

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today is a very special day for me because I have a great many of the members of my family here today. And I'd like to introduce them to you and through you to my colleagues in the legislature.

Sitting in your gallery is my very best friend and the best sister anyone could ever have, Ellie Stewart, and her husband Hugh who is very tolerant of us when we get together; and their two terrific children, Elsh and Ryan. Also sitting up there are my husband's two daughters, Penny Murray and her son Luke, and Gillian Murray. And my husband's also up there, but he asked me to ignore him, so reluctantly I'll do that.

I hope that they appreciate the fine Vancouver and Victoria weather we've provided for them today. And I would ask all of you to join me in welcoming them here to Regina. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce to you, and through you to other members of the Assembly, a group of 52 grade 7 students in the west gallery. On a regular basis, at least since I've been elected, we've had similar visits — I can't remember how many, but this group, Mr. Speaker, is from McKenzie Junior High School in Dauphin, Manitoba. Their teachers are Kathy Baxter and Kelly Kuzyk.

I want to just say one short word, Mr. Speaker. I was born and raised on the east side of the province and we used to . . . the one thing I remember about Dauphin was CKDM Radio, and at 7 o'clock every night we'd listen to the Cisco Kid . . .

An Hon. Member: — 7:30 on the dot.

Mr. Upshall: — 7:30. So it was a pleasure for me today to welcome the students and their teachers to the Assembly. I hope you enjoy your visit to Regina, I hope you enjoy your stay at the legislature here, and I wish you a very safe trip home. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Stanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud to introduce to you, and through you to the Legislative Assembly, a good friend of mine and my constituency assistant, Deb Firus, who is in Regina to clean up my office and a few other things. And I'm sure she's going to have a good day. She's really looking forward to question period.

And Deb does a lot of work for us, for the government and for me, and I'd like all of my colleagues to

welcome her here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to rise and welcome the Stewart and Murray families. My seat mate is very close to me. And I wanted to add one thing that she was reluctant to mention, but it's a very special occasion that we welcome them here. It's the wedding of their son Andrew and daughter-in-law-to-be Kirsten from the Edenwold area. So I wish them well in their future together as well.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Economic Summit

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question this morning is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, now that you have had 24 hours to reflect on the mess that your government has made of job creation in the province, I wonder if your 24-hour reflection has allowed you to take away some of those harsh words that you had for the business community in our province.

Now that you realize in these last 24 hours, Mr. Premier, that you're 16,000 jobs short of what your budget, your own budget, projects and the targets that you've set, will you now admit, sir, that you do need some help and that you're willing to agree to give Saskatchewan business people the opportunity to sit down with you and your government cabinet ministers and review your own plans to strengthen the province of Saskatchewan? Would you do that, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the acting opposition leader for the question. To answer the question specifically, we have always maintained a policy of consultation with not only the business community but the trade union movements, cooperatives. Anybody who wishes to talk to the government, we try to arrange an appropriate time to meet with them.

But I would also say to the Leader of the Opposition that today's Statistics Canada figures are encouraging. They indicate that the labour force is up this month — April that is to say, the month of April — by more than 4,000 new jobs compared to March of 1993 — 4,000.

And to compare that from year to year, April of '93 compared to April of '92, that's up by 2,000 jobs according to StatsCan. Agricultural employment is increased by 7,000 — by 7,000 — from the March '93 level to 82,000 persons. We still have the lowest unemployment rate in all of Canada to boot.

Now that's not to say that we're satisfied with that. We have to continue to working hard on this. I simply

point out that the figures are, as I've indicated earlier in question period, encouraging, that we have begun to turn the corner. We have turned the corner. We're beginning our climb back up out of the recession and out of the difficulties the former administration put us into.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, when I asked you yesterday to meet with the business community in this province to develop some new job creation strategies, to review your own document, you came back by chastising the business community and saying: don't worry folks, don't worry; everything's fine; be happy.

You passed out this progress report yesterday on your government's record to date. Well, Mr. Premier, I've read the report, and other than providing some work for one of your NDP (New Democratic Party) printing companies, there isn't a whole lot in here to give anyone some hope that there's a job around the corner.

Mr. Premier, you need some help. Your own document, the "Monthly Statistical Review", April '93, confirms what the business community are saying, is that you, sir, are a way off the mark — your very own document. Now you need some help, Mr. Premier. Instead of declaring war on a segment of this province that's going to pay the bills down the road, why don't you say to them, yes, I will meet with you; we will have a summit; we will do it while this legislature's in session and all Saskatchewan people will have the opportunity to review the results. Mr. Premier, give us that commitment today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member either refuses to accept or simply ignores the simple fact which I've articulated already in the first question, and that is that there is a 4,000 job labour force increase, according to StatsCanada. Not the provincial government but StatsCanada. And that's 2,000 more than last year.

Now I've said to the hon. member and I've said to the business community and the working community, that's not enough. We have a blueprint and we have a strategy. We have a Provincial Action Committee on the Economy made up of business leaders, trade union people, and others, who are assisting us in working our way out of the very difficult situation which he and his colleagues have placed the province. So we're looking for advice from anybody and everybody that we can get. We think we're on the right path.

And I really suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he would be, I think, better off joining us in the direction that we're headed rather than simply trying to politic everything all the time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, members of the official opposition would love to join you and the business leaders of this province in an economic summit and we could all sit down and review your document and look at how this thing could be built in the future.

Unfortunately, sir, you keep denying that you need help. When the facts are in, Mr. Premier, in 1991 in October — on the day of the election, the day you became Premier — there were 447,000 people working in this province and 31,000 unemployed. Today, Mr. Premier, there are 426,000 jobs and 45,000 unemployed. Mr. Premier, my numbers show that there's 2,000 more unemployed than there were a year ago.

Now, Mr. Premier, that's 21,000 less jobs and 14,000 more people looking for work. That's your record, your legacy, Mr. Premier. There are people out there willing to help you turn those numbers around. You can't blame it on someone else all the time, Mr. Premier.

Now the biggest group of people in this province that are going to help you pay the taxes are saying that they'd like to sit down with you and redress these numbers. Mr. Premier, why don't you accept that offer of help? Why will you not sit down with the business community in this province and try and update that document so that it's meaningful, instead of just more fluff that your government puts out? Why don't you do that, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member again refuses to listen to the answer. Please, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, listen to the answer.

We do want to listen to the business community, we do listen to the business community, like we listen to the working community and to the farm community. That's why we have the Provincial Action Committee on the Economy, sir. It's made up of leading business people and leading trade union people. They are advising us on the implementation of the blueprint.

And I repeat again: 4,000 more people added to the labour force — 4,000 in April of '93 compared to March of '93. In one month's comparison — 4,000. I think that's a pretty good indicator that we are beginning to make some progress. Those numbers will go up and they'll go down. We'll have some set-backs.

But generally I say to the member opposite that we are working with the business community. We're working with them and the trade union movement. We're asking everybody to cooperate, and I think that most people in the province of Saskatchewan are definitely interested and helping us in turning the situation around.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is the one that has the hearing problem.

Mr. Premier, in one of your many versions of the speech delivered in New York, and we're not sure which one, but on one of the many versions of your speech in New York you said to the bankers that we have offset these increases to some degree with a number of tax incentives that are targeted to encourage expansion in the small-business sector and create jobs.

Mr. Premier, what the business community are saying to you, sir, is that this simply isn't true. That what you're telling the bankers in New York about what you're doing with the business community in this province simply isn't true. The numbers prove it, Mr. Premier — 21,000 less jobs in this province since the day you took office as Premier, 21,000 less. Unemployment far higher than it was before.

You tell the New York bankers one thing; the business community says, Mr. Premier, this isn't the facts we need to sit down and review your *Partnership IN PROGRESS** document. We need to re-evaluate it because you're not meeting the mark.

Now, Mr. Premier, you're not in New York. You need to come out and be straight with Saskatchewan people. Commit to the summit, Mr. Premier. That's all they're asking for is just commit to a sit-down with them to review the progress report. Would you do that, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the earnestness with which the Leader of the Opposition tries to portray the question unfortunately does not mask the total failure to understand the facts. The facts of the situation are that in the last budget about \$31 million in tax concessions and incentives have been directed to the small-business community.

Now if the Leader of the Opposition is saying that at the time that things are tough going for the people in Saskatchewan in some sectors, in some areas, as we readjust and try and work our way out of this economic hole that we . . . that he put us into, that we should be pumping more money to a particular sector like big business, like they did from 1982 to 1991, I tell the Leader of the Opposition those days are gone. We don't have megabucks for megaprojects. We don't have the projects for Cargill and Saferco now. We don't . . .

The hon. member, the former premier, says how do I like it. I'd like to know how he likes it. He likes it so much that he's joined a competitive board of directors and he says that that's in the interest of the province of Saskatchewan. That to me is very, very puzzling.

So I think, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, what you should do is get your economic policy in order, perhaps maybe reining in the former premier to be on side with you would be a good idea. And from that point of view we might be able to work to develop Saskatchewan even stronger than I think it's going to be in the years ahead.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's the politics that the Premier indulges in that is the problem here. I mean he goes to New York, and I quote from the same document, Mr. Speaker:

And many other national and international companies, Cargill, Hitachi, IBM, Northern Telecom, and Weyerhaeuser, to name a few, all have substantial projects in our province and are the reason that we're going to do so well.

