

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Clerk:** — According to order, the following petition has been reviewed and pursuant to rule 11(7) is hereby read and received.

Of citizens of the city of Saskatoon humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the Minister of Health to examine the proposal to close emergency and cardiac care at City Hospital.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, sir, and to all the members of the Assembly, five very special guests who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. I'm of course referring to the members of the Sandra Peterson curling rink, the Canadian champions. Sandra Peterson, skip — perhaps you could stand as I introduce you — Sandra Peterson, skip; Jan Betker, third; Joan McCusker, second; Marcia Gudereit, lead; and Anita Ford as the alternate and the coach.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity to congratulate these fine athletes on their victory at the '93 world women's curling championship in Geneva, and like thousands of people right across this province, across this country, I followed, we followed, their progress with great pride and admiration.

Today, I wish to congratulate them once again on their Scott Tournament of Hearts victory earlier this month and offer our very, very best wishes for this year's forthcoming world championships.

I know all of the members of the Assembly would agree that this rink, the Peterson rink, truly represents the very best of Saskatchewan's winning spirit.

It was my pleasure to be with them today at luncheon and get all the inside scoop as to how they won the Canadian championship and how they're going to win the world championship. Win, lose, or draw, they will represent Canada very, very well.

I know that they are going to win, and on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and this Assembly, we congratulate them and wish them well. And after their world championship, have a real big, royal Canadian celebration in this Assembly as we did last year.

Congratulations, and welcome.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I

want to join with the Premier in congratulating the five ladies.

There are some perks to this job, Mr. Premier, that I'm envious of, and I wish I could have been at the luncheon with you. Just some, mind you. Just some.

**An Hon. Member:** — Buy the lunch.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Right. Well we, on behalf of the official opposition, we want to also extend our congratulations on just a wonderfully well-done job.

I make this introduction with some trepidation. Last year in my concluding remarks — and they will remember this; Sandra's laughing already — I did wish them well at the Brier. And I won't make that mistake this year.

But congratulations on winning the second time the Scott Tournament of Hearts. You've got a good chance of doing it next year because you will automatically be in there again. And let's make this an annual event. How's that? Okay, let's go for the hat trick then.

And I wish all members to congratulate them once more.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Of course we too as the Liberal caucus and the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan would like to congratulate you.

We love it that you're making this a habit. So to you, Sandra, to Jan, Joan, Marcia, and Anita, it was such a privilege to observe excellence. And you really do raise the spirits of every single person who has the honour of being able to watch you. Again, congratulations.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through to the House, I would like to introduce a couple of friends from Regina, Ross Joorisity, and Petria Racette, up in your gallery and I would ask that members of the House welcome them here today.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, 20 grade 11 and 12 students from Martin Collegiate seated in your gallery. They're here today with the illustrious curling team and I know that all members will want to welcome them here today in the gallery and I hope you enjoy question period.

We will be meeting with you after question period for photos and drinks and I look forward to answering some important questions at that time.

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

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### St. Patrick's Day

**Mr. Carlson:** — Mr. Speaker, today is St. Patrick's Day, a day when everyone in North America is more Irish than the Irish, the day when the colour green is given to products it was never intended for.

In Canada we acknowledge St. Patrick's Day for the simple, important reason that Irish settlers were one of the major groups of settlers who came to this country in the early 19th century and later. In fact, an early English account called "Roughing it in the Bush" states that in many ways, the Irish and the Scottish settlers were much better prepared to succeed in the New World because they were not encumbered by outmoded aristocratic assumptions. They came to prove their worth by working, and prove it they did.

In the process, of course, and over the years, Irish people have contributed much to the mosaic that has come to define Canada. Their laughter, their music, their love of the language, their story, and the myth, have enriched us all. Most of all though, we have been given the story of the man who single-handedly confronted evil in the form of snakes and defeated it.

The truth of this story is in its message to us, not in its historical accuracy. That is why the story endures and that is why we celebrate St. Patrick's Day.

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

### Prairie View School Division Teachers' Institute

**Ms. Bradley:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the Assembly know on Monday I attended a teachers' institute for the Prairie View School Division in Yellow Grass.

One of the sessions was on the contents of the High School Review Advisory Committee's final report. It is too early to comment on the report itself, but I'd like to say a word about the process. I was impressed, first of all, by the incredible amount of work that went into the review to make this report thorough and comprehensive.

The committee, made up of teachers, representatives from the trustees, administrators, post-secondary institutions, business, and the Department of Education, gathered information from 165 briefs, many of which were supported by oral presentations at eight public meetings. As well there was an extensive opinion poll and several small group meetings conducted by a professional research company.

The committee also met with small groups representing a broad cross-section of our communities — aboriginal people, teachers, students, parents, and Northerners. The watchword was consultation. Consequently, the report can claim to be one of consensus building. Of course there are

controversial recommendations to be discussed, but in a diverse province such as ours this is inevitable and desirable.

Their task was indeed a challenge. I want to compliment the members of the committee who gave their time and expertise to this review. In particular, I congratulate Georgia Joorisity, principal of Avonlea School in my constituency, who is a member of this committee and who did an excellent job in her presentation on Monday. This review is . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

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

### All-China Youth Federation Delegation

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to inform the members of the Assembly that later this afternoon we'll be welcoming an all-China youth federation delegation to Saskatchewan. These professionals from all over China are representatives of China's youth groups. This trip was in part made a reality by a constituent of mine, Dr. Hsieh, a professor at the University of Regina.

Apart from this, Dr. Hsieh is also involved with the programs of twinning our province with a province in China. The Chinese twin of Saskatchewan is Jinan, Regina's twin city is Jilin, and the University of Regina's twin is the University of Shandong. This program was an effort to create greater understanding, cooperation, communication and appreciation between our two different cultures.

Since the arrival of the all-China youth federation delegation earlier this week, they've been quite busy. They have attended a luncheon hosted by Mayor Archer and a dinner hosted by Dr. Don Wells. They've visited two schools, Campbell Collegiate and Dieppe School, and had a potluck supper that was sponsored by AIESEC (International Association of Students in Economics and Commerce) and the University of Regina student union.

Today they have visited the University of Regina's Faculty of Administration for a brief lecture on the Canadian economic system and banking system. They also have come here today to see our beautiful Legislative Building and to visit with some members of government.

We hope that they have enjoyed their visit to Regina, and I look forward to introducing you to them later this afternoon. Thank you.

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

### Regina Home Builders' Association

**Mr. Trew:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I thank the Regina Home Builders' Association for having us to their MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) night, their dinner meeting at St.

Athanasius hall in north Regina last evening.

Each year the Regina Home Builders' Association use one of their general dinner meetings to network with each other and with MLAs.

We were particularly pleased last evening to meet with Mr. Ted Bryk, the national president of the Canadian Home Builders' Association, and Ken McKinley, the executive director of the Saskatchewan Home Builders' Association. It was clear from the meeting, Mr. Speaker, that the home builders are concerned with their product, with professionalism, with quality, and clearly all of that is improving, thanks to their good work.

It was interesting to hear them talk about the good economic base that has been built in Saskatchewan and the praise for the Economic Development minister and his department. And it was especially heartening to hear the real optimism that was expressed, not just empty rah rah euphemisms, Mr. Speaker, but clearly the Saskatchewan home building business is set for ongoing, real, solid growth based on the real and solid economic growth that is taking place in Saskatchewan. We look forward to continuing dialogue with the home builders' association.

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

#### Origin of St. Patrick's Day

**Mr. Draper:** — Mr. Speaker, sir, on this St. Patrick's Day I would like to remind the members that St. Patrick in fact was a Welshman who was kidnapped into slavery by Irish marauders and remained there for several years before he eventually escaped. He returned after many years to Wales and then took holy orders, and from there returned to Ireland to convert to Christianity the heathens who had kidnapped him and so sadly misused him in the first place.

And it is for this reason that this day I wear my Welsh tie emblazoned with a red dragon on a field of green, I would like to point out, sir, and claim St. Patrick in the name of his true race, the Welsh.

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

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### Labour Standards Amendments

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a few more questions for the Minister of Labour regarding The Labour Standards Act.

First of all, Minister, it appears that you were mistaken yesterday when you said that only 1,500 of the government's four-page colour brochures on the new Bill were printed and distributed. It is my understanding that these brochures went out in the province's daily newspapers and there were also large ads taken out in the provincial weekly newspapers.

Mr. Minister, could you please correct the statement you made yesterday and tell us what is the total cost of your advertising campaign to promote The Labour Standards Act?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The member yesterday asked about the mailing. I pointed out there were some 1,500 mailings, the cost of which was \$47,000. I also pointed out that those were done in completing an undertaking that I would get back to them.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. We will await your answer on the rest of the costs involved.

Mr. Speaker, the minister also misspoke yesterday when he provided me with the complete Price Waterhouse report, which I have here. He said that the complete report was made available to the media. I subsequently found out that that wasn't the case. But none the less I do thank the minister for providing me with this information.

Mr. Minister, the Price Waterhouse confirms that the provisions of benefits of part-time employees will force employers to reduce the number of part-time employees or reduce the number of hours that they work. It goes on to say that this will negatively impact the elderly, the disabled, and the students, and others who need and want the flexibility provided by part-time work.

Mr. Minister, your independent study says that the elderly, people with disabilities, and students will be hurt by this legislation. Why do you want to hurt the very people that you professed to defend when you were in opposition?

