

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to be able to introduce some petitions this afternoon on behalf of Saskatchewan folks.

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 petitions come from Saskatoon, Abernethy, most of southern Saskatchewan, Corning, Stoughton, Shaunavon, Mr. Speaker, Mankota, Humboldt, and some more from Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to table those now.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to table some petitions before the Assembly. I'd like to read the prayer first:

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.

And, Mr. Speaker, the petitions I have in my hand are signed by individuals from Saskatoon, Humboldt, Englefeld, Courval, Anaheim, Muenster, and a number from Regina.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have several petitions I would like to lay on the Table. 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.

Mr. Speaker, these petitions come from down through the Eston, Lampman, Roche Percee, Estevan, Torquay, Eastend, all through that area, as far west as Naicam, and all through that country, Mr. Speaker.

I would be pleased to lay these on the Table.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have some petitions to present today. 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.

These petitions, Mr. Speaker, come from the McTaggart, Weyburn, Fillmore areas of the province, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to lay this on the Table now.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have petitions to present on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. The prayer goes:

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.

From the town of Weyburn mostly and some from Regina. I'd be happy to table these at this time.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a petition to lay on the Table today. It's pertaining to SaskPower:

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

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

Several companies in this area have applied to generate power. Allowing non-utility generation of power in this area will make the construction of the power line and its attendant \$42 million expenditure unnecessary.

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

Order SaskPower to table in the legislature a complete economic analysis by an independent auditor that proves that economic benefits of the proposed line exceed the economic benefits of non-utility generated power or conversion;

Further, order SaskPower to cease and desist all

planning, surveying or preparation for construction of the Condie to the Queen Elizabeth 230,000-volt power line on any of the proposed routes until all other points in this petition are honoured.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners come from Dilke, Bethune, and there's quite a few from Regina, Moose Jaw. There'd be landowners living in the city that own the land along the power line.

I therefore lay this on the Table. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to table some petitions with respect to the NewGrade upgrader. I'll 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.

These are from major cities across Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker — from Weyburn, Estevan, several pages from Regina, from the city of Saskatoon — and from several rural communities.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to present to the Assembly today some petitions that have been given to me and the prayer goes:

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 have people here from Watrous, from Shaunavon, from Tugaskie, Eyebrow, Regina, and Fort Qu'Appelle, Balgonie. I table them today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have petitions from concerned Saskatchewan citizens today pertaining to the NewGrade heavy oil upgrader. I'll only read the prayer, Mr. Speaker:

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.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have several dozen petitioners who are all from the city of Regina, who wish to express their concern with what the government is

doing in this regard, and I would be pleased to lay on the Table today on their behalf their names.

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 praying that the Assembly defeat any legislation introduced to redefine the NewGrade Energy Inc. corporate governance and financing arrangements.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Renaud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you to the Assembly I would like to introduce a group of guests sitting your gallery today, 55 grade 7 students from Stewart Hawke School in Hudson Bay. They are accompanied by Blain Emerson, Wendy Anderson, Garry Hein, Elvina Rumak, and Laurel Emerson.

And also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce in the west gallery, Mr. Lee Schultz, a friend of mine and a resident of Regina, who is a former student of the Stewart Hawke School in Hudson Bay. And I would ask that we in the Assembly welcome our guests today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harper: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to all the members of the House, a couple of ladies sitting up in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, just above me. And they are my wife, Carol, and accompanying her here today is her sister Elizabeth Surcon from Yorkton.

And I'm very pleased to see the ladies take some time out of what I know has been a very busy day shopping here in the city, to come down and join us for question period. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to encourage them to stay for much of the afternoon, because the longer they stay here, Mr. Speaker, it's less time they have to spend money in the malls.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask all the members to offer them a warm welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Executive Council Publications

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, can you confirm that your office, Executive Council, has been using its staff and resources to distribute blatantly political material to NDP (New Democratic Party) constituency executive members?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the hon. member is referring to. I obviously can't

answer that unless I know what he is referring to.

What Executive Council may be distributing in the eyes of Executive Council may not be what he sees through his eyes. So I don't know how one can answer that kind of a question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, if this has been taking place, if you have been using your office to distribute political propaganda to NDP executive members, do you feel this is an appropriate use of the Premier's office and of taxpayers' money?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to give the same answer which I just gave to the first question. The member has got a script that he insists on reading through. Fair enough. But I mean he has to show me what he's complaining about, and far be it for the Premier's office to be political.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, yesterday I received a package in the mail that was supposed to be sent to NDP MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly). The return address on this package was Executive Council, Room 110, Legislative Building — your office, Mr. Premier.

This package included a cover memo which reads: NewGrade upgrader. The following information is intended for distribution to your constituency executive members.

One of the parts of the package is a blatantly partisan memo entitled: Devine's bad deal. Mr. Premier, you are using your office and taxpayers' money to send NDP propaganda around to NDP executive members.

Mr. Premier, that's totally inexcusable misuse of personal personnel and taxpayers' money for purely political purposes, and I would like to hear an explanation for that, Mr. Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, no explanation to the hon. member is required. Because if the hon. member is saying that the Premier, including the former premier, or any premier for that matter, has no right, no obligation, no duty to mail out information pertaining to government policies and legislation and programs to government MLAs or to other people, party or other people — we'll even include the Progressive Conservative Party people, if you want — there's no problem in that context whatsoever. And perhaps maybe some of them should know about how bad a deal you negotiated with FCL (Federated Co-operatives Ltd.).

If the hon. member opposite said that that is not a proper function, for goodness' sake, I don't think he understands what the role of a premier is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, there are a lot of people in this province who don't appreciate receiving junk mail, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier. But when Saskatchewan taxpayers find out that their own money is being used to distribute NDP junk mail, I think they're going to be a little more than irritated, Mr. Premier.

I'm going to send you over a copy of the material, Mr. Premier, and I want you to assume . . . I'm going to send you a copy, and I've addressed it: return to sender, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Premier, how much money was spent by your office on this NDP junk mail campaign? How much money was spent?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, no money was spent to send out NDP junk material. Some money was spent to send out information pertaining to government programs. I'll take notice of that and provide it in due course.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, how much of your staff's time and resources were spent on this NDP junk mail campaign? And do you intend the NDP Party to pay for this junk mail sent out by your office, rather than the taxpayers' dollars?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm assuming that the question is in order, although I would direct you, sir, to the attention that the hon. member asks me to answer questions about the NDP. I'm not here to answer questions about the NDP; I'm here to answer questions about the operations of government.

On the assumption that the operations of the government involved a dissemination of information, we'll provide that information as I indicated to the hon. member in the first question.

But if he wants to talk about waste and taxpayers' waste, I'll tell you, whatever the cost of mailing this literature and information out is only but a fraction of the cost that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan will bear for the next . . . for a number of foreseeable years for having the very good friend of the former premier, Dave Tkachuk, appointed a beloved senator for the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, once again you've demonstrated that your own narrow, political agenda is more important than saving tax dollars. Once again you've demonstrated you're willing to put a lot of time and effort into reducing the value of the

importance of the Co-op upgrader. Once again you're demonstrating that you have no economic plan for the province. Your only hope is political, to put all your time and resources into discrediting others, and once again you have demonstrated that you have no reservations about using taxpayers' dollars for that kind of junk mail.

Mr. Premier, every day you get up and say how willing you are to negotiate. My question to you then is, Mr. Premier: how can there possibly be real negotiations when the Premier of the province is prepared to spend taxpayers' dollars and use his office to attack other people in that negotiating process? Would you answer that question for us, please.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the material here consists of letters, which have been tabled publicly, to Mr. Leland, letters between the minister, various . . . got even correspondence from FCL. Correspondence from FCL's contained in there; government press releases which are part of the package, which the hon. member indicates is somehow material which he finds unacceptable. In fact there's even a copy of a letter to Mr. Bill McKnight.

