

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Stanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the Legislative Assembly a friend, a constituent, and a former colleague of many of you: Bob Long. Bob used to be the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) from Cut Knife-Lloydminster and was also the minister of Highways, and he is visiting here today. So I'd like all of you to welcome Bob to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to introduce to you and through you to my colleagues in the Assembly today 14 students from Riceton, which is a wonderful small town in my constituency. The students are accompanied by their teacher, Laurel Herman, and the teacher's aide, Bev Ulrich. And I'm really looking forward to meeting with them later on this morning to answer some of their questions and have a photograph taken.

So I ask all members here to join me in welcoming them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Bradley: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would also like to extend a warm welcome to the students from Riceton. They're from the school division that I formerly taught in Prairie View, and of course I used to live down the road from Riceton, at Gray. So just a warm welcome, glad to see you here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Scott: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, two very important people in your gallery, my children Adam and Heidi. They don't have school today and they wanted to come and see how hard we work here today, and I'm sure that everyone will join me in welcoming them and be on their best behaviour. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you some adult students from Victoire who are attending the Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technologies. They're seated in your gallery.

With them today is their teacher Eric Langley; two chaperons, Wayne Lachance and Gilles Chiasson; and the bus driver, Harry Bear. And I would ask the members of the Assembly to welcome them here this morning.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, along with the member from Turtleford, welcome the students and the teacher and introduce them in their own language, Mr. Speaker.

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

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Electoral Boundaries Legislation

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this morning my question is to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister, yesterday I sent the Premier a letter outlining a proposal on the electoral boundaries legislation which you brought into this legislature last week. Under this proposal, Mr. Minister, there would be 56 provincial ridings created by dividing each federal riding into four provincial ridings.

Mr. Minister, we feel that this proposal addresses all areas that your government has in mind when you introduced your legislation, and that would be cost, fairness, effectiveness, and political neutrality. In fact we feel that it improves on the government's proposal in all of these areas.

I'm not asking you, Minister, to pass judgement on this plan. What I'm going to ask you to do though this morning is to give the Electoral Boundaries Commission the opportunity to evaluate this proposal and any other proposal without undue influence from the government.

Mr. Minister, will you remove the restrictions you have placed on the Boundaries Commission, namely the number of seats and the variance, and will you allow them to make that determination themselves after studying our proposal, your proposal, and any other proposal that may come forward?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. We had seen the news reports with respect to his press conference, and the Premier has, as he mentioned, received a letter which we are considering and which we will reply to.

I think there are positive elements to the member's suggestion, one of which is that they apparently agree that we have to have a better equality between various constituencies in Saskatchewan. And I think his proposal was based on that assumption, that that would be a desirable thing, and we're pleased about that.

I think there are some problems with his proposal, and in a press interview I mentioned some of those. But I was careful not to be too negative about it. Just because there's problems doesn't mean that the whole thing is worthless.

So I want to say to the member that we are in the process of considering his proposal. The Premier will be responding to his letter in due course. I can't say that I hold out a great deal of hope that we could accept the proposal as he put it forward. But as the member knows, we're prepared to consider any constructive suggestion with respect to any of our Bills, and we're treating this one in the same light.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister. Mr. Minister, we were simply responding to your call for cooperation. You've asked the opposition to cooperate in this particular endeavour of yours. So I think, Mr. Minister, you understand that when too many restrictions are put on an Electoral Boundaries Commission, there's always charges arising by others that the government of the day, by bringing through legislation, using their majority, are using it to their own advantage.

Now, Mr. Minister, I think that the independent commission that you've asked us to cooperate on could determine best for Saskatchewan people by giving them the power to determine the number of seats, the variance, and the way the boundaries should be drawn up.

And I say again, let them examine our proposal, let them examine your proposal, and any other proposal that might come along. Because I think, Mr. Minister, in all fairness, that is the only way that Saskatchewan electors and taxpayers are going to get what they truly want, and that is to have good, effective representation in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well I want to remind the member that in my second-reading speech yesterday I referred specifically to this question of the suspicion that opposition members have that the government may try to draw the map to its own advantage. And I was at pains yesterday to explain movements that were made as long ago as 1971 away from the gerrymandering kind of situation that we had experienced in this province in previous years. And I think we've done that through an Electoral Boundaries Commission which is, I believe, the fairest model that we in this province, or indeed in this country, have yet come up with. And I've invited the member to participate in that and I believe that he's going to. So we will depoliticize that whole process.

We were reluctant to . . . well we in fact did not consider leaving to the commission the question of how many seats there should be. That has always been a decision that this legislature has made in any redistribution. The prime motivating factor in this redistribution is the fact that we have to reduce the size of this Assembly. The people just demand it of us and we have to respond to that. So rather than refer that question to a commission, how many seats there will be, we thought it more than appropriate in this financial situation to tell the commission how many

seats there should be and let them then draw the lines.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the member thinks it's a good idea to cooperate with respect to this type of legislation. We did not feel that from you when we were in opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, the only problem with the way your approach is — and you can give the most well-meaning second-reading speech you want in here, as you've done on a number of other Bills, to try and assuage the worries of Saskatchewan voters and taxpayers — but I tell you, Mr. Minister, they don't always accept your second-reading speeches at face value.

Because what it amounts to, it's like Henry Ford once said, Mr. Minister: you can have any colour you want as long as it's black, when he was talking about the way he built his cars.

Well your legislation that you brought in basically gives that kind of instructions to the commission. You know, you can have any colour you want as long as it's black and it's the NDP (New Democratic Party) way.

Now, Mr. Minister, you can draw your boundaries any way you want. But if your system stands all the tests of fairness, of cost saving, of effective representation — as you say it does — then why are you afraid to let it be evaluated by an independent commission?

The Premier has said . . . And all we're asking the Premier is, remove any restrictions from an independent commission and let them do their job for the best interests of the Saskatchewan people. Mr. Minister, don't just paint the colour of the car black. Let Saskatchewan voters and taxpayers have a choice of the colour that they want.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that we won't be drawing the boundaries. That's what this independent commission is all about. And I don't think the member is attacking that commission and its composition in any way at all.

I want also to say to the member that we're not painting anything black. We're trying to come up with something that works and something that responds to the expressed wish — we've all heard it — of the Saskatchewan people that we bring down the size of this Assembly and reduce it.

We have selected the number 58. I've made it clear there's nothing magic about that number. It just seemed to us to be an appropriate reduction because it reduces the size of this place by 12 per cent, which is significant.

I want also to say to the member that he should not just assume that we're totally negative about his suggestion. It just seems to us that there's a lot of problems. That map is based on data, on census data that dates back to 1986, and we know from the enumeration done in the last . . . in the referendum campaign, that there are significant differences in the sizes of the federal constituencies, that weren't present, there now. We've got fresh numbers in 1991, so it just seems to us more logical that we draw this map based upon the most recent data and not the second-last census data.

But having said that, I want to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that we are giving serious consideration to his letter, and we will be fully responding to it as soon as we can.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the same minister. Mr. Minister, if the commission is truly independent . . . As you've said yourself, there was no magic when you selected 58. You just reached up and plucked it out of the air one day. We have come forward with a proposal which is based on a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fifty-six is because of the number of federal ridings. There was no magic to it. I guess we could have had five members per federal riding, but the wish of Saskatchewan taxpayers to cut back on this Assembly, as you've said, meant that you should go with a number less than what we have. It seemed logical then at 56. The Liberal leader may come in with a proposal that is at 57 or 55 — I don't know — based on another premise that she feels is equitable.

Now, Mr. Minister, there should be no fear in the hearts of this New Democratic Party government to allow a commission of independent men and women from the province of Saskatchewan to pass judgement on those various proposals, to see which has the proper merit as far as cost cutting, fairness, and effectively delivering equal representation on behalf of citizens of the third largest province in Confederation as far as land area. I would think that is the type of chore we would want to charge the commission with, Mr. Minister. Your legislation prohibits that.

Mr. Minister, why do you have fear in allowing that to happen? Mr. Minister, please respond.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, fear is not one of the emotions that affect our judgement in this situation. Fear has nothing to do with it.

We have problems though tying our wagon to the star of the federal electoral boundaries rules. We are trying to put forward a Bill here that will continue year after year, so it won't be necessary to . . . or census after census so it won't be necessary to come back to this House with a fresh piece of legislation every time it comes time to redistribute the constituency boundaries. And we're reluctant to tie that idea to the

federal legislation which permits a plus or minus 25 per cent in the Act. And that number just doesn't work for us. We're not prepared to accept plus or minus 25 per cent because it damages so badly the principle of one person, one vote, which is an ideal to which we all want to move. It's a sound democratic principle.

Now in the last federal distribution they actively achieved less than plus or minus 5, which is what we got on the Bill. And that's good. But of course the next time they redistribute they may not do that. They are allowed to vary by as much as 25. Now maybe that works in a federal electoral situation where you have the vast kind of territories that they have to draw seats in, but it doesn't work in Saskatchewan, demonstrably so. We know that from the last distribution. It does not work. So we're reluctant to tie our legislation to that.

Now the member is . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Economic Policy

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, yesterday we saw the Saskatchewan business coalition become so frustrated that they started running their own advertising campaigns. And today we see the Saskatchewan Construction Association is doing the same thing.

Mr. Premier, these groups would rather be meeting and working with the government than working against it. These are groups that would rather be spending their money on job creation and economic activity rather than on advertising to get their messages through to the government.

The problem is, Mr. Premier, that the government isn't listening. This is the only step left for these people to try and get their message through to you. Mr. Premier, why don't you meet with and start working with the business community instead of against them?

And I know that the Premier or one of his ministers will stand up and say that you're meeting with these people all the time. But will you really meet with them and listen?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I want to tell the hon. member opposite that we really have been meeting with them and that we will really meet with them in the future.

I indicated to you yesterday, to the Leader of the Conservative Party, that we had met with the new president of the chamber on Tuesday night for a couple of hours to deal with legislation and potential amendments. And I know my colleague, the Minister of Labour, has met with them often. And one shouldn't

be surprised that the business community will try to lobby the government to get Acts and legislation that better meet the needs of the business community, much as labour will lobby and try to get amendments or settlements of contracts that will be in their best interest. None of this should surprise anyone, that this is the process that we are now going through.

But as far as meeting with the business community of Saskatchewan, the Premier has on many occasions . . . I know he's meeting with business people this weekend in Saskatoon. We have meetings planned in the weeks ahead with chambers of commerce around the province. And I want to tell the member that we really will be meeting with business people, as we have been in the past.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, it's good to know that the Premier is making his presence available to business. The only problem is, he's not listening while he's present.

Mr. Premier, your minister stood in the House and said that the union-only preference policy in contracting was not going to cost the taxpayers any extra money. But the contractors don't believe this, Mr. Minister. The people who work in the industry have seen firsthand how your government has tried to secretly change its policies.