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

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Those are the members' conclusions. I wouldn't slander the authors of the report by attributing those conclusions to the authors of the report. The authors of the report provided a costing, an economic model, and that's all they provided. The conclusions which the member drew are clearly his own, and I suggest are your own, and aren't being drawn by fair-minded people across Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Minister, employment opportunities for the elderly people and the disabled and the students will decrease as a result of this legislation. Now that is not my evaluation, Mr. Minister, that's the findings of your independent study. This one, right here.

Mr. Minister, have you determined how many of these people stand to lose their jobs as a result of this legislation? And if not, why isn't this matter being studied? When is it not clear that the labour legislation is going to hurt some of the most vulnerable people in our society, the people that can least afford to be hurt,

are the ones that you're going to hurt.

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

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Perhaps it might be of some assistance to the hon. member if I quoted from an editorial in the *Edmonton Journal*. It says of The Labour Standards Act — this on March 15, '94 — it says of The Labour Standards Act:

The Saskatchewan amendments are not revolutionary — despite the high-pitched reaction from some business spokespersons.

They may have had the member from Maple Creek in mind in that comment. It goes on to say:

The only unusual aspect of the government's action, though, is that it isn't taking place throughout Canada. Every province has witnessed the marginalization of . . . workers (of its part-time workers) . . . Every government will face a bill for what amounts to a dumping by companies of their social responsibilities (on) towards workers. The reaction of most governments . . . (and I might add, most oppositions) has been one of indifference.

Well it's not one of indifference in this government; we're dealing with the problem.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the Price Waterhouse study indicated that some levels of part-time work is good for employers because it provides flexibility in staffing and scheduling to handle such things as weekends and evening work, peak loads, and things like that.

The study indicates that some levels of part-time work is good for employees because fully 65 per cent of those working part-time in Saskatchewan are doing so by choice. They don't want a full-time job because it conflicts with their education, their family commitments, or they simply prefer to just work a few hours each day.

But once again your government is saying you know more than both the employers and the employees, by bringing in legislation that will reduce the number of part-time opportunities for those who want part-time work, like the elderly and the people who are disabled and the students of our province.

Mr. Minister, how many part-time jobs will be lost as a result of this legislation? And if you don't know, will you put this legislation to rest and put it on hold until you can do a study and find out how you're going to impact the people of our province?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well unlike Liberals and Conservatives opposite who could care a whit for the plight of part-time workers — and that's the only interpretation one can place upon your behaviour today when you judge a Bill without ever having seen

it — unlike the members opposite who could care a whit about part-time workers, this government seeks to provide some amelioration in their workday, and we think we have done so. We don't think there's going to be any decrease in part-time workers and we think there's going to be quite an increase in the quality of their working lives.

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

### Judges' Salaries Recommendation

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to report that the minister . . . Saskatchewan's Minister of Justice, the highest officer of law in the province of Saskatchewan, has knowingly and deliberately broken the law. He has failed to comply with the 90-day legal obligation to implement the decision of a binding tribunal regarding judges' remuneration.

Regardless, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, of how tasteful the tribunal's decision may be, the legislation brought forward by the minister himself states that the minister must comply with the tribunal recommendation.

Mr. Minister, most people are fined when they break the law. Do you feel it appropriate that as the Minister of Justice you can break the law with little more than an apology as a substitute?

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

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for that question. If he has been paying attention he will know that the government has had great difficulty responding to the award of the commission.

The problem, briefly stated, is that the award of the commission is much, much richer than we had ever anticipated would emerge from the process that this House agreed to — and I emphasize, this House agreed to — during the last session of the legislature.

So with our fiscal problems it is a very difficult decision for our government to make, and unfortunately we weren't able to make it within the time limited by the Act. This is known to the judges and the judges have stated publicly that it's not a big problem for them. They are more concerned in what the decision is, rather than when it is delivered. So in light of the fact that the people affected don't have an objection, we're not especially concerned with the fact that the decision is taking as long as it is.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, as we indicated the other day, we realize the predicament you've put yourself into with regards to your legislation.

The fact is, the law is the law, regardless of the implications or consequences. And in defence of your

action you have said that no one is really being harmed by your breach.

However, Mr. Minister, if someone should run a red light, and no one is harmed, then that's fine. The law is the law; you can't run a red light. You'll be penalized, even if you don't hit someone.

Mr. Minister, you've had three months to determine your government's action on this matter, yet you still find it necessary to break your own, as you've indicated, your own piece of legislation.

What I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, is what kind of message does this send to others who might feel that legal deadlines can be broken by the Minister of Justice?

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

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Well of course governments don't like to miss deadlines; no question about that. It happens, and the law certainly is clear about what the deadline is, and we were not able to meet that deadline. And I have said publicly that we regret that, and I say it again: we regret that.

Unfortunately the decision here was of a magnitude and of a consequence that resulted in us being unable to announce a decision prior to today. I have said publicly, and the member will know this very well, we expect to be in a position to make an announcement tomorrow.

Now if anyone is prejudiced then of course I should speak to them. The lawyer for the judges' association has said quite clearly and publicly that they don't have a problem with it; they're more interested in what the decision is rather than when it is timed.

So frankly, while I take the member's point that these legal deadlines ought to be met, in this case I don't think any prejudice is involved, and therefore we are . . . we just have to live with the situation. We have to live with the situation as it is. The decision takes as long as it will take.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, if the commission had decided on no raises for the judges, the judges would have to accept the final decision and live with it. Why not you?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — I don't know what point the member is trying to make with that. Is the member trying to say that he wants us to just simply pay the award? And if he's saying that I'd like to hear him say that. If he's saying that we should amend the legislation, I'd like to hear him say that.

The government is trying to come to grips with that exact question. We've had extensive debates about this, extensive analysis, extensive consideration of the impacts, and we expect to be in a position to announce our decision tomorrow. Now if the member

has any advice to assist us between now and tomorrow as to what position we should take, I'd be glad to hear it.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, a final question to the minister. Mr. Minister, I think if we read *Hansard*, we did offer a suggestion the other day. And talking to the media, we also offered a suggestion that possibly would have . . . should be looked at once this piece of legislation or this decision is made.

But, Mr. Minister, thousands of farm families would love to have the same kind of leeway on legal deadlines that you, as a minister seem . . . feel . . . are free to break. Crop insurance deadlines, fuel rebate deadlines, income tax deadlines — these are all significant deadlines. However, Mr. Minister, and as we've seen a number of your ministers even last year . . . the date, the deadline — March 31 — is the deadline. People had to abide by it.

Mr. Minister, would you be willing to cut the same slack that you've given yourself, with respect to the law, to thousands of Saskatchewan farm families who were not offered the same privilege? Would you be willing to do that?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — There's always a purpose for a deadline. A deadline doesn't exist just for the fun of it. A deadline is put in place because of some kind of considerations. Normally, they're administrative and that certainly is the case with the filing of our income tax return.

And the other examples that the member gives, I think, are all administrative requirements also.

In this case the deadline was put in there after negotiation with the judges, as giving the government a reasonable period of time in which to respond to the award and put the regulations in place. The deadline was there for the benefit of the judges.

Now those people have said publicly and quite clearly that they have no problem with the fact that we haven't met the deadline. Therefore the purpose for the deadline has really not been violated and frankly we just . . . we have to take as much time as it takes for us to make this decision.

Now as I understand the member's answer, he would have us pay this award and then come back to this House and review the legislation. If that's not the position of the official opposition, I invite him to clarify just what their position is now.

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

### Saskatoon Long-term Care Funding

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, your cuts to health care are beginning to hit home. Boards of long-term care homes in Saskatoon

were led to believe in your budget that there would be a 1.5 per cent increase in long-term care funding. Days ago they were informed that they will face a shortfall of 7 per cent. The effect on long-term care facilities, to whom we've spoken in Saskatoon, is that this will be devastating for elderly people, the most vulnerable in our society, because of bed closures and because of staff lay-offs.

Madam Minister, will you confirm that Saskatoon long-term care boards have just three weeks to cut \$2.8 million from their budgets? And will you tell this Assembly exactly when you informed them of that, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to have a question today. Having some Irish ancestry myself, I wouldn't want to avoid a question on St. Patrick's Day . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and I'll speak to the member from Gravelbourg later.

In any case, with respect to the leader of the Liberal opposition's question, what we also pointed out in the budget was that funding was going to vary from district to district and that district boards would be receiving global budgets, and in order to equalize funding from one area of the province to the other, there would be a variation in how much funding each district received. This is going to be a very slow process over a period of time, but eventually we will move to a more equitable distribution of funding across the province.

With respect to notification received in Saskatoon, I don't know the details of that. I will look into that. However, the district board in Saskatoon will be administering the distribution of those funds.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, there are approximately 300 new admissions to long-term care homes in Saskatoon each year, and the reality is that beds become available only when residents die. This 7 per cent shortfall will likely result in at least 250 fewer long-term care beds in Saskatoon and substantial staff reduction cuts.

Tell us right now where the elderly are to go when these beds are shut down.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is highly unlikely according to the Liberal leader's accusation that people are going to be moved out of their homes. That is highly unlikely.

I cannot comment on the details of the situation that she's describing in Saskatoon, and I'll ask the district health board for . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. We simply cannot tolerate the constant interruption when ministers are answering questions. I would ask members to please resist from the temptation to interrupt.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, we are talking about dignity and respect and compassion for the very people who built this province, and they entrusted us with their care. The Saskatoon Health Board, hospital administrations, and long-term care homes have already made very difficult decisions to accommodate your government's last round of cuts. And many hospitals have planned to send level 4 patients to nursing homes simply to free up beds for acute care.

