

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here to present to the legislature this afternoon, and I'll just read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

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

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to present this petition on behalf of a number of Saskatoon residents and communities surrounding Saskatoon.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague in presenting petitions to the Assembly as well regarding the NewGrade Energy Bill before this Assembly. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

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

I so submit.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have some petitions, and these also are from the Saskatoon area, Mr. Speaker. And I will read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

I would like to lay that on the Table, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, I too have petitions to present:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

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

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, come from Stoughton, Regina, and the Saskatoon areas. I would like to present these to the Assembly.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am happy to present on behalf of people from the Saskatoon area today a petition that is self-explanatory from the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. governance and financing arrangements.

I'll now present these.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with my colleagues in presenting a similar petition. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

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

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners all reside in the city of Regina and it is my pleasure to table these at this time.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions that I want to present to the Assembly. And the prayer is:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

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

These petitioners are from Tugaske, Eyebrow, Brownlee, Davidson, Saskatoon, Kenaston and areas in that district between here and Saskatoon. I want to lay these before the Assembly.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to present petitions. And I'll just read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever

pray.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have citizens from Saskatoon, Carmel, Benson, Stoughton — Stoughton, Saskatchewan; Lang, Saskatchewan; people from all over the province of Saskatchewan. I so table.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too have a petition from citizens from the province of Saskatchewan regarding the proposed 230,000 volt power line from Condie near Regina to the Queen Elizabeth power station in Saskatoon. And I shall read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that the Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to do the following:

(1) Order SaskPower to facilitate the production of non-utility generated power in areas of increased demand, namely Lloydminster and Meadow Lake;

(2) Order the Minister of the Environment to undertake a complete environmental assessment including public hearings;

(3) Order SaskPower to ensure that there is a full and complete compensation package for all affected landowners;

(4) Order SaskPower to table in the legislature a complete economic analysis by an independent auditor that proves the economic benefits of the proposed line;

(5) Order SaskPower to table in the legislature a review of all national and international studies on the effects of electric and magnetic fields on humans; and

(6) Further order SaskPower to cease and desist all planning, surveying, or preparation for construction until this petition has been honoured.

And the people for whom I'm reading this, Mr. Speaker, are from Dundurn, Denholm, Clavet, Saskatoon, La Ronge, and various places throughout the province.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

And:

Of citizens of the province humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reverse the government's decision to close hospital facilities.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased today to announce sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and ask all members to welcome to the House today, 52 students, grade 4 and 5, from William Grayson School in Moose Jaw. They are accompanied by their teachers today, Pat Barbier and Carol Macdonald.

I had a wonderful opportunity to meet with these students for about half an hour and they asked some very, very good questions. They are leaving a little early now to attend over to the Government House to tour there. Thank you all for coming, and I'd ask all members to welcome these students.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you and to other members of the Assembly 58 students, grade 4 and 5, from Wascana School here in Regina. They're here with their teachers Janice Ryan and Linda Walsh, as well as chaperons Laura Lee Smith, Penny Matte, Judy Sum, Gaylene Weir, and Debbie Faer.

I want to say to the students, welcome to the Assembly, and I look forward to meeting with you after the question period. We will be meeting in room 218 and getting our picture taken. So welcome to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have three introductions that I'd like to make this afternoon. The first, Mr. Speaker, to you and to other members of the Assembly, is a constituent of mine, Mr. Leo Weaver, who is sitting in your gallery. Mr. Weaver is a bus driver, works for the Saskatchewan transportation corporation and is a member of the executive of the Amalgamated Transit Union.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to welcome some more guests here in the east gallery, members of the Retail Wholesale & Department Store Union who are locked out and presently engaged in a dispute at Westfair Foods. Note some new faces are here from yesterday and I'd ask all members of the Assembly to welcome them.

And thirdly, I understand there's a group of . . . a representative of a group of employees of Federated Co-operatives Ltd. These are employees who have been thrown out of work, 180 employees who have lost their jobs, some would say through the undemocratic actions of Federated Co-operatives . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I would ask the member to please not engage in any political rhetoric when

he's introducing guests. The member has been here long enough to know that.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the representatives of these employees are here to watch the proceedings of the Assembly today. So I'd ask all members of this Assembly to welcome this group of working people and fine folks of Saskatchewan here to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Funding Reductions for Seniors

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister responsible for Seniors. Madam Minister, over the last 19 months we have seen your government undertake the single most brutal attack on seniors in the history of Saskatchewan.

Madam Minister, you have cancelled the senior's heritage fund. You've gutted the Saskatchewan Pension Plan. Madam Minister, you have closed hospitals. You've cut funding to long-term beds. You are phasing out level 1 and 2 funding, and increases on prescription drugs, utility bills, taxes, have made it extremely difficult for thousands of seniors on fixed incomes to get by month by month.

Yet at the same time, Madam Minister, the same time you are slashing the real income of thousands of seniors in this province, you have political assistants in ministers' offices receiving salary increases up to 46 per cent — increases, Madam Minister, up to \$1,400 a month. Madam Minister, there are seniors in this province don't have income of \$1,400 a month.

Madam Minister, can you stand in this House and tell the seniors they must make do with less so that your political assistants can enjoy huge salary hikes?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — I want to thank the member for the question. And I want to say that in our budget decision making, we had to deal with current fiscal reality brought about largely by 10 years of Tory waste and mismanagement. And it forced our government to make some very difficult decisions.

The priority of our government, after consulting with many individuals, groups, and organizations, was to target our very limited resources to those seniors most in need. And this was done by continuing the Saskatchewan income program with the higher rates introduced in October of 1992 and by providing health coverage for low income seniors for optometric, chiropractic, drugs, and other health-related programs and services.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Madam Minister, you certainly

changed your tune since the days you used to stand on this side of the House and pretend that you cared about seniors. Madam Minister, the concern you had for Saskatchewan seniors ended on election night, and you've been attacking them ever since.

Madam Minister, you have hiked drug cost, hearing-aid cost, oxygen, insulin, chiropractic care, and optometric care. You have increased sales tax, income tax, power bills, phone bills, and natural gas bills.

Madam Minister, these increases may not mean that much to those 24 ministerial assistants whose salaries have been hiked to over \$46,000 a month . . . a year, sorry. A year. Now, Madam Minister, but to a senior trying to get by on just a few hundred dollars a month, those increases amount to a substantial portion of their total monthly income.

Madam Minister, again I ask you: why should the people who built this province repeatedly be asked to sacrifice when the people at the top of their government make no such sacrifices? Would you please answer that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — To reiterate, this government was faced with a \$15 billion debt when we were elected in October of 1991. After coming to terms with the fiscal crisis facing this province and after consulting with literally hundreds of people, groups, and organizations, we made a decision to target our very limited financial resources to those seniors most in need. That is the decision that we made.

We have ensured that seniors will continue to receive Saskatchewan Income Plan; for low income seniors we've ensured that they will receive a host of health coverage for low income seniors. That's the commitment of this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Madam Minister. It seems like when you don't have a good answer, you bring out the blame thrower again. Madam Minister, there was a very telling paragraph in the Finance minister's budget. In her address this read and I'll quote:

This Budget requires sacrifice. But there are some in our midst who cannot be asked to sacrifice; they have nothing left to give.

Madam Minister, when I heard that, I thought that the minister was talking about seniors on fixed incomes, about seniors trying to get by on less than a thousand dollars a month. I had no idea, Madam Minister, that you were talking about protecting ministerial assistants, while those who do need help in our society will be asked to pay more and more and more.

Madam Minister, your government shows compassion to ministerial assistants whose average salary increase has been fourteen and a half per cent,

on average. Your government shows compassion to the Deputy Premier, who gets \$800,000 budget increase to run the NDP (New Democratic Party) campaign. Your government shows compassion to its political cronies like Don Ching and the Lord of the Flies at SaskPower. When are you going to be showing a little compassion for the seniors of this province, Madam Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — As I said earlier, the current fiscal crisis facing this province, brought about by nine and half years of Tory waste and mismanagement, has caused our government to face the music, and the music is that this province is not doing very well financially.

After consulting with numerous groups, numerous seniors' organizations, individuals, and people across this province, we made a decision to target our very limited resources to those seniors most in need.

Now had your government not spent \$500,000 on High R Doors in North Battleford, had your government not spent close to \$400,000 to paint strips on buses, we might have a little bit of money in this province. But time after time after time, you chose to waste the taxpayers' money, and we're now coming to terms with that. And that's called fiscal responsibility, accountability, and reliability.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Well, Madam Minister, I don't think I said anything about not needing to make some changes. What I'm asking you, Madam Minister, is why on the backs of the seniors? Madam Minister, you want to talk about money wasted; we could go back into your term of government in the '70s and show you some.

However I want to recap, Madam Minister. You and your government . . . here's the recap. Seniors' heritage program, cancelled; Saskatchewan pension plan, cancelled; prescription drug plan, cancelled; level 1 and 2 funding, cancelled; 52 hospitals, closed; long-term bed funding slashed; oxygen cost, insulin cost, hearing-aid cost, chiropractic and optometric cost all increased; income tax, sales tax, fuel tax, utility bills, all increased. And the NDP campaigned on a promise to protect seniors. That's the problem, Madam Minister — what you promised and what you're doing.

Madam Minister, I suggest to you the seniors of this province don't need assistance from your government. They need to be protected from your government. Madam Minister, when are you going to start doing what you were elected to do and start helping seniors instead of attacking them on every issue?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a list

that I'd like to read of Tory waste and mismanagement. Nine hundred thousand dollars spent by the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation on an option to purchase the Regina YMCA (Young Men's Christian Association) in 1988, written off; 349,000 spent on the Department of Finance's glossy budget documents in 1989-90; \$322,000 spent by the Crown Management Board to pay the salary and severance of Otto Cutts, the former president of SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation); \$705,816 spent by the Crown Management Board to pay the British firm N.M. Rothschild & Sons for advice on privatization, gone; \$401,518 spent by the Crown Management Board to pay Wolfgang Wolff, the president of the board of directors of CMB including a severance package of \$236,000, gone.

Time after time after time, hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars of wasted taxpayers' money that led to an accumulated debt of \$15 billion. And now we have to make difficult choices because of this kind of waste and mismanagement.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Information on Piper Aircraft Project

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Economic Development. Mr. Minister, it has come to our attention that a number of media outlets have made application under the freedom of information Act for the following information: the total amount of government money spent on the Piper Aircraft deal, the number of consultants hired to work on the Piper Aircraft project, the names of those consultants; and the total amount government paid these consultants.

This request has been denied, and I quote: the prospects of negotiating a Piper deal are still being addressed, is the reason given for denying them.

Mr. Minister, you yourself have admitted that the Piper deal is dead — another failure of your government's dismal economic development record. Mr. Minister, since the reason given for withholding this information is no longer valid, can we expect this information to be forthcoming?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the member opposite that the individual or the company negotiating the Piper deal was in fact Mr. Paul Hill, a very well-known business person in Regina. And to take those kinds of shots at an individual who worked very, very hard and in fact is still looking at the possibilities of Piper . . . that is what he says. If you get the Regina *Leader-Post*, in the clipping as it relates to Piper he said very clearly that it's on hold at this time. That's what he said.

And at this time the deal, while not moving forward, obviously the companies involved in looking at bringing Piper to Saskatchewan or purchasing it, are

still looking at the deal. It's not dead. There's still a very, very, I might say a remote chance that they would want to go back and negotiate at some point. And for you to stand here and say and discredit the company that was involved in negotiating the deal, because quite obviously I personally wasn't involved and the department wasn't involved — we've said this from day one — for you to attack companies for trying to negotiate a good deal, is not legitimate.