And they can tell you how much money this change is going to cost. According to the Saskatchewan Construction Association your new tendering policy is going to cost as much as 239 million extra dollars this year alone — 239 million. At a time when you are asking every person in the province to sacrifice, at a time when we're struggling to create jobs and get the economy going, how do you justify this totally unnecessary expenditure of an extra \$239 million?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to the hon. member opposite that as the investment dealers of the country have indicated, the reason for the slower than normal growth in Saskatchewan has little to do with whether there are union contracts as you had in the past or non-union contracts as you had in the past. The fact of the lower growth in the province is due to the wind-down of some very, very unsatisfactory investments that you people made in the past few years leading up to the election. And they say very clearly that it's due in large part to the megaproject sector which is wrapping up.

Now for you to insist that we go out and borrow another billion dollars to build another Rafferty or to build another Co-op upgrader doesn't seem to be in the best interest of contractors, taxpayers, or the people of the province of Saskatchewan. The simple fact is that the rating agencies tell us over and over again that there is a real damper put on economic development in this province because of the problem we have of digging out from under the \$15 billion in

debt that was left by you people.

But on the positive side, in the first quarter of this year, in the oil sector with no subsidy from taxpayers, we have seen 184 per cent growth in the oil and gas sector, with no subsidies, no subsidies. Housing construction in the province . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, you talk about the investment dealers and their comments. They commented in 1990 that the projects being brought forward by the previous administration were good and worthwhile projects. And in fact when you go to New York now, you use those very investments as an example of how . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Please give the member from Souris-Cannington a chance to ask his question.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you go to New York you use these very investments as an example of diversification and the benefits to Saskatchewan. When you come home you use a totally different story.

Mr. Minister, your policies are going to cost, according to business in this province, an extra \$239 million a year, and this is from the government that promised to be open and accountable. Mr. Minister, this \$239 would operate 52 hospitals for five and a half years; \$239 million would pay for a thousand nurses for five and a half years; it would fund the drug plan for 24 years; it would provide children's dental care for 24 years . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The member has to ask his question. I wish the member would put his question directly.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why is it more important, Mr. Minister, to spend \$239 million on your anti-business agenda rather than on these other items?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. member that he may have misspoke himself but the \$239 he mentioned is probably closer to the fact than any other number that he has mentioned.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member should be aware of the growth in the province in the past 12 months in a number of areas that is occurring without any support or assistance from the taxpayers of the province. And I want to list them out because they obviously don't know. Housing starts . . .

An Hon. Member: — It's not because of you either.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — No, I'm telling you, it's not as a result of government. That's right, it's not as a result of government.

We're not taking hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars and plugging it into Raffertys and Co-op upgraders. These are happening without any incentives from the government.

Now you may not know about any economic development without government support, but I want to tell you about some. Housing starts last year, up by 65 per cent; this year, up by 80 per cent. In the oil and gas sector in the first quarter of 1993, up by 184 per cent; that's significant. Our non-traditional exports last year, up by 15 per cent; that it is important. And in every one of these areas, the business people are saying: Saskatchewan, people, is a good place to invest now that we have a government that is dealing with the \$15 billion deficit that you people brought in.

Now you may argue for more megaprojects. You may argue for more of these deep holes dug in the ground that people look at and marvel at. We're seeing if we can turn them into tourist attractions, but we just haven't quite got to that point. We're looking at places where they . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Next question.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister talks about the oil industry. The reason the oil industry is moving in this province is because you haven't changed the policy that was put in place under the Tory administration.

Mr. Minister, I'd like to read a quote to you from the *Leader-Post*:

"If you put the emphasis on tax increases, you are going to discourage investment, slow growth, and it will be counter-productive. You will not achieve the kinds of deficit-reduction figures you want . . ."

This is what a Mr. Russell said.

Mr. Minister, at a time when you're asking everybody to tighten your belt — their belts — why don't you show some leadership and save Saskatchewan taxpayers the \$239 million by simply giving contracts to the lowest qualified bidder as the construction association is asking?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to members opposite that when they were in government, they did projects using union contracts. My understanding is that Rafferty was a union contract project. And if you go to that project and look at it today, you will see a project that was designed by your government, whether union or non-union, that turned out to be a bad deal. Hundreds of millions of dollars of wasted taxpayers' money which has nothing to do with whether it was union or non-union.

You'll see a boat ramp up on the side of a hill. If you go to Rafferty, you'll see a boat ramp that was built by

your government that cost a great deal of money, up on the side of a hill. There isn't water within 10 miles of the boat ramp.

Now this has nothing to do with union or non-union, nothing to do with union or non-union. Are you blaming the unions for the fact that Rafferty was built? Come, my friend, that simply isn't accurate. That was bad decisions by your government. Bad decision . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and to the minister responsible for Economic Development. I want to ask you a question about your vast volume of improved business and the quality of life.

Go to Swift Current and speak to the chamber of commerce in Swift Current and you ask them — and they gave you a roasting too, Mr. Minister — you go ask them whether they are accurate in their . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Will the member please direct his question through the Chair rather than any particular member in the House.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, the people there were not very happy with you or the member from Swift Current for the kinds of economic development that they have there.

Would you provide us an answer to the reason why they're dealing so greatly with their retail sales in the business community in Medicine Hat versus the people in Swift Current. Would you provide us the reason why they're doing that?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to address the hon. member and his issue on Swift Current by saying to him that one of the big issues in Swift Current is a project called Impact Packaging started by your government, which is now closed, which cost the taxpayers of this province \$17 million and now sits on the edge of town, a huge project, empty and no workers in it — \$17 million put there by you people with all the equipment and no one working there.

You made that decision. You were on the treasury benches at that time. The leader was I believe minister of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) at the time the project was brought in. And you have the audacity to sit there and ask why we have to raise the provincial sales tax by a per cent this year. It's to pay for the boondoggles that sit in Swift Current empty as a result of your misguided economic policy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, it's time you got on your horse and rode over to find out and see what was going on in the industry so that you could get business into that community. That's what

your responsibility is, and providing assistance to the community on the basis that the project was good. It was an opportunity for economic development in the province of Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Minister, is a fact.

I want to say to you also, Mr. Minister, that why are the people going to Medicine Hat — that's the question — why are they going to Medicine Hat to purchase goods? And the reason as indicated in the *Leader-Post*, Mr. Minister, the reason is indicated in the *Leader-Post*. It says that if you raise the taxes too high, the people in the province will go elsewhere. On the west side of the province they do that, Mr. Minister. Why are 240 cars sitting in the parking lots in Medicine Hat versus Swift Current in dealing with the retail sales? Why is that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to say this to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. Clearly there are problems with the sales tax on the west side of the province. Nobody doubts that. Nobody wonders about it. It was a problem when you were in government; it's a problem now.

But I want to tell you why the provincial sales tax had to be increased. All the bond rating agencies know, all of the people in eastern Canada know, and I believe most of the people in Saskatchewan know the reason the tax regime had to be changed was to deal with the \$15 billion debt that is consuming a larger and larger portion of the taxpayers' money of this province.

One of the projects is the very project in Swift Current, the area you talk about, Impact Packaging. How was the decision made to put that amount of taxpayers' money into a project that has never delivered product anywhere. It sits empty. We're trying to sell it. You made that decision. That's why the taxes of this province are as high as they are — because of the \$15 billion debt. If the debt was 5 billion, we wouldn't have had to increase taxes; in fact we could have lowered them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Order.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 88 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Provincial Court Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

TABLING OF REPORTS

The Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I'd like to table pursuant to section 222(1) of The Election Act a report respecting annual fiscal returns of registered political parties for the fiscal year 1992.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, for question 112 I believe I have a response that I'd like to table.

The Speaker: — Response tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 77 — An Act respecting the Implementation of Certain Treaty Land Entitlement Settlement Agreements

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure, my distinct pleasure today to rise to move second reading of The Treaty Land Entitlement Implementation Act.

On September 22, 1992, an historic Indian land agreement was signed by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Saskatchewan entitlement bands, and our own Premier.

I was present with the Premier on September 22, 1992, as the minister responsible, Mr. Speaker. I'll never forget the day. It was a beautiful fall day, typical of a fall day in Saskatchewan — nice, hot, high sun, wind blowing. And we were gathered in the outdoor amphitheatre at Wanuskewin which is the site of Indian encampments and constant use for thousands of years. The site, Mr. Speaker, lent a sense of history, almost timeless history to our purpose there that day. And the scene, Mr. Speaker, was one of powerful emotion to the accompaniment of traditional Indian singing.

The Prime Minister and the Premier signed the agreement. And then in a ceremony filled with emotions that were overpowering, the chiefs of the entitlement bands accompanied by members of their council came forward, sat at the table, and signed the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, no one present will ever forget the drama and the excitement of those moments. No one present will forget the dignity and the bearing of the proud leaders, the chiefs of the first nations, first nations who once owned and occupied all of the land that we now call Saskatchewan, as they came forward to sign the document that will finally deliver the land promised to them at the time of the treaties more than a century ago. I and all other people at that ceremony were indeed deeply moved.

The purpose of the legislation before the Assembly today is to give full effect on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan to certain provisions contained in the Treaty Land Entitlement Framework Agreement. A companion legislation has been approved by the Parliament of Canada.

Our government is very proud to have played a part in concluding this historic agreement. We were and are strongly committed to working with first nations people to resolve the debts of the past and to forge a better future for all Indian people.

I believe that Indian people must be full partners in decisions that affect their lives and communities. The agreements signed last September are an expression of that partnership. We have honoured both Indian treaty land entitlements as well as the province's obligations under the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement of 1930. This is a significant beginning, Mr. Speaker — an historic achievement.

Before outlining the specific provisions of the Bill, I'd like to briefly review the events which led this province to the signing of the treaty land entitlement agreements and the need for the legislation that is before the Assembly today.

Between 1874 and 1906 Canada entered into certain treaties with bands of Indians residing on land which is, I say, is now the province of Saskatchewan. These treaties, Mr. Speaker, required Canada to provide to each family of five, one square mile of land or 128 acres per person.

In 1930 Canada transferred to Saskatchewan all Crown lands, including minerals and other natural resources within the province. This transfer, however, was not without its conditions. Under the terms of that agreement, the province was and is obliged to set aside out of the unoccupied Crown lands transferred to it such further lands as the federal government may require to fulfil its treaty obligations with first nations.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, it has been obvious to the Governments of Canada and of Saskatchewan that there were not sufficient unoccupied Crown lands and certainly not adequate unoccupied Crown lands to fulfil the outstanding treaty land entitlements. For many years this fact frustrated attempts by governments to meet their moral and legal obligation to first nations.

In 1990 the long awaited breakthrough in this impasse came about based on a report issued by the Office of the Treaty Commissioner. And I want here today to commend the Treaty Commissioner, Cliff Wright, for the splendid work that he did in finally breaking this very difficult impasse. At the heart of the commissioner's report is the concept that governments could provide dollars rather than specific land in order to meet their obligations.