And now the long-term care homes will have less beds available to accommodate those level 4 patients, people who were still in hospital because they were too ill to be in long-term care. The staff cuts are going to put enormous strain on remaining staff and the delivery of adequate care to the elderly is becoming more and more difficult.

Have you any idea at all of the possible dilemma that you've created for the directors of Saskatoon long-term care homes and the Saskatoon Health District Board?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, I will get the details of that information for the member. I don't necessarily accept her facts as she's presented them here because this will not be the first time that she's presented me with incorrect facts.

So the best way to approach this is to get the details of her concerns. I'll talk to the Saskatoon Health Board and I'll talk to the Department of Health to determine what is actually happening.

Now I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are very concerned as a government about elderly people and about the need for long-term care and appropriate services. As a result, home care has been given something like a 40 per cent increase since we've taken government in order to provide more extensive services for seniors and elderly people in their home. So we have made seniors a priority.

The Health Services Utilization and Research Commission has just produced a very extensive report to provide us with a plan for the future as far as seniors as concerned. And if we can work towards that sort of plan in a non-political fashion, in a cooperative environment, we should be able to achieve results that everyone can benefit from. Thank you.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Yes, Madam Minister, you have talked about incorrect information, and what it indeed is, is when an ambulance driver suspects a broken back but it ends up being multiple fractures of the pelvis. And instead of taking four days to get treatment, it really took five. That's really, really incorrect information. It's amazing that that has little interest to you.

Madam Minister, you talk about increases to home care funding. We're talking long-term care beds here;

quite a different situation. The local boards of directors are in a state of shock — these are their words: a state of shock — because they had absolutely no idea that this was coming. And your deadline is April 1? They are in a state of absolute disbelief that they are being asked to adjust their budgets by April 1 when the funding cuts will take effect.

Do you consider this to be giving these people fair notice after they've been planning, Madam Minister, for a 1.5 per cent increase indicated in your budget by your Finance minister, and they are now facing a 7 per cent shortfall? I mean do you honestly believe that they can do this in three weeks?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — I think that the member opposite should be working more constructively with her district and her community, Mr. Speaker. I think that what the member opposite should do is meet with the Saskatoon Health Board and bring the concerns of those people to the Saskatoon Health Board, instead of attempting to grandstand in the legislature. If she is seriously . . . if she has the interests of the people at heart, she will work in a constructive fashion, rather than through a . . . ranting and raving in a political forum.

I invite her to work constructively with the Saskatoon Health Board. I will take her concerns . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. I want to tell the member from Souris-Cannington that if he does that again I will not recognize him in question period. He knows full well when someone else has the floor, he has no right to stand there and interrupt the member by his presence in standing in this legislature.

Next question.

#### Study on Private Vocational Schools

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — My question is to the Minister of Education. Madam Minister, while in opposition as the NDP (New Democratic Party) Education critic, you said that the current rules for vocational schools are not being stringent enough and I think that the regulations have to be tightened. That's quoted from you on November 5 of 1990.

In opposition you said that you would study vocational schools and see to it that students weren't taken advantage of. And you did study them, Madam Minister. In April of last year the government paid \$69,000 to review private vocational schools.

Madam Minister, what recommendations were made, and how has that \$69,000 report benefited Saskatchewan students, specifically those students affected by the actions of vocational schools?

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — I want to thank the member for the question. I'm pleased to inform the House that my officials are preparing draft legislation based on the recommendations, based on the recommendations of the Private Vocational Schools Review Committee, chaired by Dr. Ailsa Watkinson. The new legislation

will ensure the close and tight regulation of private vocational schools in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. It's good to know that there's draft legislation coming forward, because perhaps these questions will lead you to examine that a little more closely.

Madam Minister, Ross Joorisity and Petria Racette of Regina believe that these rules have not been tightened enough. They attended Reliance Business College for a short period of time. When both students quit after attending 11 to 15 per cent of their courses, both were told by the former owner that the proper percentage of monies the college received from student loans would be returned and that Ross and Petria would be responsible for only their percentage.

That didn't happen, Madam Minister. Money owed from Reliance College was not returned and the result is that Ross and Petria are left to foot the entire bill. How stringent are your regulations to the 40-or-so private vocational schools when institutions can take thousands of dollars that rightfully belong to student loans and keep the money?

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

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — I must thank the member for the question. The regulations at present do outline specifically the kind of refund that students are entitled to, depending upon the length of their stay at a private vocational school. So refunds are referred to in the regulation and the present legislation.

The new legislation obviously is going to deal with the Private Vocational School Review Committee's recommendations. And I can tell you that the present legislation and the present regulations do make reference to refunds for students. So students are in fact protected.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Madam Minister, for saying that students are protected because you're responsible to enforce those regulations. In this particular case the students haven't been protected.

In 1989 you said someone is benefiting from student loans and that may be the private operator of some of these schools which aren't regulated very well. You also said to the minister of Education that he should be held accountable — as you are today, Madam Minister — and that he better put regulations in place to protect the young people of our province.

Madam Minister, now it's time to prove your commitment to that promise unless you are in the running for Mr. Mandryk's hyppy awards. Madam Minister, in fairness to Ross and Petria and to the other students who seem to have been taken advantage of, will you personally look into this situation and launch

an inquiry and if the law has been broken, take those responsible to task? Will you do that now, Madam Minister?

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House of this: that my officials advise me that these two students have been in contact with the department in the past four weeks. Department officials have asked these two students to provide further additional information. I can assure the House and the member of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan that our department is working with these students in order that they can receive their refunds.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### **Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act to create a Family Law Division and to enact Consequential Amendments arising from the enactment of this Act**

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Queen's Bench Act to create a Family Law Division and to enact Consequential Amendments arising from the enactment of this Act be now introduced and read a first time.

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

### **Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act to provide for Mediation**

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that a Bill to amend The Queen's Bench Act to provide for Mediation be now introduced and read a first time.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## SECOND READINGS

### **Bill No. 10**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Cunningham that **Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Vegetable and Honey Sales Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Mr. Speaker, this Act is an Act that a number of people have been looking forward to. We've sent out the copies of the Act to many of the interested third parties. We've had a fair number of response and there are concerns that have been raised with these members.

But, Mr. Speaker, instead of taking the time of the

House to explicitly go through those concerns at this time, I'm simply going to wait until the Committee of the Whole and then we'll be asking distinct, direct questions of the minister based on that particular Act.

So I have no problem at this time, Mr. Speaker, in simply letting it go to committee.

(1415)

**Mr. Koenker:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's a little bit of confusion, I take it, as to what piece of legislation, which Bill is really before us. Now that it's quieted down a little bit, Mr. Speaker, I think I can speak to this Bill. I won't speak very long, but I do want to recognize the importance of this legislation for the small producers of Saskatchewan fruits and vegetables and for the honey producers in our province.

Saskatchewan has almost 50 million acres under cultivation, 50 million acres of land, and with the fresh water that we have in our province and the research capacity that we have in our province, especially in my constituency, at the University of Saskatchewan — and the opposition will be interested to know that I'm very appreciative of the fact that there are good, first-class food science facilities at the University of Saskatchewan in the new agricultural building there — we have opportunities for value added processing in our province. This legislation strengthens the hand of Saskatchewan fruit and vegetable producers, honey producers as well.

I note that the Saskatchewan food producers association have their convention in Saskatoon beginning tomorrow and I intend to drop into that convention and to look at some of the initiatives in terms of food processing that are taking place.

As we all know, this is a growing business. Saskatchewan produce — fruits and vegetables and honey — goes all across the world. This is only a very recent development, but there's a great future for the industry and this legislation is intended to help establish and extend our fruit, vegetable, and honey industry in Saskatchewan.

So I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak briefly on this legislation.

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

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

### **Bill No. 2**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter that **Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Department of Economic Development Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a



lot of things that we want to talk about this. The information that I have is that the Leader of the Opposition wants to speak on it. And since he just arrived, we will allow him to do that. And I will give him an opportunity to collect his thoughts, and with that we will begin.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll excuse my seat mate for talking about my presence in or outside of the House, but anyway I do appreciate the opportunity to talk in the debate on Bill 2.

Mr. Speaker, the new corporation being proposed to take over the functions of the Department of Trade is an interesting concept because it talks about the partial privatization of the trade function of the Government of Saskatchewan. And that's both with shares held and funding provided by people outside of government.

I believe the intent is to provide an ongoing consultation with people that are involved in trade. And as everyone in this province is aware, fully 80 per cent of the products and goods and services that we produce here are exported. I don't think there's another province in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that has to move so much of its product outside in order to economically survive, as we do.

I think by doing this that government is looking at ways to control cost in association with these endeavours and I wholeheartedly agree that we have to take initiatives in trade matters. We have to rethink trade policy and certainly we have to consult on a very regular basis with the people that do trade in an extensive way.

Mr. Speaker, our whole world as we've known it is changing very rapidly. Saskatchewan being an agricultural-based province for the last several decades, had much of its trade channelled through quasi-government institutions. And one only has to think of the Canadian Wheat Board which was set up in the 1930s to handle the sale and export of grains outside of the western Canadian basin. And trade to many people for a long time in this province was a matter of driving your truck or your wagon to the elevator and dumping your product in the pit and someone else sort of looked after the function of moving your products.