I mean, he indulges in his political flippancy in this legislature day by day. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, the facts are 16,000 jobs in one year off the mark. Those are the facts. And yes, those big companies are here employing people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Premier, stop the politics. The business community are saying to you, we will help you redesign the assistance perhaps. We will help you do things better. Sit down with us and be open and accountable. Mr. Premier, give that commitment to them today. Would you do that, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, again the Leader of the Opposition simply refuses to accept the facts. I repeat to him again that there is an organization called the Provincial Action Committee on the Economy. The Provincial Action Committee on the Economy is comprised of business leaders. It's comprised of business leaders from the resource sector, the manufacturing section, straight across the piece. They meet regularly. They advise the government. They monitor our economic plan. They indicate whether or not we're heading in the right direction.

The fact is that we have 4,000 more jobs added to the labour force in April of '93 as opposed to March of '93. The Leader of the Opposition can't get around that fact. He simply ignores it. He simply wants to continue to politic.

And I simply say to the Leader of the Opposition and the Conservative Party that they ought to face up to realities and to basic facts. And once they do that, then I think we can get on to working in a cooperative fashion. I mean, I repeat again, we have to pull this province out of the sink-hole, the depths of debt which it was sunk into by the administration when it was in power, by the members opposite. We're doing that. It took us nine and a half years to get into this mess; we're not going to turn it around overnight. But by golly, we're making a very good start at it in 18

months — a very good start.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I would just like to ask members to please not a constant barrage of interruptions when the Premier is trying to give the answer.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, you're not listening. That coalition of business groups covers the piece in the province of Saskatchewan as far as people who hire and employ and pay taxes, Mr. Premier. And you can have all the committees that you want, appointed by your government, running around this province; the simple facts are, sir, that the numbers aren't there. And whatever you have done isn't doing the job, Mr. Premier. Your leadership and your vision, they are saying, is not doing the job. We've got to step back, reassess, realign, and come up with a plan that does make some sense.

Now, Mr. Premier, surely you have the time, when they say that the provincial economy is falling apart, that you would have the time to commit yourself and your government to a sit-down; at least listen, Mr. Premier.

It's Friday morning, sir; why don't you send a message out for the weekend that would give people in this province the hope that they could spend their life savings on their business and know that they've got a government that'll back them up? Mr. Premier, give them that commitment this morning.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, again I can't help but be amused at the attempt at earnestness by the Leader of the Opposition, from a government when it was in power after nine and a half years — which by the way virtually decimated the business community and virtually bankrupted the province of Saskatchewan. The member from Arm River knows that — virtually bankrupted it.

By the way, I find it passing strange also I might add, that some of the business leaders of that period were absolutely silent for nine and a half years when they saw this kind of bankruptcy and pillage taking place in the province of Saskatchewan.

I welcome their comments now, don't get me wrong. But for nine and a half years they were silent. Now they're speaking up — some of them are. We welcome that, but it rings hollow, by the Leader of the Opposition, it rings hollow for him to say that we're not listening to the business community; we are.

The Provincial Action Committee on the Economy is made up of business and community leaders and trade union leaders right across the piece. I have total confidence in them. And I simply say that the so-called coalition speaks in some areas for their own concerns and interests. I don't think that they represent the average, ordinary small-business

person. That's my view.

We're not going to dismiss their comments. We're going to take their comments seriously, but by golly I'm not going to put or accept your interpretation of what they say. The facts speak for themselves — 4,000 new jobs in April of '93 compared to March of '93. You never had that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Purchase of Video Lottery Terminals

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Gaming Commission. Mr. Minister, the former gaming commissioner in West Virginia has been arraigned on five federal criminal charges stemming from his work as a head of that state agency. The allegations include insider trading, Mr. Minister. The gaming commissioner allegedly bought 700 shares of GTECH, 300 shares of VLC (Video Lottery Consultant) in '91 and '92, and also sent wire orders for the purchase of 4,000 shares of VLT (Video Lottery Technologies Inc.).

Mr. Minister, I am sure you agree that these are not very reputable transactions. Can you tell me if the security check, which you have been hiding from the public, can you tell me if that report knew of these problems when it said GTECH and VLT were model citizens?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to respond to the member's question. I became aware of the events with respect to West Virginia on the 28th day of April, as did the Gaming Commission. At that time, Mr. Member, is when I became aware of the FBI's (Federal Bureau of Investigation) investigation in the United States.

I want to say that we took action when we were made aware and I will pass on the memo that was sent to the president of Property Management Corporation as well as the chief executive officer of the Saskatchewan Gaming Commission with respect to the issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, can the minister tell this Assembly that he has finally, finally read the report that was passed on to him by SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) through his top security man there, Mr. Egan? Have you read that report to this day, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I have had a condensed version of their findings and their investigations and I can suggest to you that I am sure Mr. Egan in his investigation did all due diligence and was aware of all of the information available at the time that the study was done and at the time they made the recommendation to the Gaming

Commission.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Did that *Reader's Digest* condensed version include the mail fraud also involved, the mailing of advertising contracts, the second mail fraud count charges that were laid in West Virginia? Does it also include charges of insider trading? Does it also include of buying shares in the companies? Does that also include meeting and visiting with the people that they shouldn't have been meeting? Does that also include that he was fired by the governor of the state of West Virginia? Does it include that? That condensed version that you read, does it include that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I think the member is well aware of the timing and of the events that these charges were made with respect to the director of gaming in West Virginia. And I'm thinking he's also well aware of the fact that these events would have happened just prior to the 28th day of April. And I want to say to the member that we have taken the necessary action with respect to the happenings in the United States.

And I think the member is well aware of that, and as I have indicated, I will pass a copy of the memorandum after question period so that he can better understand what action we have taken in this regard.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, does that mean that the minister has cancelled the contract with GTECH in response to the information that he has received from the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the United States?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am passing across a memo with respect to VLC and the happenings with respect to the West . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. I haven't kept track — I want to remind the member from Estevan this morning — but it must be around the 50th that you have interrupted this morning, at least that many times, at least that many times. I've asked him before to quit interrupting.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, that's unfair. If you don't know, you shouldn't say.

The Speaker: — I wasn't talking to the member from Rosthern. If he'd just please stay out of it.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, to satisfy the concerns of the member opposite, perhaps I should quote part of the memorandum. And it reads:

I am most concerned about this indictment because it is our responsibility to ensure that

the gaming industry in this province is kept clean of the problems that have become well established in the United States.

Based on this information, I am hereby directing that no agreements be signed . . .

That was sent on April 28.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, I have been raising this question with you for a lot longer than the period of time from April 28 till now. And, Mr. Minister, I have told you over and over and over again, we have a stack of information that deals with exactly these kinds of issues from two years ago to today.

And, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, my question to you is again: why don't you take the time to read that report and deliver to the people of Saskatchewan a clear, unequivocal opinion that your decisions are clean and that they are absolutely clean?

Will you confirm to the Assembly that you're going to be prepared to do that today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the member opposite, at the time when the investigation was done, that the Property Management Corporation and the Gaming Commission clearly looked at all of the information that was available to them at that time. They looked at the circumstances that were available. And I want to say that with that information, they passed a recommendation to the Gaming Commission. And I think the member is well aware of that.

I want to say to the member opposite, if you have information that was not available at that time to Mr. Egan, I'm going to ask you to forward it to us.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, I think you have a responsibility today, to not only table that memorandum that you sent around, but also table the condensed version — the *Reader's Digest* condensed version of the report — plus the report to the people of the province of Saskatchewan so that they can read it. They, Mr. Minister, will take the time to read it even though you don't take the time to read it. Will you provide that for the Assembly today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member opposite that when the investigation was done, Mr. Egan used all of the information that was available and that was public and that he could receive from other gaming commissions, from other jurisdictions, as an example, the Government of Alberta. All of this information was compiled and based on the information that was available at that time. He recommended to the Gaming Commission what the recommendation was, and you clearly know

what it was.

And I want to say just one more time, and I'm going to quote again from my memo, that we are very concerned with respect to the integrity of gaming in this province. We are well aware of the way gaming is handled in the United States. And because of that awareness, we are going to do everything, Mr. Member, to ensure the integrity of gaming and the integrity of this operation in Saskatchewan.

And I want to say to you that that is why I instructed, and because of those concerns, that no agreements be signed until we have further information with respect to this issue. And I am going to forward a copy of this memo to the member opposite.

And I ask you once . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, the minister has said to me over and over again that he is going to provide information to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan that he knows what's going on. You have had one news release saying you awarded contracts to two companies in the United States, VLC and GTECH, you have already stated, Mr. Minister. Then you went again and said that, oh no, we'll just do GTECH. Now, Mr. Minister, you're saying you haven't done anything at all.

Why did you do that? Was it because, Mr. Minister, you never checked with the California people, with the Idaho people, with the Oregon people, with the West Virginia people, with the Maine people, with the Minnesota people, and all of those people in United States, and the reason is because you didn't read the report, Mr. Minister? Isn't that the reason why you didn't do it then?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, let me refresh the member's memory. And he can research *Hansard* and he can check through the jurisdictions which were consulted by Mr. Egan, both in the United States and in Canada. And he will be well aware of the fact that this Gaming Commission in this province and the investigator from this province has consulted with the Government of Alberta with respect to their dealings and with respect to their information.

And I want to say to the member, we have consulted widely in the United States with all of the different states and we have talked with their gaming commissions, and we put together all of the information that was available to us.