Now I want to say to you, some of the deals that you did negotiate, your members when you were in government, I'll tell you that many of those deals, if we were to do them over again, we would wish that we would have walked away from a great deal of them if we could only have that chance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, no one is attacking Mr. Hill. What is simply being requested of your government is the information about your government's actions with respect to this deal, the Piper deal. And once again we see the spectacle of your open and accountable government doing everything it can to cover its tracks on another one of its failures.

Mr. Minister, it seems fairly straightforward, this request for information. Why would you be so concerned about not allowing that information to come forward to the public? Did you spend too much to go after the Piper deal? Is it because you don't want the names of the NDP consultants you hired exposed? Is it because you don't want us to know how much money you spent for those consultants? Or is it all of those reasons, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Minister, can you tell us: what is the reason, the specific reason you will now allow this information to come forward when you know and you even admit there's only a minute chance of this deal ever coming together?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that members of the Assembly and the press would observe the questions that are being put by the members opposite. When it came to CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) where there was a need for a \$15 million tax reduction for the railways, the member for Greystone says we didn't pay enough. Not enough money was spent by the government, by the taxpayers to get that deal. The member opposite now from Kindersley says that we maybe spent too much trying to get Piper.

And I wonder why they don't sit down and discuss whether or not they want economic development or not, and whether or not we're spending too much money, as the member from Kindersley says, or we're not spending enough, as the member from Greystone says.

But clearly I want to indicate to you that there's a great

deal of economic development being done in the province, as indicated by PGS (Plant Genetic Systems (Canada) Inc.) announcing in Saskatoon the establishment of an international centre for plant genetics in Saskatoon on Saturday. On Monday of this week, the Royal Bank said that they're setting up their pay system — 60 new jobs — in Regina.

Now obviously not every deal is going to work that the private sector goes after. And Mr. Hill would be the first to admit that the Piper deal, although we jointly went after it hard and he did the negotiating, simply wasn't on. And some deals won't go.

But I can tell you when it relates to some of your deals, i.e., the Co-op upgrader, many people in this province — in fact I would say the most — would wish that that deal had never been cut by the previous administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, it was the media who made the request for information on the Piper deal, because they realized that the deal is gone. Only you seem to be holding to the fact that it may still be able to be revived.

And it's interesting to note how the principles of the NDP have changed depending on which day you talk to them. On Friday we saw the Premier making a big fuss about how the terms of the Co-op upgrader deal were never disclosed, even though he knows the fact that his party was kept informed every step of the way. But now when we see the NDP working on a deal, it's perfectly all right to keep the information from the public.

Mr. Minister, the people of Saskatchewan are getting really tired of watching you do one thing and say another thing. If you really believe in openness and accountability, just release the information and let the public decide whether the money was well spent or not. Why are you afraid to do that, Mr. Minister? Why won't you come clean on this issue?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the member from Kindersley is off base again. We've indicated to the press and to anyone who has asked that we will make public the cost of studies and analysis as it would relate to Piper and any other arrangement or deal that we are working on in Saskatchewan. That's not the issue.

The issue here is, is that we are still involved with our private sector partner in an arrangement. And until the day that the deal is not there or is there and we can release the documents, you will just have to be patient.

But I can make the commitment — and I have at many occasions — that when the deal comes to fruition or is not on go, completed or not completed, we will release to the public the total cost of trying to arrange

the deal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, just a few minutes ago we heard how well your government has kept its commitment to seniors. Now we are seeing how well you have kept your commitment to an open and accountable government.

You refuse to release any information about the Piper negotiations because they're an embarrassment to your government, and that's simply the case. You refuse to release the security report on your U.S. (United States) gambling partners, GTECH and VLC (Video Lottery Consultants). You refuse to tell the reason that a bingo licence was revoked and then reinstated the next day. You refuse to make CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) accountable to this legislature and to the auditor through the books, as recommended by the Gass Commission. You refuse to give us a list of court cases your government is involved in. You refuse to give us any information . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Does the member have a question? Does the member have a question? I want the member to put his question.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, it's a very simple request. The media is simply asking for information on the Piper deal. You yourself admit the chances of it are very, very remote of it ever being put together again. Will you release the information on that deal for us today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — The answer to the member from Kindersley, Mr. Speaker, is yes, we will release the documents. I have told you this incessantly over the last few months that in fact we will release the documents at a time when the private sector partners involved in this arrangement conclude that either the deal is completed or that it will not go ahead. We will be releasing the documents.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Education and Health Tax Increases

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. You have received two letters from the Swift Current Chamber of Commerce blasting both the performance of your government and the performance of the two ministers, the Minister of Economic Development and the Associate Minister of Finance who met with the chamber on May 13.

Mr. Premier, the chamber says that Medicine Hat is the beneficiary of \$50 million of retail sales to Saskatchewan customers annually. That's \$50 million, Mr. Premier, that your high tax policies are draining to this . . . out of the south-west part of the province. That's a lot of economic activity.

Mr. Premier, why don't you listen to the members of the Swift Current chamber and do something about your tax policies . . . (inaudible) . . . reverse the situation that is there. Would you do that for us please?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question that the member from Morse is asking was asked of us when we were at the chamber meeting in Swift Current a couple of weeks ago, and we indicated very clearly the position that the government was in. And the reason we're in this position is because of the previous government's huge debt load that was left to this province. That's why we have to levy an extra 1 or 2 per cent on the E&H (education and health) tax, as we had to, since the day we formed government.

The other thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, is that the member quotes some figures. When we were in Swift Current, the president of the chamber of commerce said that Swift Current was losing \$10 million to shopping in Medicine Hat. When a letter to the editor indicated how erroneous that was, how silly it was for somebody to go to Medicine Hat and save \$27 in taxes and spend \$50 in gasoline, then the president of the chamber of commerce immediately raised the number to \$50 million. And when that number gets challenged next week, he'll raise it to a hundred million dollars.

I mean there's absolutely no credibility in what this man says, nor is there much credibility in the question that the member asks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member from Swift Current, who used to be a member of the chamber of commerce and also a member of the city council, is refusing to identify with those people. I prefer to identify with them.

And, Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, those people say that they're losing \$50 million out of the south-west part of the province. Maple Creek, Gull Lake, Cabri, all of those communities are losing money on a regular basis. And that, sir, is causing a serious problem to the Minister of Finance.

Would you provide an opportunity for the people of the south-west part of the province, including all of the province of Saskatchewan, to come together with you to meet to solve some of the problems that they understand are there and want to meet with you to identify them and to provide solutions to you and your cabinet? Would you do that for them, please?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have met with the chamber of commerce from Swift Current every time they've asked to meet with me. I've met with them privately on an executive basis. I've met with them when they've had larger groups of

numbers there, and the Minister of Economic Development and the Premier has met with them. We have done everything within our power to meet with these people.

What is happening over here in this House today is a member getting up and quoting numbers that are completely erroneous. And those numbers will not be the same next week because as soon as this number of \$50 million is challenged, they're going to raise the number to 100 million. You make it whatever you want. So until they've got some facts and figures of what it really is, I don't think there's any credibility.

Let me point out one more thing, Mr. Speaker. Cross-border shopping into Alberta is not a new phenomena on the west side of the province. If these people think that this just happened this March because the E&H was raised 1 per cent, they're fooling themselves.

Cross-border shopping has always been there and people have always gone over to Alberta to shop. But not because of the tax. They go there simply because they like to shop in Alberta, not because they're saving any money. Because it can be easily proven that they do not save money if you consider the costs of going to Alberta and paying the hotels, the meals, and the gasoline. You have to buy \$1,000 . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, the president of the Swift Current Chamber of Commerce is Mr. Al Kiesman. He's a chartered accountant, Mr. Minister. He's a chartered accountant and he says as per the attached document, it appears that Medicine Hat is the beneficiary of annual Saskatchewan retail sales in the amount of \$49.357 million.

Now do you want to tell the people in Swift Current that Mr. Al Kiesman is not telling the truth? That's what you told us here in the Assembly today, Mr. Minister.

And I ask you again, Mr. Premier, why don't you allow the people in the business community in the province of Saskatchewan to identify with the opportunity to develop a policy that will increase the investment in this province, increase the amount of retail sales in this province, and provide an opportunity for people to work in this province? Why don't you meet with the business community to have that happen? Why don't you meet with them?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Penner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the member opposite and the chamber of commerce in Swift Current and the people in Swift Current that when they want to call a meeting with any ministers or MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) — and I think I can ask the Premier to come as well — we will meet with them. We have met with them. It's not a matter of not having met with them.

These people always say that you don't consult with them. But their definition of consultation is simply this, if you don't do it my way, you didn't consult with me. And that's exactly what the member from Morse is saying now.

I will reiterate again, the member from . . . the Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Labour and I were in Swift Current for the chamber meeting. This same Mr. Kiesman that you're referring to stood up in the public meeting and said, this area is losing \$10 million of sales to Medicine Hat annually. When that figure was challenged by a letter to the editor, he raised it to \$50 million.

Don't give us the line that this man is a chartered accountant and suddenly has the corner on the market of all the figures and facts in the world. This man is . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Why is the member on her feet?

Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, with leave, for the introduction of guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to and through you to the other members of the Assembly, 54 grade 8 students from Silverwood Heights School in Saskatoon, seated in the east gallery. I will be looking forward to meeting the students in room 218 at 3 o'clock for refreshments and a photo and to answer any questions they may have. And I would like to ask the Assembly to join me in welcoming them to Regina today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Tourism Awareness Week

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a statement on Tourism Awareness Week in Saskatchewan. As part of the *Partnership for Renewal* economic . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. There is just way too much noise. I can't hear the minister's statement.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — . . . economic strategy, I recently announced the 17-member minister's task force on tourism partnership, consisting of industry-government representatives. The group will examine ways to enhance Saskatchewan's tourism marketing development through potential new funding sources, organizational structures, and revenue generators.

In the meantime, however, by entering into the spirit

of Tourism Awareness Week, each of us can help the industry in its effort to promote our province's many attractions and to encourage individuals to help tourists feel welcome here in the province.

Tourism, Mr. Speaker, is part of the fastest growing and high value added sector in the province. It has great potential for growth and job creation. And right now, Mr. Speaker, job creation is one of the highest priorities of this government. The tourism industry is service oriented and thus is a key component of successful renewal of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, travellers spend over \$800 million per year in our province on tourism; \$260 million of that total was spent by non-residents, making tourism Saskatchewan's fourth largest export.

The tourism industry is very labour-intensive, supporting 22,000 direct and indirect person-years of employment in Saskatchewan. Tourism represents 3.6 per cent of Saskatchewan's GDP (gross domestic product). And, Mr. Speaker, tourism also contributes to Saskatchewan's attractiveness as a place to live and do business by providing most of the amenities that add to the quality of life here in the province.

Mr. Speaker, the theme for this week is: home for your holidays. Under this theme we are all encouraged when considering destinations for our vacation, to think about staying in the province and seeing some of the many attractions that are right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the government's policy of working in partnership with industry, there is a growing awareness of our province as a vacation destination. Thousands of people in businesses and communities all over Saskatchewan have been working hard at developing a busy schedule of unique vacation experiences.

