amendments will be the highest there are in the world.

With this committee recommendation, what the board wishes to do is to maintain, as I indicated before, at equal level, the benefits of the surviving spouse with what the worker would receive. And that's exactly what this would do. It recommends that the injured worker would get his contributions to Canada pension and the spouse would get exactly the same amount. And that's why we put it that way — keep them equal. And I would suggest that it is appropriate to keep them equal, and the benefits are in fact the richest in the world.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 19 agreed to.

Clause 20

Mr. Hagel: — I just wanted to ask a question, Mr. Chairman. I'm saddened by the two amendments to see the members of government voting against widows, in effect. That's the effect of that vote. And I'm surprised that with the Premier sitting in the House as well, that it didn't give . . . wasn't given . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The member is not to make reference to absence or presence of members in the legislature.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Chairman, section 20 is an amendment to section 104 of the Act, and it seems to . . . it is explained as providing the discretion for the board to withhold payment of benefits to workers in certain cases. Now it's interesting that in the amendment that's in the Bill, it says:

The board may suspend payment to a worker or a dependent spouse of a worker . . .

And I underline that — or a dependent spouse of a worker. And then it goes on to say, for a cause unrelated . . . if the worker "is unavailable for employment for a cause unrelated to the injury."

Mr. Minister, in the interests of time, can I just give you two or three questions at the same time and ask you to respond to them all. Why was it seen appropriate to

include the phrase "or a dependent spouse" in this amendment? That's a significant change from the previous legislation, and you're not impacting only on workers, but their dependent spouses as well.

And can you also answer, Mr. Minister . . . do you want these together? Would you prefer them together? Okay. What cases . . . the example that's used in the explanatory notes, it refers to incarceration, etc. My question is: what's etc.? What's the rest of the list? Because this is obviously giving discretionary powers to the board to withhold payment. So what other cases besides incarceration?

And I ask, would you please define for me those other cases and why it's felt that the board needs to have this prerogative.

Would you also just answer a very basic question for me. Does this mean that a worker with a broken leg, for example, has to sit by the phone waiting for a job offer for an employer who's looking for a guy with a broken leg to come and do a job for him? That may sound facetious or ridiculous, but when I look at the wording of the clause here before us, it does seem to leave itself open to that potential interpretation.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — This is, I'm advised, would be used in rare situations, as the explanatory notes talk about incarceration. Or let's take a case of somebody that was deported, or something like that — that type of situation. Very rare case, but it's a . . . would be broad enough to cover that.

Mr. Hagel: — Can you think of anything else then, besides incarceration or deportation? This is a question that is of concern to some people because it gives discretionary powers to the board and doesn't define what causes unrelated to the injury are. You said incarceration, you've said deportation. Can you think of any other possible reasons that the injured worker and the dependent spouse — and would you please explain that too, Mr. Minister — why they could be deprived of benefits?

Mr. Chairman: — Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, for the approval to introduce a guest.

Leave granted.

(1645)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce a special guest in the House today, Miss Noreen Coghlan from Ireland, who teaches at the Montessori school here in Regina. She's been teaching here for the past year and Noreen will be leaving to go back to Ireland at the end of the term. So I just want all members to join with me in welcoming her here today and wishing her a safe return to Ireland.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979**Clause 20 (continued)**

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the main focus of this, as I indicated to the hon. member was the incarceration type situation, deportation was another one. Nothing else is really available to me at this point in time. I would . . . Perhaps the best I could do is when the Minister of Labour returns. I could have him undertake to perhaps answer that question to you in writing.

An Hon. Member: — And the reason for dependent spouse?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The reason for dependent spouse is the same type of situation. Dependent spouse falls into that same category herself or the individual falls into the same category, not the injured worker. The spouse then has to be the one that would, let's say, was incarcerated, for example, and that would be treated exactly the same . . . only after the 18-year period, not during that 18-year period.