Now he says, how can we negotiate. Well we can negotiate the same way that FCL can negotiate, putting out full-page ads setting out their expenditure proposition. And the question that you ask of us is equally applicable to them. They say they're prepared to negotiate and can do it. We're prepared to negotiate with them and we can do it also — very simple.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, on one of those pages there it says this: the following information is intended for distribution to your constituency executive members. And it has four items that it says that you're supposed to distribute to them.

What actions will you be taking to address this misappropriation of taxpayers' dollars? Will the NDP Party be reimbursing the government for these misspent funds? And will you be determining which one of your highly paid political advisers authorized this misuse of taxpayers' dollars to put this junk mail out, and will you be asking for that person's resignation, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I think the answer to all of those will be simply no.

And the hon. member opposite, if he would get his head out of the sand and acknowledge that this is an absolutely atrocious deal for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. Everybody acknowledges the deal has to be renegotiated. FCL says renegotiate the deal; the

federal government says renegotiate the deal; Estey says renegotiate the deal; the Government of Saskatchewan says renegotiate the deal. That is what this material says, and sets out the history and the background for renegotiating the deal.

The only people on the face of this planet is the small rump group called the Progressive Conservative caucus of Saskatchewan that says, don't renegotiate the deal, somehow this is NDP junk mail. Well I tell you, no wonder you people are so far down in the polls and why you're sitting where you are, because you simply refuse to face reality. Look, get real. Tell the people of Saskatchewan that you made a bad deal and tell them that you support Estey and let's negotiate a deal. And we'll do it this afternoon. We'll do it this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, I will be sending the original of this package to the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Premier, to see if he feels this is an appropriate use of your office and your office's budget. In the mean time, I would like to ask you to refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections as well.

I would like you to ask their opinion as to whether the Premier's . . . should be paying for such blatantly NDP functionary junk mail, Mr. Premier. Will you give this commitment today to give it to this committee to do its work in a proper fashion? Will you agree to that today?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the only junk around here, with the greatest of respect, is the questions that the hon. member has been directing in this area. How he can categorize correspondence, including both the responses between the FCL and the Government of Saskatchewan, on a matter of important public basis, a matter of important public issue, a question of junk, is only up to him in his mind.

I'll tell you one thing, it wasn't D-Mail that put it out, it wasn't Mr. Dave Tkachuk, and it's only a fraction of the cost, only a fraction of the cost to what it'll cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to keep the good friend of the member from Estevan ensconced in safety and comfort for the rest of his life.

And you say that the people of the province of Saskatchewan should continue to harbour a deal which requires some form of renegotiation. Shame on you. Of course, I'm not going to . . . (inaudible) . . . to that kind of an answer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Premier, Justice Estey has said that you should negotiate, not legislate. Don Gass has said that your heavy-handed legislation will do significant harm to Federated Co-op and force them to walk away from both the upgrader and the refinery. These two people whose opinions you used to put a lot of stock in, you've quit listening to them, Mr. Premier. Instead of negotiating, instead of looking

for a solution that's suitable to all parties, you are spending your time, energy, and taxpayers' money to send out this kind of mail from your Executive Council office to executive members of the NDP Party.

Will you put an end to this political vendetta against the Co-op upgrader; and will you quit misusing taxpayers' money; and will you instead turn your efforts to negotiating a settlement, a real settlement for the people of the province of Saskatchewan who buy and use and trade through FCL in their petroleum products. Will you do that for them please, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, this line of questioning the members repeat, and the answers I must repeat. I want, the government wants, a negotiated settlement. We've wanted that for 18 months. We have not been able to get a negotiated settlement for 18 months. I argue that this taxpayers' exposure of \$600 million, this deal is so bad that it requires a renegotiated settlement.

But I say something else to the hon. member. If a renegotiated settlement is impossible, then we are not going to sit by and do nothing. We are not going to adopt a policy of prayer. We're not going to adopt a policy of hope. We are going to adopt a policy of acting in the interests of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

And in this debate I am shocked that you, sir, being an MLA sworn to uphold the interests of the taxpayers, are concerned about a mail-out list and don't say a word about \$600 million which the taxpayers are on the hook for. My goodness where are your priorities? Shame on you. Shame on you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Opposition to Bill 38

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, one would have to question where the Premier's values are.

My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, by now I'm sure you're fully aware of the nature and the extent of the opposition to Bill 38. We have received literally thousands of letters and phone calls from Saskatchewan citizens from all walks of life, from every profession, representing all political parties. And, Mr. Premier, I am sure that your office have received these and very likely many more like them.

Mr. Premier, very early in your term of office you pledged your government to the principles of openness and consultation. That pledge has yet to be fulfilled. And nowhere is that more evident than in your refusal to listen to the concerns of the people over Bill 38.

Mr. Premier, as per the wishes of the people I serve and as a member of the opposition caucus who is

allowed to not only speak freely but to act freely, I am asking you to either withdraw Bill 38 or accept the amendments that so many people support. Will you do that today, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder who wrote that question for the hon. member because he has raised some of these matters in committee, and I have addressed them in committee and the answers to the questions are on the public record.

I will say to the member that I don't know of a piece of legislation that has been introduced in this Assembly that has had as much consultation about it and meetings about it and correspondence about it and telephone calls about it than this Bill. We have consulted everyone. We know everyone's views. We have treated all those views with great respect. We have either answered them in the form of amendments before this House or we provide the rationale for why it is impossible or inappropriate to deal with those matters in this Bill. I mean the matter has been fully debated, fully considered.

I want to say also to the member as I said in committee, Mr. Speaker, that when the essence of Bill 38, when the matters raised in Bill 38 are explained directly and appropriately to people, then the vast majority of people support the idea that we should not discriminate against people in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, again to the Premier. It is painfully evident that you do not listen, that you do not care. You've denied farm families. You've slighted the business community. You've neglected residents of rural Saskatchewan, rejected the cooperative movement. You've betrayed and gouged taxpayers and you ignore the wishes of the majority of Saskatchewan citizens who have real concerns over the consequences of Bill 38.

Mr. Premier, now we see examples of how you are muzzling the views and opinions of your own colleagues, why you muzzled the members of the opposition through your many closure motions. But now we see you choking off free speech of your own NDP MLAs. The members on this side of the House would at least allow the member from Regina Rosemont to table his Bill so that we can review it. But, Mr. Premier, rather than being open and democratic you choose to play the dictator and close, close, close.

Mr. Premier, will you allow the members of your caucus to express themselves freely in this legislature? You have taken the right away from the opposition on many occasions, but on issues such as Bill 38 we ask that you release your choke hold on democracy. Will you allow a free vote, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr.

Speaker, at least the member . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I would ask certain members in the opposition, but particularly the member from Estevan, not to constantly interrupt. He's been doing it too much today.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, at least the member has made it clear to all people in this Assembly and to the television audience watching that this question is not his; he has read somebody else's question. That is obvious and I extend him that courtesy by acknowledging it in this House because the member is more intelligent than to ask a silly question like that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The matter of how our caucus will treat Bill 38 is a matter which I have explained in this House and outside this House. It was a vote within our caucus to handle it in the way in which we're handling it. And that, Mr. Member, is how we are going to handle it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the questions have certainly raised a tone of fear and anxiety over on the opposition side of . . . on the government side of the House when . . . Mr. Speaker, who's to say whether or not I specifically wrote the questions out or gave a lot of information forward and brought some information forward?