I urge all members, Mr. Speaker, to help build on this strength and create jobs by sending the tourism message to all the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, indeed tourism is an important area of our economy in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this government, as we've seen in question period, seems to be only interested in helping out tourism in Alberta. The taxation policies of this government are just some of the reasons why we're seeing tourism slipping away from the province of Saskatchewan. It's unfortunate that the government will not look at ways of enhancing tourism in this province, Mr. Speaker.

I think there's a number of ways that the government could be looking at to enhance tourism, and one of them is by not raising the sales tax such as they've been doing in the past few years, 26 per cent increase in the last two years alone, Mr. Speaker.

But in spite of all of that, the tourism industry in this province, Mr. Speaker, is working very, very hard and

diligent in trying to attract people to come to this province in spite of the government's efforts to take that away from them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Not Debatable)

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that it be moved to motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motion for return (debate).

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the second, third, and fourth orders be moved to motions for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Item nos. 2, 3, and 4, motions for return (debate).

(1445)

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — There's two more here, Mr. Speaker, that I would move to motion for return (debatable): no. 5 and no. 6.

The Speaker: — Motion nos. 5 and 6, motion for return (debate). Order.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would at this time move that the House move to government business, adjourned debates, Bill No. 38.

The Speaker: — Did the member ask for leave? The member must ask for leave. Does the member have leave?

Leave granted.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 38

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

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think it gives me some pleasure to be able to participate in this debate. I will try to be succinct in my remarks. But my objective, Mr. Speaker, at this point is to simply lay out for the members of this province, for members of this legislature as well, my feelings and my thoughts on Bill 38.

And I guess one of the initial responses I would like to have is that I would much prefer, Mr. Speaker, if I could spend my time in this legislature discussing issues like the Minister of Economic Development just

raised, and the response given by my colleague the member from Kindersley.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the situation in this province, in this legislature, of some legislation which in my opinion is unwarranted, Mr. Speaker, and is unnecessary. That I will try to explain over the next 10 or 15 minutes as I put my thoughts on the record on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

And let it suffice to say at the beginning that this is one of the most interested Bills that my constituents have found over the last number of years. And I say that simply as a response to the response that I'm getting from my constituents in their concern over the elements within this Bill.

The thoughts that I'm going to be expressing are to a large measure my own. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will be exercising the duties that I have as a member in bringing forth the concerns of my constituents. And that is what I'm going to be doing.

Over the last couple of months I would say, maybe even longer than the last couple of months, this opposition has been trying to talk some sense into members opposite. Because the message that we are getting, Mr. Speaker, loud and clear from across this province, is that indeed there's a great deal of apprehension within the citizens' minds in this province. And they are saying essentially, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is unwarranted; it is unnecessary; and most certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is not wanted by the vast, vast majority.

And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because my responses, the responses that I have received from my constituents, number literally a thousand. And that is way more than on any issue that I have received. And, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that in those 1,000 responses that I have had, I think there is one that supported the Bill. And I say I think because I cannot quite figure out the message that was left on that response which was unsigned, so unfortunately I cannot go to source and discuss with that individual precisely what his or her concerns happen to be.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the magnitude of the response on the people in the Rosthern constituency. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that I could ask my colleagues and they could confirm that that is precisely the response that they are receiving.

Mr. Speaker, I will go a step further and say that if members opposite got up and had their speech on the second reading of this Bill 38, that they in turn would get up and say yes, there has been a tremendous response from my constituents, and to a man and a woman, the response is almost identical to the one that I am expressing here.

Now I recognize that there will be varying degrees, but, Mr. Speaker, far and above any other response I think that they would concur with what I have been saying so far.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the problem that we have here with this Bill, the essential problem, the focal point, is the Bill itself is wrong. The Bill itself is fundamentally flawed, I say to the Minister of Justice, and that is why we really don't know what to do with this Bill. When you have a Bill that is fundamentally flawed, how do you fix it up so that it is acceptable?

And so I guess what we're going to be doing in the next course of the next number of weeks, whatever it takes to bring this Bill to its conclusion, is that we're going to try to make a silk purse out of that sow's ear. And, Mr. Minister, I say to you that's extremely difficult to do. I've tried that on a number of occasions. And in my job outside of this legislature, I have not found a mechanism wherein that can be done.

So there is a fundamental premise here, Mr. Minister, that is not going to allow us to come to a satisfactory conclusion unfortunately, I believe. Mr. Minister, one of your premises is based on a high-minded principle and that high-minded principle, Mr. Minister, is essentially that discrimination is wrong. Would you not agree, Mr. Minister, that that is the essential principle of this Bill, that discrimination is wrong?

And I don't think that there is one individual in this province, Mr. Minister, that's going to take umbrage with that. I think you've got 100 per cent agreement that discrimination is wrong, and it should not be tolerated within our society.

And I don't think that I, during the rest of my remarks, am going to indicate that I support discrimination. Certainly in listening to the speeches and so on, given by my colleagues, that has not come about either.

But you see, Mr. Minister — and I say to the Minister of Justice as the leader minister on this — that the fundamental flaw in this Bill is that you are being totally inconsistent, totally inconsistent with the Bill and how it is in practice. And you smile. I'm glad that I got your attention. So now I'm going to expose to you the fundamental flaws within this legislation.

Mr. Minister, you say that you want to discriminate against homosexual on several counts. Did you get the thrust of that statement? First of all, the Bill is based upon the premise, discrimination is fundamentally wrong. Then you go about and you say, members of the public, we want to discriminate against homosexuals on these bases. We want to say that we will not allow homosexuals to adopt children. That's what you've said. You're not going to allow that. Mr. Minister, that's discrimination. That's discrimination. You say that you do not want homosexuals to have spousal benefits. You've said that. But, Mr. Minister, that's discrimination.

Within the very Bill that you espouse to be preventing discrimination, I've already cited two examples of discrimination inherent within the very basic principles of that Bill.

You say that you wouldn't want any teaching of the homosexual lifestyles in school. In fact I think I've

read some excerpts where you say that would not be desirable, and we certainly would not recommend that, and we certainly don't want that, that the homosexual lifestyle will become a basis for teachings in school. But, Mr. Minister, that's discrimination.

You say that you do not want to recognize same-sex marriages. You don't want to recognize same sex-marriages. We agree with you. But that's discrimination. That's discrimination.

You say that if a person has two rooms to let, two rooms to rent, you cannot discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation. But at the same time, you have indicated that if a home wants to let one room then you don't have to accept homosexual couples. Well, Mr. Minister, that is discrimination.

Or isn't it discrimination? In my way of thinking and most people that I've talked to, that is a classic example of discrimination.

Can you see the web that I'm weaving here, Mr. Minister? That within the old premise of a Bill that is saying discrimination is wrong, to which all of us would agree, you are saying, in support of the Bill to try to appease the opponents of the Bill, you are saying, oh yes, but we will allow discrimination on this; we'll allow discrimination on this and this and this. And I've given you five examples of where you are saying, oh yes, it's all right to discriminate in that case.

So I guess what I'm having a problem with is recognizing the seriousness with which you are advancing the cause of non-discrimination. Because you're being inconsistent — inconsistent in your own remarks as opposed to what the Bill is purporting today to do. So, Mr. Minister, the inconsistency is something that I'm having a great deal of trouble with in this Bill.

And I know that you have been quite amenable to having some amendments made. At least you have indicated that in the media, that if we come up with certain amendments, that perhaps you would be allowing them to pass, and that they would form part of this new Bill. And I assume from that that you mean that you would put into the Bill these concerns that the people are expressing in the ones that I have raised so far.

But, Mr. Minister, if you're proposing to do that, even that causes me some concerns because of what I think that will do, in my opinion. And I'm still out . . . the jury is still out in my mind, quite frankly, on a personal level whether I would even support those kinds of amendments, because I think fundamentally what those amendments will do is let you off the hook.

Because now you're going to be able to say to the folks, look, we took all of those obnoxious sections out of the Bill, or at least we added safeguards into the Bill that will accommodate the concerns that people may have.

But, Mr. Minister, by the same token — and I'll be coming forward with some of these issues later on — we know that if you are going to include these, the Human Rights Code, which seems to be the overriding law in the province of Saskatchewan, is still subject to the federal Bill of Rights and the code of rights. And if there's anything perceived in the Saskatchewan human code of rights that is contrary to the principles established at the federal level, it's going to be overruled anyway. So nothing has been gained by putting in amendments like this.

But like I said, the jury is still out. I think if it comes . . . that push comes to shove, I think I would support amendments. Because what it will do is cause this whole issue to be taken to the next step, to the next stage, to the federal, and the ultimate, Supreme Court. And I think that is where the decision is ultimately going to be decided upon.

And even there, I have an extreme concern. Why are we going to take legislation passed by this Legislative Assembly to the Supreme Court for interpretation? That's a concern that I have — that we're giving extra power into the hands of the courts to make decisions, while we can make it very, very plain and simple and forthright, as legislators, to say precisely what we mean, to reduce the chances of it being misinterpreted by some judge or by some court jurisdiction.

Now those are some preliminary comments. What I want to do is lay out my position, the way I feel on some of these issues. And I will say at the outset that when it comes to issues like that, I take a somewhat simplistic approach. I have been accused at times of being too simplistic and straightforward and can't see the trees for the forest.

(1500)

But the approach that I take on this issue is very similar to my approach when it came to the abortion issue. And when it comes to the abortion issue, I know that as legislators here we are supposed to represent the views of our constituents. And 99.9 per cent of the time, I'm sure, that's what we all do on a regular basis. And we are to do that — that's the fundamental democratic exercise being put into motion.

But there are some times within our lives where we have to take a personal stand and say that this stand is non-negotiable. Here I stand; I can be no other. And that is the stand that I have taken on the abortion issue, where during the election I will go out and I will tell people my stand is pro-life. My stand is against publicly funded abortions.

That fraction of 1 per cent where mom's life will be in danger is so remote that essentially it does not exist, although it is there. And if my constituents would say to me, you go to the legislature and vote for publicly funded abortions, I'm afraid I would not do that. I have told them I will not do that, in spite of the fact that I'm a democratically elected legislator.

There are times when we must stand up and be

counted. That is one of the things that it comes to when I make my mind up on that.

This is essentially and fundamentally the same type of issue, in my opinion. And so therefore my stand is no, I cannot support any kind of activity that is going to promote the homosexual lifestyle. And I know you members have gotten up and you've been trying to tell the people that this is not a promotion of that. That's precisely what it is.

But there's one difference between me here, and let's say, the Liberal leader for example, who in the past has said that the homosexual lifestyle has got to be protected. Now all of a sudden there's a different tune coming up when a poll has been taken, and whoops, maybe that's not a proper thing for me to say now because my polls are indicating that the constituents say this is wrong.

Well my instincts tell me and my inner belief tell me that it's wrong. And I will be voting against this Bill, Mr. Minister. I may be supporting the amendments; depends on how they wash out. But fundamentally I'm going to be opposing this Bill. And by coincidence perhaps, by happenstance, I'm getting a 99.99 support from my constituents in this matter.

And I think that's something that you should take note of. It's something you should take note of, Mr. Minister, because no person, no school, no institution, in my opinion, should be forced to accommodate a lifestyle with which they disagree. That's a fundamental premise. If they do not like the hippie lifestyle, then they should have the right to exclude it from their home, from their school, etc.

If they believe, for example, in chastity as a lifestyle, they should be able to then also be allowed to exclude any of those that lead a very active and free heterosexual lifestyle even. And if they believe that homosexuality is wrong, then they should be able to exclude homosexuals from their lifestyle. And again, Mr. Minister, I think that that is fundamentally wrong, and so therefore I cannot support it.