And I'm asking the member, if you have some inside information from some secret source that you appear to have, would you table those documents so that the Gaming Commission can be aware of all of this inside information that you seem to have?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Sonntag: — I ask leave of the Assembly for introduction of guests, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my colleague, the hon. member from Kinistino, I'd like to introduce to you in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, through you to the rest of the Assembly, 18 students from the Wakaw School from grades 4 to 8. They have with them their teacher Mrs. Brueckner, and chaperons Mrs. Nemeth and Mrs. Wawyrk. And also, I don't have the lady's or gentleman's name, but their bus driver is from P.A. Northern Bus Lines.

I will be meeting with them briefly right after . . . in a few minutes for pictures and drinks. And I want it on record that the drinks will be on the member from Kinistino. It'll be on his tab. So I look forward to meeting with them and I would ask the Assembly to join with me in welcoming the students from Wakaw.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — What's the member's point of order?

Mr. Upshall: — I didn't hear you call orders of the day. Maybe I missed it.

The Speaker: — The member's point is well taken. The Clerks forgot to call orders of the day and I missed it too, so your point is well taken. We will by leave go back to orders of the day, if we have leave.

Leave granted.

PRIORITY OF DEBATE

Removal of Barley from Canadian Wheat Board Jurisdiction

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today, pursuant to rule 42, on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. The issue is the federal government is on the verge of taking arbitrary action to remove barley from the sole jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board in the North American market.

These federal actions are apparently based on one set of opinions from a questionable study done by California economist Colin Carter — actions which are contrary to a number of other studies and opinions which demonstrate the tremendous harm that would be done to prairie barley producers and their successful marketing should barley be removed from the sole jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to move the following

motion:

That this Assembly unanimously support the efforts of the many farm groups such as the Canadian Wheat Board, the producer-elected Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the National Farmers Union, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Manitoba Keystone Agriculture Producers, Prairie Pools Inc., Western Canadian Maltsters, amongst others, who reject recent federal actions taken that would remove barley from the sole jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board and further damage prairie farm income.

The Speaker: — The member has asked for leave under rule 42. Is leave granted?

Leave not granted.

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order.

(1045)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984

The Chair: — Would the Minister please introduce her official who is with her today.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have with me John Edwards. He's the director of municipal policy and legislative services for the Department of Municipal Government.

Clause 1

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I will be making a few remarks at the beginning of this, and I believe that the minister will be provided with an amendment, a House amendment, which I'm going to propose at the appropriate time during consideration of the Bill.

Mr. Chairman, the issue of wards in Saskatchewan cities has been around for some time. It has certainly been a controversial one and has engendered fairly strong feelings on both sides.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Moose Jaw were given some choices back in the 1970s to move to the ward system. Some of them did. Some of them didn't. Some preferred to stay with the at-large process. My home community of Moose Jaw has never had any desire to have a ward system, and they've expressed that over a number of occasions. The city of Regina has held a plebiscite on the issue, and I believe had the citizens of Regina resoundingly endorse the ward system.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP government has now come forward with a Bill which is going to mandate the

ward system to these particular four cities. Mr. Speaker, we believe, we believe, as do the representatives of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipality Association) — and they've expressed this to the government — that cities should have choices as to the type of ward system that they wish to implement and also to the type and way that they set their boundaries, that they be given the choice because it's their jurisdiction.

And I'm sure as we've seen from the results from the city of Regina, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a ward system. There's no question. The citizens, the electors, the taxpayers of this city have said, we want a ward system.

But what civic officials are saying is that let us design the ward system. Let us have the opportunity to set the boundaries. And, Mr. Chairman, for the life of me I don't understand when this topic, which has been so controversial, which has obviously been in the political realm for some time . . . why this government, who supposedly are onside to let our urban jurisdictions design the most efficient and effective type of urban government possible, especially in these days of cut-backs, when we've seen major offloading occurring now from this government down onto the backs of urban municipal government, the education system and the health system, when we have seen and will see a half a billion dollars of offloading occur in the next four years and major pressure on the mill rates in these urban jurisdictions . . . that the government instead of saying "shall" in the Bill, would change that and say: may.

There's a big difference, Mr. Chairman, and I think they would give some credit to our urban councillors, our mayors, the people that are charged with handling these very difficult times, the people that are going to be in charge of handling this half a billion dollars in offloading, the people that are going to have to sit down and work with their school boards. They're going to have to work with their newly-formed hospital boards, to work out what is the most reasonable system.

And it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is very heavy-handed of this government to impose their reviews and their will through this particular piece of legislation on our urban jurisdictions. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that there is somebody in the planning department in the city of Regina that can sit down with their city council and draw the appropriate boundaries for the wards in this city — I am sure that there is — and not have it imposed by senior government.

And if members of the Legislative Assembly would take time to read the Bill, they'll see that that is exactly what can happen. That this government, through the way this Bill is worded, through this piece of legislation, can dictate that. And, Mr. Chairman, members of senior urban government in this province find that offensive. They've said it to the minister. They've said it to the government. And for the life of me, I don't know why they would want to have the

power to mandate those changes, Mr. Chairman.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I will await for the appropriate time in the Bill to bring forward the House amendment.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chair, thank you, and to the member of the opposition, I listened with interest to the comments that you made and I think there are several inaccuracies in those comments, and at the appropriate time we will give the appropriate interpretation of the Act in which you've overlooked the circumstances relating to boundary determination and to other issues.

On the issue though of self-determination, which you have made a point of, both the city council and mayor of Saskatoon and Regina have asked for reinstatement of wards. We are not disregarding the view of civic officials at all.

In fact, they were instrumental in bringing about petitions, laying a petition before the electorate and asking the electorate. And through that process, both by the city council, initiated by the city council, and as responded to by the public of Saskatoon and Regina, there was a overwhelming, positive response to bringing the wards back.

So this government is not intent on imposing any system on any city that both the people and the government have now asked for. And I believe your statements around that are quite inaccurate.

I will argue the issue around who decides the boundaries and the issue on mandatory versus permissive at the appropriate time. But I just wanted to make sure that the public of Saskatchewan are aware that the last government in 1987, without consultation, with absolute no consultation whatsoever, eliminated wards in Saskatchewan, not asking the municipal governments at all at the time.

And it's passing strange right now that we have the very same members over there that are so intent on allowing for local officials and local governments to make up their own mind, did not, at that time, give the same due process when they were in government. So you have taken quite a change of heart since you were here.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would move that we:

Amend clause 3 of the printed Bill by striking out the word "shall" where it appears for the first time in subsection 25(1) as being enacted therein and substituting therefor the word "may".

I so move.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chair, for the reasons that I have said before, we will not accept that amendment. We believe that the clause as it is written reflects the desire and the intent of both municipal governments and the people of those cities, and we will leave it as it is.

The division bells rang from 10:55 a.m. until 11:05 a.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 6

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	D'Autremont
Neudorf	Haverstock

Nays — 26

Wiens	Hamilton
Teichrob	Trew
Koskie	Draper
Solomon	Whitmore
Carson	Sonntag
Mitchell	Cline
MacKinnon	Scott
Penner	Kujawa
Cunningham	Crofford
Upshall	Stanger
Koenker	Knezacek
Calvert	Kluz
Murray	Jess

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act

Clause 1

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be very brief on this. But once again it's the issue of choice that is being denied people in our larger urban areas. Once again this government could have agreed with the pronouncements of people in urban government that they heard at SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association).

This issue, Mr. Chairman, is simply one of urban government knowing that the '90s are going to be very difficult times for them. They know that they are faced with diminishing resources, decreasing budgets. And they want to have the ability, Mr. Chairman, to be able to meet the demands of their ratepayers. And they know those demands will be very, very difficult to meet.

So it's clearly just giving these people enough latitude and enough choice in their democratically elected systems, Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely essential for one of their levels of senior government to give them. Not to be holding over their heads all the time the Legislative Assembly.

Now I know, Mr. Chairman, that the minister will stand up and say when you guys were in government that you . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, we are saying in the opposition, the official opposition, that we heartily concur with people from local government having the ability to design their own electoral systems — design their own electoral systems.

And I guess, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the members of the official opposition have learned is to listen to people. We lost the election campaign because the New Democrats promised that they would be a listening government, that they were going to be able to do so much more with less, that they were going to listen to urban government. So urban government comes along and says, senior government, this is what we'd like; will you please listen? That's the election promise that you made 18 months ago.

Do they listen? No. It's like the Premier on economic development in this province and job creation. Does he listen when somebody says you're breaking your promise to us about being open and accountable and listening? Members of the official opposition, Mr. Chairman, paid the price, paid the price of electoral defeat in the area of urban government because they didn't listen.

Well I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that what we are bringing to this Assembly both in Bill 37 and Bill 30, is simply that the words, the wishes, the demands of urban government to have enough latitude to cope with what they know is going to happen to them. But this government is insensitive, won't listen, and simply says, it's our way or the doorway.

Well, Mr. Chairman, last year in GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) we heard it. This year in health we've heard it. This Minister of Municipal Affairs, or whatever they happen to call it these days, comes in and says, it's our way or the doorway. And people in the province are getting a little tired of this attitude, this government that is drunk with political power, that simply won't listen.

And, Mr. Chairman, these are the kind of amendments that make this type of legislation totally palatable to local people, locally elected government. There is not one thing in the House amendment that I will propose on this Bill that infringes on anything that senior government wants to do, not one thing. Senior government holds the hammer financially over the heads of these people for ever and a day.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's like Bill 37, they simply want to be able to direct politically, the process from on high at all levels. And that is why we see this government so intransigent on these issues. If they would simply

listen for a change instead of imposing, they wouldn't be getting in the trouble that they're getting in today with so many groups in the province of Saskatchewan.

For, Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I will be proposing a House amendment on this particular Bill.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in the comments of the member of the opposition. Under the last Bill, he made mention that Moose Jaw, the ward system would be imposed on Moose Jaw. That is totally inaccurate. We're not imposing any ward system on anyone that hasn't asked for it. Moose Jaw does not want a ward system and this Bill does not impose one on Moose Jaw.

Let me go over the history of this once again so that it's on record. Last year we introduced the wards Bill; we sent it out for public consultation with the standing committee. Over many weeks of public hearings not one person came forward to the standing committee saying they didn't want a ward system. In fact everyone told the standing committee, please bring back the ward system in the major cities.

The recommendation from the standing committee therefore was, bring wards back. They enhance the democratic process. They better reflect the ability of councillors to meet the needs and concerns of their constituents in large cities.

We also had to listen to the plebiscites. There were two plebiscites held in both cities and as well as the city of Prince Albert. Those plebiscites were positive in response to asking for a ward system.

So when you say, do we listen to the people, we've asked the people last year through the Standing Committee on Municipal Government, holding public hearings. We've had plebiscites that overwhelmingly asked for ward systems to come back. And the councils, the councils of those cities are also asking.

(1115)

I cannot understand where you say, let the municipal councils decide; they want the autonomy. Not one council has asked for that. Not one council has come forward and said we don't want to have ward systems.

So you are inaccurate, Mr. Member, when you say that the city councils themselves do not want this legislation. They do.

Furthermore, when you talk about making it mandatory, you overlook the provision in this Bill that says what we are going to do is return to the situation prior to 1987 and after two terms of ward systems, then if they want to opt out, they have the choice of opting out. We are not imposing upon them anything. We're going back to the situation prior to 1987 for two terms, and then if the city councils and the people of the city decide that the ward system is inappropriate, they do have the choice. So it is not a mandatory provision here at all.

You are inaccurate on all those counts, and I believe that what we have here is a Bill that reflects the desire and the need of the people of the cities of Saskatchewan, and we support it.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I move:

That we amend clause 4 of the printed Bill by adding immediately after the words “shall elect one councillor” where they appear in subsection 12(1) as being enacted therein the following:

“or, where the municipality has not been divided into wards, the electors of the municipality may elect councillors at large”

I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Mr. Chairman, if they would read the total Bill, they would find that their amendment is already there on 13.

Clause 13 says:

In a municipality or school division which has not been divided into wards, the electors of the municipality or school division shall elect the aldermen (councillor) and board members at large.

It's already there. I don't think we need to have an amendment to that effect.

The division bells rang from 11:18 a.m. until 11:21 a.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 7

Swenson	Martens
Muirhead	Britton
Devine	D'Autremont
Neudorf	

Nays — 21

Thompson	Hamilton
Wiens	Trew
Teichrob	Draper
Koskie	Cline
Solomon	Scott
Carson	Kujawa
Penner	Crofford
Upshall	Stanger
Koenker	Knezacek
Lautermilch	Kluz
Murray	

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I would like to thank my official, John Edwards, for being with us this morning, and the members of the opposition.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too would like to join with the minister in thanking the official for coming in this morning and helping out with these two particular Bills. The topics around the ward system probably won't go away for quite a while so I appreciate the department staying on top in the answers from the minister.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting Security Interests in Personal Property and making Consequential and Related Amendments to Certain Other Acts

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With me today on my right is Mr. Ray Petrich, who is the master of titles and the director of personal property security registry. And on my left, Darcy McGovern of the legislative services division of the Department of Justice.

Clause 1

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister. This is a fairly comprehensive Bill. I believe it's been in the works for quite some time. The previous government had worked on it; now your government has worked on it and brought it forward. While we generally support most of the items in the Bill, we do have some questions to ask you.

Just wondering what was the rationale for bringing this forward and who did you consult with in doing this?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Member. You're correct in saying that the work on this Bill has spanned both the previous government and this government.

In December of 1990 the Law Reform Commission, following an extensive series of consultations, submitted to the then minister of Justice its report which was entitled *Tentative Proposals For A New Personal Property Security Act*. Consultations then followed with the people that would be interested in the operation of the Act.

It was a joint effort between Professor Cumming of the Law Reform Commission and officials of the Department of Justice, and that resulted in the tabling in the last session of this Assembly, Bill 90, which was entitled The Personal Property Security Act, 1992. Then that Bill was widely circulated to again the people who would be interested in it, to receive their comment.

In the meantime the final report of the Law Reform Commission on this subject was submitted last June — June of 1992 — and that report received wide circulation as well.

So that this legislation that we're considering in committee this morning represents the end result of the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission and all these consultations over a period of two and a half years.

In general terms — if you want me to carry on about the Act itself — the Act maintains the basic structure and function of the system as it has existed for many years in this province but introduces a number of amendments that modernize the Act to reflect evolving business practices, to harmonize our Act with similar laws, particularly in western Canadian jurisdictions, for obvious reasons of commercial convenience and bordering on necessity.

(1130)

It also accommodates innovations and intended innovations in computer technology to offer computer access and registration on a remote basis; and finally to address a number of judicial decisions which were inconsistent with the intended policy of the legislation as it has existed for many years.

Consultations — if I could just go back to that for one moment in answer to the member's question — it included a large number of actors and included the Canadian Bankers' Association, Credit Union Central, and the Canadian Bar Association representing the legal practitioners, the law firms and lawyers who practise in this field and have an interest in it.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Does this Bill also deal with the exemptions that are allowed for personal property securities?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The answer is no, the exemptions are not in this Bill, as I understand your question. The exemptions that I believe you're speaking about would be found in two other Acts, which by the way, we currently have under review. One is The Exemptions Act and the other is The Saskatchewan Farm Security Act, and this legislation does not affect the exemptions in those laws.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I didn't see it in here and that's why I asked about it, because I believe that Exemptions Act was originally brought in in the 1930s, and I'm sure it's been updated somewhat since then, but there are quite a number of things in there that are no longer relevant, such as you're allowed to protect your cream separator or 40 bushels of potatoes. Now not many people grow 40 bushels of potatoes any more, so I'm hoping you will take a look at that Act.

In this Act, we know that the federal government's legislation applies to the chartered banks. In the province, this legislation deals with credit unions. And there's not necessarily a balanced playing-field

there between what the credit unions have to provide for security and what they can realize on and what the banks can do; that there's a difference between section 178 of the Bank Act and what the credit unions have to operate on. Does this bring it closer to what the chartered banks are allowed to do?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — This is a very good question that the member puts forward. It's been a problem for a long time. And to some extent we try and address it in this Bill.

In section 9 the member will have seen that we try and put the banks into a position where they have to make up their mind whether they're going to take their security under section 178 of the Bank Act or are they going to take their security under The Personal Property Security Act. And that of course has been a complaint of the credit unions for many, many years. And it is a very . . . it's a good position for the banks because they've been able to take their security under both the Bank Act and The Personal Property Security Act.

And as the member knows then, that the bank is in a position, rightly or wrongly, of being able to pick where it goes. Is it more advantageous in one situation to realize its security as a Bank Act security, or is it more advantageous to realize its security under the provisions of this Act. Or in a complex situation can they use both methods, depending upon what chattel they're dealing with or what the exemption situation is or what have you.

So that we are trying to clarify that situation right up at the beginning by having the banks make a determination in the character of the agreement that they present to their borrower. Are they securing the loan under the Bank Act or are they securing it in a more general way under this Act. And we try to deal with that in section 9.

In addition in section 34(11), we deal with a security interest in crops or the proceeds of crops that are . . . where the advance or the loan is made to the debtor to enable — I say debtor, the farmer — to produce the crops. And this security interest is given at a time when crops are growing. And during the six-month period . . . Well the member will have seen section 11; I don't want to get into a big, technical, detailed discussion of how that works.

But in any event, that will now be available to credit unions as a security interest that they can use in respect of their advances, and it deals with another problem that the credit unions have had over the years, competing with banks as they do in the farm credit market.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Yes, Mr. Minister, I know it's been a problem because the credit unions have had a great deal of difficulty in taking inventory as collateral, and that is one of the things that section 178 does provide to the banks.

What differences will the banks realize between

section 178 and this Bill?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The situation under section 178 of the Bank Act is of course governed by federal legislation, and there's nothing that we in this Assembly can do to affect that law and its operation, the federal government having the jurisdiction over banks and banking.

Under section 178 of the Bank Act, for example, the banks . . . the exemptions that they face are different than the exemptions faced if you're operating under the provincial law, as the credit unions are. So that's one important difference.

I might mention just in passing, dealing with The Exemptions Act, that the member raised an example, and I give you another one. I think a teapot is exempt, but your coffee pot or your coffee percolator is not — obviously an Act that needs some work.

An Hon. Member: — Hey, what have they against Juan?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Yes. The other major difference is a procedural one.

We have in Saskatchewan, as the member knows, a network of law relating to the seizure of . . . by a creditor, and notice provisions. And in this Bill in "Part V, Rights and Remedies on Default", there's a whole web of requirements that a creditor has to observe, and steps that the creditor has to go through, in realizing on the security.

Under the Bank Act, the procedure is much more summary, much more direct, much less considerate for the position of the farmer, of the debtor. And so it . . . that's probably why it's been a problem for so many years.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. You touched on the point that I was going to bring up next, and that's the realizing on your securities.

Under previous . . . under the Act before, if you wanted to realize on a farmer's combine, you could not do so while his crop was in the field. You also had to give him a three-month notice that you were going to realize on that security.