This concept, dollars instead of land, formed the foundation of the Treaty Land Entitlement Framework Agreement. The agreement marks the beginning of a new chapter in the relationship between the Government of Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan's first nations. Indian first nations which are a party to these agreements have never received the land promised in the treaties. These promises are now being met.

More importantly, first nations are now receiving sufficient monies and lands to allow for the creation of a strong economic base — a base from which to build and to improve their society and their way of life. Saskatchewan and its people are also presented with the unique opportunity for economic development and diversification in partnership with its first nations.

Mr. Speaker, while the negotiations culminating in that framework agreement were between the entitlement bands and the Governments of Saskatchewan and Canada, the concerns and needs of the municipal governments and the school divisions were not ignored. Over the next 12 years approximately \$450 million will be provided to Saskatchewan bands. This funding will permit the purchase of approximately 1.7 million acres of land which will be eligible to receive reserve status.

Throughout the process the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association were consulted. In addition to providing for the lands and the monies, as I mentioned, which will be received by first nations, provision has also been made in the agreement for the establishment of two tax-loss compensation funds. One for rural municipalities and the second for the rural school divisions. Each of these funds contains \$25 million. Provisions in the Bill now before the Assembly provide for the establishment and administration of tax-loss compensation funds for school divisions through amendments proposed to The Education Act.

Provision is also made to authorize urban municipalities to enter into binding agreements with Indian bands with respect to tax-loss compensation, by-law compatibility, and dispute resolution. Under the Framework Agreement, these agreements are necessary as a prerequisite to the establishment of Indian reserves in urban municipalities.

Further amendments to The Rural Municipality Act are proposed to confirm the obligations in municipalities receiving tax-loss compensation to maintain roads within, adjacent to, or providing access to new reserves at the ordinary standards that apply.

Mr. Speaker, the education of our youth is the key to our future. We all agree on that, and nowhere is this more important than among the children of our first nations. As the size of reserves grow through land acquisition, existing facilities owned and operated by school divisions may more logically be transferred to first nations in some cases. Amendments to The Education Act will authorize school divisions to sell facilities to bands and will provide for an impartial arbitrator to set the price in the northern school divisions.

My government, Mr. Speaker, places a high value on the establishment of formal and structured relations between municipalities and first nations. In the weeks and months ahead, we will be making every effort to facilitate this important relationship.

I wish to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, the significant contributions which were made by Mr. Bernard Kirwan, the president of the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), and Mr. Daryl Chambers, the executive director of SARM. I also should mention very, very emphatically the role played by Chief Roland Crowe and First Vice-Chief Dan Bellegarde of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations. President Ken Krawetz and executive director Craig Melvin from the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association have made a significant contribution to this process. Without question, the Treaty Land Entitlement Agreement is a product of their leadership and their vision and their dedicated effort to resolve the problems that were posed by this very important and historic step.

I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday in Saskatoon there was a very large conference convened by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and attended by the people I have just mentioned as well as many other municipal, education, and community and industry leaders in Saskatchewan.

It was a full house in a large conference room in the Bessborough hotel in Saskatoon, and the subject was the Treaty Land Entitlement Agreement and how things would work under the agreement and how their relationship would develop and how they would manage it. It is the first of many such meetings.

And the spirit in the room, I am happy to report, was positive, constructive, and very, very cooperative. There were a lot of good vibrations among the people there and I think that it launches a process which will be important in the implementation of the Treaty Land Entitlement Agreement.

(1045)

Mr. Speaker, most of the land purchased by bands will be transferred to Canada and provided with reserve status. And that process is of course known to us and it will be the situation here.

In keeping with tradition and the policies of the Canadian government, amendments to The Crown Minerals Act and The Water Corporation Act are proposed in this Bill to allow for the transfer of minerals and beds and shores of water bodies as set out in the agreement.

More specifically, Mr. Speaker, the province will be able to meet, where required, the expectation that minerals be transferred along with the reserve lands. The interests of current mineral disposition holders will of course be protected. These individuals will be able to negotiate separate agreements with first nations or continue under provincial programs for the duration of their lease.

Mr. Speaker, a standalone provision is also contained in this legislation which ensures that no unintentional reservations are withheld from reserve lands in favour of the province. This provision was insisted upon by

Canada during negotiations as a fail-safe measure to ensure that all provincial interests in lands to be designated as reserves are disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, the Treaty Land Entitlement Agreement is a landmark for which all Canadians can be proud, Indians and non-Indians alike. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge again, as I have in the past, the work and the encouragement from the members opposite, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition in his cabinet portfolio in the past government.

The commitments and decisions made by the previous government to proceed with these negotiations and to oversee the early stages of discussion and the negotiations for a cost-share agreement, set the province on a course which resulted in this historic achievement.

While I have to say, as I have also said in the past, that we were not happy with all aspects of the cost-sharing agreement that was negotiated, we made the decision to go with it and we will honour it. In this instance both sides of the House have been united in their commitment to do the right thing in this situation.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to ask for the continued support of all members of the House in the passage of this legislation. And I just might add, Mr. Speaker, while I'm congratulating ourselves and the members opposite, we can be justifiably proud of these accomplishments, but much credit must go to Indian elders and Indian leaders.

Over the many years, these individuals have made significant sacrifices and have shown the wisdom that was required by all persons who had an interest in those unresolved questions. With their support we have found a way to fulfil their vision and to pay this long-outstanding debt, and to do so in an honourable manner.

This has not been an easy process. But the results are most worthwhile and heartening. In these times of financial problems, we have I believe met our commitments to Indian people and met our legal obligations under the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, and we have done so in a financially responsible manner.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the words of our Premier at the signing of the framework agreement in September at the Wanuskewin park. And I quote:

We are reaffirming principles of natural justice. We are celebrating our links to the land. We are acknowledging a shared destiny. May we also live in mutual respect and genuine affection.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Treaty Land Entitlement Implementation Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just

respond briefly and then I'll adjourn debate for others to get into the discussion.

I want to make some observations that I believe will compare and correspond to what the Minister of Justice was saying to us earlier.

I believe that this agreement that has been reached in dealing with our entitlements to the native people in the province of Saskatchewan is significant. And the reason it is significant — it has gained support from all of the levels of government, it has gained support from the Indian community, and also from the non-Indian community.

And I believe that that's been done in two areas, Mr. Speaker, that I think are important. First is the area of compromise and consensus, a willingness to participate in compromise. And when you reach an agreement of this magnitude with this volume of people and the amount of players, there has been significant amount of flexibility on individuals' parts in order to have a consensus and a compromise reached.

And I want to say that we on this side of the House believe that this has been done. We believe that the volume of work required to make this happen has not just taken one decade, it's taken two decades to accomplish. And I believe that that is significant in the volume of discussion that has taken place.

And what it has done, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, it has moved the typical Canadian solution-making process into the focus of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. It has done that in a very clear and precise kind of a way. And it has done that by doing the two things that Canadian people are willing to do, and that is compromise, and from that compromise give a little bit, and in that light have a great deal of consensus reached.

And that has been done, as I said earlier, by all the levels of government. And I want to compliment the school trustees association. I want to compliment the SARM. I know that they have worked long and hard to make their membership aware of the details of the process, the details of the agreement, and they have worked hard to raise that positive consensus that they have made in endorsing the agreement that has been reached.

I want to point out to the Assembly that the people who negotiated on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan — going back to the former administration and even going back into the '70s when the government opposite was in power — these people need to be commended for their foundation, their groundwork, and the things and the decisions that they made.

I want to pay recognition to one of the people that worked on our behalf in relation to this, and that was Mr. Wakabayashi. And I believe that his insight into the kinds of things that we have in the agreement are an undercurrent of the kinds of things that he as an

individual felt and needed to be there. And I think that those are important for us to consider.

I want to compliment Mr. Wright on the way that he handled himself. And I believe that he not only gained credibility as the former mayor of Saskatoon, but also as an individual who respected the dignity of the individual. And I believe that that is important to consider.

I want to also say that without the help of people like Roland Crowe I don't think that this would have been accomplished. I really think that he needs to be complimented in a very, very special way in dealing with this because of his flexibility and also because of the credibility he had within the framework of the people that he represented. I believe that that is very significant in dealing with the whole, total concept of the negotiations but also in its relationship to the native community. I believe that that is very significant.

And I believe that the consensus reached on that basis is important, that we tell these people that they have achieved a milestone in the history of Saskatchewan. And I think that it's important for the players to be acknowledged as a part of that. I believe it's an important part for us as an Assembly to recognize the contribution they have made to society.

And I guess what I believe is significant is that we have all of these players and taking a time line that did not have a specific end time to complete the negotiations. It took that . . . it did not put any pressure on that time line to complete it. It became the part of an evolution of time.

And you know what I think, Mr. Speaker? — the public in the province of Saskatchewan agree with this. I believe they agree with it. And because of an agenda that did not qualify a time line, I believe that that was accomplished because of that very principle. And in the native community it didn't have a time line, and in the rest of society in Saskatchewan, it didn't have a time line. And that is significant in dealing with the kinds of things that we were talking about here.

Because you have to take time to sit down and let the people come with you to the point where they're agreeing with what's being done. I think that's happened here because the school trustees association and the SARM who are local people had their requirements met or their . . . the things that they wanted to have in the agreement, they were met, Mr. Speaker. And I believe that that took a time to develop.

I recall very clearly the first day that Mr. Kirwan decided to have Mr. Crowe at their district meetings throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I recall that very clearly, Mr. Speaker. And I said to myself, is this going to accomplish what Mr. Kirwan and the executive of SARM have set out to do?

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Crowe, through his capacity as an individual and as a communicator, did exactly accomplish what he set

out to do and it accomplished what SARM wanted to have happen. And I believe that's a good thing.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as we take a look at this Bill that establishes this entitlement for the claims that were set back in before my grandfather even came to this country, those kinds of claims are being addressed today in this Assembly.

I want to point out another thing that is significant to me in this. As my grandfather came to this country and he left property in the Ukraine — and he left a significant amount of property in the Ukraine, Mr. Speaker, and he came here — and if I went back there, I likely wouldn't get any back. But it is significant to me, Mr. Speaker, that we honour the things that our forefathers did in this country, and we respect that dignity. And to those people that lived here before, we respect their individual rights and freedoms and the things that they had. We're showing some respect for that even though the majority of people who came to this country had their properties taken away.

And so that is a significant milestone to bring those individuals who have had their land entitlements taken away from them from the countries they came from. And that, Mr. Speaker, is significant for the people of Saskatchewan to have moved to that extent and said to the people of the province, this is a good thing to do.

And so I want to say that I believe that the people in the province of Saskatchewan have moved, in my involvement in public life, from a position where they were firmly against this sort of thing to the place today where they will publicly say and accept what is going on here today. And I think that that's important for us to consider as a part of the evolution of this land entitlement.

(1100)

So I want to say, as I conclude my remarks, that I appreciate the speech the minister gave and I know that there are many people who agree with that, and I do as well. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, because I think there's others that have been directly involved in this discussion that will want to speak on it, I move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 78 — An Act to confirm an Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan varying the Saskatchewan Natural Resources Transfer Agreement

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of the Saskatchewan Natural Resources Transfer Agreement (Treaty Land Entitlement) Act.