And secondly, in going through my position here, Mr. Minister, I believe that the Human Rights Commission has extended so far that it is now actively and systematically denying human rights on a regular basis. And this Bill, Mr. Minister, will simply add to the cannon-fodder of the Donna Greschners of this world as she wages her own personal war.

And what I'm going to say, Mr. Minister, is a calculated statement. I know what I'm saying when I say that the Human Rights Commission in this province of Saskatchewan has received over the last while almost a death blow. The credibility of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission is in serious, serious jeopardy — the credibility — simply because of the appointments that you have chosen to make in the form of Donna Greschner who has one aim in life, and simply by the appointment of another party faithful in the form of Nadine Hunt.

I think, Mr. Minister, and I will repeat this — I've said this outside the legislature and I will say it inside the legislature now — for me to put the lifestyle and the whole aroma of Saskatchewan people and atmosphere within Saskatchewan at the doorstep of the Human Rights Commission the way it stands right now, is extremely disturbing to me. And what I'm hearing from people out there, it is extremely disturbing to them because the lack of respect that you have perpetrated upon the Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I thirdly want to put forth as my position that I believe that this Bill is too open to interpretation — too open to interpretation not just by the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission but also the courts themselves. And I think — and this is something that you folks are hearing too — that people are fed up with the trend that they have seen in different institutions making the laws. And I made reference to this at the outset of my speech.

Mr. Minister, the people of this province expect this legislature to pass laws. They expect this legislature to say this is the way it is going to be, in unequivocal terms. And, Mr. Minister, that is not what is happening here. Because there is no doubt about it, no doubt about it by your own admission, that it will be the Human Rights Commission that will be determining many of the nuances that are evident within the wording of this Bill, and that they will be making the interpretation as to what is right and to what is wrong. And I say that is fundamentally wrong within this Bill. That's part of the fundamental flaw that this Bill has.

Mr. Minister, on Tuesday, May 4, 1993, in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* there are some articles. And I just want to quote a few lines because it kind of summarizes some of my thoughts. And you say, for example, in this article: "I don't know how we can do that" to write the intent into the legislation, which is a concern that I have. That's too loosey-goosey. It's not direct enough to say precisely what this legislature means.

And you say:

I don't know how we can do that. How do you write into a bill that this is not the thin edge of the wedge, or that we are going this far, (that we are going so far) but no farther. I can say on behalf of this government that we will not be going any farther, but of course, that is not binding on the next government.

So what you're saying . . . which is of course us, yes, I recognize that, Mr. Minister. But what we are saying, that if it was us sitting over there we would probably not have that too much of a concern.

But you're saying, it's not our intention; trust us. But the people don't trust you, Mr. Minister, in this aspect. Maybe not on a personal level, but certainly they don't trust the motivators behind this, the people that are egging you on — the promotionists of this whole Bill.

And eventually, Mr. Minister, it will come to fruition — the concerns that the people of this province have on those four or five incidents that I enumerated at the outset of my remarks. That is their concern. And you're not giving them any assurance, Mr. Minister, because you say we won't be going any further, but of course that is not binding in the future.

And, Mr. Minister, I say to you that when these issues, as surely they will, come up to the Human Rights Commission and ultimately to the Supreme Court of Canada for interpretation, those courts are not going to be looking at your second-reading speech where you try to give assurances that these were not your intentions. They won't be looking at that.

They'll be looking at the letter of the law and the letter of the law is very fuzzy. Initially what's going to happen is, is that your self-appointed and self-styled Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission that is going to be interpreting this law. That's why there is absolutely no confidence in the people of Saskatchewan, or of the people of Saskatchewan, in this legislation and your assurances.

So, Mr. Minister, I'm saying to you that if your purported intentions in this Bill are to eliminate discrimination on the basis of jobs, employment, and . . . What was the other one?

An Hon. Member: — Employment, housing.

Mr. Neudorf: — And housing — pardon me, I had a momentary mind lapse there. If your intention is to eliminate that discrimination on housing and unemployment . . . or employment, then why not do it the direct route? Don't do something indirectly what you are afraid to do directly.

We don't need this type of thing put into the human rights legislation because you can easily go to the other Bills that are affecting employment. Put it in there. You can easily do that in the housing sector. Put it in there. Be specific if those are the concerns that you have, and we can address that without opening up this potential Pandora's box as it is tending to be turning out right now.

So, Mr. Minister, there are a lot of concerns along that line. Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister further that for a government that claims it is changing the electoral law of the land because it believes in democracy, I find it reprehensible that this same government says that they will totally ignore a democratic vote of the people on this issue.

And again, Mr. Speaker, I want to address a concern that has been expressed to me, and that I have, and that is that the minister has gone on record as saying, so you come up with a hundred thousand petitions opposing this legislation. Well whoop-de-do, I'm not going to pay any attention to it.

That's what you said, Mr. Minister. You said to the folks out there, you can get as many petitions as you want, a hundred thousand, and I won't pay any

attention to you.

And do you know what, Mr. Minister? I believe you. I believe you because your government already has a track record where you don't listen to people.

We had an issue in the last session following the election and the plebiscite when there were over 300,000 people — signatures — saying we do not subscribe to publicly funded abortions; please don't do that; change it. And you said, oh no, my calculator shows me that that's only 63 per cent of the population; that's not enough to dissuade me; 63 per cent is not something that I'm going to be listening to.

Well we have another democratic process in place which states that if we can come up . . . what is it, 15 per cent of the population? It's about 95,000 signatures that these folks have to get, and then you will be forced — you should be forced — to have a plebiscite or a referendum on that.

But you have already tried to pre-empt that process by telling people, oh don't bother, don't bother coming up with those names because even if you do come up with those names I'm not going to listen to you anyway because we know better. It's that Big Brother mentality coming out again that you are determined that you know what is best for people. And it doesn't matter what the population of Saskatchewan says; you are going to do it regardless.

Well all I can say is, to the people out there, all I can say is, to the hundreds of thousands of people in Saskatchewan who have already registered their concern with us, all I can say to them is, don't stop, don't give up hope. I think they should continue on their path. I think they should continue to register their concerns with your government.

It may not dissuade you at this time, but certainly upon reflection as you go to bed at night and you look at those stacks and stacks of petitions of people who have a legitimate concern, maybe it will begin to grow on you and you will have second thoughts. And the power of the people, the voice of the people, is powerful. And ultimately, Mr. Minister, if you're not going to listen to the people, you will pay the price. You will pay the price.

(1515)

And when I went out to my constituents and said, there are certain things that I'm not willing to compromise and I will not do even if my constituents say you should, I have to pay the price for that, and I would pay the price politically for that. But if you have your principles, you will stay by them and you will be willing to pay that price.

Now if your principles are such that you are not going to listen to the people — and goodness' sake, I don't know what those principles could possibly be — that is a decision that you are going to have to make, Mr. Minister.

And I'm picking on you all the time, and that's not fair because you're part of a conglomerate there and it's a caucus decision that you have embarked upon. And I realize that and I recognize that. So I'm not picking on you personally because you're . . . I'd like to say you're a victim of circumstances, but perhaps you're a willing victim at the same time by my interpretation of that.

So, Mr. Minister, I also . . . I'm wondering about the democratic process. You say you're doing all of these wonderful things for the electoral process by changing boundaries unilaterally. And yet you are not going to listen to the votes of the people as they register them in this process of trying to come up with a plebiscite.

And at the same time we have already . . . my leader, in his speech, indicated to you, well if you're going to try to force this through the House, then at least let each member of your caucus stand up and be counted. That's what we wanted to have you do. In other words, let's go for a free vote on this.

Now I know you're saying all of your members support this wholeheartedly and everybody's gung-ho and there's no problem with it. Well if that's the case and if you're that confident, then let them make a decision on their own and publicly say: of my own free choice, with no party discipline directing me, I am standing up and I am voting for this legislation.

Now I know what part of your response is; that oh, this has got nothing to do with morality. This is not a moral issue — it's a legal issue. And so therefore, because it's a legal issue, party solidarity and party discipline must be maintained. And I think, Mr. Minister, if that is your response, that that also shows an inconsistency.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, I just want to say this: I believe homosexually . . . homosexuality is to be morally wrong. I think it's degrading. I think it's dead wrong. I think it transgresses about what God's plan for humanity was; I don't think it is in tune with God's plan for man.

But not only does homosexuality transgress that law, the ultimate law, it also transgresses the law of nature. I can see it no other way. And it's fundamentally flawed, fundamentally wrong.

However, Mr. Speaker, even as we see some of the hideous consequences in society of this type of lifestyle that has a danger of being propagated through various sections, about the educational aspects and so on — I'm not going to get into all of those areas; my colleagues can pick up on that — but I want to say that even though I fundamentally believe that, I fundamentally believe it is unchristian, it's immoral to practise that lifestyle, I firmly believe . . . in the same breath, I will say if people want to follow that lifestyle, they should be free to follow that. And if they want to do that it's not up to me to stand in judgement upon them. That time will come.

And I do not believe that discrimination should be there, but if they want to lead that type of lifestyle, let

them. I want to lead what I believe in, and I want to be able to raise my family in a lifestyle that I believe in and that my children will believe in. And I don't want a conflict between the two.

While I should not be able to dictate what goes on in that type of bedroom, they should not be able to dictate what goes on in my bedroom and my home. And anything that affects that, Mr. Minister, I take as a threat, I take as a threat upon my own individual freedoms. And I do not think it's fair to . . . so it's a two-way street, Mr. Speaker.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take my place. I'm going to say that we probably will be coming up with some amendments. And I'm going to take the liberty of my leader to say that I will be able to vote as I want to vote on these issues, and I will certainly be doing that. But fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, I just reiterate that the plan is fundamentally wrong, and I will be voting against this Bill.

Thank you for your time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It really gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise today and speak in support of this Bill to amend the Human Rights Code. It is legislation like this that makes the New Democratic Party what it is. It is legislation like this that puts us at the cutting edge of Canada's conscience.

It is in effect a reform — a reform that unlike so many reforms, carries no price tag. When a government tells you that they're going to reform taxation, you know that your taxes are going up. But this amendment simply reforms the way that one person treats another.

And the member for Rosthern has told us this afternoon that this Bill is unpopular and it has had a lot of press, a lot of letters against it. And I won't deny that. I've had a lot of letters against it, probably the majority. But the point with this Bill is that it is not that it is popular, but that it is right and it is just and it is fair.

And I would point out to the hon. member for Rosthern and his colleagues over there, that a few years ago the federal Tories brought up in the House of parliament in Ottawa the matter of capital punishment, and despite the fact that the vast majority of the population of Canada, if they're asked, would say they're in favour of capital punishment, parliament voted it down as they voted it down before and as they will continue to vote it down. Because parliament does not just reflect the opinions of the people in Canada, on certain occasions and on certain matters it leads the way. It shows the way forward and says, you may believe this, but it is wrong. The right way to go is this, and we are going this way and we're prepared to accept defeat on the next election on the matter of our principles. And we on this side of the House are prepared to do this today.

Some weeks ago I sat here specifically to listen to the

arguments of the opposition in case I've missed something that might alter my attitude towards this Bill. And one I heard, sir, was the mealy-mouthed mumblings of the member from Morse.

An Hon. Member: — Could you repeat that?