What changes have you made in that way, that people can understand that are watching today?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — This Act will not change the process that is laid down in The Saskatchewan Farm Security Act. That situation will be unchanged.

The Chair: — I wonder if the members can agree that we proceed through the Bill, part by part, until we come to the clauses of the Bill that are proposed to be amended. Is that agreed? Agreed. Then we'll proceed in that way.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 18

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chairman, I move:

That section 18 of the printed Bill be amended:

(a) by striking out the words "clause (1)(a)" in clause 14(d) and substituting the words "clause (2)(a)";

(b) by striking out the words "clause (1)(a)" in clause (15)(d) and substituting the words "clause (2)(a)"; and further

(c) by striking out the words "subsection (1)(a)" in clause (15)(d) and substituting the words "clause (2)(a)".

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 18 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 29 inclusive agreed to.

(1145)

Clause 30

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move:

That section 30 of the printed Bill be amended by adding the words "of goods" after the word "buyer" wherever that word appears in clause (1)(c).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 30 as amended agreed to.

Clause 31

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move:

That section 31 of the printed Bill be amended by striking out the words "pursuant to subsection 28(3)" in subsection (4) and substituting the following words: "pursuant to section 26 or subsection 28(3)".

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 31 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 32 and 33 agreed to.

Clause 34

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Section 34 of the printed Bill be amended by adding the words "subsection (6) and" after the words "Subject to" in subsection (2).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 34 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 35 to 48 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 49

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Section 49 of the printed Bill be amended by striking out the words “Subsections 50(7) and (9)” in subsection (11) and substituting the words “Subsections 50(7) to (9)”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 49 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 50 to 85 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Before doing that, could I, on behalf of the Assembly, thank the officials for all the help that they were to me in the preparation of this legislation and for coming to assist in the committee dealing with it today.

Mr. D’Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The opposition would also like to thank the minister’s officials for coming in today and for helping him provide us with the answers.

Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The Police Act, 1990

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce to the Assembly Mr. John Baker, who is the director of policing in the Department of Justice. And also with me is Mr. Darcy McGovern who I introduced earlier today to the committee.

Clause 1

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just have a couple of questions and then I’ll turn it over to my colleague.

This Act is to amend The Police Act and I understand, Mr. Minister, that one of the issues that . . . well I’d like you to clarify what prompted these amendments. Was it the particular case that you referred to in your second-reading speech with reference to Martensville or was Martensville just coming on stream because you had anticipated problems like this prior to it?

Now I have a . . . My understanding of the situation is that the RCM (Royal Canadian Mounted) Police have themselves developed a policy where they will not get into direct negotiations with municipalities of under 5,000 people but they are willing to enter into negotiations with you as Minister of Justice on behalf of these towns to facilitate certain problems that exist. Is that correct, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — That’s exactly correct, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Member.

The triggering mechanism was the new police agreement that was negotiated over the last several years and was finally signed last year. It’s a 20-year agreement, and it changed the threshold from 1,500 people in a community to 5,000. And that left a gap in the formal arrangements under which policing was done for communities between 1,500 and 5,000.

Now for communities that already had an agreement, those agreements were grandfathered, but for other communities it was necessary to have some other mechanism. So we are in effect using the same mechanism that we have previously used for communities between 500 and 1,500. So we raised that 1,500 population ceiling up to 5,000, and we are able to arrange for policing services under the extended contract basis that has been in effect for the smaller communities for many years.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Could you walk me through the procedure that will take place now? Martensville has been in the news unfortunately for the past year or so, and it has created problems within the community. And although the community has approached you for the RCM policing as opposed to local constables hired by the town, that of course does not mean that that is a unanimous decision within the community itself.

But because it creates a lot of disturbances, this decision has created disturbances within the town itself, with the existing police force now being disbanded. And I think you can appreciate some of the problems that that creates. But in the process, stability has to be brought on to the scene.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is number one: has the town of Martensville officially, officially made representation to you to act on their behalf on this issue? And having said that, subsequent to that — and I take it that they have — what is the time frame that you perceive for this whole thing to be judiciously brought to a conclusion where the RCMP will actually be policing in Martensville?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — We have been in close touch, I think that the member knows, with the Martensville mayor and council throughout. And the present status is as follows: the RCMP are policing the community on an interim basis under an order under section 24 of The Police Act, and I issued an order with respect to that.

And if this legislation is passed by this House, we already have in hand a request from the town to enter into an agreement. And we’re prepared to do that just immediately after the legislation is passed, in a very timely way. It’ll happen very quickly. And then that’ll mean we move from the emergency service to the regular service. And it should happen very smoothly and very quickly.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well I appreciate that, Mr. Minister, and I make my commitment that this legislation will pass within the next five minutes so you can get going on with it. Thank you.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I see my House Leader has put a time limit on my questions.

Mr. Minister, how many communities will be affected with this change from 5,000 population to 1,500?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The answer, interestingly enough, is only Martensville. Others are already parties to contracts that are grandfathered in the Bill. So at the moment Martensville is the only one.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. That answers my second question. What kind of a cost difference or impact will this have financially on those communities that may wish to use the RCMP versus their own police force?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the cost for Martensville, to use that specific example, will be approximately the same.

And I just want to add a little bit because it's very interesting . . . at least my advice is — I hope the members find it so too. Under these policing agreements, arrangements, the federal government will pay 30 per cent of the costs so that the cost of Martensville is about the same even though the RCMP is involved, which probably has a higher pay structure than you would expect to find at the municipal police level.

There will be four RCMP officers put into the town of Martensville and I think that their force was four before the town decided to disband their police force.

(1200)

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Again, Mr. Minister, I would like to thank the officials for coming to the Assembly this morning and assisting the committee.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The opposition would also like to thank the officials for coming in today and providing the answers. Thank you.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984

Hon. Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I move this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act

Hon. Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting Security Interests in Personal Property and making Consequential and Related Amendments to Certain Other Acts

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

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that Bill No. 33 be now read the third time and passed under its title.

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

Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The Police Act, 1990

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 38

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell that **Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code** be now read a second time.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take a few minutes to speak on Bill 38. And obviously, Mr. Speaker, I do not support the Bill. I believe that it is badly drafted. I believe that it is incomplete and I think that we'll provide sufficient evidence, not only here in Saskatchewan but across Canada, to show that indeed the Bill would not sustain itself if it was challenged.

I'm going to take the opportunity to say at the outset that there is a great and growing concern in Saskatchewan and across Canada about NDP governments initiating Bills of this nature that are not well thought out and will not be supported by the general public and, in fact if it were taken to a general vote, would not likely be supported in a free vote.

And I'm going to use as some examples, Mr. Speaker, the concern now in the province of Ontario, and I'll bring it right here into our jurisdiction. Because I think even church leaders today, while many, many of them are against adding additional protection or rights for sexual orientation, even those that thought it might be okay, and there are some who are now having serious second thoughts.

And let me just read, for example, the Roman Catholic bishops' position in the province of Ontario. And there's two or three points that are really worth noting. The following statement was issued by Ontario's 20 Catholic bishops on October 1, 1986 and we've subsequently heard about their positions to date. The Catholic bishops of Ontario gathered in plenary session in Toronto and are opposed to the present form of an omnibus Bill 7 now before the provincial legislature.

In this omnibus Bill they say:

Much in this Bill is good and quite acceptable; however section 18, numbers 105 to amend the human rights of Ontario prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of a person's sexual orientation is unacceptable. The bishops support basic human rights for all members of society including those with a homosexual orientation. However the church and the Judaeo-Christian tradition carefully distinguishes between homosexual orientation and homosexual behaviour. For the church a homosexual behaviour or lifestyle is contrary to Christian morality, and any law that leaves the door open to such a lifestyle will cause great harm to society.

And I'm quoting the church's position. And this is a key point:

Bill 7 does not make this crucial distinction. Indeed the very ambiguity of the phrase sexual orientation lends itself to totally unacceptable applications.

I'll read that again.

Indeed the very ambiguity of the phrase sexual orientation (and I understand in this Bill and in the Ontario Bill, undefined) lends itself to totally unacceptable applications.

Now I'll go on and read. And what I'll make and argue, if I'll just break from this and argue, is that when I go through several different examples of applications I'm sure the minister will say, well I agree with you there. I wouldn't mean it here, and I wouldn't mean it there, and I wouldn't want to extend it here, and I wouldn't want to extend it there. I might even consider amendments for this amendments for that.

And I'm not going to encourage amendments because I think it's flawed to start with, and amending a flawed Bill and ending up in a flawed situation will not, will not be . . . is fundamentally flawed and would not be

consistent. But the applications that the bishops are talking about here, I believe that the Attorney General will agree and the NDP party will agree, lead to all these exemptions and exemptions and the applications you really don't want. Therefore what are you sticking up for here? What's it all about?

Let me continue to read. I quote the Catholic bishops of Ontario:

We believe that Bill 7 in its present form will have the social impact of promoting the recognition of homosexual unions as marriages and also seriously restrict the freedom of churches, governments, societies, businesses, and schools to set criteria of conduct for their employees.

In other words, what they're saying is part of the total unacceptable application will be the acknowledgement of marriages, the affirmative action that might be taking place in various situations, or the fact that you would have to teach about it, that is the sexual orientation with the consequences that are listed here, in schools because you've said that they cannot be discriminated against. And the church says, you're digging yourself into a minefield that you just can't get out of.

The demand for social support for homosexual couples has already surfaced in Toronto, see *The Globe and Mail* of September 30, '86, page A15: "Family benefits should be offered to homosexual employees, city told."