The changes necessitated, Mr. Speaker, in agriculture by low commodity prices and other factors have meant that a lot of people are now directly involved in that; that the quasi-governmental institutions no longer are the only people in the field. And rightly I think the minister has recognized that. He's done extensive travelling around the world and has associated himself with people who are opening up new markets and new opportunities.

So we do applaud the concept because I think, Mr. Speaker, all of these new entrepreneurs out there who, because of the Free Trade Agreement with the Americans or now with the North American Free Trade Agreement or with other bilateral situations that

are occurring around the world, are saying yes, I want to be part of that, I want a piece of the action, and I want to know that government agencies are there to offer support and direction when necessary.

And I think it is a very important function that government has to play, not necessarily as the engine that drives the process but as the person that defines the playing-field and defines the rules by which people will play.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what the minister's proposing though in a number of areas and ways. I am concerned about the cost implications of switching the current trade bureaucracy from the mandate that it has had now to what is being proposed, the new one. And I do this because the Act to me, Mr. Speaker, and to those around the province that we've shared this with, feel that there are no guidelines in this Act for the formation and operation of the corporation being proposed.

And I think that's very important, Mr. Speaker. It's important to establish from the outset. I think when you're dealing with this new mix of government and private, it's important to establish from the very outset how responsive this particular trade corporation is going to be to the people that it is charged with serving.

The details of the corporation announced in the minister's February 10, '94 press conference have the government holding the majority of the shares and providing a majority of the funding with private investors holding at best one-third of the corporation. I believe the budget numbers that I remember, Mr. Speaker, are even more imbalanced than that. I believe out of a \$1.6 million projected initial budget, we're talking one and a half million from the government and only about a hundred thousand dollars from the private sector.

Obviously the government will have a majority control of the corporation, and this is where some of the guidelines that I talked about, Mr. Speaker, not being in place really come into play. Because will the government by matter of course be able to override any suggestions made by private investors? Because if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, then for all intents and purposes you have exactly what you had before — you have the government with its Department of Trade making whatever decisions they make. But obviously without some kind of a guideline to tell us how disputes would be settled or how these guidelines would be in place, anyone investing from the private sector would have to be very leery given the present scenario.

It means then, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, that the government simply has the ability to override at any time that it wishes, that we not only have wasted the potential investors' money but we've wasted taxpayers' money.

An important element, Mr. Speaker, I think of guaranteeing both the accountability and the

accessibility of this corporation is the staffing component. Once again, there is nothing clear in the Act that tells me how the staffing of this new entity is going to be structured.

If we are simply going to move the current component of civil service jobs from where they are in the Department of Trade into this corporation and the private sector component of the corporation has no say in staffing, then, Mr. Speaker, we have changed nothing.

And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is almost an admission of failure by the minister if that is the case. Not because they are poor people, but the policy direction that the government has set, Mr. Speaker, since October of '91 has been a dismal failure. And I think the job numbers and the welfare numbers and others would back that up, that that particular department has not been able to do very much at all with the mandate that it's been given.

So I see this. If this new structure that we're going to have simply takes the existing people and moves them over to the new one, then, Mr. Speaker, we have accomplished nothing. And I think that would be an admission that you've got the same old people doing essentially the same old job, and the private sector component of this corporation not having any say, then we do have a failure.

And it's important, Mr. Speaker, if this is to work — and I understand that there are other jurisdictions in Canada where this model has been attempted to certain degrees of success and failure — but I think it's very important, Mr. Speaker, given the preponderance of people in this province that are dependent on trade for their livelihood, that this new agency not become simply a new whipping boy for government policy.

And, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately — and it was raised again in question period today — the reaction day after day after day in this Assembly from our Health ministers has been exactly that. I mean day after day they say, well that question isn't for me any more; that's for the board. That's for your health district board to answer; that's got nothing to do with me. I set their budgets and I provide a lot of the employees, but I don't have anything to do with the policy any more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that maybe is an easy way out for government ministers who are under pressure. But that simply doesn't get the job done. And it may be a way for, I see in this particular instance, for government ministers to lay off blame on their private sector partners.

And I'll give you an example, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Economic Development, I think, was chastised quite roundly about a year ago for taking a round-the-world trip. When the government was cutting back on services all over this province, taxes were being increased dramatically, and the Minister of Economic Development took off on a holiday to the Caribbean and other warm places at a time when the

rest of us were staying in Saskatchewan under very cold conditions and freezing.

So, Mr. Speaker, under this new agency I can see a scenario developing where the minister gets to fly off on one of these trips, but because there are some private sector partners involved in this new corporation, you can avoid public criticism because supposedly the approval and partial funding would be by the private sector. In other words, there would be enough other folks there that the minister can say, well I'm not wasting taxpayers' money when I jet off to a warm, sunny place in the middle of winter on a fact-finding mission.

(1430)

And we recently saw the Minister of Agriculture off to California for a couple of weeks to study raisins and grapes. Well, Mr. Speaker, the relevance of the cooperative movement in California and the relevance of the cooperative movement in Saskatchewan, well that's a long bow to stretch, Mr. Speaker, to anyone I think in this province today.

And those are the kind of examples, Mr. Speaker, that the public and people that the government hopes to have as private sector partners in this new corporation are frightened about. Because unfortunately this government has a habit of trying to find a scapegoat at each and every opportunity to allay any of the criticism that they bring upon themselves.

This new corporation also allows the government, Mr. Speaker, I think, to reverse its stand — and this was an election promise — on foreign trade offices. And I think they can do this relatively painlessly because, once again, they will be able to get their private sector partners to rubber-stamp any initiatives that they make.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it was wrong-headed move, but the government made, the NDP Party made, a lot of political hay by saying that they were going to cancel these very expensive trade offices. And they did, Mr. Speaker; they did cancel them. I think Saskatchewan has suffered correspondingly in a lot of market-places because they did that.

But we know today, Mr. Speaker, that this NDP government and party would promise just about anything in order to gain control of the treasury benches in this province.

And that's why people who have reviewed this Bill have brought that to our attention. They said the government probably realizes it made a mistake, the NDP realize they made a mistake, and they now want to reverse that policy but they're looking for someone else to carry the can when they do it.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, as one looks at this piece of legislation — and it will be interesting when we get into committee of the Bill how the minister will handle this — but I think he's failed to spell out how he's going to go about attracting the private investors and

how this corporation will function if he doesn't get any. Because it's very clear, Mr. Speaker, that this entity simply will not function without a very large and aggressive private sector component attached to it.

If the government achieves less than its target of one-third private investment, the Act, at least on the face of it, from what I've seen — and I'll wait for the minister's explanation — but at least on the face of the Act it means that the government is simply going to provide the extra funding that's needed.

And if that's the case, what happens to the consultation process? Does the government consult with only a few, if that's all they get? Or do they still have the ability to consult with those that saw fit not to invest in this because they weren't pleased with the structure provided to them?

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, what assurances were there — and I see none in the Bill whatsoever — what assurances are there that investment in the corporation simply does not become a method to garner favour with the government? In other words, I'll throw in a few hundred bucks here, a couple of thousand dollars there, just so that I make sure that my name is high up on the list when any of these foreign trade junkets take place; or if there are new trade offices being opened, to make sure that maybe I have some influence with whichever of the government's friends they decide to put in the trade office.

And it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that I make that allegation, but what we've seen in the last week in this Assembly would leave me no other direction. When I see an institutionalized list of 92 New Democrats in this province prepared to either step into the traces or are already there, pulling hard for their friends in government, if there are new trade offices I suspect that's the way it will go.

Will higher levels of funding by the government, Mr. Speaker, translate into more government influence in policy direction? Because at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, what I think the whole purpose of the exercise was, to develop trade policy that was real, trade policy that was going to have Saskatchewan people enter the next century equal to those around them. That the playing-field that is being established in North America which is, we hope, going to be a very level playing-field through the various processes involved in the North American Free Trade Agreement, the arbitration panels, the lowering of tariffs, all of those things that should allow our producers and our manufacturers and others smack dab here in the middle of North America to compete very actively and viably with others.

Is that policy that is going to be developed by this agency going to truly reflect what's going on? Because we have seen in the past this government and NDP politicians across Canada roundly criticize the very trading area that we're in. They have criticized the North American Free Trade Agreement, they criticized the Canada-U.S. (United States) Trade

Agreement; anything that didn't sort of build a wall around the province or the country, NDP politicians have criticized roundly, Mr. Speaker.

And to this day I have not heard anyone in the Government of Saskatchewan, the present-day Government of Saskatchewan, stand up and applaud the new market-place that we live in. It is reality and there's not a darn thing that anyone of these NDP politicians over here can do about it, Mr. Speaker. It's the reality in which we live. So I don't know why they don't simply face up to facts and get on with working as best as we can within the milieu that we have to work with. It's a real ostrich-like mentality that you can go around sticking your head in the sand believing that this other stuff is simply going to go away. You know, that the 100 million people in Mexico and the 250 million Americans next to us are simply going to disappear in a fog somewhere.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that that's the environment we live in and that's the environment we trade in and that's the environment that we're going to have work with for a long time to come. So we should do it as smart as possible.