Mr. Draper: — The mealy-mouthed mumblings of the member from Morse.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Draper: — And that, sir, really convinced me that this amendment was just. Such meandering, sir, I could really expect from a neophyte who was new to the Assembly, embarrassed at standing up in public and making himself look silly and opposing simply for the sake of opposing. But I really expected more from somebody who until not that many months ago, had been a member of the government of this province.

Since then, sir, I have listened with a great deal of interest to everything that the opposition said. I've read everything that's been reported that they've said in the press. And it seems significant to me that after all that the only amendment by the Progressive Conservatives in this House to the Human Rights Code in their period of office dealt with the mentally disturbed. And I wonder whether that was a matter of self-interest, a kind of nepotism.

Sir, there seems to be no problem with the categories of family status or being in receipt of public assistance, and yet these grounds are equally important if not as inflammatory. The vast majority of those who are on public assistance are embarrassed enough that they are unable to obtain and hold down a job without being asked what their means of support is.

And I really don't see that such a statement when looking for a job would prevent them from getting the employment if they have the necessary skills. But I do understand that it is very difficult if you're on welfare, to obtain accommodation. I really don't understand why this is; I just know from personal experience that it is the case.

Landlords seem to have a funny idea that tenants should pay rent but not actually occupy the property. And there seems to be some fundamental difference between the unemployed poor and the idle rich which seems to be worthy of debate in its own right. Nobody but nobody should be denied accommodation because they are on assistance, and I'm sure the opposition will agree with that.

It would have made a very sad end to the story of the good Samaritan if when he took the injured man to the inn, the innkeeper refused to look after the injured man because he wasn't paying for his own accommodation. Think about it.

The . . . (inaudible) . . . family status, sir, is a sign of the times really. It used to be marital status in the days . . . and I remember it: single, married, or widowed, then gradually and grudgingly and embarrassedly,

divorced and separated crept into the lexicon. And now the situation is so confused that no single term seems to be adequate to cover all the possible permutations, so family status will have to do until we have a new norm.

At one time not so long ago, the term common-law marriage or open marriage, were terms that drove the temperature past boiling point. Now no one turns a hair even at our Roman Catholic hospital of St. Joseph's in Gravelbourg. People are employed on the staff there that 20 years ago would have been considered as mortal sinners and shunned, let alone employed. But times have changed, as times must. The pendulum swings from one extreme to the other and frankly, I think the same will happen with regard to the so-called sexual orientation.

Today's avant-garde is always tomorrow's passé. The daring of one generation is dismissed as old-fashioned by their children and grandchildren. This Bill will pass and be forgotten in the light of tomorrow's course and ebb.

Nevertheless, I really see no logic to the opposition's stance. If simply making it illegal to ask a person's sexual orientation is promoting homosexuality, then *pari passu* we must be promoting everybody to marry or become a single parent by making it illegal to ask an applicant's family status. Imagine it, Mr. Speaker. Every 13-year-old girl is going to become a mother simply because of this act of legislation, and every 15-year-old boy is going to be seduced in order to comply with that. It's strange, but by the same token every working person is going to give up a perfectly good job and go on welfare simply because the NDP outlaws asking the would-be tenant if they're on welfare.

Sir, the possibilities of this kind of thinking are enormous if you look at it a little bit closer. If we reversed this Bill and made it illegal to ask a person if they were actually in employment or to ask a person if they were celibate, everybody would go out and get a job and everybody would stop having children.

It just goes to show how being in opposition has stimulated the higher brain of the PCs (Progressive Conservatives) in just 18 short months. At the end of 50 years in opposition it's incredible to think of where they should go to. You know, they are the nabobs of *non sequiturs*. Pierre Elliott Trudeau 15 years ago made the statement that the state has no place in the nation's bedrooms, and that should be sufficient to quash the opposition of the Liberals in this House.

(1530)

So in the armed forces we now have no longer a ban on homosexuals, and they can now serve their country at sea, on the land, or in the air. Six provinces with Liberal and Conservative governments now prevent discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. We are simply bringing our legislation into line with them, so why is there such a howl from the opposition benches?

The other jurisdictions will follow in short order and I'm sure that the legislators in the provinces that have already enacted this legislation were bombarded with the same hate literature that we are getting now. They passed their Bills and the sky has not fallen on their heads except for the usual swing from Tory to Liberal in mainly elections. We too will survive, and in 10 year's time nobody will give it another thought.

It's a very interesting Bill, sir, in that . . . an unusual debate in the three matters here, three categories of discrimination, but really the only one that's been seriously debated is this of sexual orientation. We're getting the words homosexual, lesbian, gay, bandied about, yet none of these words appeared in the original code of human rights and they don't appear in the amendment. Obviously this is a very emotional subject but we're getting off the track by a country mile.

This Bill in fact protects heterosexuals as much as it does anybody else. And I will give you a hypothetical example that will demonstrate that.

There's a singer in the neighbouring province who uses nothing but lower case letters in her name and has declared that she is an open lesbian. And she has a large entourage of musicians and managers, recording technicians, publicists, etc. How would it sit with this House, sir, and with the general public . . .

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

Mr. Swenson: — I beg leave to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg for allowing me the opportunity to make an introduction to the House today to you, sir, and to other members of the Assembly.

Today I have the honour of introducing 23 grade 4's from Lindale School in Moose Jaw. Mr. Speaker, Lindale is the school that Thunder Creek school unit has within the boundaries of the city of Moose Jaw. They're all rural children from the constituency of Thunder Creek. Today they have with them their teacher Sonja Susut, and bus driver Jerry Hoff.

This class, Mr. Speaker, is special to me in a couple of ways. Lindale is the school which I attended from grade 6 onward through my public school days. But today I have the honour of having my eldest son here today with his class. And he's turning a bright shade of red right now, but it's always a pleasure when we have members of our family attend the House and be able to introduce them here. So I'm very pleased and proud that Sonja's chosen today to bring her class to the legislature.

I would ask all members of the legislature to help me welcome the grade 4 class from Lindale.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 38

(continued)

Mr. Draper: — Mr. Speaker, sir, I'll repeat my question. If this lady . . . how would it sit with this House and the general public if when this lady needs extra staff, she were to ask an applicant for the job what their sexual orientation was? And if they declared themselves to be heterosexual, and she refused them employment on those grounds, I suspect that if such a case happened, the member for Morse and the member for Rosthern would be so hot under the collar they'd demand a Bill like this to protect that applicant.

In fact, sir, this situation is probably more prevalent than we would think of. Many homosexuals are forced from their jobs because of discrimination. Because of that, they go into business for themselves and instead of being employees they now become employers. A lot of them go into industries like music and the arts, the cinema, and literature, where there is tolerance of such abnormalities, and they become employers of labour of a much higher proportion than their numbers would apparently warrant.

And a previous example of this sort of discrimination which led to problems like this was with the Jews in Europe who were refused admission to the professions like law, medicine, and teaching, and therefore went into jobs like goldsmithing, jewellery, furriers, banking, and financiers, and became, although an oppressed minority, a very important and a very rich and a very influential group.

And I suspect that a lot of this sort of thing is happening under our eyes today, but we don't know it because these people are not labelled with a denomination and they don't all wear ringlets and Homburg hats. But it's there just the same.

I'd like to mention some names of who may be familiar to you, names like Somerset Maugham, who was not only a doctor but was a very famous and successful novelist; Ivor Novello, a composer of light opera; Jean Cocteau, French film director, cartoonist, man of letters; and his protégé, the actor, Jean Marais, who appeared in many of Jean Cocteau's films because of their mutual inclinations; Rock Hudson, the American film star, who died of AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) some years ago and made an open declaration of his homosexuality; and presumably Rudolf Nureyev, who I understand died of AIDS last year, although it's not completely clear.

All these men were queer, as the saying goes, and

without them we'd lose the music of Gisele and Swan Lake, because Piotr Tchaikovsky was another member of this tortured group. Who amongst us would not have been proud to have any of these people as friends and neighbours or members of our family?

And I'd like to bring perhaps a little bit of levity into it by asking which of the members of the opposition would have had the temerity to try and wrest the Crown or prevent from going into his castle, or any castle for that matter, Richard Coeur de Lion — Richard I, Richard the Lionheart, King of England from 1198 to 1212; crusader, man of God, a leader of armies, a leader of his country, and a preferer of young men rather than young women. Stand up to him, see what homosexuality could be like under those circumstances.

Sir, the impression that most of us have here of women's liberation movement is a bra-burning harridan, because that is what is shown on the television. Similarly we are shown shots of militant gays and lesbians marching down Pennsylvania Avenue proclaiming that they are about to take over the world. There are such women's libbers, and no doubt there are such homosexuals. But they are in a very small minority, a minority in fact within a minority.

The majority of gays — and believe me, sir, that is a very unhappy and inappropriate term — are quiet, unassuming people. Teachers, carpenters, and insurance clerks, to my own personal knowledge, who do their jobs as anybody else and simply wish to be left alone to pursue their careers to the best of their ability and snatch whatever happiness they can from their abnormal lifestyle.

And abnormal it is, and abnormal most of them recognize that it is being. The hopeless desire to be able to pursue a fulfilling family life like their neighbours, and yet for some abnormality of genes or upbringing — possibly a combination of both; we really just don't know yet — they are unable to do so.

Sir, the law of averages would indicate that from one to six, depending on whose figures you take — from one to six of the members of this Assembly are likely to have an abnormality of sexuality. But in this Chamber, sir, we do not ask.

And that, sir, is the point of the amendment to the Human Rights Code. We do not ask what a person's sexual orientation is, in the same as we don't ask what their religion is. If during a period of association with somebody we discover what their religion is, we don't bother. We don't dismiss them. We don't say they're not going to be friends of ours any more. We're not going to mix with them in social functions. We're not going to resign from the Lions Club or the Kinsmen because so-and-so is a Catholic or a Jew. I'm not quite sure the vast majority of us wouldn't do that if we discovered that one of our close colleagues had a different sexual orientation to ourselves.

And we are simply making it illegal for anybody to ask what an applicant's sexual orientation is before we offer them a job, an apartment, or a promotion. And should an employer or a landlord discover that that sexual orientation is not acceptable to them sometime down the line, they simply have to ignore it. And in most cases, they would just shrug their shoulders and say, well I'll be damned, and forget about it entirely.

This does not confer any special rights on anyone nor does it promote sexual deviance. It simply acknowledges that sexual differences exist, have existed since the beginning of time, and will continue to exist until such time as we have some suitable means of treatment for these unfortunates.

We have the ludicrous situation that where a homosexual could become a colonel in the armed forces, courtesy of the federal Tories, and in charge of perhaps a thousand men, but the provincial Tories would deny them any job; by grace of the federal Tories, again, could command a battleship or a tank battalion, but the Grand Devinians of Wacko, Saskatchewan, would not allow them the key of an apartment. This, sir, is patently absurd.

They brought up the matter of spousal rights. And I'm sorry, this is another non-starter. Spousal rights for the same-sex couple will not be enacted, have not been enacted, because they will not be necessary. Spousal benefits became a bargaining point where, because of pregnancy and child-rearing, a wife and children became and are and always will be vulnerable.

With same-sex couples, how many of them are likely to get children, for pity's sake? Which means that both of them can work and earn their own benefits in their own right. If one is severely crippled or mentally retarded or ill, they will get full protection under other legislation, under social services, under medicare, whatever.

So this really is not a point. It is a hare that's been started by the opposition and which their colleagues in the other provinces in the Tory parties have denied.