Mr. Hagel: — . . . (inaudible) . . . If an injured worker is receiving benefits, is incarcerated during that period of time, but it's within that 18-year period, that will not deny the spouse of receiving those benefits that are being, in effect, paid to the family. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The only thing is, the spouse to get the benefit, the injured worker would have to be deceased.

An Hon. Member: — The injured worker is alive but in jail . . . (inaudible) . . .

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — In that case the benefit goes to whoever is getting the benefit, not to the spouse. The spouse only comes into it when they become a survivor.

Clause 20 agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

Bill No. 84 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of Certain Acts and the Passing of Certain Orders and Regulations pursuant to The Government Organization Act

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, my official is Ron Hewitt from Executive Council.

Clause 1

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to hold this Bill up for any great length of time, but I do have

some questions that I will ask of the minister, and I'm sure that the answers will not be difficult or take any long time to answer.

The point that I make, again, is that the damage has already been done, and when a bill is referred to as consequential amendments to another Bill more commonly known as Bill 5, I think it's pretty clear to all members of this House that these are amendments which are apropos to a Bill which was passed here in 1986, I think in the fall session of 1986 or '87, which gave powers to the government which no government ought to have, totally contradictory to the principles of parliamentary democracy.

And the period of time leading up to the budget of 1987, in which time the government devastated programs in Saskatchewan, devastated programs like the school-based children's dental plan; destroyed whole departments like the department of co-operation and co-operative development because of the authority it gave onto itself without ever coming to this legislation — I think all of those examples speak for themselves.

They were debated at great length when the Bill 5 was in this legislature, you will remember, and the member from Meadow Lake obviously remembers. That Bill took a long time to pass through this Assembly, and I think the damage of it all has been very clear.

I want to just ask the minister on different clauses, as we proceed through this Bill, some specific questions rather than doing a lot of debating on section or clause 1. But one general question I have is an example of what one might call sloppy draftsmanship, or sloppiness in putting together this legislation, in that in sections 57 and 60 there is some reference to amendments to four different liquor laws.

Now as far as I can recall, when the new liquor control legislation was introduced in the House and passed, some of those laws were eliminated. Therefore, Mr. Minister, do you have . . . will you have before this House, amendments to repair some of those sections because, as far as I am able to determine, they're not going to be relevant any more?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — What the member says is right except that the draftsman has to draft to take into account the existing situation. We didn't know that you were going to support The Liquor Act for instance; we thought you might beat us on that one, in which case, had he drafted in anticipation of The Liquor Act going through, he would have been, you know, drafting inappropriate legislation as you're accusing him of doing now.

An Hon. Member: — No, I'm accusing you. He's a nice guy; he's a nice guy.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Oh, you're accusing me. I'm sorry. Okay, and I'll talk to him about that. And so, while it's still appropriate because that legislation you're talking about hasn't been proclaimed. But the minute that it is proclaimed, yes, more amendments will have to come back, as I understand it, to deal with the consequential to government reorganization.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I think that answers my question, Mr. Chairman. It's obviously a make-work project for the government so that the minister can bring back another piece of legislation in next session to correct this one. But with that assurance, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to let us move through clause by clause.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I wonder, in the circumstances, unless the member has some specific questions as we go through, can we go page by page?

An Hon. Member: — That's quite all right with me.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Thank you.

Pages 1 and 2 agreed to.

Page 3

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, here's the first example of what's happening under the administration of this government. There was a time when the statute law could be referred to by lawyers, and by the public when they were wondering, or needed to know, what the status was with regard to powers of government in certain departments, or what legislation provided ministers certain powers to do certain things; in fact, legislation which required ministers to do certain things.

Here we have an example of how that is being totally destroyed and unknown powers given to ministers and Executive Council, because in section 19 here, clause 19: "The Department of Advanced Education and manpower Act is being repealed." I have here in my hand the Act respecting the department of advanced education and manpower which has a number of important provisions which put constraints on the minister, which give direction to the minister of manpower and Education. That is all gone.