And we've had a major discussion in this Assembly. We have asked the Premier on many occasions, we've asked the Minister of Justice on many occasions, why he will not allow a free vote in this Assembly. And that's what we're asking today. That's all that we're asking, Mr. Speaker.

Is it not appropriate for the members of the opposition to ask the government for that free vote for all members that they promised the electorate in the last election? Is that not true, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Now this is . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Will the members on both sides please come to order. It's simply inappropriate . . . it's inappropriate to yell across the floor when another minister is trying to answer the question. The same thing applies from the government side.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — This is an incredible line of questioning, Mr. Speaker — an incredible line of questioning considering that the vote in principle on Bill 38 has already been held. It's over. Several days ago the vote was held.

In our caucus, Mr. Speaker, we looked at Bill 38 and saw Bill 38 exactly for what it was; it was a question of

prohibiting discrimination, a matter of human rights. Not a matter of morality, not a matter of religious conscience, but a matter of prohibiting discrimination in an area where most parts of this country have dealt with it a long time ago. And we decided that we would vote as a caucus in the way that we did, and we did that about one week ago. Now, Mr. Member, catch up with it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, yes, there has been a vote, but there are many more opportunities for votes in this Assembly. And since that vote some members have had the courage to stand up and express their views.

Mr. Premier, what we're seeing . . . what we have seen of the NDP Party is that . . . what you do with those who break ranks. Steve Langdon is a good example. So there is no question that fear permeates your leadership in your caucus both nationally and provincially.

Mr. Premier, many of your colleagues have said that the only option they are left with is to be absent from the Assembly for that vote. And that is an absolute shame, Mr. Premier. You, sir, are denying them the opportunity to represent the views of their constituents in the Legislative Assembly of this province.

Mr. Premier, let me remove the fear you have on losing the power of your office in a free vote. The opposition, the caucus assures you that a free vote in this legislature will not in any way be interpreted as a vote of non-confidence in your government. In fact we will view a free vote as a vote of confidence in democracy.

Mr. Premier, given that we have removed your greatest fear, will you now declare a free vote on Bill 38?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, for hundreds of years in the parliamentary system, everyone involved in . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I will simply take the time until the members come to order, and let the minister answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I was saying that for literally hundreds of years in the parliamentary system that we follow in this country, everyone involved knows, even the former premier knows, that in the passage of a Bill a vote on the principle of the Bill is taken at the conclusion of the second-reading debate.

I want to tell the member, in the event he did not listen to my earlier answer, that that vote actually took place in this House about a week ago. So I'm not at all certain what he's carrying on about with respect to a free vote. That's behind us. That's done, Mr. Member.

Let's get on with it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, and again to the Premier, let me quote back to you what you promised you would do if you were elected. Mr. Premier you promised, and I quote: the role of private members must be enhanced in order to restore public confidence in the role of the people's representatives and improve the ability of all MLAs to act directly on their constituents concerns. That was your promise. That pledge, Mr. Premier, came from your NDP caucus in January, 1991.

Mr. Premier, I ask you directly and I ask you to answer directly: what can be more serving to this principle than allowing your MLAs to vote freely on Bill 38 and allowing them to, as you promised, to act directly on their constituents concerns?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I sympathize with the member, Mr. Speaker, whose instructions obviously are to fight his way through that list of questions no matter what they are.

We have on this side of the House a democratic caucus in which we discuss and debate issues and arrive at decisions collectively as a caucus. We do that whether or not the member agrees with the decisions we make.

Our members are all satisfied, without exception, with the way in which that process worked, and I challenge the members opposite to ask any one of them. They are satisfied with the process and how it's worked and they're satisfied with the results, Mr. Member. And we'll run our caucus without the benefit of any advice from you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I can assume that's the type of rhetoric we can always appreciate that comes from a legal mind.

But, Mr. Minister, what we do have . . . yes, we've had a vote in principle on second reading on the Bill. But, Mr. Minister, the Bill still has to go through committee. The Bill still has to receive third reading. The Bill is not law. There are many amendments that are going to be brought forward.

Will the minister give his commitment today to review those amendments carefully, listen to the people of the province, and allow those amendments to protect the people of the province from the major concerns they have regarding Bill 38? Will the minister do that today, please?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well we're eagerly awaiting those amendments, Mr. Speaker. We have just handled a couple of Bills in this House in which we received a large number of amendments and

considered them and dealt with them in the parliamentary way, and we'll do that with respect to these Bills.

Just so that the member's questions here are not the complete disaster that they seem to have been up to this point, let me say this: I will go back to my caucus and I will ask them how they want to handle the votes during the committee stage. Now will that make the member happy and can we finally put an end to this ridiculous line of questioning today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 56 — An Act respecting Occupational Health and Safety

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I move this Bill be given third reading and passed under its title.

The division bells rang from 2:38 p.m. until 2:57 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 36

Romanow	Lautermilch
Van Mulligen	Calvert
Lingenfelter	Murray
Shillington	Hamilton
Teichrob	Johnson
Solomon	Trew
Goulet	Draper
Atkinson	Serby
Kowalsky	Whitmore
Mitchell	Roy
MacKinnon	Cline
Penner	Crofford
Cunningham	Knezacek
Upshall	Harper
Hagel	Keeping
Bradley	Langford
Lorje	Jess
Pringle	Haverstock

Nays — 9

Swenson	Toth
Muirhead	Britton
Devine	D'Autremont
Martens	Goohsen
Boyd	

The Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Chair: — Order. Why is the member for Bengough-Milestone on her feet?

Ms. Bradley: — To beg leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Bradley: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my honour, on behalf of my colleague from Shaunavon, to introduce to you and through you to the members of the legislature, a school group that's visiting today in Regina from Cadillac. They're grade 4, 5, and 6's and they're accompanied today by their teachers, Steve Climenhaga, Collette Andrée; chaperons, Gina Hedlin; bus driver, Jody St. Jacques. And I'd just like to welcome them here today and I look forward to meeting them afterwards to have a visit and answer their questions, have drinks, and a photograph.

And I'd like all members to join me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 49 — An Act respecting Correctional Services

The Chair: — I would ask at this time that the Minister of Justice please introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With me today on my left is Ms. Madeleine Robertson of the Department of Justice, a Crown solicitor. Behind me is Darcy McGovern who is also a Crown solicitor with the Department of Justice. And seated to my right is Mr. Dick Till who is the executive director of corrections.

Clause 1

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, I understand that Bill 49 is dealing with some early release procedures and has some regulations . . . amendments in the Act regarding early release and how it is handled. And I wonder if the minister could explain the purpose and the intent of Bill 49. I know he's given a bit of an explanation in his second-readings speech, but I wonder if the minister could make a comment.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chair, I apologize to the member for taking a few minutes to collect my notes and materials here on that question, which is a question that we have discussed in this House in Department of Justice estimates, I think it was.

The early release program has, as the Assembly will know, been in effect for some considerable time. And it is a program that we take some satisfaction in in this province. I think that I speak for my predecessors as well as for myself.

We are very careful about the administration of that program and try our hardest to ensure that the people who get the benefit of an early release program are low-risk prisoners who are unlikely to commit a crime

or to repeat. And that's an especially sensitive area as the member knows and as we have agreed in previous discussions in this House.

The statutory base for the program was contained in another Act. And with this Act, we are bringing those provisions into this Act and provide a statutory base for what we have been doing and what we intend to continue to do.

We are, as I say, very conscious of the risks of this program and very conscious of its controversial nature considering some of the well-known cases from elsewhere in Canada where serious crimes are committed by people who have been granted parole and who are given the benefit of a release before the expiration of the time of their sentence.