Marriage has always been between male and female, and it's not going to change. Marriage was instituted again for the protection of women and children, in particular the children. Same-sex couples are not going to produce children, so they're not going to need this sort of protection. The Bill does not allow for either same-sex marriages nor spousal benefits, and it cannot be construed as such.

As for the matter of adoptions, this does not come under the legislature. This is a matter for the courts. It's always been a matter for the courts. It will continue to be a matter for the courts. The courts have denied same-sex couples from adopting children. I see no reason why they should not continue along that line.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, sir, no matter how many lessons you give a chicken, no matter how good the teacher, no matter

how bright the chicken, that chicken will never become an eagle. And by the reverse procedure it is also true that an eagle, however unsuccessful an eagle that eagle may be, will never ever become a chicken.

But one of the problems here is that we're having the Bible quoted at us right, left, and centre. I'm surprised that some of the opposition haven't looked up a bit of Arabic and quoted the Koran or maybe a bit of Chinese and quoted somebody else. But Canada just cannot be compared with ancient Israel. We are not a theocracy. We are a democracy. And our government deals with crimes, not with sin. If this were not the case, we'd still be stoning unmarried mothers and women taken in sin.

And it wasn't so long ago that expectant mothers were expelled from high school. Yet at the same time the expectant father involved was not expelled from high school. This was considered unfair, and it no longer occurs. And I'm sure the opposition would not want us to return to that, and I'm quite sure that if in some time in the future they are returned to office, they will not rescind this amendment to the Human Rights Code.

And if the fundamentalist churches really wish to address a fundamental issue, I'll give them one to take up. Let them start and carry out a campaign against pornography, particularly pornography with regards to children. This is something that really needs a crusade.

Some sage told us that people lead lives of quiet desperation. And if this is true of we who have normal sex lives, families, and children, how much more true of those who do not. This government prides itself on its compassion. And this Bill epitomizes that compassion to the nth degree.

Mr. Speaker, sir, I'm really very proud that our government has had the courage to introduce these amendments. And I am very pleased to lend my support. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased as well to stand in my place and speak to Bill No. 38. And as my colleagues before me have spoken and reiterated a number of points that they've been bringing forward, that have been brought to our attention by concerned citizens across the province of Saskatchewan, I want to take a moment to just raise a few of the concerns before I adjourn debate on the motion before us.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most important factors that we must observe and take note of . . . and I think to a month and a half ago now when the Minister of Justice gave a second-reading speech on the Bill before this Assembly, and a number of comments since then. And I think the emphasis at that time by the Minister of Justice was re-emphasizing the points of the reasoning for the Bill and the fact that he wanted to reaffirm in the public's minds at least or to . . . maybe

his back-benchers, a number of the back-bench MLAs who have a number of problems and a number of concerns and have raised these concerns.

The minister brought out a number of points and kind of indicated that he had gave a very solid, very stirring and sound, second-reading speech to reaffirm what the Bill was really doing. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the minister and as we've been in this discussion since then, it would appear to me that if this Bill really didn't have a lot of problems associated with it, that if the Bill was really as clear as the minister indicates, that the type of speech that was presented by the minister wouldn't have been necessary because there'd have been everything in the Bill that would reaffirm what we have been saying all along.

And I think what we've seen, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there are a number of areas that this Bill still leaves wide open for interpretation, and certainly I'm pleased that the minister has taken the time to even sit down with some of us and listen to our viewpoint. We would rather though have had the minister pull Bill No. 38 and sit down and address the issues of housing and employment directly through another piece of legislation, as we've seen a number of jurisdictions in . . . certainly in America.

A number of states in United States of America have addressed the housing and employment problems that the homosexual community claim that they are facing, being discriminated on. And it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that certainly that would have been an avenue that was open to the government as well, rather than opening up the debate on the human rights issue by adding the terms, sexual orientation, family status, without really taking the time to define what that means.

Mr. Speaker, that's the major area of concern, the fact that there is no real definition defining those terms and what they mean. That's why we say, and that's why we argue, Mr. Speaker, that what we find taking place . . . and down the road, it may not be here tomorrow, may not be today, may not be tomorrow, but down the road certainly the Human Rights Code and the human rights Bill over the past number of years have been used by individuals to get more and greater demands and greater access to, if you will, public funds and to put their demands at the feet of the public in general.

And I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that by opening the debate on the Human Rights Code and by changing the terminology, it will open the door to greater demands, and certainly by the homosexual community for some of the areas that they feel deprived of as yet that the public in general feel very strongly about. Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the points, and a number of points I would like to raise at a later date and I believe that it would be appropriate at this time to allow for other House business to proceed. Therefore I move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 87 — An Act to amend The Mental Health Services Act

Clauses 1 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chairman, before moving, I would like to extend a thanks to the officials from the Department of Health who joined us here last Thursday, I believe it was, and who were here for the day and provided much valuable assistance to the committee at that time. So in their absence today, I would like to thank them.

And now I would like to move the Bill without amendment.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 87 — An Act to amend The Mental Health Services 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.

(1600)

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**General Revenue Fund
Loans, Advances and Investments
Saskatchewan Gaming Commission
Vote 142**

The Chair: — I would ask at this time that the minister please introduce his officials to the committee.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce two officials that are with me today. I have Gord Nystuen to my left, who is the acting chief executive officer of the Saskatchewan Gaming Commission; and to my right I have Gwen Frankowski, who is the director of administration and human resources.

Item 1

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, would you provide to the committee those individuals who are working on your behalf in the minister's office, handling the Gaming Commission. And would provide for me also the information as to how the individuals are paid, what they're paid, and details of their salary, and where they're located too. Would you provide that for me, please?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Chairman, all of my staff are paid through Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. The Gaming Commission pays for none of my personal staff.

Mr. Martens: — Did you provide that information to the member for Arm River when you were detailing that information?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes. Mr. Speaker, under estimates for Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, that information had previously been provided.

Mr. Martens: — When the minister travels on the . . . with the responsibility of the Gaming Commission and individuals who travel with him, does he charge any of that to the Gaming Commission?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Chairman, I can say to the member from Morse that in terms of my staff, there have . . . under this budget item there have been no charges for travel at this point. We have some travel costs that have been incurred by the Gaming Commission and Gaming Commission staff by the former minister in charge, and we can pass that on to him, if you would like.

Mr. Martens: — Yes, I wouldn't mind having that. Also would you be able to tell me which minister it was.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — It was the member from Churchill Downs. We will pass that, if you'd like. It's short items. I can read them into the record for the member opposite.

Sheila Denysiuk has incurred costs of \$1,386; Dave Innes, \$1,010; Robert Jeanneau, \$8,847; Gerry Meier, \$191; and the member from Churchill Downs, \$40. Just in addition to that, that was the amount that had been paid to these people in terms of reimbursement for travel. The amounts are similar other than Dave Innes travelled in the amount of \$3,827; Robert Jeanneau in the amount of \$11,670; Gerry Meier in the amount of \$1,602; and the member from Churchill Downs, \$998.

Mr. Martens: — Would you be able to pass that information over? I was busy writing it down. I didn't keep up with it.

The travel, I believe you stated for some individuals was \$11,000, \$3,800. Would you provide the details of where the individuals went and to the various places they went? Would you be able to provide those details as well?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — To the member from Morse, I'll pass this over if a page would like to take this. We can supply for you a breakdown of the travel. The former chairman of the board, Robert Jeanneau, I think that was the amount, \$11,670 that you were curious about. Part of that was reimbursement for commuting between Saskatoon and Regina, but we'll pass you a detail of those expenses across.

Mr. Martens: — Was any of that incurred in air flights to any destinations? Dave Innes as well, and Gerry Meier. I'd like to have those details. Also Sheila Denysiuk.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — We'll send across a detailed list of his travel, in terms of his flights and how much was for reimbursement as a member of the . . . or as chairman of the commission. We'll have that sent across to you.

Mr. Martens: — Actually, Mr. Minister, Mr. Jeanneau actually spent a significant amount of money. And I would like the details if you could provide for the . . . what the committee within directly . . . Looks like there's in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 in travel that he spent, one as the chief executive officer, and I suppose the other one would be too, of the Gaming Commission. Have you got the information there? And would you be able to provide it to us today?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Chairman, to put that information together, I'd like to remind the member opposite he may, and I'm sure he's aware having been a member of Executive Council and in charge of arms of government, he will well understand that the Gaming Commission appears before Public Accounts, and that's basically where detailed information is supplied.

We're certainly more than willing to provide information. But I'd just like to remind him that the items that we're discussing are from the blue book dealing with the money that was allocated for the purchase of the video lottery terminals.

But as I say, we certainly want to be helpful, and we want to pass on as much information. We don't perhaps have the amount of detail that you may want here today, but I'm sure as he is well aware the opportunity to do detailed analysis of the gaming corporation's expenditures will be afforded under Public Accounts.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, that's all fine and good. But that's a year after the fact when it's audited and then a year after the fact that it's assessed by Public Accounts and Crown Corporations.

And so if I'd have the indulgence of the minister to provide them to me, it would be an asset for us to be of assistance to the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan in detailing some of the things that I think are important for the taxpayers.

The volume of dollars to travel anywhere is in the neighbourhood of \$1,000 if you want to do business in eastern Canada or in the States. And so if I would take this as an overview, Mr. Jeanneau probably went quite a number of places. You indicated that it was for his travel allowance coming down here but it definitely would be far in excess of that.

Dave Innes spent almost \$5,000 in travel. Others spent . . . And there's a big pile of money there, Mr. Minister, and we'd like to know the dates that these travel expenses occurred and the destinations of those individuals and where they went.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I want to indicate to the

member as well, I clearly understand the cost of some of the trips that members of Crown corporations and line departments of government are asked to embark upon, and we are more than willing to supply a breakdown of exactly where these dollars were spent. And I think the member as well understands, as I've indicated before, that what we're debating here today is on revenue.

We're looking at the blue book; we're looking at the revenue, and we're looking at the projected expenditures of the Gaming Commission. And maybe what I would do is refer him to page 12 of the blue book under statement of revenue and other enterprises and funds which is where the . . . which is what we're looking at today.

I could also indicate to him that we have in the blue book an item under loans to the Crown corporation, to the Gaming Commission in the amount of \$23 million that will be indicated in the blue book. And as well, on statement of debt, on page 154 there's 20 . . . projected estimate for '94, \$20.287 million.

As I've indicated, we certainly want to be forthcoming and supply as much information as we can to the member opposite. We're more than willing to give you a breakdown of all of the travel incurred by officials and, you know, a detailed accounting of where in fact this travel has been.

Mr. Martens: — Can you give me details of . . . the Gaming Commission is going to be blended or put together with the Liquor Board. Would you give me an overview of how that amalgamation will take place.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well to the member from Morse, we are in the process right now of putting together the organization and how the organizational structure will look. We're certainly hopeful that we can have a model of that. My officials indicate that they will be bringing that organizational overview to me within the next couple or three weeks. And it'll be reviewed as to just how it will function.

As the member will also be aware, the legislation with respect to the amalgamation has been before the House and we certainly hope under the guidelines of that, that we can put together a very efficient-running operation. We think that there are some fairly significant cost savings that can be achieved with the amalgamation.

We're trying to void ourselves of duplication of services, investigative authorities. We want to look at the public health inspectors in terms of what role that the gaming inspectors, the liquor inspectors, and the health inspectors may be able to achieve by savings by amalgamating those roles. And we certainly hope that the model that we will put forth will function well and that we'll have a very smooth-running, lean corporation when we've had the operation completed.

Mr. Martens: — What will the cost of the amalgamation be? You mentioned something about

savings. What are the costs of the amalgamation going to be? And would you be able to tell me where the office will be located — in Regina or Saskatoon or wherever?

(1615)

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — We're in the process right now of looking at office space. And we would like to put the two operations, the Liquor Commission and the Gaming Commission . . . Those two operations as they exist now, we want to amalgamate them because we think it'll function a lot better having one set, you know, one place for the administration and management to work out of, but we haven't made a finalized decision on that yet. As I've indicated, we are looking at different options with the net effect, we hope, will be a reduction in cost of property.

In terms of costs of the consolidation, there's certainly no doubt that there will be costs associated with putting these two bodies together. But I think we can . . . as an example, there may be in terms of management there may be some severance. If there's a duplication in services that two employees provide, what we're going to attempt to do is to move those around; we have some vacancies over there now. But we do assume there'll be some severance costs. But the net saving we're hoping for is in the neighbourhood of 200 to \$250,000 on an annual basis.

Mr. Martens: — Is that for each of the Liquor Board and the Gaming Commission, or is that the combination of both of them?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — No, that's the total cost.

Mr. Martens: — How are you going to handle the commissioners? Are you going to streamline that too — move some out and move some in? Or how are you planning on doing that?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — The actual size really hasn't been determined yet, because we're going to want to do this in consultation with some of the people who are involved in terms of what type of representation we actually put on there. But I think it's fair to say that by having one commission as opposed to a Liquor and a Gaming Commission, that we can have some cost effectiveness in that area.

But I think it's going to be a fairly diverse board, we feel, in that it will be a board that will be looking at the operations of the bingo halls, the video lottery program, the VLT program that we're looking at introducing this summer, at the operations of casinos; as well the hotels, the restaurants, and the different outlets that are involved in the sale of alcohol.

So we want to be very careful when we're putting together the board, to make sure that the people who are represented in the industry have people on the board who understand their industry and who can understand their concerns on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Martens: — I want to change direction here a little

bit and ask you some questions about the VLTs (video lottery terminal). On March 19, the individuals who wrote this up — I believe you were the minister at the time responsible for this, for the Gaming Commission — indicated that you had reached an agreement with GTECH of West Greenwich, Rhode Island.

And it says here:

. . . will supply the central computer system as well as 1,000 machines. The company has also been given an option to provide 500 more machines within a year.

And then the next paragraph you go on to say that:

Video Lottery Consultants of Bozeman, Montana, will supply the commission with 1,000 machines. They also have the option of providing an additional 500 machines within a year.

Would you tell me and the committee whether in fact that is a fact, or that was a fact at the time?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I think what the member is referring to was a press release that was put out by the Gaming Commission with respect to the companies who were short-listed and then ultimately chosen to begin negotiations with to set price, to look at whether or not we could involve some Saskatchewan economic development.

And the member opposite — we've been through this in this legislature on a number of occasions — will be aware that those are the two companies that were chosen to deal with, and the amounts that were quoted there are the amounts that the Gaming Commission was looking at with respect to purchases of these machines.

Mr. Martens: — Did the Gaming Commission, through the minister earlier on — perhaps not yourself — did they initiate a study to investigate the credibility of the two companies that you're doing business with here? Was there an investigation done, and would you provide that information to the committee.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — As the member for Morse is well aware, there was an investigation done by an interdepartmental body of government. Property Management Corporation was involved. The Department of Economic Development, the Saskatchewan Gaming Commission, and I believe the Department of Finance was also involved. And these companies were . . . there was an analysis done under Mr. Egan, who as you will know is a former commissioner or a former chief executive officer of the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) in this province. And he was as well in charge of the investigation.

The economic base, I guess the soundness of these companies, were checked in some great detail. The technology that they were offering and the kind of technology that they had on the market was analysed

in depth, and as well there was a security check done in consultation with other jurisdictions. There were a number of American states who had been involved in dealings with some of the companies that were checked. There were a number of provinces in our country who had done business with them. And a security check was done, and I believe a very in-depth analysis of the base of these companies was done.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Minister, did you initiate that review?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — No, that review was initiated prior to my arrival as the minister in charge of the Gaming Commission.

Mr. Martens: — Would you tell the committee which minister it was?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — No, that was initiated by the member from Saskatoon Westmount.

Mr. Martens: — That would be the Minister of Finance?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — That's correct.

Mr. Martens: — Would you give me the day that she initiated that review?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — We don't have that information here but we can pass it across to you. We don't have the exact date that the review was started.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, it would seem to me that the issue has been raised often enough that you would familiarize yourself with the details of it, and I would like to have that information before we continue later this evening.

I have a paper that you gave us in the Assembly here that says that the security review was completed with the assistance of two members from the security branch of SPMC, and you have that letter as well:

In addition to regular sources available for background investigations, information was requested through Canadian Law Enforcement Agencies and Security Personnel of other Gaming Control Agencies in the following jurisdictions . . .

I want to ask you whether you did, whether that report had any information as it related to information provided from the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the United States.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Just to go back with respect to the date that this study was initiated, the request for proposals began on August 26, it was set. It was put out in August 26 of '92. So the investigation would have been between that time and as soon as the proposals came in and the date that the short list was done, which was in February of 1993.

With respect to the jurisdictions and the enforcement

agencies that were consulted in terms of the choice of the ones that were short-listed, there were a number of law enforcement agencies, not only in Canada, but in the United States, who were consulted in terms of the review and the work that was done by the investigative branch.

Mr. Martens: — Did any of them include the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) in the United States?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I have no reason to believe that the FBI would not have been consulted. I would suggest as the major law enforcement agency in the United States and the fact that a number of gaming commissions throughout the United States were involved in the security check, that it's safe to say that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been requested of information.

Mr. Martens: — Have you read the report?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes. I think I'd like to, if I could, just explain sort of the process. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, as I am led to believe, will only deal with other law enforcement agencies, which would mean that the contacts that our investigative branch had within the RCMP would be through them gathering information that was supplied to that law enforcement agency by the RCMP . . . or by the FBI.

Mr. Martens: — Did you read the report?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — No. As I've indicated to the member on a number of occasions, I have not read the report. As you will know, it's the property and was commissioned by the commission, by the Gaming Commission, which is a quasi-judicial board.

I have, after being briefed by officials from the Gaming Commission, was secure in the knowledge that they had done their job and had done a thorough investigation. And I had a chance to look at the criteria that the selection process used to base their final decision and was comfortable at the time that they had done a proper diligence on this particular matter and had no reason to read the report.

Mr. Martens: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think that it would have been due diligence on your part, as a minister responsible for the Gaming Commission, to have reviewed that report. Because you're going to spend \$20 million and you're asking us to approve \$20 million to be spent. And I would say that it would be in the best interests of the people of the province of Saskatchewan that you would read the report who you're going to be paying the money to.

And I would suggest to you, sir, that it's an important part of the agenda for you to do that. And I would say to you also that it would be a responsibility of yours to read the report. And I cannot for any observations that . . . Like I've been a minister myself. And if there would have been matters of urgent pressing nature of this sort that would have been the responsibility, my responsibility, and I would not take it upon myself to

understand clearly the scope of responsibility that I had, I would consider that as a slight on my position as a minister.

(1630)

And so for you to say that on one hand you don't want to be a part of the commission, I can understand that. But surely you should have the right and the responsibility if you're going to spend \$20 million of taxpayers' money, coming to this Assembly and asking for \$20 million to spend — actually 23 — and you're going to be spending that and receiving revenues, as I understand, of over \$40 million, then you have a responsibility to the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan to put that review of that report in the hands of the cabinet, in the hands of yourself, to make sure that that is done properly.

And that, Mr. Minister, is what we're challenging you on here today. And I think you should have done that. And you'd better have some good reasons why you didn't, because I don't believe the reasons that you have presented so far.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well let me say to the member from Morse, I guess what I'd like to do is put this in context. We had an intergovernmental agency who did a technical review, who did a very in-depth financial review, and who did a security review on the companies that we were about to short list.

And let me also remind the member that what we're involved in here is the purchase of electronic equipment — video lottery terminals which have PC (personal computer) boards, and they have relays and switches and lights and all of the things that electronic equipment do.

And so let me draw a parallel between another piece of electronic equipment, a computer or desk laptop computer. Would you, sir, ask I guess, for the same in-depth analysis that was done on these video lottery terminals for the purchase of computers, or would you not?

We wanted to make sure and ensure that the technology that we were purchasing was sound, that it was reliable, that the companies were in a good financial position to be able to deliver the product before we send a cent to them. And those are the kinds of things that we asked from this committee.

Now this committee came with a recommendation in terms of which companies they would suggest that we dealt with, which was taken to cabinet and a decision was made by cabinet . . . or to cabinet, based on the professional opinion of the people who worked on this committee to put together the recommendation.

Now what I ask you is, do you see the purchase of perhaps a laptop computer as being somewhat a parallel to purchasing a video lottery terminal? Because I think you can draw some very strong parallels.

I say to the member from Morse, what we're involved in here is the purchase of equipment, a purchase of electronic equipment to an aggregate of in the neighbourhood of \$23 million. Now some of these are computer systems; the central computer is an example that we're purchasing from GTECH, a similar computer that you may find perhaps housed in the Alberta Gaming Commission's central computer system because these people are dealing with the same companies that we were dealing with, and had done the diligence that we had done, I would assume, and I hope as in-depth as we did, to determine that they were buying adequate technology, that it would be technology that would satisfy the needs of the customers, and that they would be buying a central computer system that their people would be able to monitor because that's what we're embarked upon here, and that's what this money is going for.

I guess maybe what I'd like to do is explain just a little further to the member opposite that we're setting up a central computer system that will be managed by the western Canada lottery foundation which is a Crown corporation of three provincial governments — the Conservative government in Manitoba, New Democrat government here in Saskatchewan, and the Conservative government in Alberta — and they'll be manning and housing this central computer system that will take information from the technology, from the video lottery terminals that we purchased, or that we intend to purchase. They will take the information from there, house that in the central location which we have announced will be located in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

So what we will have here is a free-standing, government-owned electronic network that's going to feed information from the video lottery terminals through the Saskatchewan telephone . . . SaskTel's lines, into a central computer system which will feed out information that will tell us . . . And I think it's important to explain to the general public exactly what we're doing here, what we're buying. Because I think there's been a lot of aspersions, a lot of innuendo, and so I'd like to clarify it.

What we're buying here is a package of electronic equipment, electronic gaming equipment. The proposal from the company that . . . or from the intergovernmental commission that looked at these companies that we intended to purchase from recommended these companies because they had sound technology and because the companies were on a sound financial footing. And at the time they were investigated, to the best of their knowledge they felt that these were reputable companies and therefore recommended to the minister, who recommended to cabinet, that we purchase this electronic equipment.

Now I'm not sure where the member is trying to take this. But I'm . . . And if he's got a motive here, what I'd like to do is I'd like to see him make his point. Because to play cat-and-mouse games here I don't think is helpful. What we're here to do is to determine whether or not the government of Saskatchewan are

going to get adequate technology, the best technology we can buy, and whether it's going to serve the purpose of the video lottery terminal program that we're intending to put throughout this province, in perhaps up to 600 locations.

Now I want the member opposite to understand that what we have here is a purchase arrangement not unlike if a government agency other than the Gaming Commission were to go out and put out a call for proposals on laptop computers, perhaps 2,000 of them, because it's very much the same.