Mr. Speaker, on the face of this Bill, the government has assumed that the new corporation will have private sector funding. They said earlier. We applaud that. That it will provide a net benefit to the province, an increased trade activity, we applaud that. But we do not applaud any moves, Mr. Speaker, that simply cost the taxpayers of this province more money by flipping functions into new entities that aren't any different than the old.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can see in this Bill that gives me, at present, the confidence to say that there aren't an awful lot of questions going to have to be answered before this particular piece of legislation sees the light of day in its final form, because there are so many areas that are grey and unanswered, Mr. Speaker. And I think it's appropriate that the minister do more consultation before he's prepared to move this Bill through the legislature.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is interesting that this particular Bill, An Act to amend The Department of Economic Development Act expands the mandate of the Economic Development department to allow the minister to create yet another arm of government to focus on economic development. And to be fair, I don't think the province is lacking in departments or agencies to promote economic development and trade, Mr. Speaker.

Currently, we have the following agencies whose primary function is the promotion of those very ends, and I think we could get to a point where we have more departments than we have tangible results.

If one looks in the government directory, Mr. Speaker, we have the trade policy branch, the policy and research branch, the trade development department, the Saskatchewan trade office, the market development branch, the development services

branch, and a myriad of support departments throughout government. In addition, there are countless independent agencies and local authorities working to promote trade development.

What is in question here is whether the department is more concerned with development of the economy or development of the department, the Department of Economic Development.

The legislation empowers the minister to establish corporations and I'm interested to know how the proposed Trade Development Corporation will function, what its goals and objectives will be and how it will better serve the people of Saskatchewan than what is currently in existence, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of process, I do find it strange that we would be asked to give the minister authority to create something which has not yet been defined or mandated or explained to the public. If there is going to be an agency or corporation of value that will be added to the expense of government during times of restraint, I think it is only prudent, Mr. Speaker, that we first be given the courtesy of examining the proposal in some kind of detail, so that we as representatives of the public can engage in debate as to the value of such an expenditure in direction of tax resources.

I certainly believe in the development and promotion of increased trade for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but I do not understand what this particular body will do that could not already be done within the existing bureaucracy through repriorization of resources or redirection of the department staff if the desired results are not being achieved today.

I understand that this will be a joint venture between business and government, but I also understand that the partners are not very clear on just what the cost of this particular partnership will be. And I do not know of any business people who feel comfortable getting into a partnership without knowing what kind of a budget their partner plans to operate on, especially if they're going to be putting up part of the money.

I think the minister is making a quantum leap between conducting a survey in which 70 to 75 per cent of businesses said that they would support the "concept" of a joint venture to promote trade development; he's making a quantum leap to think that business would expect the taxpayers to give the Minister of Economic Development a blank cheque to set this up without knowing the details.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what that smacks more of — irresponsibility or some kind of arrogance. Because we just came through a decade of having a government squander taxpayers' money without telling them what was going on. And then along comes a new government, elected on its promises of accountability, a government that puts forward this kind of legislation that is completely open-ended, as open-ended as the entire prairie scene of Saskatchewan.

Now I have an article here from the *Star-Phoenix* that is dated April 12 of 1994 and it sheds some light on just how sketchy this proposal really is. And I quote, Mr. Speaker:

The development corporation would be financed by money currently in the Economic Development Department — matched by private sector from either fees or contributions . . . (the minister said).

Either fees or contributions. Now just what exactly does that mean? Were the 70 to 75 per cent of businesses who were surveyed and asked about whether they would like to pay fees or contributions? I mean I'd be interested to know how many businesses would give government that kind of a *carte blanche* to bill them some unspecified amount for some undetermined service of unexplained value.

The same article goes on to say, and I do quote the minister again:

How much taxpayers' money is involved is still "subject to negotiations," . . .

What kind of negotiations, one should ask, between the government and who? And the article continues, Mr. Speaker.

. . . he could not say exactly how many people the new authority will employ, (but the Minister of Economic Development) suspected it would begin with about four or maybe five people.

I get very nervous when the NDP talk about adding to the bureaucracy in terms of beginning with four or five people. Because we never know how many they'll end up with, Mr. Speaker. So I do have grave reservations about creating a corporation in this particular manner.

Because the evidence is there that governments simply should be trusted to have a blank cheque to create bureaucracy without explaining how it will function and what it will accomplish. Obviously we need to do all that we can to enhance our trade development. But I think that people deserve to have an answer as to how the money they spend is going to achieve results.

The fact of the matter is that if this corporation is created, as suggested by the proposed legislation, it will be one full year into its operation and it could be almost two years before it would have to table an annual report, given the current tabling time frames. The year end then, Mr. Speaker, could be March 31, 1995. But the document wouldn't be tabled until the spring of 1996, unless the Assembly is in session in July of 1996.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the corporation could operate for two full years, spending who knows how much money on who knows what, and there would be no accountability until perhaps after the next

election.

(1445)

Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned with the duplication of resources and the overlap of departments. And I have sincere reservations about amending legislation to create something which is perhaps already in existence, or could be created from what already is in existence.

There is no doubt that the passage of this amendment will result in a new corporation. But I have doubts about whether the new entity will be better equipped to deliver trade development than any existing department, whether it was affordable or effective.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when this Bill is considered on a clause-by-clause basis in Committee of the Whole, I will be proposing an amendment that would require approval of the Legislative Assembly before the minister incorporates a new trade development body. Thank you.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

### Bill No. 30

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell that **Bill No. 30 — An Act respecting Victims of Domestic Violence** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Draper:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to say one or two words on behalf of this Bill. The Minister of Justice regaled us last week with the Inuit story of the two sisters who fled from an abusive father and an abusive husband. After much deliberation and many alternatives, they decided in effect that there were no refuge to be found on earth and they fled to the heavens and became the thunder and the lightning.

Now that was a very eloquent tale, sir, and I shall remember it. But today I would like to tell you the story that is only 10 years old. It's equally eloquent, it's equally moving, and it is true. It's not the story of thunder and lightning but the story of a lady called Judy, and Judy is or was her name. I won't give you her surname.

Inuit fables have their counterparts throughout history and throughout the world — ancient Greece, Rome, and the Hindu tales. I've heard similar tales in Africa and I know of plenty from Australia. And the story of Judy also has its counterparts in the Arctic, in the tropics, and in the temperate zones between and beyond.

It was indeed a dark and stormy night. It was a Saturday night in the depth of winter, and I was in the hospital after visiting hours when Judy appeared out of the snow and literally threw herself against the locked plate glass doors of the hospital and beat upon it with both fists and screamed for help.

She was wearing a short, white cotton blouse, sir. A short, white cotton blouse. So short that it could not have been tucked into the top of her skirt or trousers had she been wearing any. But she wasn't, sir. Nor any underclothes, nor any socks, nor any shoes.

And the only relief from the white of her blouse and the equal whiteness of her skin was the red of the bloodstains from her head and face dripping down that blouse and down her legs.

She had fled several blocks from her home to the hospital in this state, to an escape from her abusive husband. It takes a lot to run virtually naked through the snow in Saskatchewan.

And the hospital was her only choice, it was her only refuge. And rural hospitals are often like that. There's nothing else in our small towns and this was the only refuge from many problems, and it still is. And not all of those problems are medical.

I'll shorten the story, sir. We took her in and we protected her until the following Monday. The police had no accommodation for her except a jail cell and it was not very warm in the middle of the winter. And the social worker — the nearest one was 75 miles away in Moose Jaw, and she wasn't going to come out on Saturday night or a Sunday. But she'd get there on Monday if she could.

Eventually the social worker did come, sir, and so did the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police), but it was too late, because Judy had returned to her husband because she had nowhere else to go and nowhere else to turn to. And we did not hear from her for several months and when we did hear from her, she had left the town and she had moved to Moose Jaw with her husband where she knew absolutely nobody and had absolutely nowhere to hide.

The minister told us that it's only after 30 acts of violence, on an average, that a woman will ask for help; 30 acts of violence which may vary from one slap in the face with an open hand to a thorough beating with both fists or a boot or a club or a belt; sometimes clubbed into unconsciousness, sometimes permanently scarred.

But when Judy was found, sir, she had 49 discrete acts of violence which she'd suffered at one time — 49 stab wounds to be precise. And after these 49 stab wounds Judy was not able to ask for assistance. And if any had been available, it would have been too late.

Her husband, I understand, has already been released from prison. I just hope he will not find another Judy.

And it is to help people like Judy, her successors, that this Bill is introduced. If it can create a refuge for one woman, to save one life, this Bill will be worthwhile.

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

**Ms. Stanger:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud to

rise to support this Bill. This legislation will strengthen the options available for responding to domestic violence. It'll take a small but significant step in a new direction by providing remedies to help protect and assist the victims of domestic violence.

After hearing the eloquent story given by my colleague, I have to say that many of us are tired of the denial that exists in society. Tired of the denial that exists when people hide their heads in the sand of the violence that is taking place all around us daily.

Domestic violence is one of the most pervasive and serious problems that we as a community have to address. We know its magnitude in Canada and in Saskatchewan is shocking. It has devastating effects upon individuals who are victimized and those who witness such violence.

Statistics show that one in five occurrences of assault in Saskatchewan are spousal assault. In cases of the worst forms of violence, homicide, as we heard just described, approximately two-thirds of female victims are killed by family members or persons known to them.

A Statistics Canada survey found that one in four women experience violence in a relationship. More than one in ten women who reported violence in their current relationship have in some point felt that their life was in danger.

When we are going towards the year 2000, this kind of existence of violence is completely intolerable in a civilized society. We talk about a civilized society, a society that is a Christian society, and yet we put up with this kind of violence. It is intolerable.