Now, Mr. Minister, can you tell me, with the repeal of this Act, where the provisions that we find in this Act will now be found, if it's found later in this Bill, which I think is very possible. Are all of them there, or just certain portions of them?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — They're all there. It's section 19, and we're dealing with The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower Act is repealed. One point, section 17, is dealt with in the government re-organization Act that we dealt with last session. Section 8 is in The Education Act as section 8(1). Sections 9 and 10 are in The University of Regina Act, and so on. And I can take you through the whole list if you like. And if you go over to section 83 on page 16 in this Bill, you'll see that: "The Education Act is amended in a manner set forth in this section." And it sets that out there.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at section 9 of the department of advanced education and manpower legislation, which you may or may not have with you, but I think I heard you say that this will be provided somewhere else, and I would like you to make a specific reference to this because this is very important.

In this Act, which you're repealing, there is a provision titled: academic freedom, section 9 or clause 9:

The universities shall exclusively exercise the powers conferred on them in relation to:

the formulation and adoption of their academic policies and standards;

the establishment of their standards for admission and graduation; and

the selection, appointment, suspension and removal of their staff.

Now, needless to say, universities that do not have this kind of academic freedom, but may be subject to governmental or other outside interference, I think no longer can be classified as universities in the truest sense of the word, as they must be.

Now can you tell me specifically where I can find that exact provision so that I don't have to leave this Assembly in the greatest of fear that you or one of your colleagues will interfere with the academic freedom of our universities?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — There is nothing would cause me more discomfort than to cause my honourable colleague . . . cause him discomfort. So I invite you to go to page 42 and 43 of this Bill and look at section 106, The University of Regina Act, and section 107, The University of Saskatchewan Act, where those very provisions were taken out, directly out of the previous Acts, continuing education, or whatever it was, Education Act, and now put into The University of Regina Act and The University of Saskatchewan Act.

Page 3 agreed to.

Page 4 agreed to.

Page 5

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, there is another issue there that I think fits into the overall debate of . . . over your plunge into privatization at the expense of everything else that's important in Saskatchewan. This is the repealing of The Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development Act, which is a department in Saskatchewan that has been very significant and an important department. This now no longer exists. I think that clearly indicates the priorities, or the lack of priorities, that your government puts into the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan.

That's regrettable because the reason, as my leader has often said so eloquently, why Saskatchewan is the way it is because we've used every single economic lever available to us to build this province to something special. We've used the private sector and we've used the public sector and, importantly, we've used the co-operative sector. Now here you are, doing away with Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development Act.

Now you may say that it's found somewhere else, and if you do, I'd like to know where it is. But the point that I'm making is this: that even just having the separate piece of legislation is significant in itself because it truly shows the priority that any government would give to the co-operative system in Saskatchewan.

The fact that you feel compelled to do away with this legislation that establishes a department, even though you bury some sections of it in some other bigger piece of legislation, I think clearly say that the priorities that your government has given to the co-op movement are very low, if they exist at all. And I think that's very regrettable because that's a very important economic level that we have always had in Saskatchewan, and I hope we'll have for a long time to come.

So can you tell me where this may be covered, and whether all of it, as it is here in my hand, is covered in some other section of this Bill or some other Bill?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — In the old Act, department of co-operation and co-operative development is repealed; while in that Act, section 5(a) of the old Act is found in the Act, Economic Development and Tourism, 9(1). Or maybe it's (i) — I think it's got a dot over it.

Old 5(b) is now found in 5(f) of The Consumer and corporate (Commercial) Affairs Act; old 5(c) is now 5(e) in The Consumer and corporate (Commercial) Affairs Act. And so on. I can go through the whole list if you like.

The responsibility of the old Act was essentially split, and those areas dealing with regulation relative to business registration and so on are in consumer and Commercial Affairs, as is the case with other businesses, and those businesses relative to co-operative development are in Economic Development and business and trade, whatever we call that new department. And I guess, suffice to say that actions always speak far louder than words, and our record in co-operative development, I think, deserves some comparison.

(1700)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — One item, and I will ask it on this bill . . . I could do it on The Department of Culture and Recreation Act, a department which . . . Act which you are doing away with; I could ask it on The Department of Education Act, an Act which you are doing away with; an Act to continue Department of the Environment, an Act which you're doing away with in your wrecking-ball approach to government.

In all of those there is a provision, as I see, in clause 7 of this Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development Act, which limits the amount of grant of money that the minister can make to a certain amount. In this case the minister can make grants up to \$5,000 subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Now, Mr. Minister, can you tell me where that restriction is provided now that this legislation is going to be gone?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Okay. In the old scheme of things, in almost every department that limit was \$10,000; some departments were 5. In the new scheme of things, it's been standardized across the board at 10, and it's found in the government reorganization Act, Bill 5 of the previous session. And I don't remember the section, but I think 16 or 17. Thank you.

Page 5 agreed to.

Pages 6 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Page 12

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, no doubt there is a quick answer to this one. It is indicating here in subsection 12, section 43 of, I believe, The Education Act, is repealed. Section 43 of The Revenue and Financial Services Act is repealed.

Section 43 is that provision which required the tabling of an annual report for the department of revenues and financial services. Can you tell me where this requirement will now be legally found in order that the Minister of Finance cannot hide his annual report in the same way that he has tended to hide his Public Accounts?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Okay, in all cases this is covered by Bill 5, The Government Organization Act. Okay. Except in the old scheme of things, Finance, Executive Council, and Provincial Secretary were not required to table an annual report. Since revenue was rolled into Finance, we took the view that it was part of Finance and therefore does not have to table an annual report.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm looking at your Act, which was An Act respecting the Organization of the Executive Government of Saskatchewan, Bill 5, and it is indeed found in clause 21, requiring the tabling of annual reports.

Let me just get this clear though. Are you saying that there will no longer have to be a report tabled for the department of revenue and financial services, or that portion of a new department which involves the revenue and financial services function?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I'm told that it's been covered off in regulation, that those three departments, Finance, Executive Council, and Provincial Secretary . . . I'm told have never filed annual reports, ever. And so . . . but it's covered in regulation, not in legislation. Legislation, I think, tells you that we file annual reports, except we're exempted.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — But the department of revenue and financial services has always has had a report tabled. It has been a requirement that it table a report. It was in the legislation. That part of the Act is being repealed, Mr. Minister. Why? Why is it you would no longer want to be required to table an annual report for the department of revenue and financial services?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — The position taken by Finance, and of course it follows that we do, or we wouldn't have done it this way, is that Finance, Executive Council and

Provincial Secretary have never filed annual reports. Finance's annual report, in effect, is the economic statement done by the Department of Finance, the Public Accounts documents, and the budget and Estimates done here in the House.

And so it was determined for those reasons, that since revenue is now part of Finance, that they would not file an annual report and are therefore excepted. Finance, Provincial Secretary and Executive Council, I'm sorry.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well I understand why Provincial Secretary no longer files a report. There is nothing in it but your political operation. For that, I'm sure, I would not want to file an annual report either.

But I want to express my concern about taking a department, which was in this case the department of Revenue and financial services, putting into another department which was part of reorganization — and I accept that — but automatically at that point then saying it will no longer have to table an annual report. Because that's just another piece of information on government expenditures and government collecting of taxes which will no longer be available to the public in the form that it was — easily accessible and easily understood.

Now your Minister of Finance is going to take that information, bury it in his budget somewhere, probably not include most of it there, keeping information from the public which the public ought to have the right to know. Now that's no way for a responsible government to function. That may be the way your government functions, Mr. Minister. I can certainly assure the viewers and for the *Hansard* record for those who may check it some day, that that would not be the position of our government when we are sitting on the other side of this Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, there are some things that make us different, there's no doubt about that. Let me say that the questions that you raise show up in detail in *Public Accounts*, and you have the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . never wanted it. I'm not chairman.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — You have, your side. And so I think we're on one of those courses where we're just going to slip past one another in the night without really coming to agreement on this issue.

Page 12 agreed to.

Pages 13 to 45 inclusive agreed to.

Clauses 115 and 116 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.