Bill 7, if passed as it is, will erode the status of normal families by equating their legal status with that of homosexual unions. And we deplore the attempt to pass Bill 7 without the widespread consultation and discussion which will permit the citizens of Ontario to express their concern. Therefore we urgently request the government to postpone any action on Bill 7 until such consultation has taken place. Moreover, we ask our fellow citizens to write or telephone at once the respective MPPs in order to register their deep dissatisfaction and displeasure.

Now the arguments used by the Roman Catholic church in Ontario from its moral position, if you will, its legal position, and its small "p" political position is that they find the Bill, with respect to the amendment to the Human Rights Code of Ontario, totally unsatisfactory. And they're not rabid right-wingers and they're not rabid Liberals or Tories or NDP or anything else. These are people who look at this very seriously as a significant, public, social, moral, political question in Canada. Serious consequences.

Now I'll read some more of the highlights a little bit later, but I want to just take a moment . . . and from them, their Ontario Catholic bishops make a couple of arguments because I think that if people are looking for exemptions and if you were looking for exemptions to your Bill, my argument will be that the

Bill is flawed, and we don't want to look for exemptions in a flawed piece of legislation. Because if you really thought that you were doing the right thing, you wouldn't need the exemptions.

Let me give you an example. The NDP government says it doesn't want to allow homosexual adoption. That's the case; now I assume that's the case. Well then the argument would be: why discriminate against a couple when it comes to adoption if you don't think that you can't discriminate against them at all? Either you believe that they're beyond discrimination or they're not.

But if you say that fair enough, we will not let them adopt children, well what's wrong with them? Why are you discriminating against them?

(1215)

You see what the Catholic bishops in Ontario are saying? You've left a whole range of implications open. You will not stand in your place and say yes, I think gay men can adopt children. You won't do that. I certainly would support you.

But it is therefore illogical to say, well . . . but we'll have to have a Bill so we can't discriminate against these people. Well either you think that they can be discriminated against or not. And that's what the Catholic bishops are saying.

So you could say, well I'll put in an amendment so that it says that we won't touch adoption; we'll just leave that part out. Well how can you have before the charter of rights and amendments and say, well you can't discriminate against these people, but mind you, Mr. Supreme Court members, in the case of affirmative action or in the case of adoption or in the cases of marriages, they don't count? They only count for this.

It's illogical. It's not consistent. It's fundamentally flawed. I don't want you to make any amendments for adoption. Number one, I obviously don't think that we need more protection for this orientation. And I agree with the Catholic bishops of Ontario that say you have not distinguished clearly enough between sexual orientation and the very fact that you can have homosexual activity that would be unacceptable to this legislature in adopting children or in affirmative action or in taking them into your home or anything else.

You haven't been clear enough. And we will not let you off the hook by saying, well I'll have three or four amendments that say, well I'll just . . . won't let you do this and won't . . . (inaudible) . . . you this, but we'll protect them.

Now what we have to ask is: why are you doing this then? What's your reason? What's your philosophical reason or your moral reason? I haven't heard one yet.

So what I would have to say, maybe you just have a partisan reason. And if that's what it's all about, then

it's totally unacceptable, if this is a partisan reason to garner support. That isn't consistent.

So I think the Catholic bishops have been very, very clear on this. I'm going to just state it again. The very ambiguity of the phrase sexual orientation lends itself to totally unacceptable applications. I totally agree with that. Your Bill, undefined, leads to totally unacceptable applications.

Now I'll read you one that I just have. It says: would you allow homosexual couples to adopt children? Yes or no? Well I suspect that you would say no. Now if you say yes, fair enough. Then you're at least consistent with the Bill — you won't discriminate. But if you say that homosexual couples, lesbian couples, gay couples cannot adopt children, then who are you defending? Why are you doing this Bill? What's it for?

Now if you do want to say homosexuals can adopt children, we're into a totally different debate — totally different debate — which would be totally unacceptable to the Canadian public and probably the public of the world generally. Obviously homosexual couples cannot have children; children are not born to these people. And obviously the implications on education and environment on children are serious consequences, not only moral but social, political, economic, and all of the above.

Let me give you another example. The NDP government says it doesn't want to recognize same sex marriages. Well why would you discriminate against homosexuals? Why won't you recognize same sex marriages?

Well because evidently you don't think it's right. And if you don't think it's right, why are you passing this Bill? And then you kind of say to some of your colleagues, well I'll have an amendment just on marriages. This won't apply to marriages. Okay, so I have this new Bill protecting homosexual and gay rights and orientation, but got to tell you that it doesn't apply because I'm going to discriminate on the basis of adoption and I'm going to discriminate on the basis of marriages.

Why? What's the logic behind this? Why are you doing this? Because the Catholic bishops and church people and common sense will tell you exactly what the bishops have said: the ambiguity of the phrase sexual orientation in law lends itself to totally unacceptable applications in society. These applications in law will lead to totally unacceptable applications in society, and you're trying to have it both ways. It doesn't make any sense.

So you said, well I will discriminate against these people on the basis of orientation if it comes to marriages. Well that's a fine how-do-you-do. I will discriminate against these people if it comes to the raising of children and adoption of children. Well that's a fine how-do-you-do. How do you think these people feel? You're just playing politics with their lives, absolutely you are. Absolutely.

If you were to ask Svend Robinson today should we discriminate on sexual orientation on the basis of marriages and adopting of children, what would he say? He'd say, of course not. Homosexuality . . . NDP members of parliament that are homosexual, talk about it, say yes we are, they would say, I have the right to adopt children. I have the right to be married. I have the right to do all of these things, and I should not be discriminated against. But the NDP here say, well gee, Svend, I don't think we can do that.

Well then what are you doing? What in the world are you doing? It doesn't make any sense. You are discriminating clearly legally because normal couples, heterosexual couples can apply for adoption and can receive the benefits of marriage. So if the church doesn't and you don't, what's this all about? It doesn't make any sense. And amendments that allow . . . I mean it wouldn't be consistent with Svend Robinson and it wouldn't be consistent with the law, and it's not consistent with the general public good. So it points to why are the NDP doing this? What is their logic? What's the rationale?

Well I mean I guess it's from the inside of the party. They'll have to try to tell that, but the general public is . . . you're probably playing politics. Well we'll get a little bit . . . We'll look like we're supporting the rights of people; that's what we'll look like. We'll kind of support the rights of this and the rights of that. But when it gets into some of the responsibilities for raising children and responsibilities for marriages — whoops — we'll just kind of discriminate there a little bit. I mean there isn't a six-year-old that wouldn't see through what you're doing. Think you're fooling people?

Third one, Mr. Speaker. The NDP government says it doesn't want to give homosexual spousal and family benefits. You don't want to grant homosexual spousal and family benefits. You discriminate against spousal benefits. Oh, they don't quite count here. Well it's the same argument all over again. It doesn't make any sense. It's not socially or morally or publicly or religiously acceptable, what you're trying to do. And when you try to weasel your way out of it, there's no place to go. You're inconsistent in the law and you're inconsistent morally to these people.

If you thought that they were legitimate in terms of sexual orientation, needing special rights, then you'd give them the whole nine yards. But you don't have the courage to do that. It's shameful. You're playing politics with their lives.

People have asked you for their support because they think that, well look, the NDP said that sexual orientation needs to be protected and we'll do that. And then when it comes to the bottom line, number one, you finally figured out you can't do it; and number two is you're trying to do it halfway, part way. And so you've got churches upset with you. You've got people — all kinds of people, heterosexual and homosexual people — very upset, very, very upset.

And the inconsistency is resulting in people prepared

to sign petitions, that literally by the thousands and tens of thousands, saying, you weren't elected to do this; you have no idea what you're doing; I don't like the implications. Just like the bishop said or the Mennonite church says or the Anglican church says or churches all over the place — Evangelical churches — they said, we'll put you, give you tens of thousands of names, perhaps over a hundred thousand names, so that in fact you can take it to the people.

And I think it's correct, and the minister, Attorney General of Saskatchewan can correct me if I'm wrong, but he said: well I wouldn't recommend you do this, folks. One, it's expensive; and number two, I wouldn't live by it anyway. Wouldn't live by it anyway. And I believe that was quoted on the radio.

My research staff said that the Attorney General said: well you can have all the plebiscites you like . . . And mind you, the NDP voted for the plebiscite and referendum legislation in this House. We introduced it; they voted for it. Three plebiscites were passed in the last election. They didn't even mind; they didn't even care. And now when the people have a moral issue before them and they say, we'll bring it here, the Attorney General says: oh well I wouldn't bother; it's kind of expensive, and frankly I wouldn't live by it anyway.

Now you think you're getting public support with that attitude? You won't allow a free vote; you won't allow the people to speak. I mean it starts to get repetitious, Mr. Speaker. You unilaterally change the rules of the House, you cut off debate, you unilaterally change farm support programs, you unilaterally close 52 hospitals, and you now are saying: well I won't even let . . . even if you had hundreds of thousands of people come in here with a plebiscite I wouldn't live by it anyway. Arrogance — flat arrogance, an ill-conceived arrogance.

You haven't got the confidence of farmers that you know what you're doing. You certainly don't in health care people. And now you're going out on a moral issue; you don't have the churches. And I'll tell you, as we speak here there are people across Canada saying: more power and more rights to homosexuals and sexual orientation is not on, Mr. NDP, wherever you are. It's not on; it's not right; it's not moral; it's not needed.