And as I mentioned, we're quite pleased with the results in Saskatchewan. The rate of failure — if I can use that term — is quite low. So we are — let me put it this way — we're satisfied, but we're very watchful.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the minister was trying to find his paper, it took me back to question period and the comment from across the way as to whose questions, and I begin to wonder whose answers the minister was trying to build up for the question. But I appreciate the response.

Mr. Minister, one of the major concerns, and we certainly addressed it in estimates on Justice, was the problems that victims face. And I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, in regards to this particular piece of legislation, is there anything in here to address the concerns of a victim or a victim's family, or that where possible victims should be addressed through this Bill?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — No, Mr. Chair, this Bill is concerned with the administration of the correctional facility and the handling of people who are sent to us by the court system. The victims are taken . . . are dealt with elsewhere, in other programs within the department.

Mr. Toth: — Another question, Mr. Minister. Regarding reduced custody offences, I wonder if the minister would have any examples of the most serious offence where a reduced sentence would apply or could apply.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I think the member and I can call the score even in this game of who's reading what, so I'll just skip over that part of it.

I want to say, as I think the member knows, that the people who are incarcerated in correctional centres are people who are sentenced for a term of less than two years. So we don't find generally in correctional centres the big, heavy-duty offences, the big criminals and the people who have committed a very serious crime. So we're not faced with the same kind of problems that my counterpart is in Ottawa who would be dealing with prisoners who are there for offences which the community would regard as being serious.

And we sort of don't have the same kind of a problem that they have.

But I can give you some examples of . . . We would not grant early release to a person charged with attempted murder, who'd been convicted of attempted murder, if we were to have any of those in our correctional centres, or any inmate who caused the death of a person in the commission of a crime within the last two years. And that would be our . . . that's our two years, you know, because of the fact that we don't have any prisoners sentenced for longer than that. Or prison breaches, offences committed while in the centre.

But generally the answer is that we don't have the kind of long-term criminals or really serious crime situations that my counterpart, the Solicitor General, has in Ottawa.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, you also made a comment about the fact that they're allowing for more stronger and effective, cooperative, community-based programs that will be administered under this Act. I'm wondering, Mr. Minister . . . You mentioned earlier about a consultation process and about consulting with groups. I'm sure there's organizations out there that now are involved in some form of rehabilitation programs, and I'm wondering if you could just let us know about the consultation that took place and the groups that were talked with and some of the suggestions that came out of those meetings.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chair, I thank the member for the question. We deal with a number of groups on an ongoing basis about correctional problems, and those groups have been consulted with respect to this Bill.

They include the John Howard Society, and the Bill was reviewed with them. The Elizabeth Fry Society, and similarly, Mr. Till consulted with that society. And with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, vice-chief Dan Bellegarde, who has a special interest in and special responsibilities in the field of aboriginal justice. And as well, the Gabriel Dumont Institute.

With respect to all of these groups, they were satisfied with the legislation, had no objections, and supported it.

(1515)

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, we do have a number of amendments here but they're the type of amendments, we believe, that could certainly be looked at and maybe even implemented through the regulatory process. So what we intend to do rather than taking the time of the Assembly to go through meticulously, I'll table them and ask if you would look through the amendments.

And I believe, Mr. Minister, you would find that there are some amendments that, if not all of them, would certainly find a place in the Bill. And those that you really feel could add to the Bill, we'd ask that you look

seriously at them, review them, and take the appropriate action, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I'll be glad to take a look at those. As the member knows, there is quite a broad regulation-making power and we will try and incorporate as many of the suggestions as we can under section 57, the regulations passed under that section.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 67 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chair, on behalf of members of the Assembly I'd like to thank my officials for the enormous amount of work they did on the preparation of this legislation and for coming to the committee to assist us today.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, as well on behalf of the opposition I'd like to thank the minister and his officials for being here and responding. Certainly we got into a lot of questions but I think we've answered some of the appropriate questions and concerns that were raised. So thank you very much.

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

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With me today, sitting beside me is Mr. Victor Taylor, who is an assistant deputy minister with the Saskatchewan Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat; and behind me Mr. Mitch McAdam, a Crown solicitor in the constitutional branch of the Department of Justice.

Clause 1

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, in the essence of cooperation here, I will be asking questions on certain clauses so we'll move ahead. I would ask one thing though. It's been brought to my attention, Mr. Minister — and I hope you give your own answers rather than referring to your officials' answers; you seem to want people to use original work here today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I don't know, Bob, if it's even yet or not — I've been informed that the economic development side of the department that I used to deal with has now been transferred out of your hands and into the hands of the Minister of Economic Development. Can you tell me if he has total control now with any consultation with your officials; or is this a cooperative effort; or who do aboriginal people who traditionally dealt with your secretariat, how do they function now?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The member is right, Mr. Chair, the Leader of the Opposition is correct when he says that this program has been moved over to Economic

Development. With the program went two employees who had been administering the program in the secretariat who are gone over to Economic Development. So the same people are administering the program.

My understanding is that the similar advisory board mechanisms will continue as was the case when the Leader of the Opposition was the minister. And you'll know how those committees were constituted.

Actually it's been pointed out to me by my official that one of the positions were vacant; two positions went over and one person.

The relationship between the secretariat and other departments, including Economic Development, is close and I think not different from the days when the Leader of the Opposition was the minister responsible. In other words, the secretariat is the source of a great deal of information and advice to the Department of Economic Development.

Mr. Swenson: — Will any of the entitlement process now involve the Minister of Economic Development, seeing as that he has control over and understand that part of the selection process that some bands were going through, involved joint ventures, other things that they were considering putting their settlement into in lieu of land that also involved potential economic development projects in parks, in urban areas? Would they now have to deal with the . . . if their choice of their band is to make that particular purchase rather than say a block of farm land, is it my understanding now that they deal with the Minister of Economic Development in those areas?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The Minister of Economic Development will not be involved in the kinds of situations that the member raises. Those options that you mention will be exercised downstream by the band and working primarily with the federal government. And if they get into an economic development project, they need make no reference at all to the minister.

If they want to access one of the programs for additional funds over and above the funds provided in the agreement, then naturally the department and therefore the minister would get involved for those additional funds. But for the treaty land entitlement funds itself, the minister has no voice.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 5

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, the fact that the province of Saskatchewan has now okayed a third school board network perhaps changes the landscape a little bit here on treaty land entitlement.

I can envision a French school board being formed in the appropriate place, then receiving remuneration under the agreement which was struck with the other entities in the education field and being able to

receive a pay-out even though they might only be a few weeks or a few months old, if one was so inclined.

And I'm not saying that anyone would do this, but we do have a third player now. And as you know, there was long and hard negotiations with SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association) and others to arrive at what we have arrived at. And if someone were to throw a wrench in that, I think it might be very unproductive for the whole process.

I'm not going to say that . . . ask if you know of any such move, but I'm asking you: would that be possible under clause 5 of the agreement, that a French school board could be formed and then receive compensation because of the entitlement process proceeding forthwith?

(1530)

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The question is . . . I think we know the answer to the question. I believe that the French governance provisions do not confer a taxing power on the French school boards. If that is the case, then they won't have a tax loss, and therefore the provisions would not apply to them.

Now I have to say to the member that my officials were not involved in the French governance legislation, so we're not certain of that. It would not apply immediately, in any event, because the school divisions would have to be in existence for a period of a year before they could have a tax loss. And that would be a factor to be considered, although that's not the . . . you know, obviously this land entitlement and the acquisition of land is going to go on for a period of years.

And if we're wrong in our understanding of the French governance provision, then I suspect that the answer is that the French school divisions would be in the same position as other school divisions, namely if there has been a tax loss, they would be entitled to compensation.

But I think I had it right the first time. I think these boards are without taxing powers and therefore will not have any tax loss.

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Minister, I suspect that you are, if we take this at first blush. This question was posed to me just a week ago by a person that has been involved in education in the province for some time in the provincial level.