What we're trying to do and what we're attempting to do is to put this in place. We're hoping to have the central computer system in place very soon, the middle of July, so that we can continue with our arrangements and our decision to purchase these VLTs so that we can do what this program was intended to do — to help the small hotels in rural Saskatchewan maintain a viable economic base.

Not unlike what your cousins and what your neighbours and what our neighbours have done in Alberta. The Alberta government has done very much the same as we've done. And I would assume that they have done adequate due diligence as we feel we have.

Not unlike what the Manitoba government has done in terms of purchasing the equipment to put into their rural hotels because they understand the problems in rural Manitoba and rural Alberta as we do in rural Saskatchewan. And the goal and what we're trying to achieve here is another way for rural hotels to maintain some economic viability. And that's the bottom line.

And what we intend to assure is that we buy the best technology that we can, with the amount of money that we intend to spend, and that the central computer system that'll be hooked up to these machines will ensure that it'll be a smooth-running operation that will create no security problems. And that's what we're attempting to achieve.

So I guess what I'll ask the member opposite, if you're taking this line of questioning in any particular direction, we'd be interested to know where you're heading with it. Because at this point, it's really not clear what your motives may be.

Mr. Martens: — Well it's not really my point to have motivation in this one way or another. It's I guess our observation that we would like to understand the motives of the minister and the Gaming Commission.

The report, as I understand it, dealt with two companies, GTECH and VLC (Video Lottery Consultants). The information that I have is that it indicated that VLC was okay; however you shouldn't deal with GTECH. And I'd like to know from the minister whether this is in fact a fact. And that's why it's important for the minister to have read the details of the report.

Would you confirm for the committee that GTECH

and VLC were the only two that were identified in the report, and also that VLC was given an okay and that GTECH was not to be considered? Would you provide us the information about that?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I can't provide that sort of information because the recommendation came to the minister the same as it came to the Alberta government who are dealing with the same two companies. That both VLC and GTECH were companies that they would recommend with respect to the purchase of the video lottery terminals.

So in order for me to confirm anything else, it would have to be confirmed contrary to the facts. Because the facts of the matter are that these two companies were recommended by Mr. Egan and the people that he worked with, in the same fashion that these two companies were recommended by the government commission that looked at the Alberta request, and the same two companies that were recommended to the Alberta government. That's what I need to confirm because that's the truth.

Mr. Martens: — Would the minister give an overview of whether any other minister has read the report?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I can say, to my knowledge no other minister has read the report.

Mr. Martens: — Would the minister indicate whether the Gaming Commission have read the report.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well certainly. That's part of their mandate; that's their job. As were the Alberta Gaming Commission who clearly made the same recommendation and must have read a report done quite similar to the one that we did here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Martens: — Did Mr. Egan read the report?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well certainly Mr. Egan would have read the report. He was one of the people that put it together and made the recommendation.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, then I will move a motion by the . . . from myself:

That this committee, pursuant to section 19 through 25 of the Legislative Assembly Act, command and compel the attendance before this committee of Doug Egan to provide sworn testimony responding to members' questions regarding allegations of impropriety in the conduct of the affairs of the Saskatchewan Gaming Commission.

I so move.

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

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be in order for members to speak to this particular motion.

The Chair: — Well I'm just checking to see whether it's in order. And when I make a determination, then certainly.

(1645)

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is very appropriate that the House take this action. Over the last month and a half repeatedly there have been questions in this Assembly that the minister either refuses to answer or says it is not within his realm.

Today, Mr. Chairman, what we are requesting is that Mr. Egan be brought before this Assembly, before the bar of this Assembly, as a witness to help answer questions, questions that we believe will clear up for the Assembly, if there has been any impropriety.

I would refer you, Mr. Chairman, to the substantive motions in the Committee of the Whole and the Committee of Finance, the section that says that this is very appropriate in these type of proceedings that witnesses, not officials, but witnesses can assist the committee in arriving at the proper conclusions.

And I believe in the case of this one, where the public must know and understand clearly the process that has been gone through to make sure that it meets all the criteria and all of the answers that have so far been given in this Assembly, that I think all members would welcome the opportunity for a former member of the RCMP police and now an official with the Gaming Commission to give sworn testimony to this House. That is an individual whose testimony I would assume all members of the Assembly could rely upon in order to clear up some of the issues that have arisen. And I would not understand, Mr. Chairman, at all why this committee would not look upon this in a favourable way in order to deal with this issue.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to speak to the motion. And I would want to say just in the outset that the member from Thunder Creek and the member from Morse spoke about ongoing questioning in this legislature. And they're right — that has been the process.

But I would want to say that as this process progressed, members of the government who were questioned with respect to this issue were as open as it was possible to be. And I want to say that the members opposite know full well the process under which the freedom of information Act allows information to be tabled by this legislature.

The members opposite will well know that information that was gathered by this interjurisdictional body was information that was received from some law enforcement agencies and gaming commissions around North America who asked that the information be held and be used on a confidential basis. And the members opposite are aware of that.

They've asked for a copy of the study that was done to which we've indicated and offered to help and assist

them to find . . . to understand the system through the freedom of information Act to gather up — if it is appropriate — to gather it up. They know that the Department of Justice has recommended that the information would not be appropriately released. They understand all of that.

And I want to say to the members opposite, if they have any evidence of impropriety by any member of the Gaming Commission, which they allege in here this evening but who are unwilling to allege outside of this legislature, if they have any information that would indicate any member of the Gaming Commission or any official of the Gaming Commission has acted in an improper fashion, then let them table it before this legislature.

But I say, Mr. Chairman, they won't do that because they can't do that because they have no information. It's only allegation.

And I say to the members opposite, instead of the wasting the time of this Legislative Assembly, why don't you go before the press and make your accusations outside where they can be dealt with. But all it is, is innuendo, political grandstanding, and political posturing. And that's all that this motion is all about.

And I say to the members opposite, you should be ashamed of yourself because you know exactly what the process is, and you know what this is all about. It's all about your petty politics.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, what we want to have in this committee is an opportunity to detail the questions that we have asked up to this point.

You, sir, made the decision. You made the decision to involve two gaming companies that supply video terminals to the province of Saskatchewan. You made that decision; it states that. And that's why I went through this process. It states that you are going to . . . well I'll read it: will supply central computer system as well as 1,000 machines — that's GTECH. Video Lottery Consultants also will supply 1,000 machines. I didn't say that; you did. And "will" and "may" are two separate items. Now when was the decision made for you to say, oh, I may. Here you decided, I will; and now you decide, I may.

Now to go on from there, you decided on subsequent occasions that you were going to take and deal with both of them. Then you decided because the FBI started an investigation and because they laid charges on VLC, you decided that you were going to do this from GTECH. Now are you busy studying GTECH?

And we need to have some individuals here who will provide us the answers because I believe that you, sir, are deliberately not providing information to this committee that you should normally provide. And that is, Mr. Minister, that somewhere along the line — if you didn't have anything to be afraid of — you would have someone come here and tell us, or you

would tell us yourself.

But we, sir, don't believe that you understand what's going on. We don't believe that you understand what went on in the Gaming Commission. You have had at least four ministers of the Crown dealing with the Gaming Commission since you took office 18 months ago.

You have had chief executive officers in and out and in and out and back and forth. How many times has Dave Innes been chief executive officer of this Gaming Commission? How many times?

And that, Mr. Minister, is what we want to ask. That's what this committee needs to find out because we believe that if you had nothing to hide, you'd come forward with the information. I don't believe that you can hide behind the fact that the various agencies that you've inquired of which, incidentally for the public, had nothing to do with the FBI — it had to do with the South Dakota Lottery Commission, Montana Gambling Investigation Bureau, Nevada State Gaming Control Board — had nothing to do with the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the FBI in the United States. And yet they laid the charges, Mr. Minister. They laid the charges on VLC.

And you had decided, you had decided that you were going to buy from them. You had decided, and I'm going to quote it here again, I will — you will — spend \$10 million of taxpayers' money on a company that was being investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and charges laid. Of what, Mr. Minister? Of improprieties, improprieties all over the United States.

That, Mr. Minister, is what we are asking you to tell us, that there was no improprieties in this instance. And we are challenging you, sir, to provide that information to this committee through the report that Mr. Egan wrote.

The Chair: — Order, order. Why is the minister on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — On a point of order.

The Chair: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — The point of order is, if the member has documentation to show charges against VLC . . .

The Chair: — Order, order. That's a question of debate and not a point of order.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you need to tell this committee whether in fact there are extenuating circumstances that relate to improprieties in the United States and if they're transferred into Canada. We want to know that in this committee, and we need to know that in this committee. And if you have nothing to hide, then you could be able to stand there and say it. You could be able to read from the report and say that is garbage. But here you stand. You

have never read the report. And you've read an executive summary, you said one day in this Assembly.

And that, Mr. Minister, is exactly the reason why we are asking the questions of you. The kind of reporting that the committee gave and the committee is receiving here today needs to have substantiated to it the information provided in that report. And, Mr. Minister, we want that report in this Assembly for the people of Saskatchewan to know and understand what was in that report.

We need to have that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, the member from Churchill Downs who perhaps has read the report would like to get in the conversation and say to this Assembly that he recommended VLC, who was subsequently investigated and charged in the United States for improprieties, that that is the kind of thing that he read about in that report.

And would he provide that information to this Assembly when he was minister responsible for the Gaming Commission? Did he travel all over the United States for \$20,000 dealing with VLC and GTECH? Those are some more of the questions that we need to have answered.

And, Mr. Minister, this committee is going to ask you to provide that to it. I think we have a legitimate right. You're planning on spending 20 million of our dollars, 20 million of our dollars, and we closed down 52 hospitals in the province of Saskatchewan for the next . . . for the last four months of this term. That's going to cost \$5 million and you want to spend 20 and you can't even give us a response? That's disgusting, Mr. Minister.

And we need, in the province of Saskatchewan, and open and honest government. You ran on that, sir. You decided you were going to do that and you said it all over the province of Saskatchewan that you were going to run on honesty and integrity — open government.

Well, Mr. Minister, let's have an observation or two made by Mr. Egan. And that's what we're asking this committee to ask Mr. Egan to come before this Assembly and tell us exactly what went on. Because we, sir, have an intense dislike for the way you're answering the questions.

And also, Mr. Minister, we need to have before this Assembly somebody who has the integrity to answer the questions. And that we believe Mr. Egan would do, because he is a commissioner . . . former commissioner of the RCMP, and he would come in here and say one way or another what was going on. That, Mr. Minister, is why we're asking him to come before the bar of this Assembly.

The member from Churchill Downs, the former member . . . or former minister of Finance and the former minister responsible for the Gaming Commission probably did read the report. Would he

say that, as a question, would the member from P.A. (Prince Albert) Carlton tell the Assembly that the member from Churchill Downs did not read the report? Would he tell us in this Assembly whether the minister responsible for Economic Development read the report? Would he tell us whether the Department of Economic Development minister and his officials read the report to provide it to cabinet?

Those are the kinds of questions that we need have answered here in order to provide us the information of why we should let you spend \$20 million. And that, Mr. Minister, is the reason why we're here asking you these questions.

Mr. Minister, VLC was accepted, we believe, in your report. GTECH was refused. Now on the other hand you have GTECH accepted and VLC refused. And on what basis are you doing that, Mr. Minister? On the basis of information that you haven't even read?

The Chair: — Order. It being 5 o'clock, the committee stands recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.