We know that children, seniors, disabled persons, and other individuals in intimate or family relationships are victims of domestic violence. In 1989 studies showed that 4 per cent of elderly people report that they have suffered domestic violence in their own homes. People with disabilities are also more likely to be victims of abuse.

And it's the children. The children are the real victims in domestic violence. Children are vulnerable in two ways — both as victims and as witnesses. Research shows that males who have witnessed violence against their mothers are more likely to abuse their spouses. It is therefore devastating to note that almost 40 per cent of women in violent relationships report that their children have witnessed the violence.

How can a child grow up and have the kind of decent relationships when all they have witnessed as they were growing up is relationships that were mean, violent, and inappropriate?

Domestic abuse and its generational cycle must be stopped. We must address this through long-term planning. But we also need to respond to those who are at risk right now. And that's why I choose to stand up and speak on this Bill, because I am tired of the denial that I see around me, and that even in 1994

people are still denying and trying to sweep this kind of problem under the rug.

Like I said, this is just a small step, but it is a step. Our new Victims of Domestic Violence Act helps victims in three important ways: emergency intervention orders, victim assistance orders, and warrants of entry.

Emergency intervention orders mean immediate action. They'll be available 24 hours a day from a select number of specially trained justices of the peace, which will be effective immediately when served and remain in effect as long as the justice of the peace directs. Orders can be contested by applying to a court.

And EIOs (emergency intervention order) can restrain an abuser from communicating with or contacting victims or the victim's family; give victims exclusive possession of the home. Women, like my colleague described, that have to run out in the night and leave their own home, will now be protected. The abuser is the person that should be leaving the home, not the victims and the children.

This is two different ways of reacting to a very serious problem. Next door we see the Premier of Alberta, and I quote this headline; it says: Klein scraps council on women's issues on the day of International Women's Day. That's a different way of reacting than we have reacted in this province.

And I think the proof of the pudding will be in how we act, not in the things that we say. When I listened to the member of the third party, she talks about protecting women and women's rights but she voted against The Labour Standards Act that was going to protect most women. And most of the women that are in situations like this are the women that are doing the part-time work and trying to struggle and make ends meet. And yet she votes against The Labour Standards Act.

So it doesn't matter all the fancy words that you have to say, it's how you act that really counts.

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

**Ms. Stanger:** — And I'm proud of this government and the Minister of Justice for putting this Bill forward.

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

(1500)

**Ms. Murray:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm one of the fortunate women in society. I am well loved and well supported in my relationship. Other women, too many women, are not. Too many women for too long have been in abusive situations. Too many for too long, when the situation becomes intolerable, have had to pack up, whatever the hour, and leave their homes.

Imagine this, Mr. Speaker. It's winter, it's cold, there are two young children, the woman has just been

physically abused yet again, and she's finally resolved to get out of the situation. In the past, Mr. Speaker, she would have had no choice. She would have had to leave the home — hurriedly pack some essentials, bundle up the kids, and somehow get out of there; get out of danger and end her and her children's suffering.

Too often, this might have been very difficult. What if she has no car? No friends or family near by? And — and this is often the case in rural areas — no women's shelter to go to? Does she walk? Does she call a taxi? Does she even have any money? A difficult, if not intolerable situation.

What this government has done, Mr. Speaker, by introduction of this Bill, The Victims of Domestic Violence Act, is recognize the plight of these abused women and their families, and has given them and the people and agencies who work with them, for the first time, has given them the support of the law.

This is so simple in its rightness, it is revolutionary. Instead of the victims having to leave, leave the comforts and security of home and undergo all the emotional trauma that leaving home entails — and this quite apart from the physical abuse they've already suffered — instead of them leaving, this Act will enable peace officers to remove the abuser. He will rightly be removed from the home and served with a court order.

This satisfies my sense of justice. And I'm sure I'm not alone. Why should victims suffer the punishment of having to leave? Mr. Speaker, I'm gratified by the early response to this Bill from women's organizations and the police who are most supportive. It is clear that this is a piece of far-sighted legislation — a piece of legislation that responds to those who are at risk right now.

We, through this legislation, say that society finds domestic violence unacceptable. And as a government we make the commitment to eliminate it in whatever way we can. Mr. Speaker, when we think of domestic violence, we immediately think of women as the victims. And I think it is particularly significant to women that this Act was introduced on International Women's Day.

We think of women as the victims but we must not forget that seniors have suffered violence in their homes, and people with disabilities are also likely to be victims. And this Bill is for them too. Most tragically children suffer, and the sad legacy is that children of abusers often become abusers themselves.

This Bill will give police, social workers, and justices of the peace, broad new powers to deal with spousal abuse. This Bill will allow justices of the peace to issue wide-ranging, emergency orders to intervene in domestic disputes at any time, day or night, even over the phone, and remove an accused abuser.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dramatic new development in the law. And the Minister of Justice and his department are to be commended on this relevant

piece of legislation which will do much to help the people in this province who are victims of domestic abuse.

I'd like to quote from an article in the Canadian Press. It said:

In a day full of speeches and marches, there was at least one concrete step in Canada to mark International Women's Day.

That step, Mr. Speaker, was the introduction of this Bill. That step was a defining moment for this government and this province. It is this government's continuing commitment to lead the way with legislation which will help to make the lives of all citizens of this province better. I give this Bill my wholehearted support. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to make just a few brief remarks on the substance of this Bill. Every one of us, I believe, that ever aspires to go into politics does so because deep down inside you feel that you want to do something to make the world a better place. And I think, I strongly believe, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of passing this Bill, part of that mission will be fulfilled. Passing this Bill will be a small but a major step; small in terms of the size of the Bill, but major in terms of impact on making this world a better place.

We have finally made a statement that says that tolerance of violence is approaching zero. Using violence as a method of resolving disputes in the home is not to be tolerated, and we wish to approach zero tolerance on it.

And I want to go just one step further than that, Mr. Speaker. Now that we've got the Bill partly in place, I would hope that we would be able to, as a society, address the whole concept of why it is that tolerance is acceptable in certain places in our society. We have to really address the issue of why we permit and we tolerate violence on television and in sports in our society, because that's where a lot of this is learned. And I think if we can also make a step of reducing the amount of violence that we see in the movies, in public, on television, in sports arenas, that we also will go a step further in making the world a slightly better place.

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

**The Speaker:** — I must warn members that the minister is about to close the debate on second reading. If any members wish to speak, they must do so now.

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I do want to make a few remarks about this Bill.

The Bill I think is a good Bill and I think its intentions are honourable. We on this side of the House agree to the thrust of the Bill. We know that from the time it has

been released it's been hotly, I would say, debated and praised and criticized.

I'm starting to get letters from people on this Bill, so I think that there could be a bit more discussion on this Bill before it's probably passed into law. Because when I first viewed the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I spoke to departmental officials on its contents, and I agree that it was a Bill that's been needed and I agree that the thrust of the Bill is to assist primarily women who are being abused. And we have no problem with that.

The Bill allows for I think quick access to help from the police or others for the women, and it does I believe accord some safeguards for the accused, and specifically a reasonably quick review of the emergency intervention order. And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I would find it very hard to argue against this Bill in its entirety.

However, Mr. Speaker, knowing that it is high time that women and their children have access to the family home and the abuser is put out quickly, and it has been far too long that a woman has been forced to creep out of the house in the dark of night in some cases, Mr. Speaker, when the spouse has come home intoxicated and she has to wait till he's passed out in order to pick up the kids and go. And then sometimes they are out on the street with no definite destination, and as one of the members spoke, it's very traumatic and it has to be fixed.

So I continue to support this Bill. And I support what it's trying to achieve. I believe it's trying to achieve assistance to a vulnerable sector of our society, and that is abused women.

However, Mr. Speaker, while we continue to bring abused women to the forefront in our discussion and particularly in this Bill — and I suppose, in all fairness, it is a case in the majority of spousal abuse — but I would request that we also speak for others who are victims, Mr. Speaker, and I am of course alluding to seniors in this case.

Mr. Speaker, there are many seniors that face the same problems day to day that torture the abused women and children of our society. Statistics — and I know when you use statistics, Mr. Speaker, it becomes dull, but I think that you will agree and others will agree that statistics prove that there is a rise in violence against seniors. And surprising, Mr. Speaker, surprisingly it is something that hasn't been brought to the forefront as aggressively as we should have I think, and it most certainly needs to be dealt with.

I'm not talking totally about physical abuse. We have heard cases where seniors have asked for repairs to their house for instance. And when the repair man has presented the bill, it was totally, totally obscene. And by almost threatening these people, they've paid the bill. There's also that kind of abuse.

But, Mr. Speaker, it has been a topic many times on TV. Several articles, various magazines and papers have talked about how vulnerable seniors are. Just like

women and children. And yet it seems that we have somehow forgotten them in this Bill. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, this Bill could have included them. And hopefully we will get some amendments to this Bill that will take care of that.

And, Mr. Speaker, the hardest part of the whole thing is to believe that children and grandchildren are often the abusers of their grandparents. And it's hard to believe that seniors are beaten up, starved, not given necessary medication, and suffer other atrocities under the care of their own families, and owners of facilities that take care of elderly people.

Mr. Speaker, that's hard for me to accept or even imagine, coming from a family as I do that have always been loving and supportive of each other. And it's foreign to me. And I was raised in that kind of a family and I still enjoy that kind of a family.