And because the length of time that the entitlement process needs in order to be finalized, that individual said to me, I believe anyone in this province that doesn't think that there isn't going to be taxpayers involved in the third school board by the time the entitlement process is finished is dreaming in Technicolor, were the words they used; that at some point taxpayers will be involved.

Now I know your minister stood here and said no, that wasn't the case. But 10 and 12 years from now at the

rate we're going, it may in fact be there. It is not hard to create a tax loss if you are in a position where you think that there is some benefit to be derived at. And I think it is a legitimate concern.

This process has taken a great deal of time to put in place. I would hate to see something happen that would impinge upon its ultimate success. Because as you know, the role of the federal government in assuming education and health costs on reserve, relieving the province, is predicated upon us also making financial contributions.

If there is a wrench thrown in the mix and school boards and divisions feel that there's another player . . . And I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, if there aren't going to have to be some amendments to the Act down the road or some assurances because we never contemplated a third school board in the designation of this Act.

And I only bring to your attention the concern of someone who has dealt with education in this province for a great number of years, and I think legitimately raises it.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well I recognize that, Mr. Chair. I think it's a good question, a legitimate question. And I want to say to the member that we'll follow up on the point and if it should require amendment to the agreement and to the legislation, those may happen in due course. But we will follow up with the other parties to the framework agreement and try and sort this out with the school trustees association and try and determine what action is appropriate.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clause 7

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, clause 7 deals with the rural municipalities and once again the arrangement that was made on tax loss and compensation, that type of thing. I never thought of this at the time but if RMs (rural municipality) are into amalgamation — and there is some indication from your government that that may be desirable — that if we get into amalgamations and some of the changes that obviously would then occur with larger entities in place, will that have any effect on . . . If that occurred, would the average ratepayer be affected any differently under this agreement? And I know maybe that's a hypothetical question, but I can't sort it out in my mind if, say, that happened.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I think the answer is no. In the hypothetical event that the municipality should of their own volition decide to merge or whatever, a tax loss is a tax loss and maintaining roads is still maintaining roads. So I think that the situation would not be changed if the eventuality mentioned by the member should happen to occur as a result of the voluntary decision of rural municipalities.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Mr. Minister, in the event that it wasn't voluntary, I'm wondering if we shouldn't think about, as was done in the health Bill . . . or districts Bill, that the rights and privileges of that RM entity be carried through into whatever larger unit happened to occur.

Once again, the length of the entitlement process means that a lot of things may change in the world and I would hope that the rights of ratepayers of a particular RM who were affected that way, then faced with entitlement changes down the road, would somehow be protected in law that the folks over on the east side of the new unit, however big it might be, could not sort of subjugate the rights of RM X who were involved in the entitlement process because they'd been shoved into this larger entity.

Because when this thing was designed, it clearly was aimed at RMs as they now exist in the province of Saskatchewan and the ratepayers involved in that RM with the various issues that entitlement might change, i.e., roads and road allowances and that type of thing.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I think it clear, Mr. Chair, that the logic of the situation would require that they be protected. And the member is quite right, the provisions in the agreement were drafted on the basis of the present system. And if there are changes to the system, then the appropriate changes will have to be either incorporated into the document or observed, at the very least.

And that is the second matter which I undertake to the member that we'll follow up on, perhaps with less urgency than the first because it's still an eventuality that hasn't happened yet. But we'll look into it.

The Chair: — I recognize the member for Regina Wascana Plains.

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you. I'm asking leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Hamilton: — Thank you. I would like to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly, 10 members of the United Nations who are here on a training program: uranium in the environment. It's sponsored by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and they're here today with their instructor, Dr. Geoff Parslow.

It was my pleasure last year to be able to speak with the group, and I will be meeting with them shortly to answer any questions they might have and to speak to them about the proceedings of the Assembly. And I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming them. They come from many countries — Algeria, Argentina, China, Egypt, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Slovenia, Thailand, and the instructor from Regina.

So I would ask all members to join in welcoming the members from the United Nations program. And I hope that I'll be able to inform them about some of the proceedings that they've seen today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 77 (continued)

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clause 9

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, under clause 9 on the framework agreement and how it deals with water and water rights and its relationship to their privileges that they have and the rights that they have, would you give me an explanation of a couple of things.

One is, if a river runs through the area that they are dealing with, whether the reserve or the land entitlement would have the boundaries around the body of water; whether the boundaries of the land entitlement would be partially surrounding a lake, for example; what the rules and the entitlement involved in each one of those three areas. What would be for us to know and for the province to know?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chair, this is perhaps the most complex part of the agreement, at least it certainly was the most complex part to negotiate. And I'll deal with the three situations that the member puts forward.

First of all, with respect to rivers running through the land, through the reserve. The river to the high-water mark does not go with the land. The high-water mark is the cut-off point.

However, there is flexibility with respect to that which will be considered by the parties on a case-by-case basis. In some cases it may be appropriate to transfer title to the bed . . . to the river bed up to the high-water mark. There is room for negotiation on a case-by-case basis with respect to that.

There is also a co-management arrangement which was arrived at — and this was really the idea that was the breakthrough on the question of water rights — a co-management agreement by which the rights of . . . the use of the water and the upstream and downstream implications can be managed jointly by government and by the band. So that's the first situation.

(1545)

The second is a body of water entirely enclosed within the land being acquired. And in that case the band will

own all of it. It will own the water and the bed, all of it.

With respect to land which partially surrounds a body of water, a lake, then the cut-off will be the high-water mark. The bed will not be . . . will not go with the land.

Mr. Martens: — Going back to your river bed or a stream that flows through the land entitlement, what kind of conditions and what kind of discussions take place in relation to that that would have a representative from either the Water Corporation or the Department of Justice who would be negotiating with them, or the Indian land claim? What kind of criteria are you using to establish whether that would go in with the land entitlement, or it would not?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — There are no criteria laid down in the agreement. It's a case-by-case basis, and one would want to be reasonable about it. So far as the provincial government is concerned, the lead agency would be the Water Corporation, but the secretariat and the Department of Justice would also be involved as well as the Indian band. And the whole process would have to fully take into account other stakeholders, as they say, interested parties, to the water and its use. But there's no criteria set out in the agreement as such. It is intended to be an open and flexible process.

Mr. Martens: — I suppose that one of the things that I would be wanting to put into the whole area of the discussion are the . . . what I would call the common law riparian rights of those upstream and downstream and the water users that are there in relation to that involvement. And I believe that that sort of public involvement needs to be there when a decision is made to go underneath the river bed or creek or stream.

And understanding the significance of it, when the federal government wanted to put the grasslands park in, they did not get the Frenchman River. And the significance of that is that authority and responsibility for natural resources rests within the framework of the province.

I recognize also on the other hand, that there were some arrangements made prior to 1930, at least in one band, where they have that right in a lake. And I don't remember the name of the lake in northern Saskatchewan where the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sturgeon Lake, right — where they have a part of the lake as a part of their right.

And I would think that there has been significant, I would call it discontent on that line between individuals who cross over and that sort of thing. I think you need to be very careful that those individuals who have a vested right below and above need to be taken into consideration when the discussion is taking place.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The answer is yes, I agree with the member fully.

Mr. Martens: — Will you define two things for me in

this? And first is what the riparian rights are of these — and riparian rights will be what every person in society has — and then, how common law relates to that. Some of these things have not been tried in any court in Canada to find out what that really is, and I'm not even sure whether British law has established what common law is.

I know that in United States, which uses the British system for rights, have established . . . for example, California had to take and remove about a million acres of irrigation that they had to give back to Arizona because the water rights really were an entitlement for the state of Arizona.