As I said in my remarks on the previous Bill, Saskatchewan — that is the Governments of Saskatchewan and of Canada and of the Indian bands

in Saskatchewan — signed historic land settlement agreements on September 22 and September 23 of 1992.

The one on September 23, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to sign on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, and it was in connection with the specific claim of the Nikaneet Band in Saskatchewan, one of the entitlement bands.

These agreements contemplated, Mr. Speaker, that amendments would be made to the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement of 1930. This agreement, the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement, entered into between Canada and Saskatchewan, was duly approved at the time by both parliament and by this legislature. It was declared to have the force of law by an Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, entitled the Constitution Act of 1930.

The effect of the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement was to transfer to the province of Saskatchewan all Crown lands, minerals, and natural resources within the province. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, this transfer was subject to certain conditions including an obligation on the province to set aside out of the unoccupied Crown lands transferred to it, such further lands as the federal government may require to fulfil its obligations under the treaties with first nations.

With the successful conclusion of the Treaty Land Entitlement Framework Agreement, Saskatchewan's commitment to the entitlement bands under the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement is fulfilled. The debt has been paid.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan also agreed in the treaty land entitlement implementation Bill — will agree when that Bill is approved — to waive its rights under section 11 of the Natural Resources Transfer Agreement to one-half of future mineral revenues from new reserves.

This right has not historically been relied upon, and under the terms of the Treaty Land Entitlement Agreement, bands must pay full compensation for minerals acquired from the province. It would be unfair in those circumstances to claim back one-half of the revenue in these circumstances, and so we propose to deal with that in this Bill.

The Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada have amended the original Natural Resources Transfer Agreement as set out in the schedule attached to this Bill. In order to give this amendment the same force and effect as a constitutional document, it is necessary that this agreement be confirmed by this legislature and that similar recognition be provided by Canada through an Act of Parliament which has already happened. The Bill before us accomplishes the province's responsibility in regard to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I noted in my earlier remarks in this

Assembly that the successful conclusion to outstanding treaty land entitlements is of great historical significance and of great current importance to the first nations people of Saskatchewan. I was very pleased to note that the hon. member from Morse addressed this subject in such eloquent and positive terms in his intervention under the previous Bill. I think that he will agree with me that this legislation that I'm addressing now complements our broader undertakings under the previous Bill.

And I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to move second reading of the Saskatchewan Natural Resources Transfer Agreement.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just add to my remarks just a little bit of the things that I mentioned earlier.

In reaching a consensus, there are certain things that you have to give up, and one of the things that I believe is happening and is in this Bill perhaps to some extent and is in the other one, and that is the whole aspect of water and the water shore line and the water beds.

And I have pretty strong feelings about those rights because nobody else in the province of Saskatchewan has those rights and nobody . . . even the federal government doesn't have those rights of those natural resources in the context that we're giving them to the first nations.

And so there are certain things that have been given up by the public of Saskatchewan to have these rights enshrined in a piece of legislation. And I know that there are areas where other people have given up things that they figure are fairly significant.

And I just want to say that it is . . . unity is not the concept that everybody agrees. There is a willingness to participate in unity when some people are prepared to give up some of the things that they are prepared to . . . would have normally been prepared to fight for or defend or stand for.

And therefore consensus and unity is not that everybody necessarily agrees on the principles, but they have put aside their differences and said there is a better goal and a common goal to reach. And I believe that this is what we're doing with this Bill, and I recognize that.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that under the formation of the corporation, the Sask Water Corporation, I started that right from the very time it began in 1983 and 1984, and the concept . . . and going back in the history about water rights and individual privileges as it relates to water development in this province. And so I have some understanding of the significance and the value that it is.

And going back in my background, Mr. Speaker, my background is Dutch, and therefore I have a little bit of building dykes and holding thumbs in dykes and that sort of background. And I want to say to the Assembly

that I appreciate the willingness of people to compromise to gain consensus, and have compromised to gain unity because the goals and principles set out that are first and foremost.

And I know that other people want to have something to say about this legislation, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of debate also.

Debate adjourned.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 11:10 a.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

- Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Labour-sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act
- Bill No. 54 — An Act respecting the Department of Economic Development
- Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Heritage Property Act
- Bill No. 52 — An Act respecting Culture and Recreation
- Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan Act
- Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984
- Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act
- Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting Security Interests in Personal Property and making Consequential and Related Amendments to Certain Other Acts
- Bill No. 48 — An Act to amend The Police Act, 1990
- Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act
- Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The Certified Nursing Assistants Act
- Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Registered Nurses Act, 1988
- Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act
- Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act, 1981
- Bill No. 58 — An Act to amend The Northern Municipalities Act
- Bill No. 60 — An Act respecting Condominiums
- Bill No. 01 — An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Aldersgate College
- Bill No. 02 — An Act to incorporate the Bethany Bible Institute and to amend An Act to incorporate Mennonite Brethren Church of Saskatchewan
- Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The SaskEnergy Act
- Bill No. 44 — An Act respecting the Inspection of Gas Installations and Gas Equipment
- Bill No. 45 — An Act respecting the Inspection of Electrical Equipment, Installations and Materials
- Bill No. 75 — An Act to amend The Freehold Oil and Gas Production Tax Act
- Bill No. 76 — An Act to amend The Oil and Gas

Conservation Act
 Bill No. 51 — An Act to amend The Wildlife Act
 Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Corporation Capital Tax Act
 Bill No. 66 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act
 Bill No. 72 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act
 Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act
 Bill No. 68 — An Act respecting Financial Arrangements for Urban Parks
 Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend The Assessment Management Agency Act
 Bill No. 70 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984 (No. 2)
 Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act (No. 2)
 Bill No. 83 — An Act respecting Registered Psychiatric Nurses

Her Honour: — In Her Majesty's name I assent to these Bills.

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 11:15 a.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 82 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

The Chair: — I would ask the Associate Minister of Health to please introduce the officials who have joined us here this morning.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With me today is Mr. Wilmer Berg, who is the director of vital statistics and health insurance registration; and also Glenda Yeates, associate deputy minister, Department of Health.

Clause 1

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, in order to give the public some idea of just what exactly it is that you're trying to accomplish here, I wonder if you could put into your own words a brief summary of what the Bill is intended to do and what it will accomplish for the people of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I can do that. I'm sure the member's aware that the Minister of Health described the intent and so on of the Bill in her second-reading speech on the Bill, which I'm sure he's read and considered.

There is a body in Canada called the Uniform Law Conference that endeavours to bring our various provincial jurisdictions into uniformity when it comes to various laws and regulations. In this case the Uniform Law Conference of Canada has provided to each province a draft of a model change of name Act.

In essence what this Bill does is to bring our legislation into line with the model proposed by the Uniform Law Conference of Canada, and therefore bring our

legislation into uniformity with other provincial jurisdictions. And so there are essentially four amendments, each of them having to do with the process of change of name in our province.

The first amendment, as you will know from reading the Bill, revises the definitions of parent and lawful custody, so that someone who has lawful custody of a child under the age of . . . a person under the age of 18 could apply in that case for a change of name for the child.

The second amendment has to do with the removal of the requirements for spousal consent in the case of a change of name if one spouse or the other wishes to engage in a change of name or in children's names.

A third amendment provides a clearer definition in our legislation of what constitutes a legal name.

And the fourth amendment permits those persons who would be widowed, divorced, or whose marriages have been annulled to resume their previous surname without the current situation of having to submit a formal application and a fee.

I may say there is one further benefit here in that this will clarify some issues that are now in fact before the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I appreciate that quick overview which has jogged my memory back to the discussions we had on the Bill and has reopened my mind to the reading and studying of it that we did some time back.

I recall that the minister explained to us that there are certain names that can't be used. Or I guess what we should better say is there are certain forms of descriptive letterings and that kind of thing that people are not allowed to use as a name. Roman numerals, I particularly remember she made the comment of, cannot be used as a name. How far does this limitation of names go? Could you get into that just a little bit further. Just, you know, what kind of things can't you use for a name?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — The Act will indicate that the names that we will choose must be entirely written in characters of the Roman alphabet. The names that we will have filed, that is officially with vital stats, must just use characters of the Roman alphabet and therefore would disallow the use of any symbols, numerals, or characters. And in this what will not be allowed for the purposes of actual registration for vital statistics would be, for instance, the description Mary Brown senior, Mary Brown junior. The senior and junior could not be used in the actual registration of the name in vital stats. It would also disallow the, as you point out, the John Brown the first or second or third.

It should be made clear that that's only for the purposes of registration. If we want to use that in our common, everyday usage — if I wish to describe myself as the first or second or third or senior or junior

— that's fine. This only applies to the actual registration of the name with vital statistics.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I see the potential for a little bit of problem here because I know of a family that has three generations all named Bill. I guess William is probably the formal name. And we in our community have always referred to these people as Bill the first, Bill the second, and Bill the third, and I suspect that they have some considerable problems with their banking and with their post office deliveries of mail. Those kinds of thing must all be very confusing, in fact to the point where I sometimes wonder why people would continue to use the same name.

But the ability of them to be able to then register their name as, say, Bill the first, Bill the second, Bill the third, would seem to me to be able to assist the federal programs such as social insurance numbers, old age pension applications, drug card distributions. Those kinds of things must also be very confusing to know which one of those Bills is actually getting the bill, I guess.

Revenue Canada, for example — whose tax form is this that's being challenged for sure? How do we identify people with those exact same names if we can't add some kind of a supplement that distinctly identifies them as someone special, other than maybe taking their fingerprints? How will we do that?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I'd say to the member I find that I, at the end of every month, find lots of bills around our place too.

I want to reassure the member and members that this Act is only for the purpose of registering a name with vital statistics. And so in community, with your bankers, with your storekeepers, with your friends and neighbours, we can continue to use Bill the first, Bill the second, Bill the third — no problem.

In the more kind of official documentation which you refer to, whether it be through . . . with the federal government or so on, the differentiation is made, not on the basis of the name, but always on the basis of the birth date and the social insurance number which of course is a different number for every individual. So when it comes to those federal matters like the income tax and so on, we're differentiated by our birth date rather than if we have to share the same name.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I take it then that you see no problems arising that anyone would be going to vital statistics and picking up the names of a particular family line and being able to get things sorted out. You have no problem with that then.

I hope you're right because we certainly have enough confusion. And I would hate to think that we might come to that point in time where, as predicted in the good book, we might end up having numbers tattooed into the foreheads of the people to identify them.

Is there any diversion, Minister, from the general form

that was as you pointed out distributed, the form of the Act itself or the direction that it should go? You suggest that this has been done to all jurisdictions to try to get uniformity. Have we deviated from that normal form that went to all other jurisdictions in any way?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — The answer is no, we have not.