But these things do happen. And as you can probably guess, I am a senior. And I've never experienced this kind of abuse, but it's brought to my attention and I find that it's very disturbing. And while we may argue that it's not as . . . maybe we don't have to look after that as quickly as we do the abuse of women, I believe it is something we have to face up to. I think the word I was looking for is pressing. You could get a debate going on that.

Mr. Speaker, it's also unbelievable that there's such a thing as physical or mental abuse in our society. That women, children, and seniors fear for their lives and for their safety, as a matter of fact on a daily basis in many cases. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that whatever members of this Assembly can do to alleviate some of the hurt, some of the pain, and help those people, that we should do it.

I still feel that this legislation will assist those surviving in such a home life. However it is now becoming evident that the Bill could be susceptible to some legal challenges. This issue was raised with the minister, Mr. Minister, in question period, I believe today and other days, and he has assured us that the department lawyers looked at this issue and it is definitely constitutional. At this point in time we have to accept that it is.

However, I have been talking to individuals in the legal community about this very same matter, but I have not completed them and I'm not quite satisfied as yet, Mr. Speaker.

(1515)

Now I want to reiterate that I believe the intent of this legislation is honourable, and fully support the minister's efforts in passing this legislation. But I'm not fully comfortable with some of the ramifications of the Bill on the accused.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on with some consultations before this Bill goes to committee. Obviously the official opposition are in favour; we're opposed to the legislation as it is. If it's being put in a



position to protect victims from violence, then we must make sure, we must make sure that the legislation is sound.

There are conflicting opinions and we want to speak to those — those on both sides of the argument, that we may pose relevant questions during committee. And I look forward to that opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are several things that bothers me about this Bill and I'm sure that the minister will alleviate some of my concerns later on. This Bill gives Saskatchewan courts new powers, powers to order abusers to compensate victims for expenses like legal costs, temporary accommodations. But I haven't seen anywhere where the accuser is protected if this was found to be a false accusation and he or she is out of pocket.

There's cost for temporary accommodation, and it will grant victims temporary possession of property such as a car or children's clothing, which is very good. And it also restrains the abuser from contacting the victim, their family members, or associates.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that poses a little problem for me. Because in the Bill it says that the accused cannot communicate with the victim or any of the children if it is to cause annoyance or alarm. Well supposing now that the abuser is abusing the spouse — he or she — and the children are not being abused; and the spouse, the accused, wants to communicate with those, apparently he can't. The way I read this Bill, he can't.

There's another thing that says they cannot come near to the victim. Well supposing that victim is a farm wife and the accused has to come to the farm to look after the business of farming. He has to be able to come onto that property and get the tractor or whatever.

Also, the way I read this, Mr. Speaker, the accused may not be able to go to his own church because it says he can't be near that victim. Well if they belong to the same church and he wants to go to church, maybe the guy's sobered up by now and he realizes he needs to go and ask for some forgiveness some place; those are the kind of things that I think I need to be comfortable with.

The other thing I might suggest as I'm going along is I get — and I'm not a legal person, but it seems to me that whoever put this together could be paid by the word or the paragraph or something — I see a whole page here where as a simple layman I could cover it in the one sentence that's at the bottom of the page, page 5. Under the heading (k) it says: "any other provision that the court considers appropriate." That covers everything; that's everything. It doesn't matter . . . all this other stuff that's gone ahead doesn't matter a thing. So those kind of things I'd like to develop with the minister before this thing goes . . . while it's in committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Regina police chief, who is Mr. Ernie Reimer, has endorsed this legislation and he says it's a

major step in law enforcement because it focuses on assisting victims instead of punishing the offender. Well that, to me, is a little bit iffy. If we don't punish the abuser in some manner, then what is to stop him from doing it again? And while it's great and wonderful to look after the victim, but are we going to do it every second week, or should there not be some kind of a penalty?

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is a good Bill; we're certainly not going to carry a long, protracted debate on it because I believe the thing that I mentioned are things that could be and probably will be cleared up by the minister.

There's one other thing that bothers me a little in this, and it's talking about action. There's no action against the peace officer, no matter what he does almost, because it says, among other things, ". . . in the carrying out or supposed carrying out (of his duties) of any decision . . ." Well who is to decide what he supposed was his right according to the decision? I'd like to have that cleared up at a later time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that's about all I have to say today, but I would certainly like to say to the minister: fundamentally, we agree with this. We do think it can be fixed a little bit and I will be asking some more questions, and I look forward to that opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure as well to say a few words with respect to this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I find myself, whenever we discuss a subject like this, somehow feeling that as a man I'm on the defensive. I can't help but get that feeling, Mr. Speaker. Some people like to present it as simply men beating women and children, and that it is wrong. And I agree, Mr. Speaker. And somehow or another it's the older sort of group of people that somehow or another have felt that this is an acceptable form of discipline, shall we say, or whatever, Mr. Speaker. And I agree that that is wrong too.

And somehow or another it's felt that the old school of thought, that the man of the house was the lord and master sort of thing, is finally breaking down, Mr. Speaker. And I say that it's high time that that's happened; that a partnership within a family consists of a husband and wife running the operations of that family, and not the lord and master type of situation that a lot of us probably grew up in, Mr. Speaker.

And somehow I get the feeling that some people feel that it's the responsibility of only men to change, Mr. Speaker. And I don't think it is. I think society has to change, and is changing. It's no longer acceptable, Mr. Speaker, finally no longer acceptable, finally, Mr. Speaker, for a man to come home at the end of the day from his work or from the bar and beat his wife and children around because he sees fit at the end of that day, Mr. Speaker.

This cuts across, Mr. Speaker, all kinds of social economic groups and it cuts across political groups as well, Mr. Speaker. There are Liberals that beat their wives and children, there are Conservatives that beat their wives and children, and there are NDPs that beat their wives and children and Reform Party members, I say, Mr. Speaker. And it doesn't matter who they are, it is wrong and should not and will not be acceptable in a free and democratic society, Mr. Speaker.

Being Conservative does not mean you have a right to do anything like that, nor does it in any other group, Mr. Speaker. This Archie Bunker type mentality that seems to exist in a lot of people in society today is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that society is finally beginning to recognize that.

Beating your children or your wife or your grandparents should not be condoned or is not acceptable in any shape or form. Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the people that find themselves in such a terrible situation resulting from something that they absolutely had no control over or had no part in.

As I said, men coming home from work or from the bar, which is often the case in these situations, Mr. Speaker — alcohol abuse plays a large role in these kinds of problems — deserve swift and immediate action, Mr. Speaker. And I think that the legislation that the minister has brought forward is going to help in that area. Removing the offender, I believe, is the right way to go.

However that does not necessarily mean that it is over, Mr. Minister. I can't help but have the feeling that you remove that offender from the situation; we'll say as some of the other members suggested, at 2 o'clock in the morning, someone comes home drunk and abusive, beating their wife and children around, raising supreme you know what in their home, and the police come, take that man from the situation, somewhat relieved I suspect, the wife and the children resume going back to bed, all of those kinds of things. They take the man down to the police headquarters, Mr. Speaker, charge him with an offence.

But is it over at that point? And I ask the minister, is it over at that point? I sincerely hope it is but I don't think that that will be the practice of what happens. I suspect in a lot of cases what will happen, that man will be released from jail that evening, released on bail, whatever, go out, simply enraged by the situation that someone has driven him from his home, Mr. Speaker. Maybe go back to the bar, resume the drinking bout all over again, and then go home to confront the people who have put him out of his home once again, Mr. Speaker.

And I worry, I really worry that that might be the result of this type of action. I hope, Mr. Minister, that you have done your homework in this regard. I hope that that isn't going to be what develops, where the person goes home completely enraged once again because of the situation that's presented itself, where they're faced with a court action now — dragged down in front of the magistrate at 2 o'clock in the morning and

goes home and decides they're going to exact revenge for that evening's events. And I sincerely hope that that isn't what happens, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister. But I worry, as I say, that that might be the type of development that can happen.

I had occasion last night to speak to a former member of the RCMP that has had a number of dealings with these type of domestic situations, and it was his fear as well that that could and likely . . .

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

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave, to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member opposite who is on his feet and thank him for his indulgence in allowing me to rise, because it's a very important topic and I appreciate the remarks that he's making.

Earlier I mentioned to the Assembly that I would introduce to you an all-China youth federation delegation, Mr. Speaker. They are present now in your gallery, and it's my pleasure to be able to introduce them to you and through you to the members and my colleagues in the Assembly. I would ask them to stand as I introduce them, and please forgive me if I make any mistakes when I use a Canadian interpretation of their names.

We have with us today Mr. Cai Wu. Mr. Cai is the head of the delegation and deputy secretary general of the all-China youth federation. Mr. Zhi Shuping, who is president of the provincial youth federation. Mr. Yan Bingzhu, who is the general manager, Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, Beijing, China.

Mr. Fang Tianlong, who is the vice-president of the Chinese Youth Entrepreneurs Association and general manager of the Guangzhou Beilong Products Development Corporation.

Mr. Huang Rufeng, who is the CYEA executive council member and general manager of Yunnan Yuanfeng Packing Business Company. Mr. Zhang Lingping, who is the president of the youth federation of Gansu Jinchuan Nonferrous Metals Company. And Ms. Zeng Qingrong, who is an executive council member and president of Harbin Songlei Business Group.

Mr. Wang Shihong, who is interpreter and staff member of the AYCF International Department. And Dr. Hsieh, as I mentioned earlier, who is a constituent of mine, but a professor at the University of Regina and someone who has made this exchange possible.