And that's the sort of thing that we have to think about when we're dealing with these two items. One is the riparian right, and the other one is the common law riparian involvement in this. Would you give me an explanation of how you see this and how your department sees it?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chair, I've taken advantage of the presence of my officials to upgrade my knowledge of the subject, which as I said at the beginning is one of the more complex areas of this agreement.

The Indian band of course will have riparian rights because either the river flows through the reserve now or because it will flow through their land. And the agreement recognizes that. And also by the agreement, the Indian band recognizes that other people have their full riparian rights with respect to the quality of the water and quantity of the water and rate of flow and those sorts of things.

This was a vexing problem during negotiations, as your leader will know, and was eventually resolved by the concept of jointly managing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, right, jointly managing the question, and we hope that will work. I think it will. It seems to be the only possible answer.

The whole agreement, with respect to the whole agreement, with respect of riparian rights, is based on the assumption that a co-management regime will sort this thing out.

So far as the broader common law rights of people with respect to rivers and the use of rivers — and there are many of them: water skiers, power boats, recreational use of one kind or another — there is really an uncertain area of the law, and quite likely they don't have any rights at common law which could interfere with the regime set up by the framework agreement.

It's quite likely with the mutual respect for the riparian rights of all of the stakeholders, that the whole system can be managed in such a way that other common law interests will not be unduly prejudiced, on the one hand. Because if you take care of all of the riparian right owners, you're probably taking care of the other people too. In any event their common law right will probably not be sufficiently dominant as a

consideration to upset these mutual arrangements.

Mr. Martens: — That's good. I don't have a problem with that at all. And I just wanted to make this point, that when the riparian rights are established and as common law establishes what the riparian rights really are, then common law takes off from that point and establishes what the rights of the Indian bands are equivalent to the rights of individuals along that same stream. And that common law will establish a practice or a precedent what that common law will be.

And I don't think there are too many places where we have established these kinds of laws in Canada. So then it has its roots in a beginning that gives equity between the players along that stream. And I think that that's the most important part and that's the part that needs to be protected. That not only enhances the opportunity for the Indian bands but it also enhances the opportunities for the non-entitlement areas.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — That's a good point, Mr. Chair.

Clause 9 agreed to.

Clause 10

Mr. Swenson: — In clause 10, Mr. Minister, I need you to refresh me about the arbitration process, because in this particular instance it talks about the transfer of buildings and that type of thing. And I need to understand this arbitration process better because that wasn't quite as far along as it needed to be in my time. And I would like you to refresh me because I think it's important that we all understand that this arbitration process will be without political interference. So can you enlighten the legislature on that?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The arbitration can arise in connection with the disputes about the value of, or the purchase price of, a school that is located in the Northern Saskatchewan Administration District. Either the school board or the entitlement band may submit the question of the appropriate price to an arbitration board.

There is a permanent, independent chairperson of the board who is appointed under the agreement within six months of the execution date. That person has not yet been appointed but there is provision there for the appointment of the chair.

The composition of the board . . . Sorry, Mr. Chair. I just couldn't find my place and this is a complex agreement. Under article 1907 of the framework agreement the number of arbitrators comprising the arbitration board shall be three unless the parties agree to another number. And each of the parties involved in the dispute appoints one of the arbitrators, and the chairperson is the person who is appointed by agreement of all parties to this agreement as I mentioned in the first part of my answer.

So that gives you a three-person arbitration board who then hear and determine the question of what is the

appropriate purchase price for the school.

(1600)

Mr. Swenson: — Maybe we should try that on NewGrade, Mr. Minister, and see how it works.

Mr. Minister, do you anticipate this arbitration process being expanded beyond . . . Obviously the school buildings were a crying necessity because of the percentage split in the framework agreement and they have to be dealt with immediately. But is it envisioned now, as this process has gone down the road, that this arbitration will work in some areas — for instance water or others? Is it anticipated?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The mechanism for arbitration is actually used very often in the agreement. There is a long list of matters included in article 1902, part (b), and includes whether a particular water body is or will be wholly enclosed within an entitlement reserve and the appropriate representation of an entitlement band on a co-management board, and whether a provincial road is used primarily to provide access to locations within the reserve, and on and on. There's quite a long list of them. So arbitration is a concept that's widely used.

And I can't speak with certainty, but I'm sure that with experience with respect of those matters, if other disputes arise in the agreement, I believe the parties will probably find it very convenient to resort to the arbitration mechanism to solve other kinds of disputes as well.

Mr. Swenson: — Has anyone suggested, Mr. Minister, that one be set up, or do you have any situations now where that is in fact the case as per the agreement? There's nothing sitting there on the horizon?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — No, no arbitration boards have been constituted to this point. And the chair, as I mentioned earlier, has not yet been put in place.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would you be able to tell me what the criteria will be for those band entitlements where they have received funding to purchase land? Is there any involvement by your department and the federal government where the money is placed — how the money will be spent in the purchase of this property?

Or will the Indian band receive the entitlement and then they have exclusive jurisdiction for the 5 million or whatever dollars that that entitlement relates to? Will they have absolute . . . will the band council have absolute jurisdiction over that dollar value that flows into that entitlement?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — The situation is that approximately 25 per cent of the total land entitlement money has to be used to buy land. And in each case the entitlement band will enter into a trust agreement with the federal government with respect to that land. The provincial government has no role or place at all with respect to that process. And our only

obligation is to the federal government under the natural resources transfer Act, and we do that, and we take no part in the land selection or the other details of how the entitlement band spends its money.

Mr. Martens: — So, Mr. Chairman, the minimum amount is 25 per cent. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — That's on average. Each band has got a different situation. But overall it'll be 25 per cent.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Appendix agreed to.

Schedule 1 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chair, on behalf of the members of the Assembly I'd like to thank the officials who are present today. They are part of a team that spent a great deal of time in the negotiation of these arrangements and in the preparation of this legislation, and I'd like to thank them for coming today to assist the committee.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too would like to thank the officials for coming in today and helping the minister answer our questions, and I hope that they raise . . . down the road, that some of those concerns that we've raised will be taken into consideration as you draft further legislation. Thank you.

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

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With me today is Susan Amrud of the Department of Justice, a Crown solicitor, who's sitting beside me; and behind me is Ms. Andrea Seale who is also a Crown solicitor with the department.

Clause 1

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, it's certainly nice to see some brightness on that side of the House right now.

Mr. Chairman, I have a . . . Mr. Minister, I have a number of questions that have been prepared for me that I'd like to raise with you. Actually, Mr. Minister, a

couple of concerns that . . . we've raised them before. I believe the Bill is more or less a housekeeping Bill, but what you're doing in the Bill is creating a commission that is going to address the salaries and establish the salaries of judges. And also, I believe another aspect of the Bill sets up the plans for pension plans for the judicials . . . or the judiciary. And I'm not sure if it goes beyond that.

But, Mr. Minister, I'm not exactly sure what the difference is regarding the pension plan you're establishing through this piece of legislation versus the pension plans that are established today. And I wonder if you could inform the House of those different measures.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — There have been a number of changes on the pension, the pension area. All judges will contribute, whereas previously only those under 60 contributed. There were special rules respecting public servants who were appointed to the bench by way of the options that they had about which pension plan would apply to them, and those have been deleted so they move to the judges' pension plan.

The 10-year vesting provision that was in the old pension plan has been reduced to two, which brings it in line with the provincial pension benefits Act. And there is a better early retirement provision in this Bill than previously existed. The judges may now leave at the age of 60 without a reduction in respect of their retirement. They're entitled to the benefit that they've earned. It is of course a contributory plan and they are eligible for early retirement at the age of 60.

There are other provisions but I think they're minor.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, you made a comment about vested, 10-year. You've changed it to two years. Now I'm not exactly sure what that means. I wonder if you could explain the intent or the reasons for that.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Previously, before this Act, they had to serve 10 years in order to become entitled to a pension, before the pension locked in. They now get a locked-in pension after two years.

(1615)

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, I take it then from your comments that the pension plan that we're discussing or that has been established in Bill 88, The Provincial Court Act, is a pension along the lines of the old-formula pension plan. I realize that there's contributory factors where judges pay into the pension plan but it's based on a formula that states that after two years, if I hear you right and if they're 60 years and they retire from the bench, they would receive that equivalent amount.

Is there a prorated factor based on your number of years service? Are you just saying if you've served on the bench for two years and you are part of the pension plan that you automatically receive what portion? Would that be a 70 per cent portion of your salary or what portion would that be, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Let's say that the judge was appointed at the age of 63 and serves to age 65 so the judge therefore serves a period of two years. They would receive a pension on retirement equal to 6 per cent. They get 3 per cent per year and it's a defined benefit formula in that sense. So they would retire with a pension that is 6 per cent of their income. And similarly if it were a five-year judge, that judge would get 15 per cent of the income.

Mr. Toth: — So then it isn't just a factor that you've served on the bench for two years and you would receive say a 50 or 70 per cent, like a long-term individual paying into a pension plan.

This pension plan as well, you mention that anyone say, moving out of the public service and say moving up to a judiciary position, would this pension plan then fall in alongside any other pension plan the member may have, or does it all accumulate into one?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chair, they'd be totally separate. Whatever they had become entitled to in a pension plan in their former life, whether it's public service or whoever, whatever their pension arrangements were, that's left off to the side. They begin to earn benefits under this plan on an entirely separate basis. They get no credit for past service or anything like that. They are simply credited for their years as a judge.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, I was just looking through the Bill. I believe it does establish a contributory factor that the judiciary puts in is . . . if I'm not mistaken, I believe I saw some place where it's 9 per cent. Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — My understanding is that the judge's contribution is 5 per cent of annual salary.

Mr. Toth: — What would the 9 per cent factor be? I thought I saw in . . . I can't remember exactly where I saw it right now but in going through the Bill there was a place where a 9 per cent factor was in. I just took that as being a contribution that a judge would make to the plan.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I know where the member got that number. For the period between October 1, 1978 and December 31, 1980, the judges contributed 9 per cent of their salary to the fund. Those arrangements were changed then in 1980 and for the period on and after January 1, 1981, the judge contributed what the legislation provided and this provision is 5 per cent.

Mr. Toth: — Well, Mr. Minister, I guess the other question poses, why would there have been a reduction in light of the fact that if a person is in a position of judgeship for a number of years, the potential is there for a fairly substantial accumulated pension plan. And I guess the problem as we look at the broad spectrum of pension plans across the country and the unfunded pension plans that are out there, that it would have been probably fair and equitable to have judges themselves put 9 per cent

towards the plan to try and make these plans or help these plans become or maintain their actuarially-sound formation.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — None of us were here in 1980 but I suspect that the reason was changes to The Income Tax Act. That's what it looks like anyway.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, in bringing forward the Act I understand that you're going to be implementing a commission, a group of individuals, that will make recommendations. I wonder if you could let us know how many people you're suggesting would be part of this commission and who you would be looking at or who you are suggesting. Are you looking at someone representing the broad spectrum of the general public — the taxpayer out there — or do you have specific type of personnel in mind with any specific qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — There has been a good deal of discussion with the judges about the composition of the commission. And the composition that's set out in the Bill is set out in section 5.1(2). And here's how it will be . . . it will work.

I will appoint one member on behalf of the government. The association, that is the judges' association, will appoint one member. And those two will then agree upon a chair. In the event that they are not able to agree on a chair, then the chair will be appointed by the person who is the dean of law at the University of Saskatchewan.

I might mention to the member that this was . . . this particular provision about who would appoint in the event they were not able to agree was the subject of lengthy, protracted negotiation, and the suggestion for the dean of law was the product of that. But a number of other officials, chief justices and the like were suggested and discarded for one reason or another, and finally this formulation was agreed to.

As to who, we're not at the stage yet. But I can say that so far as the person I've appointed is concerned, it will be someone from outside the government who is of the province — you know what I mean? A person who knows about these things.

It could be a lawyer, but it doesn't have to be a lawyer. Lawyers are in a bit of a compromisable position because they are members of their firm, appear before Provincial Court judges from time to time. So I just haven't got a clear idea of who will be appointed, but in this great province I'm sure we can find somebody to adequately represent the interests of the government.

Mr. Toth: — Well, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, if you're looking for someone . . . Actually, Mr. Minister, I see you've got . . . so actually this would be a three-person commission, is what you're suggesting. And I guess, if I could make a suggestion, I think it would be only fair that maybe someone outside of the

legal community, there should be at least one individual appointed that would have some knowledge — and it doesn't really matter to me who it is — but I think outside of the legal community just to give a broader perspective to look into judiciary salaries.

Because there's no doubt that we receive criticism all the time regarding our compensation and salaries because of our board being made up of MLAs. And I think maybe the judicial . . . or people in the judiciary or judges, lawyers, whoever, would probably feel somewhat more comfortable and at ease themselves if their commission that's setting salaries is a little broader and far ranging so that they can say: well listen, we had people outside making recommendations. And I think that it would be a sound suggestion.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the officials for coming today to assist the committee in its work with respect to this Bill — Ms. Amrud and Ms. Seale — and thank them for coming and helping us today.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd also like to extend my appreciation and thanks to the minister and his officials for their time this afternoon. Thank you.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 49 — An Act respecting Correctional Services

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1630)

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**General Revenue Fund
Economic Development
Vote 45**

Item 1 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — It's my understanding that there's a grouping of questions that we were to prepare for the opposition. I don't think we took an opportunity on our first exchange to get that for the members. I will see that that is sent to the office of the member from Kindersley at the first opportunity.

Items 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 45 agreed to.

**General Revenue Fund
Loans, Advances and Investments
Economic Development
Vote 167**

Nil vote.

**General Revenue Fund
Loans, Advances and Investments
Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation**

Nil vote.

**Supplementary Estimates 1992-93
Loans, Advances and Investments
Economic Development
Vote 167**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 167 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the opposition not for today's questions, but the other night I think we had a fair exchange.

I would also like to ask the committee to be patient for the return of the Minister of Finance. It might take maybe five minutes before she arrives back in the Assembly.

**General Revenue Fund
Finance
Vote 18**

The Chair: — I will ask the Minister of Finance to introduce her officials to the members of the

committee.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my pleasure to introduce the deputy minister, John Wright, who's on my right. Next to him is Len Rog, the assistant deputy minister of revenue, pensions, and administration. Behind Mr. Wright is Craig Dotson, associate deputy minister, budget analysis division. Next to him is Bill Van Sickle, executive director, administration division. Next to him is Terry Paton, executive director, financial management branch, Provincial Comptroller's office. And on my left is Bill Jones, associate deputy minister.

Item 1

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, in the short time that's available to us today, maybe we can deal with that one specific area and see if we can move along here.

We have done some consulting of our own on your move to accrual accounting and how you come up with the numbers in your budget. I'd like to ask you a few questions about a number of areas.

The consultation that I've done tells me that you've got about \$106 million in the accumulated deficit over equalization payments, federal equalization overpayment, you've allocated 106 million. And what people are telling me is that these . . . because these repayments are scheduled over a number of years, that you should not be including the whole amount in this year's deficit. And the fact that these things are being negotiated even, that this isn't a hard and fast number, means that you should not under accrual accounting be including the amount in your accumulated deficit, that this amount has not been finalized, and is in fact simply speculation.