Mr. Goohsen: — Is there any reason to suspect that any other jurisdiction might deviate in any way? So have we in fact then maintained the uniformity that we set out to accomplish?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — It's our understanding that on all the substantive points of the proposal by the Uniform Law Conference, that there will be uniformity across the country. Yes.

Mr. Goohsen: — I think that's really important, Minister, and I appreciate the fact that we do some of these things to get uniformity. In fact I would even go so far as to suggest that your government could do well to look at some uniformity in some other areas with some of the Acts that we have.

I'll just make you an example of that so that you'll be able to reflect on it. In western Canada we have three prairie provinces — Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan — with relatively the same types of agricultural background in that industry. We're relatively the same. We use basically the same types of equipment. And our machinery dealers have I guess what you might call the implement dealers' Act or some farm machinery Acts. I'm not exactly sure of what the names are, but I think you understand where I'm coming from.

There are Acts that regulate how agricultural equipment dealers can operate and how they do operate. And we find that there's some considerable difference between, you know, one jurisdiction and the other. So I'm suggesting to you that your government might in fact use this as a model to investigate some of those types of things, to get some uniformity between the different problems that we have within the prairie region.

And that's just one that I know is causing some significant problems for some people, so I pass that on as an example of what we could be looking at in order to accomplish even more in this area of uniformity.

If I were going to change my name to, oh, whatever — I guess it doesn't matter, I can't think of a better one than the one I have right now; I've gotten kind of used to it — but anyway, if I were to change my name, what exactly would I have to do? Would I have to go to a lawyer or would I just phone up vital statistics? Would I have to pay a fee? If so, what would that fee be? Would I have to have a waiting period? Would I have to have my wife's permission? Would I have to ask my kids? Could you let us know what that process would be?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — I'm told, in response to your question — if you wanted to change your name I

could suggest a few — but I'm told if you wanted to change your name it is through vital statistics. You do not need to have a lawyer or consult legal advice or anything like that. There is an application form that you would complete and provide to vital statistics. There is a fee; the fee is \$100. If you are married, you would need to provide notice to your spouse. You would not have to have your spouse's consent, but you would have to provide notice to your spouse.

If you would want a new birth certificate with your new change of name that would be provided for a fee of \$20. And it is required that the change of name be placed in the *Gazette*, and that would cost \$10.70. And there is essentially no waiting period other than the few days it takes to do the actual paperwork.

(1130)

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in dealing with this, is the federal government making the requirements and setting out the pattern for the uniformity? Where does the uniformity come from in relation to setting this as a standard? I'd like to have that information, please.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, the Uniform Law Conference to which I referred, and on the basis of their recommendations we're dealing with this piece of legislation and some others in this session. The Uniform Law Conference is a federal-provincial group made up of representatives of the federal government and of each provincial jurisdiction.

They look at Acts that will be common to all provincial jurisdictions, work with the Acts, try and develop consensus, and then provide to each and every provincial jurisdiction the model. It's not binding. It's simply provided as a model and then provinces are asked to, through their own legislative process, to amend or adjust their legislation as they see fit. So it's a federal-provincial group — federal reps and reps from every province.

Mr. Martens: — Has the federal government a similar statute in its books that relates typically, where this one would be similar to that?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, the answer is no. The change of name legislation is a provincial jurisdiction and so it's consistent across the province. The federal government has no jurisdiction in this regard.

Mr. Martens: — Have you made room for a name that has an apostrophe in it like Legère or the member from Souris-Cannington I think has a slash in his name? Is there room for that sort of thing in the kinds of names that are allowed? Or is just the number not allowed?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — No. As is the case today, apostrophes, hyphens, and accent marks can be included in the name.

Mr. Martens: — Well just to clear this up. Muller is a name that in German used to have two little dots

above the "u" and it was Müller. Is that available to people in dealing with their name change?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — It's our understanding that this has never been a request that vital statistics has received. And if it was a request, I'm sure they would look at it favourably. There's something about computer technology and printers and so on that perhaps the documentation, the machine, can't do it. But vital statistics would certainly be willing to look at having someone imprint it just by hand on the documentation. But it's not been a request that's been made up to this point.

Mr. Martens: — I'm familiar with that because German was a background language of my family. And I think that that's something that needs to be considered because people may in fact want to go back to that sort of thing in time.

With that, I have no other questions, Mr. Minister.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, my colleague brought up how easy it is to make a name change. I'm just wondering, what kind of checks or balances are there in place for this? Do you check to see if somebody else has a similar name, or that the person who is applying for the name change is actually the person who he says he is? What kind of checks do you have in place for that?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I'll thank the member for his question. When someone comes to make an application for a name change, their documentation is very carefully reviewed in terms of their birth records, birth certificates, marital status, and so on. So it must be to the satisfaction of vital statistics that the person who is making the application is indeed the person whom they say they are, and so there's a careful check done in that regard.

There is not provision that prevents someone from choosing any other name that one would want to choose, and therefore one could choose a name of a . . . an existing name of someone else. But at the end of the process of course the names must be gazetted — put in the public *Gazette* — so there is the public scrutiny therefore of the new name.

And our department of vital statistics, also when a name change has occurred, will be sure that that change is then reflected on birth documentation and so on. It may be held here in Saskatchewan, or in fact they'll ensure that it's changed on the birth documentation wherever it's held, if they have access to it.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. So if my colleague wanted to change his name to Howard Hughes for some particular reason, he could do so provided he can prove who he is today. But would it go back to his birth records and the name would be changed there to Howard Hughes so that on the record itself it would show that he was born as Howard Hughes?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — No, Mr. Chairman, what would happen is that the birth record would simply show an amendment, but it would continue to show the original birth name and then the date and the new name.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. You mentioned that you were making it easier for people who are divorced to change their names. In what way will it be easier? Will they still have to go through the courts to make those changes?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Of course the individual would have to, for the divorce proceedings, would have to go to the courts. This only refers to the name that a person . . . and it would apply to not only those who might be divorced but those who may be widowed or whose marriage has been annulled.

Simply what this does, it simply eliminates the process of application and fee in this circumstance. And this will most often, I expect, most often be a woman who is either widowed, divorced, or marriage annulled, who wants to return to her maiden name, her surname. And so what it does, it just simply removes the process of application and fee that we would otherwise do if we wanted a change of name.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay. Thank you, Minister. So this person would still have to go through posting the name in the *Gazette*, etc., to make those changes.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Well in this narrow circumstance, no; the answer is no. It would not have to be gazetted, simply because in the situation of if the married woman at the time of divorce or widowed or marriage annulment wishes to return to her maiden name, if that's the move she wishes to make, that is the name that is already shown on her birth record. And so then the process of gazetting doesn't need to happen.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to thank those officials who have joined us here today, Mr. Wilmer Berg and Ms. Glenda Yeates, and to thank members of the opposition for an interesting discussion around this piece of legislation.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The opposition would like to join with the minister in thanking the officials for coming in today and thank the minister and their officials for the answers they provided us. Thank you.

Bill No. 84 — An Act to amend The Litter Control Act

The Chair: — I would ask the Minister of the Environment to please introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to

introduce to you, on my immediate right, David Beckwermert, the director of legislative services for the Department of Environment and Resource Management. Behind David is Bob Blackwell, the assistant deputy minister, management services, of the Department of Environment and Resource Management. And directly behind me is Larry Lechner, the director of air and land protection over the Department of Environment and Resource Management. Thank you.

Clause 1

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I think everybody in Saskatchewan is aware of the problems that garbage causes and the need to handle our refuse properly. I'm just wondering, who did you consult with before bringing forward this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, thank you for that question. The major elements of The Litter Control Act were introduced last year, and the broad public consultation occurred then. What we're doing now is some housekeeping amendments for which there was no public consultation. The discussions have been internal within government.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. As you know I was part of the Environment Committee that toured the province this past whatever — in spring, looking into environmental concerns across the province. And one of those issues that was a recurring problem in just about every community we visited was waste disposal, particularly if you went into the smaller communities.

They had some very real concerns about this situation, particularly the concerns about whether to burn or not to burn, and how do you dispose of the combustible materials such as paper and woods in your disposal sights. And this seems to be a major problem, Mr. Minister. Will this Bill have any effects on that?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, no, this Act does not deal with the general waste management issues from that side. Those are under The Environmental Management and Protection Act. This Act deals with basically recycling initiatives and the funding for them.

(1145)

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. That's one of the problems in particularly the rural areas again, is under the environmental Acts they're not allowed to burn. And yet how do you dispose of these materials? Do you simply dump them in your landfills and cover them up and dispose of them? That causes problems in the landfill because your landfill is soon full and you have to go about trying to find new landfill sights.

Recycling is coming forward in a number of places, but the problem here, Mr. Minister, is the cost. If you're in Hazlet — which was one of the communities

that brought forward concerns — they've collected paper and yet the paper sits there because they can't afford to transport it to the recycling place which is in Regina. And so how do you get the recycling in place in this province in a manner that can be economical to the people involved? And that seems to be the major problem, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the matter you raise is the reason for The Litter Control Act, is to in fact try to coordinate the efforts of the public with the efforts of government with respect to taking pieces of the waste stream and putting them to a productive use as a resource and not adding to the burden of cost and the long-term burden of having materials landfilled for no . . . if one could avoid it by recycling.

And clearly there are a number of initiatives for which there is a great deal of public interest. The issue of used oil and tires and batteries are issues on the front burner in most provinces in Canada, and plastics are emerging as an issue. There are many initiatives that can be put in place but each has a specific need to first be identified as a product and then to have that identified as a resource in the market-place that people can use.

So the initiatives that can be begun under The Litter Control Act are in fact identifying waste streams which once one has identified that one can collect a waste resource, it then becomes a marketable commodity in time, even though for the initial period one may have to establish some processes for collecting the resources.

I want to say on the larger question of trying to get towards a high level of recycling and a reduction of landfilling, we have set up this spring two municipal waste management pilot projects, one in the southern part of the province called the Frenchman Valley project; and the other in the Humboldt area, the Carlton Trail project, by which municipalities have collected together and planned regionally to establish a regional system. And a significant part of their planning will be on how to identify individual waste streams and how to handle them in order to minimize landfilling.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, most people in the public are aware that most of the things that we think of as garbage can be recycled — such as your cans, such as your plastics, your paper, your wood. It's a matter, though, of making it economical. You talk of markets in the future. Well markets in the future are good, but what do you do with that commodity today?

If you gather up all your plastics and all your woods and all your cans, all your cellulose, at your garbage sites and you fill your site up with these collected materials, in the first place who collects it? That's a major problem in most smaller centres is who does the collection. Do you pay somebody to sit there at the dump site and inform people, well this pile and this pile and this pile? Or does that person stand there and do the actual sorting themselves? That becomes a major problem and there's a cost associated.

Once you have this material collected and sorted, you have a storage problem. One of the major concerns with garbage sites around the province is rats. If you have a large amount of this material sitting around in storage, that's just going to compound your rat problem, Mr. Minister.

So I think before we start getting into this too deeply, you're going to have to have something in place to handle those concerns: the cost of the sorting, the cost of the storage, and the rat problems that you can generate if you don't properly handle that storage.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, again I appreciate the question. I want to say that there have been some good initiatives in the past. And I'd like to give your colleagues in government credit for the SARCAN initiative which has been a very successful project, both for employment and for recycling materials. The mandate of that group is still quite narrow. They are interested in broadening that, but there's an example of what can be done.

There is a lot of public discussion though around on to how many products one wants to place a fee and a handling charge, a returnable charge. It's interesting that while the western provinces near us are implementing tire fees, the Ontario government removed it in the last budget. So I think it tells you that the policies around some of these individual products is in flux. The objective for the public is to collect these products and properly treat them.

I think you correctly identify the challenges that happen when you stop burning, and again the public needs to balance the nuisance of smoke from waste sites if they were burnt. Clearly the public concern is very, very high around that question. You need to assess the toxins that come from low-temperature burning which is the kind of burning that happens in waste sites. And the judgement was made in the department, again a few years ago, that it was no longer in the public interest to allow burning, while permits allow you to burn wood under special circumstances.

So because there are many areas here that are of public concern, I've established an advisory group on waste management matters — that includes a very broad representation from the public, municipal government, and others — to help us prioritize those issues, to deal with the kinds of questions you're asking because we really do need to balance the interests of the public from a safety and convenience point of view with the practicality of the disposal methods.

Clearly one of the major initiatives that we will be taking part in, in Canada and in Saskatchewan over the next number of years, is the activity of reducing waste, of minimizing waste by reducing packaging, by encouraging people to reuse at home.

I am encouraged by the commitment of young people. I'd like to give credit to our education system because

somehow with people who have no more sensitivity than you and I coming into the system, we have children who have no more knowledge than their knowledge of the world entering the school system and becoming advocates for proper management of waste, advocating the reduction of consumption and the reduction of waste. And I think that demonstrates that in the future these initiatives will continue to be driven by people who understand that we need to maximize the way we use our resources, minimize waste, and minimize the kinds of problems you identify when we have large quantities of waste accumulating.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. One of the things that we have to do as we proceed on this is move with what again came out of the Environment Committee is common sense, that you move forward at a speed that you have solutions for the problems, that you just don't make demands on the public that you will do this before there's a solution available to handle the new problem that you've created.

One of the things that also came out in the environment hearings was the concern about unnecessary packaging filling up our landfill sites. If you go down into any of the retail stores you'll see commodities for sale with a large amount of packaging on them which is not in size relative to the commodity that you're actually buying. And in fact in Saskatchewan we should be promoting, Mr. Minister, elimination of the loose styrofoam packaging that you get on a number of materials.

We should be supporting and encouraging puffed wheat to be used in this commodity. It's a product that we can grow here, a product that we can develop and supply, and so I think we should be pushing that. It's biodegradable; there wouldn't be any problems with it. The only problems that I can see of right off the top would be problems with perhaps insects. But I think it is one of those things that can be used. I believe in some areas popcorn is already being used as a packing material. So I think it's something that we should be trying to encourage in this province.

You talked about the two regional sites, the one at Humboldt and the one at Shaunavon area. It seems kind of surprising though that the member from Shaunavon would be prepared to support a new garbage collection system within his area and allow the elimination of four hospitals, but I guess that's his priorities.

These regional sites, Mr. Minister, what kind of cost factors are going to be involved in these things for the local communities, for the RMs (rural municipality), for the villages and towns involved.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it very clear that the initiative for these projects have come from the community, and I'm sure that the members of the legislature for the areas are supportive of these initiatives. There were in fact 17 proposals from various parts of the province, all believing that it's important to look for new ways of properly

managing our waste.

The funding arrangements for the pilot projects are 50 per cent from the community and 50 per cent provincially, recognizing that they will be experimenting with a variety of procedures and processes, that will then be good advice for the rest of the province so other people won't have to experiment with those same practices.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, how do these costs compare to what has been the normal circumstances up till now? Are these costs higher or lower?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — One of the realizations that people in Saskatchewan and Canada and around the world are beginning to come to is that we have not properly addressed the full cost of our consumptive habits and the full cost of our production systems here. And what is just coming to be realized is that a part of the cost that needs to be attached to every product is the cost of finally disposing of all of the materials used in producing the product and then packaging it to sell it.

So this is a recognition that's happening now and the municipalities are recognizing this now. And what the municipalities are looking for is a way of addressing that cost, which clearly will be an increased cost over the traditional practices in many areas. But they want to look at a way of addressing those costs in the most practical way by cooperating regionally.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm sure that the RMs and the villages and the municipalities involved want to minimize the amount of cost it is to them, while still handling the material. But if that cost is going to be significantly greater, they're not going to be able to afford it with all the other added costs that have been placed on municipalities, both rural and urban, up till this point. So is that cost significantly greater, or just marginally greater than current practice?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — That depends very much on current practice. Clearly I know from my own area — I've met with the municipalities in my constituency — the practices vary considerably, and people who've made recent investments in their facilities, like buying more land, have pretty high cost levels. Others who are operating on a traditional site where they haven't had to make a major investment recently are operating at a significantly lower cost. So it depends on the situation.

I think the recognition that happens in the regional waste management project is that in time we all will have to upgrade what we do, and we want to do it in the most practical way that we can. One of the facts is clear that we have . . . our economy has a great deal to gain from us looking at using our resources more wisely. That means reducing the resources in production. It means reducing the resources applied to packaging, means reusing as many of the resources as we can once we've established an initial product.

And we have a number of initiatives through the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment where we have engaged in national packaging protocols and those kinds of initiatives to commit ourselves to reducing, in the areas of production in Canada and in what's sold in Canada, reducing the amount of waste that actually is generated when the products come to our homes.

(1200)

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Everyone wants to recycle and to reuse these products, but we're not yet at the position of financial viability in a lot of cases for that because if everybody in Saskatchewan was . . . 1 million people lumped in one city, we could handle that. But we're spread out over a very huge area, and it's still not financially viable to bring those commodities in from the 100 and 200 town areas into a large collection site. And so until that point in time, it's going to be a problem, Mr. Minister.

And if we as a society want that collection to take place, then we as a society are going to have to be prepared to pay for that. And it's not going to be able to just be downloaded onto the back of that 100-person village to accomplish that if they live 500 miles from the major collection site. So everybody is going to have to pay for that.

When you look at these sites, such as the Humboldt and Shaunavon sites, Mr. Minister, how do they exactly work? Do the municipalities collect their garbage, their refuse, in the normal manner and then transport it to the central site? Is it stored at the farm sites or in the villages until such time as somebody else comes by perhaps a month later and picks it up? How does the system actually work?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — I just want to come back to the cost question generically first, and then I want to respond to that question. The reason municipalities are getting involved, and this goes in part way to explaining the next question, is that when they make an investment in waste management facilities they want it to be an appropriate investment for the long term, so that there will be, I think, at the initial stages as you're making a regional investment, an increased regional cost because of the capital investment.

But then in the long term, because most of these areas that are moving this way will be using fewer landfill sites, the long-term operating cost will be lower than the alternative of managing a number of sites in a less centralized fashion.

Now the issue that has to be measured in each of those cases is the merit of the hauling distances and those kinds of questions. The detail of how many sites there are going to be within an area and what is collected where, that is in fact the purpose for which the pilot projects have been established.

The pilot projects were approved on the basis that

there was a general plan and a cooperation indicated by both urban and rural municipalities in each area to structure this new process, one with a smaller group of municipalities, the other with a larger group of municipalities.

They laid out their general plan about where it was going. But they will now sit down collectively with the support of the departmental resources and say okay, now what really makes sense, so that we don't haul bulky products too far, so that we properly take individual products from the stream for recycling, so that we again minimize the total cost and maximize the reuse of resources.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Out of the current tests then, how are they working? What's the process? Do the municipalities still carry on as the way they had been prior to the test and just move their refuse into the central location? Or are there storage sites on the individual homesteads and around the villages?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — This will be an evolutionary process where the cooperating municipalities will continue to use their present practices until they've provided alternatives. This is outside of the regional projects, but I know in my own area the department has had some discussions with municipalities.

There's an interest because a few of the 17 municipalities I met with, their landfill sites are becoming close to the end of their lives within a year or two. So they're saying if we want to make an investment we would like to make it fitting a model that's going to be here a few years from now.

So I think there's going to be some cooperative discussions in that area apart from the pilot projects saying, well if we were going to change the model, if we're investing some money, maybe we would invest it centrally. And so that when we want to make our next investment maybe we can together buy some land and the system by which we landfill and regionally process our products.

I think in a number of those areas the existing landfill sites may still remain collection points for specific products even though there may not be landfilling at them all. So again there will be a variety of arrangements worked out that minimize transportation, maximize reuse.

Mr. D'Autremont: — How long are these studies, these two proposed studies going to take place?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — They'll be completed in four years.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Under the Bill you talk about licensing of depots and licensing of suppliers and collectors. I'm sure that when it comes to licensing there's also the matter of fees involved. Is there fees involved in this, and if so, what will these fees be?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — The mention of licensing in this

Act is a preliminary step in discussing the longer-range recycling initiatives so that we can begin to establish, if necessary, sites for collecting of specific recycling products. So there is . . . It's part of the development of a scheme for which later there may be fees, for example, or other strategies that also facilitate collection and processing of recycled products.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, when it talks about licensing of suppliers or collectors, the licensing even of depots, will these be only municipal sites, municipal collectors or will private industry be allowed to be involved in this?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — That's wide open. One of the observations I've made, for example, on the used-oil question, since I've had this responsibility, is that there is a variety of opinions about how the collection system should work and who then should carry it forward. Some people want guaranteed access to all the used oil from the prairie provinces. Other people are ready to go right now with smaller initiatives.

I think the ideal goal for us would be to achieve our environmental objective in terms of full recycling with minimum government involvement. What that means in the end is uncertain. My general sense is that it will, for a number of products at least initially, mean a government facilitation of the collection network and hopefully then releasing a product to the market. But that's just a general sense of where I feel it's going.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, this Bill also talks about the environmental protection fund and it seems that this Bill will discontinue that fund, that the monies in that fund will be transferred to the Consolidated Fund. And any monies that would have been collected to that fund in the future will carry on to the Consolidated Fund. How much monies are currently in that fund?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — I'd like to just take a minute to clarify the issue you raise because your statement is both true and in some ways doesn't convey accurately what has happened in terms of the transfer of the fund.

The fund has in fact been discontinued, and within it now are about \$300,000 that are there to pay for commitments made under it previously. But the fund has been replaced by a line in the budget estimates called the environmental protection subvote.

So what you will find in this year's estimates is a very unique page that I would refer you to for your own reading pleasure which for the first time in . . . ahead of the expenditures outlined, environmental expenditures, special project expenditures, is outlined the revenue sources from which those expenditures are derived.