These are fine people but they don't need extra rights. And if you have come to the position where you don't want them to have extra rights for marriage, spousal benefits, adoption of children, then what are you messing with it for? Some bright idea dreamt up by somebody who thought, well maybe we can get some political support. Is that what it's about? — political support? Is this a divergence from reality? Maybe it's a little bit of divergence. If we kind of close some hospitals they'll forget that we're not creating jobs and we've added 1.6 billion to the deficit. Maybe the NDP strategists are doing that.

Well it's hard to figure, Mr. Speaker, because the first three examples are perfectly consistent with the

Ontario Catholic bishops saying this is totally unacceptable and it will lead to unacceptable applications in society.

Here's another example. The NDP want to pass this Bill, Mr. Speaker, but they go on to say it does not want to have homosexuality taught in the schools. Well, why not? Why not? That's a very good question. Why not homosexuality and affirmative action taught in schools? Same argument — you say you have to have protection for sexual orientation. Well then you better be able to defend it in adoption and in marriages and in education. But you won't. Or will you?

Will you? Is that it? What's your plan there? Teach it in school? Teach sexual orientation in school, homosexuality? Teach about the adoption of children into homosexual homes? Is that what you want?

Well if it isn't, we're not going to let you make an amendment and say well we didn't mean that for schools; we didn't mean that for homosexual couples; we didn't mean it for adoption. Then what is it all about? Why are you . . . what is this Bill?

The Catholic bishops are right. The Bill is flawed. This is a bad Bill, bad all the way around. It's got bad intentions, dishonourable intentions. It isn't complete. It isn't consistent, and frankly it's dangerous. It is flat dangerous.

There's a section in the Bill presenting actually . . . it allows the commission to require any school to teach homosexuality — in this Bill.

Now there are members of the cabinet I think who are former school principals, teachers, have been involved in education. Mr. Speaker, you'd know about that. I didn't mean to involve you in this debate, just happened to think about the fact that you were a teacher.

(1230)

So we're now from the Catholic church and from the Mennonite church and from the Anglican church and from the Evangelical church . . . is going to teach homosexuality in school. And if you don't, by law you can be charged with discrimination which means you have to. You have to by the law. This is the law we make in here. This isn't some little trial balloon. This is the law.

And if a child or a parent or somebody else has said, no I've been discriminated against; they are not allowing my homosexual parents to have equal treatment, then we have to have this in school. Then what will you do?

Well if you don't plan to do it, if you don't plan to teach it in the schools, then why are you introducing this Bill? Because you'll be challenged, because everybody that wants equal access will get it with your Bill. And if you make all these funny little amendments to let you out, then what's the point of the Bill?

The NDP government says it doesn't want to stop the Red Cross from asking blood donors what their sexual orientation is. Why not? Why not ask blood donors what their sexual orientation is? What are you afraid of? What's the risk? Why don't you want to ask blood donors what their sexual orientation is?

Clearly the fact, unequivocal, non-partisan fact that this highest incidence of AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) comes from homosexual orientation and the people associated with that activity. And you say, we will not let the Red Cross ask what your orientation is. Well don't you think somebody's going to say, what's your motive here?

Mr. Speaker, this Bill has not been well thought out. And the churches and common sense and people across the country are saying, if this the basic, fundamental moral philosophy of the NDP Party, then no wonder they're in some difficulty, and no wonder we've always wondered about them. They're changing their positions on all kinds of things. They say one thing with great respect before elections, and one after, some things in New York and some things here.

I thought it was quite interesting, Mr. Speaker, this morning when the member from Thunder Creek, Leader of the Opposition, pointed out that while the NDP campaigned so terribly against Weyerhaeuser and against Cargill and fertilizer plants, that in New York the member from Riversdale, the Premier of Saskatchewan, the NDP Premier had it in his speech, here's the diversification and the big investments we have. Well do you think that they just happened over night, folks?

How can you campaign against fertilizer plants and paper mills and upgraders and all of those things? Definitely against them morally; that's sinful to do work with multinationals like Weyerhaeuser, and it's sinful to do all these things with Cargill. And then when you win and you go to New York, you talk about, but I'll tell you we're proud of our projects: Cargill, fertilizer plant; Weyerhaeuser, paper mill — the hypocrisy.

And the hypocrisy of what you've done in agriculture and in health care and in budget. And you've added over a billion dollars to the deficit, and you stand up here in question period and you say, well you made the deficit.

You put more on the deficit . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I know the member got carried away a bit. But we are on Bill 38 and not on agriculture or on Cargill or whatever. I just remind the member to get back on Bill 38.

Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that argument. The clear link is to the intentions and the honourability of the NDP in introducing legislation like this. It's all for partisan reasons, Mr. Speaker — partisan reasons.

They're not going to stick up for sexual orientation. They've got so many places where they're going to deny it that they can't ever expect to get political support from people with various sexual orientation because they're going to deny, deny, deny, deny all the way up and down the line. Or else they really are going to allow sexual orientation to be taught in schools and couples to adopt children and all of the above.

And it's the same flip-flop, Mr. Speaker, that we see New York versus Harris versus Regina, on health care, on speeches, on multinationals, and all of these things. The NDP are not credible, not credible when it comes to morality or economic activity or telling several versions of the same story — well they're credible there; they tell them all the time.

The New York version of what's going on in Saskatchewan is so far from the truth, it's deplorable. Imagine an NDP Premier, who got elected campaigning against Cargill and Weyerhaeuser, and introducing this Bill — Bill 38. The same NDPer who says, I don't like Cargill and I don't like Weyerhaeuser, campaigned against it, and then goes to New York and brags about the projects. Well who did the projects? He sure as heck didn't. And here, what is the motive behind Bill 38? What's the motive? How can you be so inconsistent and not sustain it right through?

Talk to Svend Robinson and say, how should we do this, Svend? And he'll tell you, you can't discriminate on the basis of adoption; you can't discriminate on the basis of teaching or marriage or spousal benefits or any of those things. That's what he'll say. Because if he was there as a good NDPer and wanted to adopt children, what would you say to him? Sorry Svend, can't let you adopt kids. Would you do that? You better answer that in here before you proceed with this legislation.

If you will do that, if you said, I will allow Svend Robinson and his homosexual partner to adopt children, then say so. Then at least you'd be consistent . . . or give you the spousal benefits or anything else. Well I don't think that you will. If you do, fair enough, that's what you believe and we'd know what the NDP is all about. But if you don't, then this Bill is terribly, terribly flawed and is not correct, not socially acceptable, morally acceptable, or legally acceptable.

The NDP government says it doesn't want to force people to accept homosexuality into their homes through forced renting of rooms. Is that true? Is that true? Will you force people to bring homosexuals into their homes to rent a room? Well if it's more than one room, under your law they have to bring them in. So Mrs. Brown who is 68 years old and has two or three rooms in her house in Saskatoon around the university or here or Prince Albert or whatever, and she says no, I just don't want to do that. And you said, under the law you have to, Mrs. Brown, in good old Saskatchewan. But you say, well I won't do that. Well then why not?

Mr. Speaker, I think I've given enough examples to tell you . . . I think I've given you enough examples and I will a lot more why this Bill is flawed. The NDP, as they have in agriculture and as they have in health care and as they have in the budget and they have in taxes and they have on so many things, have not thought out at all what they should be doing. All they can do is say, well we got elected in Saskatchewan and there was a \$14 billion deficit, therefore we have the right to do whatever we want. That's what they say.

Well they campaigned against the deficit as if it was something that they were going to deal with and they've added to it. They've raised taxes. They did not tell the truth on any of the above, and then they brought this in. Do you think you'd have been elected on this Bill? Go home and try it. Think you'd get elected on your agriculture programs, on your health care programs?

Mr. Speaker, I've made some initial comments why I'm against this Bill, and I sincerely hope the Attorney General decides to pull it, and I move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 55

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Shillington that **Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979** be now read a second time.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be making some remarks on Bill 55 today that I think show that the government has not done a good, consultative job in regards to the impact of this Bill on Saskatchewan society, Saskatchewan workplace, and the ramifications that would occur, Mr. Speaker, if we don't have this government stop and listen once in a while to the people that they supposedly are representing.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the last two days in question period the official opposition has been asking the Premier of our province some very pointed questions about employment, the government's record on employment, what we as a province can look forward to on the economic side over the next few years, and, Mr. Speaker, we have consistently had replies that the Premier says, be happy, everything's okay. Don't worry, be happy, everything's okay. We're on track; there's no problem out there.

Mr. Speaker, what the Saskatchewan business coalition did when they sent this open letter to the Premier was say that that simply isn't the truth. They are saying that pessimism, frustration, and anger have grown across Saskatchewan in recent weeks.

I think most people in the province, Mr. Speaker, in the business community, expected when the government brought forward the *Partnership for Renewal* last fall, that there were more than words

attached to that document.

Do you remember last summer, Mr. Speaker? This House was in session all summer long. We had just gone through the GRIP debate. We had the government unilaterally changing the rules of this House to suit their own purposes. We saw a whole segment of our society disenfranchised vis-a-vis the court system by this government. That this party of new-found democrats felt no problem at all in changing the rules of this legislature and taking the ability of citizens of this province to not be able to take the government to court. Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of people in the summer of 1992 beginning to wonder at this newly elected New Democratic Party government and their commitment to working with Saskatchewan people.