So I would wonder how you would respond to that.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, yes. In response to that question, we got an opinion from Deloitte & Touche on how we should book that particular item. And the advice was that we should book it in the way that we have done so.

I would also point out that this is consistent with the practices of other provinces who are on accrual accounting system.

Mr. Swenson: — I find that a little strange, Madam Minister, because I sought the advice of firms as eminent as Deloitte Touche and they're saying that if you do that you presuppose negotiations. By taking that entire figure and stating that that has to go on the accumulated deficit, in effect you are saying that there is no negotiation in place, that we are responsible for that entire amount.

The opinion I received is that even under accrual accounting the payments should be applied only in the years they are actually due, and that writing off the amount during negotiations presupposes the outcome of those negotiations. And that is a firm that is every bit

as reputable as Deloitte Touche, Madam Minister.

I'm wondering, if there's this much uncertainty out there, why you would err on the large side rather than perhaps waiting down the road before you sort of jumped that great leap of faith. Is that because you simply wanted to make that accumulated deficit number as large as possible? Is that the only reason that you did that?

(1645)

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, no, we did it because it was an appropriate way to account for the expenditure of public monies. Under accrual accounting what you book is what you know today. The 106 million is the figure that we know today. If in fact that figure changes, then the amount that you book changes.

But as I say, we got an opinion from a reputable firm, Deloitte Touche, and the opinion was that this is quite consistent with general accounting principles, public sector accounting, and audit committee principles.

Mr. Swenson: — It's interesting, Madam Minister, how you agree and disagree with Deloitte Touche these days. FCL got an opinion from Deloitte Touche that is totally contrary to what Madam Minister, I suspect, has been up to lately, and there wasn't a whole lot of compliance with Deloitte Touche yesterday.

Madam Minister, would you tell me then if the 106 has been negotiated to a finality, or are you still negotiating these parts of the sum?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is the 106 million is based on the formula as it exists; it's not a negotiated formula. If it changes, then we change the number. But as I said before, under accrual accounting what you book is what you know now, and you book it when you know it.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, you did not answer the question. Is any of that 106 under negotiation between the two governments? My understanding is that it is.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, if you would like me to repeat it, what we have booked is based on the formula that exists. The formula is a set formula; it's not a negotiated formula. Anything that changes with respect to negotiations that occur will be changed in the numbers. But the formula is obviously not negotiated; it's a set formula.

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Madam Minister, what if that negotiating process as per the formula happens to relieve you of a whole bunch of accumulated deficit, say, conveniently a year and a half from now. How will you record it then?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, we will book it appropriately. That is, if in fact the 106 million is not accurate, in fact it was 100 million, we'll take a \$6

million gain. If in fact 106 million was not accurate because it's 110 million, we'll take a \$4 million loss on the deficit.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, when would you expect to know when this number might be arrived at? Give us your best guess on when this negotiation might be concluded.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, to again clarify, this is not negotiation we're talking about. What this number will depend on is the population estimate which will be available to all concerned in September. But then the numbers are not adjusted until March 31, 1994.

But again I stress we're not talking about negotiation, we're talking about a formula and how the population statistics fit into that formula. We've made an estimate. We will find out in September whether the population estimate is accurate and this will affect our numbers in March '94.

Mr. Swenson: — So it's conceivable, Madam Minister, given that there's a whole lot of things going into equalization, that this number could change somewhat significantly for you approximately a year from now?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, that would only occur if there's some radical change in the population numbers. As the members opposite would know, when you do a budget you do it on the basis of estimates, what the best estimate is in light of all the information you have available at the time that you make the estimate. The estimate is based on population statistics. We do not see any reason for a dramatic change in those statistics and there is no reason for equalization to change before March 31, 1994.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, I'm going to go to another topic for a minute and may come back to this one because some of my other questions may trigger things.

You have allocated \$187 million for capital projects, and this once again was pursuant to the changes to accrual accounting. My consultation says that this appears to be fairly overstated, to be mild; because if I believe the principle is that if a school, for instance, was 40 per cent complete, 40 per cent of the cost must be included whether or not any cheques had been written.

Now, Madam Minister, are you going to tell me that, whole or in part, that there are \$187 million worth of capital projects ongoing in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, this is one of the fundamental principles of accrual accounting. Many of these projects have been completed. What happened in the past was the cost of those projects were spread over a period of time, over 10 years.

Under accrual accounting, as soon as you know that you have to incur a cost for a building that is constructed, you have to book those costs that year rather than being allowed to spread the costs over 10 years, which is one of the advantages of accrual accounting — once you know you have a liability, you have to book it.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, my understanding, and this is from a number of people in the accounting business, reputable firms, is that only the portion of a capital project that is completed can be reported as spent, i.e., the example I used — if you have completed 40 per cent of the school, you report 40 per cent of the cost.

Now, Madam Minister, what I asked you was, given that principle, are you telling me that, whole or in part, there are \$187 million worth of capital projects ongoing in the budget year that you refer to? You've allocated \$187 million.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, to repeat, these are projects that have been completed. Okay? In the past we were allowed to spread the costs of those projects over a period of time. Now with accrual accounting, the idea is that once you have . . . the taxpayers have a liability, you book it right that year rather than having the liberty of spreading it over a period of time. So these are projects that are completed.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, how can that be? Last year you wrote off everything in SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation), in other words all government-connected projects. You wrote them off. You wrote off the hospitals. All of that stuff had already taken a write-down.

How can you say now stuff that was completed in the past that have already written off, are now going to move it up and take a hit on it on accrual accounting? That simply doesn't work.

What you should be able to provide to me is \$187 million list of projects currently under construction or to be completed this year and the portions of each one that you're claiming for this year. You can't be dragging stuff out of the past when you've already written that off.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, these projects have not been written off in the past. What was written off in the past, I think what the member is referring to is SPMC. We wrote off a series of expenses associated with SPMC. These have not been written off in the past.

Mr. Swenson: — Madam Minister, then what I need from you is the commitment to provide this list in its entirety, the year when completed, or the portion thereof being completed; because we asked questions earlier on in interim supply about what you were doing with hospitals that you'd written off, what you were doing with schools that you'd written off, what you had done with other institutions attached to

government and Crown agencies. So we're going to have to be able to make that comparison.

So I think that you had better provide for us the list of everything that you wrote off and everything that you're assigning to this \$187 million.

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the members opposite that they were invited to a session on accrual accounting, at which time these lists were available. For some reason which I'm not clear about, they chose not to attend. I have no problem in providing those lists. The lists have been available for some time.

Mr. Swenson: — Okay, Madam Minister, we'll hope that you get those lists over fairly quickly to us.

Another issue here is the one of . . . our calculations show about \$110 million that seems to be sums included in . . . that were put under interest payments but in fact aren't. These are such items as the cost of issuing securities, departmental expenses associated with managing debt, and that type of thing that have been included as interests costs, because that's the only way I can make the numbers add up. And I come to about \$110 million. I wonder if you have any comment on that?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, could I ask the member opposite to clarify which particular 110 figure he's referring to.

Mr. Swenson: — Yes, I didn't . . . I believe it's the 847.5 million. I don't have it in my file with me, Madam Minister, but it appeared . . . Perhaps you can tell us then the cost of issuing securities and the departmental costs associated with managed debt. And this would be departments across the line, what that process would be. Where would that be recorded?

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Mr. Chairman, with respect to first of all the 847.5 million, that's interest on the public debt. It's in vote 12. And if you look there, there is also a line, fees and commissions, and the number there is 1.5 million.

Also in the Department of Finance, subvote F104, there's treasury and debt management which relates to this particular issue. And the budget there is 2.1 million.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.