What this does is it respects the public expectation that monies collected for environmental purposes are in fact spent for environmental purposes, and at the same time achieves the objectives of the auditor, the Gass Commission, when they said that these expenditures should be subjected to the same

discipline with spending as all other government funds so that you in fact have a chance, in budget estimates, to review this page like any other. Not that the old fund didn't have its own processes of discipline, but it was not through the regular processes.

So this in fact exposes these funds to the discipline of the budgetary expenditure examination that goes on here in the House and yet displays for the public the revenues and expenditures together so that the public can see the similarity between the two and know that their money has been spent for the purpose for which they have paid it.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister, because indeed the public does have a serious concern that the monies they believe they're paying into it for the environmental protection does indeed end up doing that.

I know I've received a number of complaints from people about Tetra-Paks and about glass, that they feel that they're paying for a deposit on a product on which they cannot receive any return. The Tetra-Pak one seems to be a particular irritant to a good number of people. They don't stop and think about the fact that at some point in time that Tetra-Pak has to be disposed of and there is a cost associated with that. But perhaps, Mr. Minister, you could take a look at that idea of the Tetra-Pak and finding some manner in which they perhaps could be recycled to allow people to have a portion of that deposit at least returned to them.

The environmental protection fund, when new taxes are put in place dealing with that as has been discussed, people want that assurance that those funds will be used for the environment, for environmental purposes, for cleaning up things such as the underground storage tanks, etc. And I think that's very important that that should carry on, Mr. Minister.

My colleague has a few questions he'd like to ask you.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I couldn't help but note in your comments your reflection that if we wanted to have some enjoyment, we could read some of your documentation on the environment. And I would like to suggest that in view of the fact that you consider this to be a joyful event, perhaps you'd really like to break loose and have a whole bunch of fun and review the transcripts from the meeting that was held in Maple Creek with the environmental review committee that our colleague from Souris-Cannington was on.

I tell you that you are really going to have a blast on this, because seeking enjoyment in this way, if that fulfils your satisfactions, you will be really, really turned on when you read these transcripts because they point out so very clearly and concisely the way that people in Saskatchewan feel about two key issues that are of burning necessity in their communities and need to be treated with an awful lot more caution and discretion than seems apparent.

I'm not suggesting that you are being ruthless, but I will suggest to you that the impression people have is that the power of government is being ruthless in attempting to force changes on them that they view to be extremely financially costly, that they view to be extremely difficult to comply with, and that quite frankly they believe they're not as guilty of such a big sinful act as the process seems to imply. And obviously I'm talking about the burning of garbage in small-town dumps which you've talked about with my colleague. And the other burning issue is of course the fuel tank issue.

I guess the points that need to be repeated . . . and I realize that I am repeating what other people have said, but they need to be repeated, and they need to be re-emphasized. And nobody could have said it to you better than the transcripts from that Maple Creek meeting. The people there laid it right on the line. They didn't hold anything back. And in spite of the fact that they're considered to be outspoken, they wanted everybody to know exactly where they're coming from and exactly where they stand.

(1215)

In the area of garbage burning the point has been made — and I will make it for them again — that if you take a comparison of the problems we have with our environment, then you can relax a little. The reality is that our environment is very important. There isn't a person in my constituency that won't go along with you when you say that we have to do things that help our environment. Nobody wants to live in the garbage dump. And nobody wants the world around us to become a garbage dump that we all have to live in. Nobody wants the ozone to be depleted. Nobody wants to get sunburned to death. Nobody wants to get cancer.

People do say though that there are some fundamental realities of comparison that we have to make here in order to keep our perspective on the issue. In other words, they're suggesting we may be trying to overkill in Saskatchewan. And the comparison that best came to mind, as a good one for me, was when a person suggested that in the city of New York where you have 10 million people, you have 10 times the number of people that we have in Saskatchewan. You have 10 times as much garbage in one city in the United States of America than we produce in the entire province of Saskatchewan on an individual, personal basis.

Now I do understand that Saskatchewan people seem to generate more pounds of garbage per year than individuals in some other jurisdictions, even if it were half. Suppose we only produced five times or, you know, one-fifth of the garbage instead of one-tenth; the point still is well taken. One American city produces more garbage than all of Saskatchewan. So here we are, here we are suggesting that we can clean up the environment of the world by cleaning up Saskatchewan totally. I suggest to you that you could clean up every problem of the environment in Saskatchewan 100 per cent and probably not change

the world pollution problem by a quarter of 1 per cent, maybe not even a tenth of 1 per cent.

And so I'm suggesting to you that while we have to do our thing and play our part, we have to include ourselves in the role of world assistance to save our world from ourselves, we don't want to put ourselves in a position where we destroy a lot of other good things around us and put ourselves into a position where we can't financially and economically tolerate the kind of changes that are required in order to become 100 per cent efficiency.

So what I'm saying is maybe 100 per cent efficiency is too much to strive for all at once. If we don't allow our small towns to burn garbage, for example, without having in place people who do professional incinerating within a reasonable transportation distance, then we are stuck with a dilemma that we have with newspapers, for example, in some of our small towns that decided to get onto the bandwagon a year or two back and thought that recycling of some newspapers would definitely help to save some trees.

Great idea. I agree with it 100 per cent. Let's not chop down a tree to make new paper; let's recycle the old *Leader-Post* and what not. What happened was that we collected all these newspapers and I know of a town where people phoned me and said, we've now got a small warehouse — obviously it's probably somebody's granary but they called it a small warehouse — full of newspapers, and no place to take them.

The only way they could get rid of them was to hire a truck to transport them I think it was to Regina at about 2 or 300 miles. The cost was phenomenal. It was worth more than to go out and cut a tree really. And it made absolutely no economic sense.

I'm saying to you that the people want you to take into consideration the reality that we can't achieve your goals overnight. And recognizing that to be the reality of the world we live in, then perhaps we have to move a little slower to allow people the chance to get things into place.

One of the questions I would like you to answer is: are you working in the direction of getting some of these disposal units into place? For example, we hear that there are people that will come in and dig up the dirt and take out the crude oil that has been spilled, the salt water that has been spilled, those kinds of chemicals that are used in the petroleum industry. They seem to think that they can wash that out of that dirt, reclaim the soil, put it back clean, and those kinds of things.

There are operations like that in Alberta, we understand. We have approached SEDCO and different arms of government for financial help. Community bonds have been challenged to support these. And yet nothing seems to be happening in that area. Maybe there is something going on that we don't know about. So I'll just finish my rhetoric about the other area and let you comment on that along with some other questions.

The fuel tank issue is another burning issue, although we hope it never really gets truly on fire. The fact of the matter is that we've got many fuel tanks in my constituency in the small towns that are some years old. But these fuel dealers have pointed out to me, and I'm sure you've heard this a hundred times before, that they've measured these tanks on a daily basis. The volume that they sell is subtracted from the volume in the tank, and if there's one litre missing, somebody has to account for it. It's not like you could run a hundred gallons into the ground and not miss it. It is accounted for.

Now there are some operations, I'm sure, that have fuel tanks that are not measured and not watched, but I don't think that they are from the retail outlets, the ones that are most likely to be first affected by your regulations.

And the reality is that a fuel tank that is maybe 15 years old that has 10 years of life left, in my opinion quite frankly, should be allowed to continue as it is for eight or nine more years or whatever time it is that it tests to be good, to allow it to generate all of the economic benefit that should come from it on a depreciating basis as it goes from day one to day whatever its limit of lifetime expectancy is.

Obviously we should reduce that lifetime expectancy enough to ensure a reasonable chance not to have a pollution problem, but at the same time, economically speaking, you have to allow installations enough time so that they can depreciate their value by their usage. And if we don't do that then we're saying to business people, investments that you have made no longer have time to recapture your investment; you have to make a new investment.

And quite frankly the banks won't guarantee anybody's loan to bury a tank in the ground. It just won't happen. We've talked to bankers. I've talked to all kinds of fuel dealers that said, if the banker would give me the money, I'd put it in. But they won't give us any loan guarantees on a tank that we're putting in the ground because they just simply won't touch it. It's one of those things that you cannot get collateral or backing from a bank on.

So I'm going to suggest, Minister, that we may have to, if we're going to force this issue, provide some kind of government-backed guarantees of loans for these people. Otherwise we're not going to have them. Every town in my constituency will almost lose all of their fuel tanks under the suggested regulations of about six months back in that process that we went through when we reviewed this matter.

I couldn't find a fuel tank in my constituency that would not be somewhat affected. There may be a chance that the Co-op in Gull Lake might have some tanks that would still qualify, but they themselves, recognizing that the rest of their operation in the south-west is so vulnerable, were suggesting that it would be cheaper for them to go out in the middle of The Sand Hills and put up a whole new distribution centre out there and locate far away from all

communities out in The Great Sand Hills and truck from that central location to the rest of the south-west.

If that had to be done, I suggest that the cost would so phenomenal that no other company would be involved. We would then have a monopoly situation. Unfortunately for those that think that the Co-op would be a great outfit to have that monopoly, it might not be the Co-op that does it. It might be Imperial Oil; it might be someone else. We will have a monopoly situation developed throughout the province because only one distributor of fuels could afford to put any such type of facility into any part of Saskatchewan.

So you'd end up having regionalized fuel distribution system where you might have six distribution systems in the province in each region around the province; I'll suggest to you the SARM lines for their districts in their political structure as you may understand it. That splits the province into six places or six divisions, and you might have one in each one, and that's all you'd have. You'd have absolutely no competition left in the fuel distribution system, and you wouldn't have any small town service stations left, absolutely none whatsoever. The liabilities — the costs of installing new tanks, all those things — will drive them out.

And here we suggest, Minister, that you're once again falling into what has become your government's depression philosophy. I'm going to call it a depression philosophy because that's what it is, and it's expanding. And what happens in this philosophy, sir, is that when you try to clean up one problem which is finances, you do it by trying to cut back on the creation of jobs or the existence of businesses. And you also find yourself into this trap in environment. If you eliminate all of those service stations, every . . .

The Chair: — Order, order. I'm trying to understand the member's remarks and how they have anything to do with the Bill that's before us. If the member is interested in pursuing a line of questioning on the issue that he raises, I would point out that estimates for the Department of Environment are likely the appropriate place to do so. But the member must and should be able to establish some relationship to the Bill before us. I can't ascertain that from his remarks so far.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you for that observation, Mr. Chairman. Certainly it is difficult to get specifically to the issue on such a broad-ranging problem as litter and environmental considerations. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that the problems that we're having relating to fuel tanks and relating to the burning all do come together in a broad, general question to the minister. You worry about things being related directly to the Bill, and we do too because if you don't burn garbage, for example, you will get a lot of litter. If the wind comes up in south-west Saskatchewan and you don't have your papers and things tied down, they're definitely going to end up in Regina. I can assure you that we get enough wind to take litter from the town of Maple Creek's dump site all across the province of Saskatchewan. And I can assure you that there are some studies that have been done that

indicate that topsoil that has blown off of the farms in the Maple Creek area have in fact ended up some 300 miles into the ocean to the east of us.

So litter is a real problem. And if we don't take care of it, it will certainly be all over.

I just want to wrap up by asking the minister a couple of direct questions with regards to this issue. What becomes of our rodent problem in our dumps? What becomes of our insect problems if we don't burn out the garbage dumps to kill them out? Will they expand? Have you put into place any kind of control mechanisms, any kind of monies for poisons or anything like that, to control these problems?

And I guess I should allow the minister a chance to respond to the several issues and questions that I've raised before I go into a segmented part of the explanatory notes.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, the difficulty I have is that most of the issues which were raised in the address just heard have very little to do with this Act and a lot to do with The Environmental Management and Protection Act.

I do want to comment though on a few specific comments that the member opposite made. He said it was foolish to be putting in place regulations before we have other mechanisms in place in order to deal with these issues. I think those are very important words for him to consider, because the regulations that he is complaining about were put into place in 1989 and 1990 by the previous government. And since we've come into office, I have been consulting with the broad community about trying to sensitize them to maintain the public health goals, the public safety goals that are implied here, and yet making them sensitive to the circumstances he describes.

I suspect in all the fun that your colleague was having at Maple Creek or wherever he had his meeting, he didn't bother to mention the fact that the source of the insensitivities that the people were complaining about rested with him.

I want to say, when you talk about overkill, that that comment also applies. That is the reason why we have changed the approach in the department and we are consulting on both of the issues that you raise. With respect to the landfill issue, we are consulting with the communities and dealing with the problems as they arise and we are getting good cooperation. And the communities, when we're discussing landfilling questions are cooperative in looking for alternatives to landfilling and that is the way this should occur.

In respect to underground storage tanks, you may have missed the announcement yesterday, but a series of announcements were made yesterday with respect to the sensitization of the regulations around underground storage tanks and around chemical warehouses. And we can make available to you a copy of the press release from yesterday if you didn't have a chance to read your paper or watch the news.

I want to say that it is clear that environmental management issues require cooperation and consensus processes. The department has established broad stakeholder groups for all of the issues that you describe. And without getting into any specifics that you made with respect to the issues of underground storage tanks and burning, I simply want to assure you and the public that the department is in close consultation with those people affected in order to have the regulations that provide the degree of public comfort and safety that's required and is sensitive to the financial issues you raised.

(1230)

You raised a specific question with respect to hazardous substances which is also part of another Act and not this one. And I want to say that we are meeting cooperatively. I called a meeting of western ministers of the Environment last week and we discussed these issues that affect us across the border. And I want to say that these issues, we're developing cooperative western strategies on all the issues with respect to waste management.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the fact that you're getting on top of this, Mr. Minister. You refer to the fact that the past administration brought in some of these regulations that are causing some of the concerns. And my reflection on that would simply be this: you and your government have taken a lot of time explaining to the people of Saskatchewan how wrong a lot of the things done by the past administration were. And in fact if you feel that way about it, obviously you should change those things. You are now the government in control and you are in charge of not complaining about what happened, but of making the changes necessary to make society better.

I will take no credit whatever for the initiatives though that were performed by the past administration, not having been personally involved with that. So you can leave me out of that part of it in your deliberations.

I wanted to ask, under the Bill itself, Bill 84, under the section 3 of the explanatory notes, it says here that under 2(g) of number 3 — I don't know why it's lettered that way — but anyway the definition of waste minimization places some parameters on what the minister will have power to undertake respecting waste minimization initiatives.

Now how does that in fact affect your powers? And I also, when I read the first part of that about the reducing uncertainties . . . can these new regulations in that section be done by an order in council or by the cabinet in some way without coming back with further legislation? Kind of two questions there because it's a kind of a split thing.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the disclaimers the member opposite makes. I wouldn't take any credit for the actions of your colleagues previous either if I were a wise person. And I think

you're wise in separating yourself from the actions of those who have gone before you.

I only commented on the question — your very own comments that you said it would be foolish to set up a regulatory regime without having a full plan in place. I thought that was a comment that was appropriately directed towards those same colleagues from which you disassociate yourself at the time when they initiated them. I just wanted to make that clear. And you might want to have this out with your colleagues in the back room afterwards, because they may wish to bring you into a more cooperative spirit with them.

With respect to the meaning of waste minimization, it is everything from the reduction of packaging to composting to taking special streams of product and dealing with them differently as a resource, separating them from the waste stream.

With respect to the regulation thereof, there will be no significant initiatives. I want to say that it was contemplated at one point for this Bill to actually have fees and charges implementable by regulation. We chose not to do that. It certainly does happen. But it's more common that those kinds of fees and charges are placed on a specific product by legislation.

It would be our purpose now to plan those special streams of products, and where fees and charges are a desirable strategy, introduce them by legislation next spring in the legislature. But there is no intent by any empowering regulation here to do that now.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I appreciate your explanation. Just in passing, I would say that you're right. There are some things that the past administration did that I don't totally, wholeheartedly agree with; but there were many things that they did that were very, very well done and very good for the province of Saskatchewan. And in overall consideration of weighing the good against the bad, I thought the administration was a lot better than any we've ever had in the province. I'm particularly happy with the agricultural programs that actually did put money into the hands of farmers in the province and actually did attempt to build a tax base.

So we can always point to our mistakes and I'm sure that you will make a few. I suspect maybe a few folks pointed some fingers at you when you were minister of Agriculture and might have suggested that you weren't totally on the mark with the decisions you made to destroy the agricultural base of this province.

So having said that, I want to go back into this Bill and the existing provisions and under section 7, the existing provisions in the explanation, my question that I made just a brief note here: who gets the power out of this process in that section?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Just want to ask the member if he might provide us with a list of those things of which he was proud. The issue of trying to build a tax base, I think what you built was a debt base but we will not discuss that further here. The issue in that section of

the legislation is simply a power of government.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I missed one set of questions I wanted to ask you about. This Bill talks about establishing planning and research, development, the coordination of policies and implementation of those policies. Just what kind of costs are we talking about here, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, there are no additional costs planned. Those are simply . . . will be departmental functions.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, you must have some funds allocated from within your department budget for this type of proposal. What would those funds be?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — They are the departmental costs that are built into the estimates now.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. One of your colleagues is suggesting this is slower than the ice age. Well I would suggest to that minister that we are trying to prevent the ice age from forming in this province by handling wastes in the proper manner.

Mr. Minister, how much would the total cost for this programing and everything — the initiatives, the waste reduction — cost for everyone across the province? That includes the provincial government, the municipal government, and the individuals who may be involved.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — I'm not sure how to answer the question because I . . . waste minimization may . . . waste efforts begin at the point of regulations when you describe what levels of contaminants are allowable in effluent, in air; when you describe how hazardous substances have to be disposed of; when you describe the transportation systems; when you describe the storage system as in a chemical warehousing; when you describe the appropriate dealing with a contamination that results from industrial activity or personal activity; when you describe the waste collection system and proceeding onward from it.

So the planning initiatives are not large, costly endeavours.

If you want to study the cost of properly dealing with the environmental consequences of living in a sustainable society, then we need more time than today to discuss that kind of a paper because clearly the society here . . . and I mean, the Rio conference, the Earth Summit last year, that was a major theme of their activity, was putting together 900 pages of plans, out of which there were only two major agreements.

But to address the very question you're asking — like what impact on our present activity do we have to have in order to make our society sustainable? So it's a very difficult question to answer on a large scale. It's just that it is going to have to be the way we do

business and the way we live in the future, and whatever costs there are will be the costs inherent in being able to live safely on this planet.

With respect to the planning costs, with respect to help in coordinating activities, those are nickels and dimes by comparison.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Minister, it may be nickels and dimes to you but to a good number of the people across this province who will have to be involved in things like waste minimization, it can be a very significant financial impact.

Have you done any studies to what the costs associated with implementing your study program that you have in place right now of all the collection and recycling, if that was spread across the province, what would those costs be?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — The purpose of the regional waste management strategy is in fact to test some ideas about how regional waste management processes can work. And until those tests have been done and people identify what the proper strategies are, you can't cost them.

So the whole idea of the pilot projects is to give us those kinds of numbers that you're describing, what would be the costs of doing things in this fashion that would be sustainable in the long run.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. Would you be prepared to give us some interim study reports and costing reports as this study goes along?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Yes. I appreciate the positive results of the cooperation on other Bills where we've worked together, and we'd be pleased to share any information with you that we have.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank our officials for their support in addressing the questions of the opposition on this Bill. I thank the members of the opposition for their interest and their questions on this matter, and their cooperation.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd also like to thank the minister's official and the minister for coming in today and answering those questions. We look forward to the papers that he will supply us. Thank you very much.

(1245)

Bill No. 81 — An Act to amend The Alcohol Control Act and to make certain Consequential amendments to certain Acts as a result of the enactment of this Act

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, to my left I have Gord Nystuen, the acting chairman of the Liquor Board and the Liquor Licensing Commission, also acting chief executive officer of the Saskatchewan Gaming Commission. Behind me I have Paul Weber, the vice president of liquor operations. To my right I have Susan Amrud, Crown solicitor with the Department of Justice. Immediately behind her is Hal Kathol, director of licensing and registration with the Gaming Commission. And to his right is Don McRobb, director of compliance and control with the Gaming Commission.

Clause 1

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I'd just like to have you identify where in the Act you have differences that are there that relate to the former two Acts that deal with the blend that you've got here. And if there are any differences, I'd like you to identify them and provide me the reasons why you have, and then we'll probably dispense with it quickly.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Basically there are two changes that you had asked for. And one would be the ability to regulate and manufacture gaming equipment — and that's found in the definition of gaming services which would be to the front of the Act — and collecting mark-up at the border which is section 11.1, which would allow Saskatchewan government officials to work at border crossings to collect mark-up when there might be some imports.

Mr. Martens: — You're talking about equipment that's coming in from the United States or, well, it might even come in offshore, but it might come in through the United States or wherever so that you have opportunity to be there to investigate bringing that material in or that equipment in. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Basically what it does, to the hon. member, is it gives you the opportunity to regulate the manufacturing. We can regulate leasing in the province here now, and those kinds of arrangements. But it also gives you the opportunity to regulate the manufacturing of equipment.

The Chair: — Can I ask, will the committee grant leave to deal with the approval on a page-by-page basis? Is that agreed?

Leave granted.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 62 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Mr. Martens: — If I may, I'd just like to thank the minister and his officials for coming in and answering the questions.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. I'd like to thank the member for his questions. What this does prove is that on occasion the member from Morse and I can agree on certain items. And I'd as well like to thank my officials for their patience.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 82 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — 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. 84 — An Act to amend The Litter Control Act

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — 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. 81 — An Act to amend The Alcohol Control Act and to make certain Consequential amendments to certain Acts as a result of the enactment of this Act

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — 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.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — If I could wish everyone here a good weekend, a good long weekend, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I'll move that this House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:56 p.m.