Well the government came along with the *Partnership for Renewal* document shortly after that, Mr. Speaker. And I think most people in the province — business community at least — was saying, Mr. Government, we're going to give you a second chance. This sounds good. This commitment that you made in the *Partnership for Renewal* to be consultative, to work with us, to meet some of those economic forecasts and numbers, it sounds good.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that goodwill that existed ever since last fall when the business community of this province said, Mr. Premier, we're going to give you a second chance after the member from Rosetown-Elrose had so dreadfully messed up the agricultural economy of this province, so dreadfully messed up the ability of agriculture in this province to be a contributor to Saskatchewan's economic well-being . . .

The business community said, we'll give you a second chance, if this economic strategy, if we're consulted on it, if we walk through it together, will give us the opportunity to employ more people, to stop job loss, to stop the out-migration of Saskatchewan people. The sad fact is, Mr. Speaker, that that out-migration has continued unabated, that the job numbers which the government keeps predicting and throwing out in their budget documents, we're coming nowhere close to fruition. That we see our university students graduating this spring with a high degree of pessimism, with a doom-and-gloom scenario hanging over our universities and our secondary education because they've gone out there and they've tested the job market and they're saying there is nothing there for me, that there is nothing new going on here.

And to compound it, Mr. Speaker, we have the Premier trundle off to New York and Toronto, Montreal. And I quoted from one of his speeches this morning, Mr. Speaker, and he has many speeches, evidently, that he uses. But in it, he talks about all of these glowing things that are happening in the province. And when one goes through the speech, Mr. Speaker, we realize that the glowing reports of Atomic Energy of Canada and Cargill and Hitachi and IBM and Northern Telecom and Weyerhaeuser were all things that were on the go before.

(1245)

Now, Mr. Speaker, Bill 55, which became well known to the business community a short time ago, has some components in it that flies directly in the face of what the Premier goes to New York or Toronto and talks about, which Main Street, Saskatchewan have been talking about particularly since the budget because it has the ability, Mr. Speaker, to raise the cost of doing business. It has the ability to see more lay-offs occur. It has the ability to drive our unemployment numbers up instead of down.

It is one of the symptoms, Mr. Speaker, of what this open letter to the Premier of our province by the Saskatchewan business coalition are talking about. They are saying that this is a betrayal of your promises in the *Partnership for Renewal* document.

And it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, when you go through the update that the Minister of Economic Development so hurriedly passed around to the media yesterday after question period, a supposed update that is presented to the people of Saskatchewan as further proof that this *Partnership for Renewal* is working.

And it is just so much fluff, Mr. Speaker. It is so much fluff that it isn't worth the paper that it is printed on. I don't know what this particular little item cost Saskatchewan taxpayers to put together, but you know the concerns that are raised in Bill 55, the concerns that they raised on Bill 55 about the potential, the potential of another \$200 million in business costs aren't addressed here at all, Mr. Speaker.

I think every member of this Legislative Assembly should take the time to look at this document. If this is what was supposed to pacify the business community, if this was what was supposed to say to our university graduates there is hope for the future, then once again I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is not worth the paper it is printed upon. Because this doesn't talk about one single job, not one job.

Bill 55, Mr. Speaker, even if one would take the minister's total assurance, total and absolute assurance, says that costs are going up. Costs are going up. But in the minister's words these costs can easily be borne by the Saskatchewan business community because they're on a roll. All the indicators are looking up. They're on a roll. These costs, even at the minister's minimum, will have no impact.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the actual folks out there that have faced the increases in income tax, in sales tax, in utilities — you know, the telephone, the power, the natural gas — the things that they do every morning when they open their business up and turn on the lights, all of those things that have gone up unabated every six months since this government came to power, means that even the minister's minimum, Mr. Speaker, is causing a lot of consternation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you get down to the application, the actual application, as well-meaning as the minister may be, we know, Mr. Speaker, that other things begin to happen. Mr. Speaker, this Bill supposedly was brought in to protect workers and provide a basis that would decrease unemployment and that it would further a business's ability to protect its own workers.

Mr. Speaker, the critiques that are coming in from the people that will actually have to do the implementation show us that this simply isn't the case. They are looking at things like the half a billion dollars in offloading onto the property tax base that are going to occur in the next four years as per the budget document. So they're saying, I know that my school board is setting mill rates for the coming school year. They know that things are going to change at the mill rate structure, that there are going to be additional costs.

That's why people in SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association) are saying, whoa this particular Bill has implications for us that on top of everything else mean that the cost of business goes up. I think you will shortly see people from SUMA and SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), once they understand the implications tied to much of that budget document start to hit home, that say, whoa there are some additional costs here.

All of these people Mr. Speaker, have watched this government in the area of health care. They have watched the provincial Minister of Health hack and slash her way through rural Saskatchewan, which has a lot of impact on a lot of smaller communities. They're seeing Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, and Moose Jaw with lay off, but what they're also seeing is an offloading, once again, of health care costs.

Issues that used to be dealt with by the provincial government are now back in the hands of individuals. In the case of Bill 55 it appears that we are going to see health costs that formerly were borne by the taxpayer, by the province, in a universal sense now offloaded onto a specific sector.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the track record of this government and this particular Minister of Health and her attitude, then it is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 55 engenders a lot of concern from the people that employ the vast majority of workers in this province.

They are saying, Mr. Speaker, and they understand about a system that is now actuarially sound, that operates without a deficit, and has provided some of the highest levels of benefits in the country.

Now these are business people, Mr. Speaker, that have listened long and hard to this Premier and his various ministers of Finance talk about putting the provincial economy back on track; talk about being actuarially sound; talking about all of these nice financial terms. And then they find themselves where

they have been participating in a system that is actuarially sound, operating without deficits, and providing some of the highest benefits in the country, come under attack.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they know that in other jurisdictions where these basic premises were not followed — in places like Ontario and places like British Columbia and others — they have large operating deficits in the account; that they aren't actuarially sound any more. And at the end of the day, the benefit part of it has not been up to snuff with what Saskatchewan has been able to provide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the average business person out there who pays his property tax on both his home and his business, who pays all of these increases to senior level of government on an ongoing six-month basis, and he says: you want me to now give up a system that is actuarially sound, that has no deficits in the account, that it has a surplus, that provides benefits to my employees, that rank in the top of the country; and you want me to exchange that for a system which may be like others. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they then write open letters to the Premier and say that the *Partnership for Renewal* document is flawed, that it isn't coming through with what you promised.

That's why the demand for an economic summit, Mr. Speaker, with this Premier and his cabinet is right on the money. Because this is one of the items that should be put into the mix; that should be stacked up against the *Partnership for Renewal* document and judged according to its merits, judged according to its ability to meet the Minister of Finance's projections that are now 16,000 jobs below where they should be.

And I would agree with one thing, Mr. Speaker — that those projections made by the Minister of Finance are probably what this province needs in order to meet some minimum economic recovery, some minimum economic wherewithal to even come close to what the Minister of Finance has projected over the next four years.

The questions we have asked in the interim supply, Mr. Speaker, about what is happening out there on Main Street, Saskatchewan with things like increase in sales tax — what has that done as far as employment? What has that done as far as cash flow? What has that done for walk-through traffic and tourism? Those kinds of issues that we ask and are denied on an everyday business are the very questions that the business community in this province also is asking, Mr. Premier . . . or Mr. Speaker. And they don't get the answers from the Premier and his ministers that they right and proper should.

Mr. Speaker, my home community just went through it with this government over the issue of the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) and the communications centre in Moose Jaw — 200-and-some jobs; over \$7 million in payroll per year. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? Very few answers. Very few answers. Frustration; frustration on Main Street, Moose Jaw; frustration by

the civic administration; frustration by the downtown business district, on and on and on. Because there are no answers.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.

They're saying the document obviously has some flaws. It's off track. Even then, Mr. Speaker, they don't reject it out of hand. They say, we're willing to sit down with you in full view of the public and discuss where the shortcomings are.

One of the shortcomings that's been identified, Mr. Speaker, is Bill 55. What they have done, Mr. Speaker, is take the worst case scenario and the best case scenario, they have sawed it off at various levels depending on what happens to economic growth in this province, and they're saying that it doesn't meet the criteria of the government's own document.

In other words this Bill removes control from those who pay the bill and puts it in the hands of government. What that does, Mr. Speaker, in effect amounts to taxation without representation. Mr. Speaker, as you know, one of the basic tenets of this parliamentary system that we have demands that with taxation always goes representation and the responsibility to implement it fairly and properly.

They are saying, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 55 is missing the mark because it is in effect taxation without representation. It is a change that puts the whole system of workers' compensation at risk.

What happens, Mr. Speaker, given the government's earned track record, in areas such as the construction industry? Given the government's current track record if those numbers continue to slide, if this 16,000 becomes 18,000, becomes 20,000, fewer and fewer people paying more and more puts the system in jeopardy.

The business community is saying the only way to keep these minimums that the minister so proudly talks about is to have the unemployment numbers going down, the number of jobs going up, and the ability to pay being lessened on all parts of the system that supports workmen's compensation. How else can injured workers, Mr. Speaker, expect to get the benefits that they rightly deserve? How else can they expect to get those benefits if the very people that employ them don't have the ability to pay, if there's fewer and fewer of them all the time?

They're saying to the government, your document is flawed. And in order to meet those criteria, to meet those numbers, you must sit down with us and talk about the solutions.

For two days, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has had the opportunity to stand on his feet in this legislature and give that commitment. I don't know of a businessman in this province that wouldn't shut his store, his business down, Mr. Speaker, for whatever amount of time it takes to meet with the Premier of Saskatchewan.

The Speaker: — Order, order. It now being 1 p.m. this House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday.