

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In our eagerness to present these, my colleague got up at the same time. I have some petitions to table for the Legislative Assembly's consideration this afternoon, Mr. Speaker:

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

that back pain and other highly prevalent neuro-musculo-skeletal disorders are extremely costly to the Canadian economy;

that scientific evidence clearly illustrates that chiropractic treatment is the most cost effective and efficient therapy for such disorders;

that in the face of an ever increasing pressure to adopt expensive new forms of high technology treatment, chiropractic care has proven to be a low technology, low cost, conservative, and safe form of treatment, consistent with the true wellness model of health care;

that the government publicly asserts it remains committed to the basic principles of medicare, namely universality, comprehensiveness, accessibility, portability, and public administration;

that the government is acting to destroy these principles as they apply to chiropractic patients;

and that the government's proposed restrictions on this therapy will clearly cost more both in dollars and in patient disability.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have about a half a dozen sheets here. We got about 1,580-some petitions in yesterday. And as they continue to come in, I find that they are from Prince Albert, Spruce Home, Birch Hills, Spiritwood, another one from Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker. Saskatoon, entire sheet basically from Saskatoon here; Prince Albert, St. Brieux. Most of them are from Prince Albert on this particular sheet. Birch Hills, however, has a couple of extras on there as well.

This sheet is mostly Prince Albert. Melfort, there is one from Melfort, Mr. Speaker. And then we go to the southern part of the province: Assiniboia, Caronport, Moose Jaw. And I find here, Mr. Speaker, that most of them are from Moose Jaw and then back up north to Prince Albert. This sheet is almost entirely from Prince Albert, Spiritwood.

And so it goes, Mr. Speaker, and it gives me pleasure to table these petitions for the House's perusal. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have more petitions to table today concerning chiropractor treatment in the province of Saskatchewan. As my colleague the member from Rosthern read the whole thing, I'll just read this one last paragraph, Mr. Speaker, where I think is one of the most important parts of it:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I'll just go through some of these here. This one here, the first ones are from Wilkie, Cut Knife, Rockhaven, North Battleford, Landis, Major, Unity, Kerrobert, Unity — quite a few from Unity.

The next one, Mr. Speaker, it looks like it's entirely Saskatoon. They didn't put Saskatoon on all of them, but it looks like Saskatoon addresses, but they haven't got Saskatoon beside them. So that's entirely Saskatoon. And the next one, Mr. Speaker, also is all Saskatoon. One from Martensville and the rest are Saskatoon.

And the last one, Mr. Speaker, is Moose Jaw, Caronport, Elbow, Moose Jaw. Yes, that pretty well covers them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now table these.

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to read part of the prayer that was presented that's on this petition. And I read:

that the government publicly asserts it remains committed to the basic principles of medicare, namely universality, comprehensiveness, accessibility, portability, and public administration;

that the government is acting to destroy these principles as they apply to chiropractic patients;

and that the government's proposed restrictions on this therapy will clearly cost more in both dollars and in patient disability.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

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

I have a number of pages of petitions here, Mr. Speaker, to present to the Assembly. Petitions that have been signed by people from Star City; Humboldt; Naicam; Melfort; Saskatoon; Lake Lenore; Rose Valley; Carmel; Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, a number from the Moose Jaw area; Clavet; again Melfort; Hudson Bay; Wadena; Bjorkdale; Lake Lenore; Pleasantdale; Tisdale; Bruno; St. Benedict; Brooksby; Porcupine Plain; Saint Front; Quill Lake. Again, Mr. Speaker, most of the petitions have been signed by people in that north-east part of the province, including people from Pilger, and Prince Albert, and Hague, Mayview. And again a number from the Saskatoon area.

I so present them to the Assembly.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a number of pages of petitions. I think they number about 11 or 12. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read what I think is a couple of very important paragraphs in the prayer, rather than the whole prayer. And it says here:

that scientific evidence clearly illustrates that chiropractic treatment is the most cost effective and efficient therapy for such disorders (talking about backs and stuff);

And it says also:

that in the face of an ever increasing pressure to adopt expensive new forms of high technology treatment, chiropractic care has proven to be a low technology, low cost, conservative, and safe form of treatment, consistent with the true wellness model of health care;

Mr. Speaker, I think those two paragraphs are very significant when we're talking about health care.

**The Speaker:** — Order. I have allowed the members to do some reading. First of all, I want to indicate that if one member reads the preamble to it . . . I've been very generous in allowing other members to selectively pick out of those, but when they start commenting on them then the member is really out of order. And I think he knows that. So I want the member to proceed.

Order. I don't need any comments from the members on this side. I'll make the ruling and let the members decide.

**An Hon. Member:** — Let the record show that was the government side.

**The Speaker:** — Order. That was the government over there, but this one happened to be in opposition.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly respect your ruling.

I too, Mr. Speaker, would like to draw to the attention of the Assembly of the wide-ranging areas from which these petitions come: Saskatoon, Regina, quite prevalent. Also I noticed, Mr. Speaker, Yorkton and Unity for instance. Macklin, Provost, Major — and those are in my own territory, Mr. Speaker, and I recognize a lot of the names. And I can assure you, sir, that this crosses all political lines.

Torquay is another. Estevan, Bienfait, Estevan, I go on, Mr. Speaker, to Estevan, Gainsborough, Carievale, Oxbow, Carnduff, quite a few from Carnduff. Mr. Speaker, as I said, several pages from my own area and I recognize a lot of the names: Little Pine, and it goes up onto the reservation, Scott, Unity, Hoosier, Winguard.

And I would like to just stand now, Mr. Speaker, to table these several pages of petitions.

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a list of names of people who have signed, dealing with chiropractic care. They are from Saltcoats, Yorkton, Calder, Melville, Willowbrook, Hazel Dell, Esterhazy, Canora, Springside, Tisdale, Bjorkdale, Hudson Bay, Porcupine Plain, Nipawin, Carrot River, Aylsham, Naicam, Perdue, Star City, White Fox, Weekes, North Battleford, Unity, Denzil, Meota, Wilkie, Meadow Lake, Saskatoon, and many others. I'm going to present them.

I also have to present today another petition that deals with the livestock cash advance. And it says here this:

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in Legislature Assembled:

The Petition of the undersigned citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

That the provincial Livestock Cash Advance program was vital in putting the Saskatchewan Livestock industry on an equal footing with the national grains sector, enabling Saskatchewan grain to be efficiently used in local industry, thereby supporting the entire agricultural backbone of the province, and that the provincial NDP publicly acknowledged the need for cash advance programs when they demanded the federal government restore the grains based program, and that the provincial government is taking a variety of actions in addition to eliminating the Livestock Cash Advance such as imposing taxes on farm fuels, increasing utility rates and imposing other hardships such that the additional loss of the Livestock Cash Advance will destroy many family operations and further cripple the provincial economy;

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause

the Government to restore the Livestock Cash Advance program.

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

I have another one here, Mr. Speaker.

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I think I've made a ruling on that before that the members . . . I've been very generous in allowing you to present two. But each member . . . I think if the member has another one, he should reserve it for another day.

**An Hon. Member:** — It's a different one.

**The Speaker:** — I know it's a different one. But this is in keeping with the ruling that was made in the past. Order. The member will certainly have another opportunity on another day to present that.

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions with respect to chiropractic care in the province. These ones come from . . . the first number of them are primarily from Regina and surrounding area. And the last three are all from the area of Kamsack, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to present some petitions from the people of Saskatchewan. I will read out the one paragraph:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, come from North Battleford, Sonningdale, Delmas, Wood Mountain, Mayfair, Gallivan, Paynton, Cochin, Glenbrunch, Dodsland, Glaslyn, Richard, Swift Current, Hodgeville, Gravelbourg, Gull Lake, Sceptre, Webb. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I present these petitions.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I as well am presenting petitions on behalf of petitioners, with regard to the chiropractic problem that has been read earlier today. We have from several communities around the province concerned petitioners from Netherhill, Empress, Kerrobert, Plenty, Alsask, Marengo, Flaxcombe, Leader, Eaton, Eston, Kindersley, Biggar, Saskatoon, Neilburg, Prince Albert, Assiniboia, Mendham, and from Moose Jaw. He'll take interest that many people from Moose Jaw, the beautiful city of Moose Jaw are expressing their concern — over 1,000 names I believe today, Mr. Speaker. And I present these at this time.

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to present some petitions to the House with respect to

chiropractic care. Just the last sentence of the petition:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

And a large number of petitions, Mr. Speaker, from Swift Current and area, including Gull Lake, Webb, Cabri, Neville, Saskatchewan. More from Sceptre and Hodgeville, more from Swift Current, and two pages from Saskatoon and area. Mr. Speaker, I present these petitions.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a number of petitions today. They are two different ones. Because the one has not been presented before today, I will read it in its entirety:

To the Honourable Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan in Legislature Assembled:

The Petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly sheweth:

That the provincial Feedgap program has been an essential tool in the preservation of a competitive Livestock, Feeding, Slaughter and Packing industry in the province, and just as grain farmers need and deserve support to preserve their competitive position in the face of unfair subsidy practices of others, so too our highly competitive livestock industry must be protected against the unfair subsidy practices of others and further that the loss of FeedGap will result in thousands of jobs destroyed, homes lost and the crippling of an entire industry,

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the Government to restore the FeedGap program or to establish another, equally effective program as is its duty to the province.

And I have today, Mr. Speaker, people from Mortlach, Caron, Parkbeg, Moose Jaw, Outlook, a number from Moose Jaw, the entire Moose Jaw trading area.

And I also today, Mr. Speaker, have petitions concerning the chiropractors. I'll only read the last sentence on that one.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment and that your Honourable Assembly withhold consent from any government proposal to discriminate against chiropractic patients by charging them fees not assessed for any other medical treatment.

And I have a page here that has people from Riverhurst, Hodgeville, Moose Jaw mostly, Saskatoon, Saskatoon, Yellow Grass, Pangman, Osage, Weyburn, Radville, Gladmar, Cupar, Moose Jaw, Weyburn — mostly Weyburn. I so present.

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Deputy Clerk:** — According to order, the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 11(7) they are hereby read and received:

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to re-evaluate the elimination of the Saskatchewan Pension Plan.

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to de-insure optometric services.

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Honourable Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to reverse its decision to eliminate full coverage and universal access to chiropractic treatment.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Ms. MacKinnon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce some very special guests seated along the floor of the legislature. They're members of the Saskatchewan Abilities Council, and with them are two staff people, Jill Hunt and Kerri Buckberger. Welcome.

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

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too on behalf of the official opposition would like to welcome our guests on the floor of the legislature today. We hope you enjoy yourself here and I ask all members to again applaud these people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I have the pleasure of introducing to you and to members of the House two students who are sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. The students are Iryna Synychak and Lesia Luciuk who are visiting the legislature here today, along with Lesia's sister, Stefania, and Mr. and Mrs. Gerry Luciuk who are serving as chaperons.

Now Iryna has come to this Assembly after completing a session of summer school class taking the English language in the Mohyla Institute in Saskatoon, along with Lesia. She comes from Ukraine, from the city of Kolomaya which is about 200 kilometres west of Lvov and is looking forward to possibly taking classes in Edmonton this summer.

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

I ask all members to welcome them.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Changes to GRIP

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Attorney General refused to stand in the House and answer a reasonable question placed by the opposition leader regarding the retroactive GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) legislation. Mr. Speaker, today I have a simple question for the minister.

Mr. Minister, a preamble and a piece of the legislation is usually reserved for those that directly affect the constitutional rights of individuals. There is a lengthy preamble to the GRIP legislation, so one can only believe that your department has recognized the effect this kind of legislation has on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Mr. Minister, will you at least agree that the retroactive GRIP legislation does indeed affect an individual's rights? — in this case, Saskatchewan farm families who are taking your government to court. Would you agree to that simple assessment?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, last week, I believe, I reminded the members opposite that in their second term in office — not counting any of the travesties they committed in the first — they passed 70 pieces of retroactive legislation. The sense that they now try to give the public that . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. If question period is going to start like that, we're going to have a lot of trouble here. There was no interruption when the member asked his question; I don't want any interruption when the minister is answering.

**An Hon. Member:** — Well we're asking, they're not answering.

**The Speaker:** — Is the member from Arm River questioning my judgement in the Chair here? And I just want to warn him, I will not accept that kind of interruption.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, with that kind of record, I find it ludicrous that the members should even ask questions about retroactive legislation.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I'm surprised that again the Minister of Justice has passed the question to the Minister of Agriculture because the question I am asking is not talking about the harm your government's policies are having on the economy. I'm asking about individual rights as guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I believe the Minister of Justice is responsible and I hope that he will respond.

To the Minister of Justice. I believe there is no question

that this legislation has serious implications on our constitutional rights. We see the Premier in Ottawa pretending to fight for those rights while tearing them down in Saskatchewan.

A simple question: will you refer the retroactive GRIP legislation to the Court of Appeal under The Constitutional Questions Act for a ruling regarding its constitutionality?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the members are opposite . . . opposite are now aware . . . and they are also opposite . . . and obstinate.

The members opposite are aware that the legislation that was introduced last week after too many days of obstructionist tactics by the members opposite simply introduces the GRIP legislation which was recommended to us by a broad producer committee, and the legislation provides for its effective implementation.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Justice. The minister will remember that back in 1989 a heated debate took place regarding the electoral boundaries Act, and the former administration of the day referred The Representation Act to the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada to determine its constitutionality. The case was heard quickly and the matter resolved.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is the most honourable and impartial thing to do. The Bill could be passed in this Assembly with a provision for its enforcement once the Bill's constitutionality is confirmed.

Will the minister give . . . will you give this course of action the serious consideration it deserves.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, we would not be bringing this legislation forward if it was not legitimate and legal. It represents the implementation of a program which corrects many errors that were made in the hasty implementation of the program last year.

The feature the members opposite continue to rail about in a meaningless and obstructionist fashion is the provision relative to a deadline of March 15. We gave notice to farmers on March 13.

And what I find really amusing is that the members opposite ignored the March 15 deadline for crop insurance changes for years. Before last year and last year, they made changes, as I said earlier in the House, no. 94 and no. 95, in the meetings I went to after March 15. I do not understand the objection of the members opposite.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, we believe and

many people across this province believe that this Bill takes away the individual's right to have their day in court. Are you saying this is constitutional? Is this what the Minister of Justice is saying through the Minister of Agriculture to this Assembly, that if the government has done something illegal, it can fix it by simply passing legislation saying it isn't illegal?

Mr. Minister, if you're so right and if you have nothing to hide, then I believe you should have no hesitation whatsoever in referring this Bill to the courts as we have asked you to do for months. Will you make this commitment to the Legislative Assembly today?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are fully aware of the number of times that retroactive legislation has been used in the legislature by them and others. They are aware that apart from the 70 pieces of legislation I referred to, which I can provide for the members opposite in a list if their memories fail them, there were the very significant incidents of the land bank leases and the beef stabilization program which continue to plague farmers.

And I just simply don't understand why the members opposite are trying to make a big issue of a piece of retroactive legislation.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to try again to the Attorney General and ask him if he agrees with the Premier of Saskatchewan. The NDP (New Democratic Party) Premier of Saskatchewan said this about GRIP:

I worry about contracts and all of that. I mean, one has certain rights. That's where the merit of the PC walkout is.

Then he went on to say: the courts will have to decide that.

Now, Mr. Attorney General, couldn't you at least stand in this legislature and say that you agree or disagree with the NDP Premier about rights needing to be protected and this will have to be settled in the courts? Would you agree with the Premier or not?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite ought to be aware that the courts will continue to deal with these matters.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Certainly, Mr. Speaker . . . A question to the Attorney General. And certainly those in the legislature know that he's here and he's smiling at us. And he must have some sort of an answer. The media knows that he's here. I want the . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. If the Leader of the Opposition has a question, I wish he'd put the question.

The government will decide who will answer. The government will decide who will answer the questions in here. If the Leader of the Opposition has a question, I wish he'd put his question.

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a legal question to the Attorney General of Saskatchewan. Do you . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I've just asked the members in the opposition not to intervene and I ask the government members not to intervene when the member is asking his question.

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. The farmers have sued the government. The Premier of Saskatchewan, the NDP Premier, says this will be settled in the courts. You're the top legal legislative officer here in the Assembly. We're asking you a simple question. If you're in court and you're being sued and your Premier says this will be settled in the courts, won't you refer this to the Court of Appeal so we'll all know where we stand in the province of Saskatchewan with respect to this legislation? It's the decent thing to do. Won't you agree to do that today?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, as I have already once indicated to the member opposite, this matter will continue to be dealt with by the courts. But I find it very interesting that the member opposite should ask questions about legality when I consider the headline in yesterday's newspaper, "Many in Tory hierarchy corrupt to the rotten core." And then about the former premier:

Sadly, he was surrounded by some of the most dishonest men and women who ever wore a party button or unfurled a political banner.

Let's hope they will finally be brought to justice.

And what did the member opposite do about that in his time in office?

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I go back to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, your Minister of Agriculture just said — I want the members of the media to hear this, and the public — your Minister of Agriculture answered for you and he just said, this will be settled in the courts. That's what he said. It's in *Hansard*. It's on record.

Now if this Bill denies farmers access to the courts and the minister has just said, as did the Premier, that this should be settled in the courts, Mr. Attorney General, the only way it's going to have fair treatment before the courts is if you refer this to the Court of Appeal. Given the acknowledgement now by the Minister of Agriculture and the NDP Premier of Saskatchewan that this should be settled before the courts and you're denied . . . farmers are denied the right to go to court in this Bill — won't you now do the honourable and decent thing and refer this to the Court of Appeal in Saskatchewan?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the supposed respect the member opposite has for legality and justice and honesty is not at all reflected by someone who should have been his friend and someone who believes that he would not be . . . was not respected in the party hierarchy because of his values. If I may read from the author, Paul Jackson: I suspect that . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. I believe what the member's referring to has nothing to do with the question that's being asked.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. The minister has some responsibility to relate his answer to the question that is being asked. Order, order.

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

### Crop Insurance Yield Adjustment Deadline

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for Crop Insurance. Last January farmers were forced to measure their own bins and were told Crop Insurance would verify the yields once the crop year was over, using sales records. It has come to our attention that Crop Insurance put a secret deadline of July 31, '91 on farmers to adjust their estimated '91 yields to actual, based on their sales records.

Mr. Minister, farmers were never notified of this July 31 deadline. I know because I have received a number of calls on this issue. I want to know how you can justify forcing this deadline on farmers without any notification whatsoever.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, about the detail of the question the member opposite asks, I cannot answer but I will look into it and make sure I respond later.

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Minister, farmers were never notified of this deadline, and apparently you, sir, haven't been notified of the deadline either. This deadline date for adjusting their yields . . . and there is no such a deadline mentioned in the revenue insurance or crop insurance contract. The ramifications of this deadline are staggering, Mr. Minister, both for the farmer and for the provincial government. Customers that overestimate their yield will receive less money than they are entitled to through the program. And if customers overestimate, the government will pay more than is their requirement.

Mr. Minister, will you confirm today that this is the case, and this will be happening because you fired all of the adjusters who were measuring the farmers' bins back in November of last year because you thought they were all Tories?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, much to the member opposite's surprise, I believe there were changes in staffing in order to save money for the corporation, a notion the member opposite would know very little about.

With respect to the question of bin measurement, as I already said, on the detail of the question the member opposite asks, I do not know and we'll find out.

But I do want to comment on the accuracy of the system that was established by the members opposite, another one of the rather seriously flawed pieces of the previous legislation. The members of the GRIP committee, their third criticism of the program as it was, was the administrative cost which included the necessity of measuring bins when the inaccuracy of that process is well known. The prospective error for Saskatchewan's crop insurance program, with the error inherent there, would have been tens of millions of dollars, and that's simply an unacceptable error in a farm program.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, I'll just explain it this way. The adjuster came to my place and said 32 bushels to the acre. The Crop Insurance Corporation said no, it's 35. And in actual fact it was 29. And under the suggestion which we have received and the phone calls we have received, that six-bushel margin will be accredited, not to my account, but to your account.

And so we're asking you the simple question, Mr. Minister. Will you commit today to extend this deadline for adjusting '91 yields to give farmers a fair chance, and will you allow farmers to use their actual sales as a basis for a pay-out?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the members opposite were responsible for creating a rather inaccurate system before. I fully trust the minister in charge of the Crop Insurance Corporation to continue to make sound decisions with respect to the corporation as he has done till now, and I will not make those decisions for him. Whatever decisions he makes I'm sure will be the right ones in the end.

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

**Mr. Martens:** — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, I just want to point out, sir, that all of the decisions that I have talked about happened after the December 1 date-line. And so I want to inform you that this is just another example of how really far out of touch you really are.

Mr. Minister, why don't you just admit that it was a mistake secretly imposed on July 31 and that producers and the people in the province of Saskatchewan should ask you the question in your questionnaire relating to whether your services are worth a dollar or two.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite was I think associate minister of Agriculture, while the leader of the then government was minister of Agriculture as well, and they created a measurement system that had holes in it as big as a barn door. And the new minister in charge has cleaned up the accuracy of that system, and I'm sure the new minister in charge will make sure that there is some attention paid to the interests of both the farmers and the taxpayers.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture or to the Attorney General, which ever might be comfortable with this agriculture question, just a supplementary.

Are you saying, Mr. Minister, that you are unaware, as Minister of Agriculture, you're unaware of this artificial deadline that was put on people who had estimated their crop and then were told later, even if you actually sold X number of bushels and it was wrong, you have to live with your estimate. Are you unaware of that? You took notice earlier, and you're admitting, as the Minister of Agriculture, you're unaware of that decision.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I've got the connection, I think, that the Leader of the Opposition was asking a question on which the minister took notice. I need some clarification on that. If the Leader of the Opposition was asking a question on which he took notice, that's an unfair question and I can't allow the minister to answer.

**Mr. Devine:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think you've . . . it's a good ruling; you've helped me make my point. I will ask it a different way. Will the minister give us any additional information with respect to the secret deadline imposed on people who estimated their crop, then have hauled in the actual numbers, but if it's after July 31, they have to stay with their estimate whether it's right or wrong.

Could he give us any additional information about why you did that, when you made that decision, what it might cost the treasury, and what it's going to cost farmers?

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the substance of the member opposite's question has a lot more to do with his allegations about how government functions than it does to do about any reasonable piece of information.

Talking about secret deadlines and strange plots. That's a theme that could only arise from the mind of someone who was in charge of a government described as Paul Jackson described, that is associated with a hierarchy corrupt to the rotten core, that's associated with secret plots and decision makings that have nothing to do with the public interest.

If there's a real question about something we can answer,

I'll answer it. But those kind of inferences are silly at best.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, a question again to the Minister of Agriculture or the Attorney General. Mr. Minister, you are being sued because of your mistakes in crop insurance. And you have legal opinion in the paper that says your actions are unconstitutional, they violate the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Premier of the province says it'll have to be settled in court. So we brought up another mistake and you just guffawed and laughed and throw it away and say, oh, it has nothing to do with reality or government operation.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, in the light of all of the allegations and the court cases and the admission by the Premier and yourself that some of these things should be settled in court, do you have any more information on why you would have this arbitrary, secret deadline set for farmers, when they know it's against their principle. It hurts the province, and it hurts them.

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

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition continues to make points about the . . . try to make points about theoretical secrecy in government. I find the moral authority of the man opposite absolutely lacking when considering that here again the quote is:

"Ah, the scandals that come out of Grant Devine's erstwhile government!

Fellows who apparently ripped off the taxpayers with ease, gals who drew a paycheque but seemingly did no work whatsoever . . ."

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

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

### Completion of Alameda Dam

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have received a number of calls about the current status of . . . Mr. Speaker, I've received a number of calls about the Rafferty-Alameda project and particularly the Alameda dam. These calls range with concerns about the cost overruns, because the construction seems to be at a standstill, to safety concerns as to whether the dams will be completed by next spring.

My question is to the minister for Sask Water. Will you give us today a brief overview of what is happening at the Alameda dam, how close is the dam to completion, and whether work is currently under way or not?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, the member asks questions about the Rafferty-Alameda project, which would obviously include the Shand project and the power plant. The power plant is to be officially commissioned on August 29. The Rafferty dam is virtually complete except there's no water in it, and hasn't been for

years.

The Alameda dam is very near to completion. Although there are some technical problems with the project, there's nothing that is seen to be insurmountable.

So on the three main points — the power station will be commissioned on August 29; the Rafferty dam is virtually completed except there is no water; and the Alameda dam is virtually completed as well.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Minister, is work currently taking place at the Alameda dam site? And is the court case with the Tetzlaff brothers holding up construction of that dam?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, the member from Souris-Cannington may want to get a hold of the member from Estevan to talk about the project and the problems with it. And I'm sure that the headlines in the *Star-Phoenix* of yesterday, related at least in part to these kind of decision makings, where hundreds of million of dollars were spent on the Rafferty dam, squandered on a project that is unlikely to ever provide service and production to the people in the area for cooling the power plant, for recreation, or for irrigation, all of those things that the then premier promised would be part of this project.

I say to the member opposite from Souris-Cannington, many of these questions on technical side on this project would be much better put to the former premier because we have no idea why much of that project went ahead.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Minister, you're currently in charge of whether or not the project proceeds. You're in charge of whether construction is currently taking place. My question was: is construction taking place and is the court case with the Tetzlaff brothers holding up construction of that dam?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Obviously the issue of the Tetzlaffs and their court issue and the challenge has been going on for many, many months and the former premier would be well aware of why that was the case.

But as to the whole project, we're completing those parts of it that make sense. For example, we cancelled completing the 21-hole golf course — the only one in the province — that the former premier had planned, saving some millions of dollars, although we're negotiating with a local group down there to take over that part because it makes sense now that there's an infrastructure there to try to salvage what we can.

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

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### Bill No. 89 — An Act to amend The Occupational Health and Safety Act

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to



amend The Occupational Health and Safety Act be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to introduce some guests please.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Speaker, I would . . . to you and through you to the Assembly I would like to introduce some guests that are here from Calgary. These are former colleagues of mine from when I was teaching in Swift Current. Nick and Leone Strukoff are sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like you to welcome them.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave, the government would like to move to Bill 87, the GRIP Bill.

Leave not granted.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

#### Resolution No. 40 — Consultations on Labour Legislation

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to again get on my feet and finish a few of the remarks I was making about the labour Bill. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back and kind of get back into the mood we had before dinner.

Mr. Speaker, we had occasion for the members opposite to read from newspaper headlines. And I'd like to read a couple of headlines before I get started into my remarks. And one of them is "Business sector airs grievances with Romanow". And this is by a reporter by the name of Randy Burton of the *Star-Phoenix*. And what he says is:

Saskatchewan business is "overwhelmed and frustrated" by the government's legislative agenda and says there is no apparent plan for economic renewal.

He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

"The budget . . . was entitled deficit control and restoring confidence in the provincial economy and that doesn't sound like this agenda to me.

"Certainly a lot of this looks like a payback agenda" to labour with no . . . direction in mind.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's kind of what we have in mind here when we talk about this. We understand and we know that there is a certain amount of responsibility by

the NDP to pay back the unions for the support that they gave them. However what we're worried about and what the business community is worried about is the fairness of that pay-back.

The business community, Mr. Speaker, are very, very concerned about how far it may go in the pay-back. And while the members, I'm sure, of the unions would be satisfied with a reasonable and fair settlement, we're a little concerned, I think, with the power hunger that some of the union leaders have. And that is what's got the business people upset, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not sure if it was read into the record — the numbers of the organizations that supported the letter that was read in. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We won't go into that then, at this time. I would ask your indulgence to allow me to refer to the letter in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation changes, as I said, is of great concern to the majority of the people in Saskatchewan. And the concern, Mr. Speaker, mostly is concern for the lack of consultation on the issue. And I can assure you that we need only to look at the letter that was written to the Premier to understand what they are talking about, the letter which spurred — I believe is the term you might use — the Premier to have a meeting with the people concerned. And I guess, Mr. Speaker, if we were going to be fair, we have to say that the Premier did at least listen to their concerns in order to have a meeting.

But I would like to say, and I would like to impress on the people opposite, I urge you, I urge you not to just have the meeting and then forget about these people. These are responsible people, Mr. Speaker, and they will not forget. Whether it is so or whether it is not so, these people are concerned about this legislation. And I'm sure that, Mr. Speaker, they don't want this swept under the table just because they had a meeting.

I think what they do need and what they expect from the Premier is to either hold the Bills or pull them until proper consultation has happened, until the point where they can agree with some of the changes. And as I said, there are reasonable people among these people concerned. And they will, I'm sure, be able to reach a consensus.

Mr. Speaker, the letter clearly outlines the frustration that business people have with this government. They are frustrated, Mr. Speaker, because they don't feel they've had equal time. They expect, Mr. Speaker, to see an economic development plan for Saskatchewan, a plan which was sadly lacking during the last election. And that is of course another topic for conversation, and I'm not here to speak on that, but I believe it ties into the topic which we are speaking about today and that is the motion and the amendment.

And the amendment I think illustrates quite well the concern that these people have raised, and that is that the government recognizes the needs to engage in genuine public consultations. And I think if that was done, if people would get together with an open mind, you'd find that these things would fall in place.

Mr. Speaker, the Prairie Implement Manufacturers and

the association of hotels and several others were all involved. And this is not just one group trying to further their own interests. This has a serious impact on the whole economy of Saskatchewan.

We, as I've mentioned I think before, that we've lost 18,000 jobs now, and without some kind of confidence for the creators of wealth . . . and I again use the dirty word. According to the socialists, anyone that is looking to create wealth is looked at with a jaundiced eye by some of those people over there. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the fact of the matter.

Those people are the people that create jobs. Survey after survey has proven that particularly in the small contract business, and the small-business people create more jobs on a percentage basis than some of the larger projects. And that is why these people I think should be heard, and I think it would behave the government not to sweep this under the table.

They are reasonable people and they're here for the long haul. They're not here for just a little while. If their concerns are genuine, we may see then an advantage go to out-of-province contractors and wealth creators, which will lose jobs for our own people and in matter of fact have a money drain out of the province into other provinces. And those are all parts of the concerns that the people have had in the letter that was presented to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I think I told you that I had occasion to speak with a person who was on the Trade Union Review Committee. And some of the union proposals put in, Mr. Speaker, was shocking, to say the least.

And as I said again, I know the present government owes a debt of gratitude to the organized labour; it's a huge favour. But to impose its desires on other people just in order to pay off a debt of gratitude, Mr. Speaker, I don't think is proper, particularly when the consultation was not done. And I suggest it would be extremely destructive to this province's economy and the small-business sector.

And as I said before, in reviewing what I had said, we know that in the confrontation process that has taken place now, both parties put their best bargaining position forward. In respect of the union leaders, they put the highest expectations and the employers may put their lowest.

And as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest fights had to deal with the Act's name. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was no way they would allow the Act's name to be changed, which points out, I think, what I consider some very mundane and petty things to argue about when the economy of Saskatchewan is in such a shape.

(1500)

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the unions are concerned, it is their Act. And it will remain union legislation even though it affects employers as well as employees. Now the unions won't even allow that. Mr. Speaker, if that is the amount of co-operation we have to look forward to, it's a bit frightening. It's a bit frightening, Mr. Speaker.

And one of the problems people seem to have is the pendulum swings from one extreme to the other. And according to what I read in the letter and in the concerns that people are bringing to us, that is what the business sector fears here, is not that there's some changes could be done, not that there could be a degree of fairness missing, but how far do you go? How far do you let the pendulum swing the other way?

The other issues, Mr. Speaker, the unions seem to want the right to enter into an employer's property during a membership drive without interference. And if an employer interferes, they want automatic certification. Mr. Speaker, the implications there are a bit scary too.

The fundamental belief that most of us have is that our property is ours. Our home is our castle and that sort of thing. And if you allow people to walk into other people's property without any justification other than they want to certify the workers into a union . . . and if the employer interferes, they want automatic certification.

Now if you let your imagination go a little bit, let's do a little something here that probably won't happen. And that is where we got 10 workers and one of the workers wants to be unionized but the other nine don't. The employer resists the union people, organizers entering his property, and then the other nine members automatically then become certified.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's a little bit of a scary provision as well. It interferes I believe with what we consider our inherent rights to protect our property. Now they may want to make it easier to certify and more difficult to de-certify. As a matter of fact they actually, I believe, want to eliminate an employee's option to de-certify.

There again, Mr. Speaker, that should be talked about and I think those things should be clarified with the business people and as was mentioned before by the Minister of Justice where he said, some of the wording is being changed because, as he said . . . and I will find the quotation, Mr. Speaker, but I will paraphrase it. He said that, I have always believed that the labour Act should belong to labour. And he said also that some of the changes being made was to clarify interpretation.

I quote from the *Leader-Post*:

I've always thought the Department of Labour should be for labour, said Mitchell, a deputy minister of Labour in the 1970s. That is what we're trying to construct in Saskatchewan.

He also says that the reasons for some of the changes was to interpret what the legislation was supposed to be about so that people could understand. So here we go back to what I'm saying here, sir.

Before these things should be legislated, I think they should be talked about. There may not be any sinister motives in these sections, but certainly the business community believes there are. And again quoting headlines from newspapers, which the members opposite were doing, I want to quote just the headlines

because I don't want to take up too much of your time.

And I quote from a Mr. Bruce Johnstone, and he said: The Act will stand construction industry on its head. And that's the seriousness that they see in this. And I'll quote him, Mr. Speaker. He says: To hear Labour minister Bob Mitchell talk, the government's draft Bill is to resurrect the old Construction Industry Labour Relations Act is just a bit of tinkering to make our labour laws more democratic. That's what he's saying. That's what the Minister of Justice is saying, and I have no reason to try to contradict him. But, says the former labour lawyer, the Bill will simply bring Saskatchewan into line with other provinces.

Well, Mr. Speaker, other provinces are not demonstrating the anxiety . . . the construction people in other provinces are not demonstrating the anxiety that the construction people here in Saskatchewan are demonstrating.

Mr. Speaker, they also want the anti-scab legislation that one of my colleagues developed a little bit before the lunch break. They want to make it illegal to hire replacement workers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that again should be discussed a little bit and clarified. Because if you carry out what this may do, it means that the workers could shut down a business or an operation even if it was illegal to do so. If they were on an illegal strike which hadn't been determined by either the courts or by their own negotiations, then that company or that contractor or that business could not hire anyone to keep the business at least alive until the dispute was settled.

And there again I say to you and I say to those workers that it doesn't help a whole lot if you've got a high-paying job if the job isn't there. If the salary is high but you don't have a job, it doesn't help you a whole lot.

And that goes back to what I said before lunch, Mr. Speaker, when I happened to be sitting close by when an employer and one of his employees were discussing the new labour law, where the employee said, oh boy oh boy, you'll have to pay me \$8 an hour. And he said, no I won't. And the employee said, oh yes you will. And he said, no, because you won't have a job; I can't afford it. So what good is a \$8 minimum wage to somebody that hasn't got a job? It might just well be \$800 an hour.

Now the other thing they want to do, or one of the other things, they want the Labour Relations Board to impose an agreement if a contract dispute exists. Now I believe I had the Bill before lunch and we looked at the power of the board. And this takes . . . this goes into the power of the board.

They want the Labour Relations Board to have the power to interfere in collective-bargaining process. Mr. Speaker, how many times have we all heard the complaint of unions about other people interfering with the collective-bargaining system? So what I'm saying here is, fair is fair and it's got to be fair for both sides. And the business sector are suggesting that that could be a bit unfair.

And I read into the record the powers of the board under

the heading "board," which goes back to the section that I'm talking about here. They want the Labour Relations Board to impose an agreement if a contract dispute exists. And to tie that into the Bill, I want to show you . . . The board also wants to be able to determine whether an unfair labour practice has occurred.

You see what I'm saying, sir. They want the power to say there's been an infraction and over here they want to impose an agreement. First of all they say there is a dispute, by their own definition, then they turn around and say, we're the ones that's going to fix it. So it kind of makes you judge and jury.

So there's some nervousness there among the business sector. The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, Mr. Speaker, alone had 61 changes that they wanted to see in the legislation. Now just the number of changes . . . Without consultation. Now if it was one or two minor changes, you could argue that there wasn't a big enough change and it wasn't important enough to go into in-depth consultation. But when we're talking about 61 different and separate changes to any piece of legislation, it would seem to me, sir, that that alone would indicate a lot of negotiations would be necessary.

There was even a presentation by the Grain Services Union, Mr. Speaker, and they want to unionize all domestic and farm labour. They want sectorial bargaining. And, Mr. Speaker, this is an outrageous proposal. If you let your mind go and you use your imagination, you'll find out the implications of such a change in the labour laws.

We have, and you know, in the province of Saskatchewan we did have a law that said you couldn't hire a person for less than three hours. So now we say if you're a farmer and you want some help — seasonal, part-time, emergency help — that person has to be unionized.

Now for the sake of the debate, Mr. Speaker, let's suppose that out in my country, which is quite a ways maybe from a union hall, all of a sudden someone needs one or even two people for an emergency situation on the farm. And he has to get in to Saskatoon to the union hall to find out where there is someone, and they send someone. You understand that they have to be paid their travelling time. So let's suppose that the job out there only lasts half a day — maybe it's a clean-up situation that the farmer is involved with; maybe it's a spray operation that has to be done quickly. So here we have the farmer in the position that he can't call on local people if they're not unionized.

And I want you to let your mind wander a little bit on that and find out the cost that would be to that farmer. It's two hours drive from Saskatoon to where I live, Mr. Speaker. So it would, I think, follow that it's two hours back. Well there's four hours of driving time and that would have to be paid for on a per-mile basis.

So as I say, this is a bit of an outrageous proposal, and it's no wonder that the business community has some fears of this legislation. Now if their fears are unfounded, fine and dandy. Let's talk about it. Let us — as the Justice minister said — let us be sure the interpretation is understood by

all, how you interpret what is being written. He said that that is part of the problem. So I agree with that.

And I also say to you, sir, we had, as you heard, a couple of times some derision from the other side because we want to talk about this Bill or we didn't want to take the GRIP Bill. And I said then, we certainly are not abandoning the GRIP debate. But we are of the opinion that this debate is also of an urgent nature not only because of the implications that may be in there, not only because of the fears that the community have, the business community have, but because of the time. They have to know as quickly as possible where they stand with these things, so they can bid their contracts, they can get their people hired, and they know what the costs are going to be. They also have to know the interpretation, as the Justice minister said, of what is being written here. So this Bill is an important piece of legislation.

(1515)

Mr. Speaker, as I said once before — I think I did — that . . . and you can correct me if I'm out of order, Mr. Speaker, that I don't believe this is the time for the business community and the working community to get at loggerheads to any extent.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that right now while we're all trying to work our way out of a recession, we have to have the co-operation of both sides, which comes back to my remarks I made about these people in the business sector being reasonable people. And the element of fairness has to be there for both sides.

And I happen to be one of those people that believe that with the opportunity to sit down and visit with each other, there can be an element of fairness. Because even though labour leaders seem to believe . . . And I don't want to label the whole group in the unions as being anti-free-enterprisers. If you think about it in their own way, they are free-enterprisers. They look to the best position that they can find, with the best return that they can find, to better their own station in life. So that's basically what a free-enterpriser is.

Some people choose the security of a paid position, a salary. Some people take the risk of going off on their own, and hopefully by their own ingenuity and their willingness to put in the extra hour or two, end up at the other end of their life span in a little better financial position than they might have had they taken a secure, salaried position. And I don't say that in criticism in any way at all. That's a position and that is a freedom that we have here and that is something that should be protected at all costs — the right to choose.

But at the other side of the picture, Mr. Speaker, it is the right of the free-enterpriser to choose to go and be his own employer, if you will. They have to have a level playing-field, and the fairness should be a goal for both sides. Because if the free-enterpriser, the employer, can make his business work, there should be and could be benefits for both sides.

And I believe that the union members can and should expect to be protected to a large degree by government to

take care of that . . . And I would say this, Mr. Speaker. I think that the majority of the employers are fair, but there could be the odd time when someone would try to take advantage of another person. And that's what I say, that the union members should expect a large degree of protection by government to take care of those circumstances when someone is not playing fair.

Mr. Speaker — and I know it sounds like I'm coming down a little hard on the leaders — but, Mr. Speaker, I believe the union leaders who lead their membership seem to want more power for themselves rather than looking for a degree of fairness for both sides.

And I can understand over the years that animosity has built up, which goes back to my comments about who lays the demands on the table. I happen to have a relative who works under a unionized shop, and some of the things he tells me is exactly what I'm saying here. He is frustrated because when the organizers for the unions come out and talk to them, they say to them, put it all on the table, put everything out there, whether you expect to get it or not, because you never know where the balance will be. And if you've got it on the table, if you get more than you really and truly expected, then fine.

Now I suppose that the employer approaches it in the same manner. Start as low as you can because you never know where they will balance off, and you may end up not paying quite as much as you thought you may have to. Which to me, Mr. Speaker, is not the way to go. I've never believed that, and I'm sure that the majority of the employers, particularly those employers who are the wealth creators . . . And the wealth creators in my mind, Mr. Speaker, are the small-business community. They have only a few number, a small number of workers, and it's a lot more personal basis. And so they know the problems that their workers have.

And that's something, Mr. Speaker, in my working life I never did have a hired man. What I had was someone who helped me. And I never referred to anyone who helped me as the hired help or a hired man. That person, Mr. Speaker, was someone who helped me. He was my helper, and I tried to pay him according to the help that I got from that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have one or two more comments I want to touch on. And if you'll indulge me, I got my papers mixed up a little. As I said before, we give full credit to the Premier for meeting with these people when he became aware of their anxiety. But I have to suggest to you, sir, and the members opposite, that the Premier should not have been surprised by the anxiety that was there.

Had the Premier and his people been consulting with the business groups before the draft Bill came down, then these things maybe could have been ironed out before the anxiety hit the level that it did where the business community got together and in fact almost, I would say, demanded that the Premier hear their concerns.

As I read off some of the headlines that I have here, Mr. Speaker, I want to read one more headline that I think indicates that there is concern out there by other than just

the business people. This is an article in *Leader-Post* and it was written by one Dale Eisler, who all of us are aware of. And the headline that he uses is: "Labour act excludes majority."

Mr. Speaker, there I think is a point that should be recognized because this Bill is directed at the minority:

According to the Labor Department, (Mr. Eisler says) in 1991 one-fifth of the total workforce, or (just a little over a hundred thousand) people, was unionized. Of that unionized total, less than 30,000 — or (as he puts it) 28 per cent of all union members . . .

So what we have here is a Bill that impacts dramatically on many other people who are not particularly interested in becoming unionized. And if this Bill, the way we read it and the way the business community interprets what they're reading, forces everyone then to become unionized, I read from this, Mr. Speaker, that it is the majority who is being hurt here.

Now generally in a democratic society, we look at the majority with some bells and whistles and counterbalances for the minority. But in this Bill, it's the minority — the majority, excuse me — the majority are being excluded. And I think that, of course, is part of the concern of the business sector.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there are others that would like to speak to this Bill, and I believe I have pointed out to you and to others that my concern about this Bill, I believe is much the same as the Minister of Justice when he says, we want to be sure in its paraphrasing that everyone understands and interprets this Bill the same way. Because, as he said, the way you interpret the writing of the Bill sometimes causes some anxiety.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your time.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have here before us today a motion moved by my colleague, the member from Maple Creek, and an amendment by the member from Moose Jaw Palliser. And some of the wording that the member from Moose Jaw Palliser used in his amendment is quite interesting. He used some of the words that we had already included in the motion, and included a few more of his own.

Part of his motion included our words, genuine public consultation. Mr. Speaker, we believe that there is a need for genuine public consultation in the labour relations process, in labour legislation process.

Then the member from Moose Jaw Palliser went on to talk about building bridges between rural and urban, between farmers and labour. And again, I agree with the member — that is very important.

But when you look at what this government is doing, it's sometimes difficult to see where those bridges are being built, particularly when farmers, Mr. Speaker, are being cut off at the knees, as with the GRIP legislation, and

union members are being given a monopoly situation to supply all the labour in Saskatchewan. It's difficult to see how that builds bridges between farmers and labour.

Mr. Speaker, farmers have many times been hurt by labour actions as they take place throughout the farm work place, as they take place throughout the farmers marketing system as they move their grain from the field to sales.

The farmers actions, Mr. Speaker, do not cause harm to labour unionists. They do not cause harm to the labour movement. But the reverse can and is sometimes true. We see labour action taking place as rail strikes, long-shoremen strikes, grain handler strikes.

(1530)

But as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the action of farmers does not harm the labour unionists. And fact is, the farmers are probably that portion of society which is most co-operative in aiding the entire society, because farmers, Mr. Speaker, are those that feed everyone.

When we look at building bridges between farmers and labour, I think back to what happened about 1988-89 at Thunder Bay. We were in a position where we had a large grain crop to move. We were getting towards the end of the crop year. Sales were tight. There was a large shipment was needed. And yet what happened at Thunder Bay? The grain handlers, Mr. Speaker, went on strike.

I believe that strike lasted from 21 to 25 days, held up the movement of grain from the prairies, and caused us as farmers to lose some sales. That type of action, Mr. Speaker, does not build bridges between farmers and labour; it does not build bridges between rural and urban.

The next year the same people that had been on strike and stopped the grain movement were asking farmers now to ship their grain, Mr. Speaker, through the port of Thunder Bay. The grain shipments were slow. Work was scarce. But the farmers, because they had a limited crop, because their sales were mainly in the west coast, going through the west coast ports, were going to the Pacific Rim — farmers were shipping through Prince Rupert and through Vancouver.

The unions at Thunder Bay asked the farmers, begged the farmers to ship their grain east even though, Mr. Speaker, that meant that it was going to cost more money to the farmers. Because it was a lot further around, shipping costs were much higher to go through Thunder Bay than it was for the same product to go through Prince Rupert or through Vancouver. But at the same time, when the trade unions in Thunder Bay were asking that that grain be shipped east, meant that they were denying their own union members at the west coast those jobs.

So it seems when you look at it, Mr. Speaker, that the bridges that need to be built need to be built starting perhaps indeed with labour, that their interest is very self-centred, very much directed at themselves, at their own benefit rather than at the benefit of society as a whole. That's where we need to start building bridges,

Mr. Speaker, is to look beyond our own self-interest.

The member from Moose Jaw Palliser talks of driving wedges between rural and urban. But the example I just used, Mr. Speaker, is one of those examples that does indeed drive wedges between us. The member from Moose Jaw Palliser talks of the wedges, but it's his government, Mr. Speaker, and his partners in the unions that are driving that wedge between labour and farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat on the other side of the table. I sat in wage negotiations, in benefit negotiations, with my employer on behalf of my fellow employees. And it was a very worthwhile experience and very much of a learning experience. There are times when you will not agree, when you will never agree; but there are also times when agreements are possible. And I found and my colleagues found that it was much easier to get an agreement through co-operation and through discussion, through negotiation, than it was through confrontation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not belong to a union, but I did belong to an employees' association where we had some similar powers, some similar responsibilities and duties that a union would have. And it did work well for us. It perhaps even worked better than some of the union organization which took place within the same industry.

I worked in the oil patch, Mr. Speaker, and I looked at how bridges were built within that industry between employees and managers. Everybody worked together. They were proud of the companies they worked for. They worked to improve that company to make it better, not just for management, not just for the shareholders but also for the employees.

And many times, Mr. Speaker, we see what's happening in the labour force, particularly so in large areas where you have a large number of employees in a plant. It seems to be more of a confrontational style than a co-operative style.

And we see it in this House. We see much more confrontation than we do co-operation. And it perhaps just builds over time, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but it is in many times not conducive to the well-being of this Assembly or to the well-being of the province.

The member opposite has talked of our reaction to the defeat of October 21. Well there was some bitterness and there was some disappointment, Mr. Speaker, but I also see a similar reaction coming from the other side of the House, and perhaps that's why this confrontation takes place. It happened in 1982 and it happened again in 1991 where the winning side, the government side of House, said, now it's our turn and we are going to get our way.

And, Mr. Speaker, that does not build bridges; that does not build co-operation. And that is what we need in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when we're looking at labour legislation, one of the items that we perhaps should be looking at is creating an atmosphere in which jobs can be built, in which we can increase the number of employment opportunities that we have within our province. We have

lost somewhere between 14 to 18,000 jobs since last fall in this province.

Mr. Speaker, that hurts not only union members, it hurts not only employers, it hurts everyone within this province. And part of the aim of labour legislation should be aimed at creating an atmosphere in which jobs can flourish, not an atmosphere in which jobs are removed from our society.

More and more people are leaving this province, Mr. Speaker, because those jobs are not available; because we don't seem to be in an atmosphere where employers will come in, where entrepreneurs will come in and build a facility to hire anyone, whether they be employees . . . unionized or non-unionized employees, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues came into this Assembly prepared to work together. And I found an attitude, Mr. Speaker, here of acrimony and of arrogance, of self-righteousness on both sides of the House — on the government side, because they won, and on the opposition side. Mr. Speaker, we need to take a co-operative effort in this House and build out from here into society as a whole.

We look at the idea of this amendment that deals with genuine public consultations. We see legislation before this House, Mr. Speaker, that has very little genuine public consultation.

We look at the GRIP legislation, Mr. Speaker. There was a small committee set up to review the GRIP legislation. There were a few additional members put onto it that had not been from organizations that were there before. This committee comes back, reports to the minister, and it's all over and done with. Where were the public consultations, Mr. Speaker?

The previous government had drawn up the legislation, introduced it to the House, and then went out into the general public and held numerous meetings across this province where they heard the concerns of the farmers. They heard their ideas and they then incorporated that into the legislation, into the actual operations, the regulations of the Bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, that has not happened here.

We look at other legislation. The Minister for the Environment brought in a Bill dealing with pop cans and other recycleable drink containers and non-recycleable drink containers. And yet it wasn't until after the beverage industry held a demonstration on the lawn of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, that there was consultation with that industry.

That is not genuine public consultation. That's telling people what we're going to do and if you don't like it, that's too bad. And then after the fact when they complain about it, then maybe you'll go and talk to them. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not public consultation.

We've seen the same thing in a number of other Bills. Bill 3 — there has been no public consultation. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a need for that. There is a number of items in that Bill in which many people are

interested in where it affects the lives of many people, and yet there has been no public consultation. The same as there's been very little public consultation on this labour legislation.

It's easy to get 100 per cent agreement when you go out and talk to the few people that 100 per cent support you. Then you can come back and report to the House, well we talked with the unions and they liked this legislation. But there needs to be a balance, Mr. Speaker. It's not just labour legislation. It's not just dealing with employees. It's dealing with employees and employers. There's two sides to this coin.

And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be labour legislation, and this labour legislation — if I can find my quote from the Minister of Labour: I've always thought the Department of Labour should be for labour, said the Minister for Labour, a deputy minister of Labour during the 1970s. This is what we're trying to construct in Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this labour legislation is just for labour, perhaps we also need some legislation in this Assembly in the province of Saskatchewan for employers — an employer's bill of rights as opposed to a labour union bill of rights. Because there's two sides to this coin, Mr. Speaker. Without the employers providing the opportunity for employment, there would be no employees to unionize. So we need to have a balance struck in this legislation. And a monopoly situation, Mr. Speaker, does not mean balance.

There is some things within this labour legislation, Mr. Speaker, that have some potential. The one issue that I'm hoping is in this Bill, and I haven't reviewed it all yet, but I believe there needs to be an opportunity for part-time employees to have access to some of the benefits that a regular employee within that company, within that corporation, would have.

If a part-time employee were to work for, say 20 hours a week as compared to a 40-hour-a-week regular employee, then I think it should be that that employee, that part-time employee should have available half of the benefit package that a regular employee would have. Those employees are dedicated to that company, they provide good service, and they should be compensated for the work that they provide. And part of the compensation is not just an hourly wage, but also part of the benefit package that those regular employees would receive.

And I would hope that the Minister of Justice — Minister of Labour, excuse me — that the member from Moose Jaw Palliser or the member from Prince Albert would seriously take a look at that and give it some consideration. Because I do believe that there is some opportunities there for some advancement within the labour field.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about genuine public consultation, when we talk about public consultation, not only the GRIP program did the government fail to consult with, but also FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program), fuel taxes, livestock, the livestock cash

advance program. There was no consultation there, Mr. Speaker.

I seem to have woke up the member from Moose Jaw Palliser with some of my comments, and I am hoping that he will indeed take a look at the idea of some benefits for those employees which are part time, for I believe that is an important aspect of an employee's life. There are many employees in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, who do not wish to work full time but should still have access to the benefit packages that a regular employee would have.

The only time it seems that some of the government cabinet ministers are prepared to go out and discuss with the general public some of the issues of the day, to consult with them, is whenever there is a large meeting in opposition to what they are doing. The minister for Crop Insurance went down to Shaunavon because there was a large meeting in one of the government back-bencher's constituencies. But yet when SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) held regional meetings across this province, no one showed up to consult with them. And the SARM represents a broad cross-section of people across rural Saskatchewan. They represent their constituents very well, and they should have been consulted with in dealing with many of the rural issues which have since come up.

But the government style is to consult with their friends, but not to consult with anybody who is opposed to whatever they may be doing. They seem to be more confrontational with those groups than they are co-operative.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, another one of the items in which the government did not seem to have any consultation with the public, the same as they are not consulting with the employers dealing with this labour relations . . . They have consulted with one group of employers. They have consulted with the group of employers in the construction industry that is unionized. Well it's very nice to consult with that group because they do represent a portion of the construction industry, but they should also have consulted with the vast majority of those members within the construction industry that are not unionized.

Those unionized employers would like to see all of the government contracts go to unionized companies because that's the group they represent. Why would they want to make it available — those government contracts — available to other non-unionized contractors? But it's incumbent on the government, Mr. Speaker, to consult with all of the members of the construction industry, not just those that are unionized.

The government did not consult, Mr. Speaker, when it cut out the natural gas distribution program. That, Mr. Speaker, does not build bridges between rural and urban people. Urban people have access, have had access to natural gas for a long time. And yet it was only under the previous administration that people in rural Saskatchewan were actually given access to this very cheap source of fuel, a source of fuel generated in Saskatchewan that benefits Saskatchewan people,

benefits Saskatchewan producers and the distribution system. But there is a number of people across the province of Saskatchewan that are being denied that access. Ten per cent of the program was left to be finished. That 10 per cent, Mr. Speaker, would have created employment across this province this summer, this winter, and next summer likely.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member from Moose Jaw Palliser that we need to build bridges between workers and farmers, between management and labour, between rural and urban people in this province. But to do so, you have to talk with both sides. You have to talk with workers and with farmers, not just with workers. You have to talk with both labour and management, not just labour. And you have to talk to rural and urban people, not just urban people.

Now the previous administration could be criticized for talking . . . for looking after rural people. And the previous administration did try to look after rural Saskatchewan, because in rural Saskatchewan is where the economic generators of this province reside. Agriculture is the number one industry in this province, and without agriculture we are in the state we are today. Because agriculture has taken the brunt of the recession, the brunt of the economic hard times in this province, the rest of this province is in rough economic shape.

But if you simply look at urban, as this government is seen to do, then you're forgetting where the main generators of economic wealth are in this province. Farmers have to get back on their feet, Mr. Speaker, before the entire economy can turn around.

But we have not only the farmers in rural Saskatchewan. We also have oil production, the coal production, potash. All of these industries must be returned to viability to build up the entire province of Saskatchewan. We can build a service industry in Regina; we can build a service industry in Saskatoon; but if there is no one that needs that service, we still have no industry.

We don't build bridges, Mr. Speaker, between rural and urban Saskatchewan by closing rural schools. We don't build bridges by closing small rural schools to move students into larger urban centres. We don't build bridges between rural and urban by taking classes out of small rural schools and moving them to larger centres.

We build bridges, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by working together, by talking to the people in those communities, asking them: what do you want to see happen? What are you willing to pay for? And by working together, then we can build those bridges, but not by tearing things down and pulling them apart.

And the same goes, Mr. Speaker, for rural hospitals. While some of the government side, the Minister of Health, may feel that there are too many hospitals in Saskatchewan, that there is no need to have a hospital in Dodsland or in Oxbow or in Eatonias, Mr. Speaker, those people in those communities believe that there is a need for a hospital there. And they believe that there is a need for a hospital in the other 60 to 66 hospitals that could potentially be closed.

Mr. Speaker, even the people in Eastend, they held a large meeting here not more than two weeks ago to say that they wanted to keep their hospital open. Now it's very easy to say, well you know it's just a small hospital out in Eastend. It only has perhaps 10 beds. What's the point of it? Why do you need it? They can all come into Regina or they can all go to Saskatoon when they get sick.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if you live in Regina you only live 10 or 15 minutes from the hospital. But if you live out around the Eastend area and you don't have your hospital there, you could well be an hour away from the nearest hospital. I suppose if the government wanted to put helicopters around all the province and fly everybody into a major centre, they have some possibilities. But hospitals, Mr. Speaker, are not cheap either . . . excuse me, helicopters are not cheap either.

And it is strange, Mr. Speaker, that when the member from Moose Jaw Palliser talks of building bridges between rural and urban Saskatchewan, there are also . . . The Minister of Health is talking of closing down new hospitals — hospitals that have just opened their door. Hospitals that are under construction are some of those hospitals which could potentially be closed. And that seems to be a shame, Mr. Speaker, a real shame.

When we look at this labour legislation, Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to look at a balance. We need to balance the rights of the employee against the rights of the employer. They both contribute to the wealth of this province. They both contribute to the building up of that company and to building our economy. One without the other will not work.

And one having all the power, Mr. Speaker, will not work either. There needs to be a balance. The employer needs to have the right to have labour perform the necessary tasks, and employees need to have the right to be in a position to perform those tasks without undue hazard to themselves and in a manner in which they can perform those tasks.

I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, that I represented employees in the company that I worked for. And we had problems at times, Mr. Speaker, with management, when management felt that there was a need to perform a task in a certain manner, and we in turn did not feel that that manner was necessarily the safest way to do so.

There needs to be some mechanism in place to iron that out. What we found, Mr. Speaker, was by consultation and co-operation we could achieve that end. Confrontation would have only led to a worsening of the situation.

So perhaps in dealing with this labour legislation we need to look at some sort of mechanism that diffuses some of that confrontation rather than enhancing it. And to give one side of the equation all of the power will not aid in the balance.

Some of the problems, Mr. Speaker, that arise when one side or the other has too much power we can see in some of the union hiring practices. If you have a project — and



I'll use the Nipawin project, the power plant project as an example — when that project was under construction, the union halls needed a certain number of people to come in to work. Did they go and hire local people? No, Mr. Speaker, because that is not how the union halls operate.

They went to Regina, they went to Saskatoon to look for employees. And if there were not enough employees available that were qualified through that particular union hall, then they went out of the province to find those employees.

Well those union members need jobs, true. But also the local people needed some employment. And the end result at that particular location was that it became an open site, I believe, and some people of the local people did get hired on.

If I look at what happened here at Shand in the last year or two there were some union problems down there. And that was an open site, Mr. Speaker. But the problem was not between union and non-union employees. In that particular site, the trouble was between two different unions: in this case, the boilermakers and the steelworkers.

One of the groups received an contract to build the steel towers at the Shand plant and the other ones thought they should have it. And there was an ongoing feud at that site. It caused a number of problems. There were labour disruptions because of it. But it wasn't a fight, Mr. Speaker, between management and labour. It was a fight between the two unions.

So when you come to building bridges, Mr. Speaker, at times we need to build bridges between the two different groups, between two different unions, and sometimes between management and other management associations.

Last fall, the Minister of Labour in some discussions stated that union sites are more efficient than non-union sites. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps on some occasions that's the case. But, Mr. Speaker, on many other occasions, that is indeed not the case.

Again comparing the Shand construction site, there were some lost days of work because of union activity. But as I mentioned previously, that was between two different unions and not between management and union.

You compare that to the Coronach site, construction of a power plant at Coronach. There was a significant amount of management-labour conflict and there were many lost days of employment there. And that was a closed union site, not an open site, not a totally non-union site. It was in fact totally unionized. So we see, Mr. Speaker, from those examples that those sites, union activity, 100 per cent monopoly, was not conducive to an efficient operation of that site.

We also find, Mr. Speaker, when you look at some of the union activities that it's very strange. Reading through some of these papers, you find that on a unionized site, you have one apprentice for each unionized member,

each journeyman of his craft. And yet on non-unionized sites, you can have as many as three or four apprentices for each journeyman.

Well that's a significant saving for that company when they bid a tender to build that site. And yet I find it hard to believe that journeyman, that apprentice would be following that journeyman all day long. Surely there must be work available for that apprentice to perform given to him by the journeyman, and then the journeyman would go off and do something else.

Well if he had three or four apprentices working with him, he could assign them each a job and supervise all of them besides performing his own tasks. And it would seem a much more efficient way, Mr. Speaker, to utilize your journeyman and your apprentices.

Mr. Speaker, according to Mr. Bruce Johnstone, that construction costs have come down in the last decade not because the skilled trades were getting less money, but because non-unionized contractors can use more unskilled labour to perform the necessary tasks around the site. I find it strange that if I'm walking through a plant site some place that if there's a light bulb burnt out in a location that does not require a particular safety standard, that I could not change that light bulb if I was not an electrician. I should be able to perform that task. But on a unionized site, you can't do that. Changing light bulbs, Mr. Speaker, belongs to the electricians, and the carpenters can't do that.

So that just doesn't improve the efficiency of the system, and in fact it increases the costs. Now if this happens to be a public building that you're dealing with, then that added cost is dealt with by the public purse.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, genuine public consultations indeed must take place in this labour legislation. We need to be able to discuss this, and I would encourage the government to indeed go out and consult with the construction industry and all those others who would be particularly interested in this Bill. Go out and talk with them; go out and talk with the union people. But talk to the other employees across this province also.

We cannot gain. We cannot build bridges by dealing simply with one side and not with the other. If you deal only with one side, you can indeed get a unanimous decision if you deal with those that support you. But it doesn't provide the balance, Mr. Speaker, that is needed. And it doesn't provide, as in the member's amendment to the motion, genuine public consultations. Mr. Speaker, it does not build bridges between the workers and the farmers, between management and labour, and between rural and urban people in this province.

So I would encourage the government, Mr. Speaker, to indeed go out and hold those genuine public consultations where notices are given of a set meeting date that the minister will be there to hear anybody's comments, not just the comments of those that support this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The division bells rang from 4:01 p.m. until 4:11 p.m.

Amendment agreed to on the following division.

**Yeas — 35**

Van Mulligen  
Wiens  
Simard  
Tchorzewski  
Teichrob  
Shillington  
Koskie  
Anguish  
Atkinson  
Kowalsky  
Penner  
Upshall  
Hagel  
Bradley  
Koenker  
Pringle  
Lautermilch  
Calvert

Murray  
Hamilton  
Serby  
Whitmore  
Sonntag  
Flavel  
Roy  
Scott  
McPherson  
Wormsbecker  
Kujawa  
Crofford  
Harper  
Keeping  
Carlson  
Langford  
Jess

**Nays — 9**

Devine  
Muirhead  
Neudorf  
Swenson  
Boyd

Martens  
Toth  
Goohsen  
D'Autremont

The division bells rang from 4:15 p.m. until 4:45 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 38**

Romanow  
Van Mulligen  
Wiens  
Simard  
Tchorzewski  
Teichrob  
Shillington  
Koskie  
Anguish  
Atkinson  
Kowalsky  
Mitchell  
MacKinnon  
Penner  
Hagel  
Bradley  
Pringle  
Lautermilch  
Calvert

Murray  
Hamilton  
Johnson  
Serby  
Whitmore  
Sonntag  
Flavel  
Roy  
Cline  
Scott  
McPherson  
Wormsbecker  
Kujawa  
Crofford  
Harper  
Keeping  
Carlson  
Langford  
Jess

**Nays — 8**

Muirhead  
Neudorf  
Boyd  
Martens

Britton  
Toth  
Goohsen  
D'Autremont

**The Speaker:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Premier that he was going to be asking for leave to make a ministerial statement, and the opposition agrees with that.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Progress of Constitutional Negotiations**

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd like to thank the opposition party and the opposition leader for accommodating. I have a very short statement to make here.

I thank all members of the House for giving us a chance to give a brief report on the status of constitutional talks.

As members are aware, the first ministers have met twice in the past two weeks to discuss the process for proceeding and developing a new constitutional accord for Canada. We have not of course reached a final agreement on such accord, but progress has been made. And it's been made because it looks as though, although no final decision has been decided in this context, that there will be a meeting with respect to Premier Bourassa and others very shortly.

Progress has been made in other fronts as well. As everybody knows, we have in front of us the draft statement of July 7, the so-called Pearson accord, as a working model around which we are seeking to devise a new plan. The Pearson accord, although far from perfect, represents a plan which nine provinces, the federal government, two territories, and four aboriginal groups have said that they can live with.

What remains to be seen is whether or not we can, within the framework of that Pearson accord, craft a final position which suits the needs of the province of Quebec while remaining true to the legitimate concerns expressed by other partners in the Confederation.

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that this round, after all, is the round which is described as the Canada Round of negotiations, where the hopes and aspirations of all Canadians must be taken into account. The task before us therefore is difficult but not insurmountable. We've got to find a way to welcome Quebec formally back into the Canadian family but, in doing so, not excluding anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's safe to say for all members of the House that our vision of Canada is one which has it as being inclusionary — open to the strengths and the diversity that we all bring to it. It's not exclusionary — limited in view by narrow horizons. That's why the Pearson accord, although an unfinished document, provides a valuable framework for further discussions in achieving this goal that I just described.

In the Pearson accord we see protection for regional needs, be they the needs of Saskatchewan, Quebec, or Newfoundland. In it we see the protection of the rights, privileges, and aspirations of all Canadian people. In it we

see steps taken specifically to provide economic strength, or better economic strength for such provinces such as Saskatchewan through the equalization provisions.

Now as members will know, the Prime Minister has indicated that he is meeting his federal cabinet tomorrow to determine if another meeting takes place early next week. We are all very hopeful that such will be the decision and such will be the case of the federal government. If so, Mr. Speaker, we will then enter into a period of intense negotiations and, I might add — departing from my script — hopefully the final period of intense negotiations over the form and substance of a new constitutional accord.

I hope to keep members of the Assembly as fully informed as I can and the people of Saskatchewan up to date on the progress of these discussions. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the House for giving me the opportunity of making this brief report to you today.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment to thank the Premier for informing the House of the process that has been taking place regarding the constitution, regarding the debate that is taking place in our nation today. And certainly members of this Assembly and people across Saskatchewan were quite well aware, in fact in some cases becoming somewhat bored and tired of the whole process.

We trust that as the ministers meet and as they continue to grapple with the provisions for a constitution for this nation, that they are able to, through serious negotiations and through consultation and through conciliation, able to come up with an agreeable constitutional package that is acceptable to all. Although we realize there is . . . I don't think there's any kind of an agreement that can be reached that most people will really be happy with, but certainly something that they can work with in light of the work that is being done by the Premier today and by the government.

We trust that even at the end of the day regarding the constitution, regarding the process of the constitution, that that same process would be able to work within the confines of our Legislative Building and session and in our province as well, and the fact of being able to work together to develop policies and even working together so that a government and opposition can come to agreements on many of the difficulties we also face, because the difficulties we face and challenges we run into are no different than many of the challenges that are facing first ministers today.

And so while we commend the Premier, we trust that that same process of working together to come to an agreement, when the Premier is able to really give his time to this effort, would be able to bring that into this Assembly as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

### Resolution No. 42 — Government Betrayal of Election Promises

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to again stand in this Assembly to speak to the Assembly. At the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will be bringing forward a motion that reads as such:

That this Assembly condemns the government for its massive betrayal of Saskatchewan voters by introducing a budget and legislation that contradicts promises made during the election campaign, including imposing no new taxes, supporting rural Saskatchewan, increasing support to health, education and agriculture, conducting an open and honest government, and listening to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, over the past number of days and weeks we have been debating a serious . . . very seriously a number of Bills and amendments and areas that the government has brought forward, the government's vision for the province.

One of the things that we have found over the past number of weeks, past number of months, and certainly since the election, is the fact that there are many people across this province who have become very disillusioned and very dissatisfied with the government and the actions that have been taken by the government.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly can reflect back to the election and prior to the election time on October 21, 1991 and the period of, say, the 1990 through the 1991 period when, at the time, Mr. Speaker, the former government was endeavouring to bring to the forefront and bring forward to the taxpayers of this province the fact that this government must and this province must begin to live within its means.

Mr. Speaker, we endeavoured on many occasions when the Finance minister of the day came forward with restrictive budgets, Mr. Speaker . . . that we're not talking of new tax increases or we're not talking of major increases to the funding because of the fact that the funding was not available.

And at the time, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions, we heard members — and many members who are presently on the government side of the House — for ever condemning the former government for its lack of commitment to Saskatchewan, lack of commitment in the area of health care, Mr. Speaker. They spoke about lack of commitment in the area of education. They spoke of lack of commitment to our rural . . . to our urban communities.

And, Mr. Speaker, I must indicate that I think the record will show that through the 1980s, Mr. Speaker, there was a significant contribution of the former government, by the former government, to the province of Saskatchewan. There was indeed a commitment to education. There was indeed a commitment to health care. And we just have to look around this province, Mr. Speaker, and we find a number of facilities that were constructed in rural

Saskatchewan, much-needed facilities.

Mr. Speaker, we look back prior to the 1982 election, there was a moratorium on any further construction to take place in health care. And because of that moratorium, there were many areas where facilities were desperately needed but were not made available — facilities such as care homes, Mr. Speaker, care homes that would give men and women the ability to continue to remain in the community that they had grown up in, the community that they had worked so hard to build, the community that they had been a part of, that had been a very part of their lives and their families' lives.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when we look through the 1980s we see that the former government — the government under the leadership of the member from Estevan — built, constructed some 2,400 new nursing home beds across this province. And, Mr. Speaker, the thing is the government made that commitment and committed facilities to rural Saskatchewan, not just urban Saskatchewan, which we had seen for far too long — the centralization of health care. We strengthened and endeavoured to strengthen health care in rural Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, yes, that did cost some money. It takes money to provide the services and we must . . . and most people across Saskatchewan will admit the fact that if you're going to demand something of government, if you're going to ask for more services, then you possibly better consider the fact that it's going to cost you a little bit and maybe reach into your pocket a little deeper or decide how much you want for services, what services you want to have covered by the government. And then the government could possibly then back up on its taxation and recover the costs either directly or indirectly for the services that are provided.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the debate that took place last fall regarding the harmonization of the provincial sales tax. And certainly the members opposite — and I see some members shaking their heads — did create a fair bit of debate. Some major debate took place on the floor of this Assembly regarding harmonization.

And, Mr. Speaker, what I find is as the government of the day . . . the then opposition members, certainly through misinformation and the comment that they would totally eliminate the provincial sales tax, the PST — had many people believing that harmonization was a bad thing. It was a detriment to the province of Saskatchewan.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the harmonization of the education and health tax with the goods and services tax, Mr. Speaker, would have given a break to small businesses right across this province — from Prince Albert right down through to Estevan. It would have given a break to the farm community across this province, Mr. Speaker. It would have given a break to low income families, Mr. Speaker.

But the opposition of the day spoke out against it and even campaigned against it, Mr. Speaker. They campaigned on the basis that they would eliminate the sales tax. They would do away with the PST.

And the interesting part, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions they would talk about eliminating the PST very loudly, very firmly. And then quietly, towards the end of a speech, they would talk . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. It now being 5 o'clock, this House stands recessed until 7 o'clock this evening.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.