I ask the members to join me in saying ni hao to the delegation. Ne hah.

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

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### SECOND READINGS

#### **Bill No. 30** **(continued)**

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I worry that what will happen under those circumstances as I was talking about earlier, Mr. Speaker, where a person is put out of their home and then goes back, decides to exact some kind of revenge on their family. And I hope this legislation has some way of dealing with that type of possibility, Mr. Minister.

Because as I was saying, I met with an RCMP, a former RCMP officer who has had a lot of experience in these types of situations and people don't . . . His view was that under those type of circumstances, people aren't rational one little bit. It's exactly that kind of thing that's on their mind, that they're going to go back and get even. And I can't help but worry that that might be the situation, and I hope there's some way that we can deal with that type of situation, Mr. Minister.

People who find themselves with the families . . . the women primarily and children that find themselves in those types of situation are scared, they're confused, they're battered. And we must, absolutely must find ways to protect those people.

As MLAs I think we all from time to time run across occurrences of this type of incidents, Mr. Speaker — people who phone us. I've had calls of this nature, Mr. Speaker, where they don't know where to turn. At 2 o'clock in the morning they phone you and ask what they can do or where they should go or any of that type of situation. And they're so scared, so absolutely frightened to death that they won't tell you their name or where they are or any of the details surrounding it, only that they have to get out of that situation and have to remove themselves as quickly as possible because they fear for their very lives, Mr. Speaker.

The beatings must stop. Society owes it to the families of victims of abuse. Small children watching in fear, Mr. Speaker, as their parents, often drunk out of their minds, decide to beat one another, Mr. Speaker; children growing up and watching and accepting this as an acceptable behaviour pattern; children growing up to become abusers themselves. The cycle must stop, Mr. Speaker, and I think we are making steps forward in that area.

I can't help but remembering, Mr. Speaker, the occasion I had, an invitation to visit the Saskatoon Interval House one time. And accepting the invitation, Mr. Speaker, and arriving at the open house — is the way it was described that day — walking up the stairs in what looked like an old apartment building that had been converted with barred windows and security cameras trained down on the entranceway of that building. Knocking on the door, I was greeted that day

by intercom, on an open house day, as I said, Mr. Speaker, greeted by intercom — who was I, and what was the purpose of my visit.

On an open house day security could not be let down, Mr. Speaker, because of the fear that the people inside had of the circumstances as they may present themselves. Then I stated the reason for my visit and who I was. My name I'm sure was being checked against a list of people who had accepted invitations that day. I heard what seemed to me was about four deadbolt locks being unlocked, Mr. Speaker, and then the door opened.

Upon entering at that point, I found myself as the only man, I think, in attendance that afternoon, at that particular point anyway. And it felt, Mr. Speaker, like every eye in the entire place was burning through me at that moment.

And the reason for that was simple, Mr. Speaker. These people had a tremendous mistrust of any man that entered that room or that building that day, I think. You looked at them and there was worry in their face and fear in their face. I think the reason was simple, Mr. Speaker. They wondered who I was there to see and who I was there to potentially beat, Mr. Speaker. I think that that was the reason of the fear in their eyes, as a man, and I think it would have been the same in any case no matter what man walked in that afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

These people had been victims of abuse; they knew what it was all about; they could see the kinds of things that had happened and had felt the kinds of punishment that can be enacted on them, Mr. Speaker. And as I say, I'm sure they were wondering what the reason for my visit was that day. Fear in their eyes, bruises on their face and bodies, Mr. Speaker. Just looking at them you could feel the kinds of fear that they must be experiencing at that time.

Children as well sitting there, Mr. Speaker, and looking up and wondering, I'm sure, who I was there to hurt, Mr. Speaker. Quickly, you know, quickly realizing what was going on there, I explained the reason for my visit and wanted to discuss their plight, Mr. Speaker. And at that point, and it was only at that point, Mr. Speaker, that I think the mistrust was replaced with an outpouring of stories of criminal abuse and intimidation.

These women were in need of protection, or some measure of it was being given — at least there was some measure of it being given to them at that time, Mr. Speaker. Sorely underfunded, they were doing what they could however, Mr. Speaker, at Saskatoon Interval House.

And I couldn't help, as I toured the facility, Mr. Speaker, to notice as I was walking by, I think the only telephone in the building. And there was a big message above that telephone and it said, this number is not to be given out to anyone under any circumstances. Please respect this message; all of our lives are at risk. And that was the message that was

prominently displayed right above the telephone.

And you couldn't help but wonder at what kind of telephone calls must come in there from time to time, Mr. Speaker, or what kinds of goings-on happen at the front door of that building from time to time, Mr. Speaker, where enraged men, generally speaking, I would think, pounding on the door at all hours day and night wanting to get in and thrash their families or their wives once again. And I think that was . . . and obviously that was the reason for the security that was there.

Mr. Speaker, it was one of the most . . . probably one of the most difficult days of my life, watching and listening and hearing what was going on there that day. And I can only imagine, can only imagine what a day in the life of those women and children must be like.

Mr. Minister, this Bill represents a quantum step forward in the area of abuse, and I congratulate you and your government for bringing this type of legislation forward and sincerely, sincerely hope that the legal opinion that you have that this legislation is constitutional is right, because the abuse must stop.

And as members of this legislature we can all do our part, Mr. Speaker, and move this legislation forward so that this type of abuse can stop. Society I think is progressing, Mr. Minister. Finally, I think, it is progressing, in short steps however.

And as I said, the abuse must stop, and we are beginning to realize, I think society as a whole, that this type of thing is no longer acceptable, if it ever was. And unfortunately it does seem that there are people out there even today, still, that believe their wives and children are possessions to be used and abused in any manner they see fit.

But I think this type of legislation and other things, and education that we are beginning . . . through education we are all beginning to see what kinds of terrible injustices there are when you look at these types of things, Mr. Speaker.

I firmly believe, however, that the attitudes of old, the attitudes of fear and the attitudes are beginning to change, Mr. Speaker, but ever so slow. I hope that legislation like this will move that one step forward that much more quicker. I think education, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, would help as well. An educational process through the school system to encourage people to step forward when they know of cases of abuse would be helpful, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I guess in conclusion I'll say it once again: the abuse must stop. I believe you're doing the right thing, Mr. Minister, by bringing this legislation forward. I hope it's constitutional and I hope that the people of Saskatchewan respect the legislation the way I think all of the members of this legislature respect the legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think there's reason to believe that

there's lots of folks out there that would like to have input into this piece of legislation. We're receiving calls from people in our offices, as I'm sure the government is receiving calls from their offices as well about these types of things.

I think it's genuine concern, Mr. Speaker. I think there's concern. I think most people want to see this legislation moved forward quickly. However I think they also want to be sure, absolutely sure that this legislation will stand up and that the right thing will be done with it, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, in order to give opportunity for as much input, to allow for a tremendously strong Bill to move forward, I think that we need to have additional time to hear from as many folks as possible on this subject, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn the debate on this further.

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

Debate adjourned.

(1545)

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

### General Revenue Fund Labour Vote 20

**The Chair:** — At this time I would like to ask the minister to introduce the officials who have joined us here this afternoon.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. To my left is Merran Proctor, the deputy minister; behind her is Janis Rathwell, assistant deputy minister; behind me is Jeff Parr, who is executive director of policy planning and research; on my right is Terry Stevens, executive director, occupational health and safety. I look forward to the members' questions.

### Item 1

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well, Minister, I want to welcome you and your assistants today. And it's been some time since we've had a chance to go into estimates on Labour issues and to discuss the issues of our labour force and things that concern people who work for a living in our province.

I don't know if I have learned very much over the past year, but hopefully we have. And I know that you've been working hard at your job because you have brought forth some new legislation this year again, as you did last year, and that of course keeps us both fairly busy.

Now I know that as we look at the estimates, Minister, that you've probably done some studies and research and spent some taxpayers' money to try to determine what kind of legislation you should bring in for the province to best balance both the needs of workers and labour creators in the business sector, as well as to

balance the ever present political needs of our province, and the way to sustain that balance.

So in those studies we would expect that you have expended the dollars, and we would like to examine with you just how some of those dollars end up being spent as we've progressed into the present time.

And while it's fresh on my mind, I'm wondering, in your projections, if you estimated the costs of such things as the advertising program that you've gone into to promote the legislation that you're bringing in, as you did to some extent last year, and again more specifically did this year.

Did you, in those projections, Minister, for example, as we discussed earlier today and also in question period on March 16 . . . We discussed that there were approximately 1,500 letters sent out to do some advertising. And I have a copy of the brochure that was sent out, and I showed it to you earlier today, and I'm sure you recall it very well.

Mr. Minister, clearly these letters . . . or these brochures were not letters. They were a brochure. And in our office we received a copy of this brochure stuffed into the *Leader-Post*. Now would that have been some sort of an accident, that that got into our *Leader-Post*, or would that have been an indication that every *Leader-Post* in the delivery area would have had one of those brochures stuffed in it?

And with that, Minister, I would ask you to let us know how many of those brochures in fact were put out in the *Leader-Post* and through other vehicles.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I don't know if I can tell you exactly how many were distributed. We made a number available to the *Leader-Post* and they were distributed in the *Leader-Post* area. I can give you the total cost of it or I can give you the cost of the . . . let me give you the cost of the distribution, and that may assist the member.

I'm informed that the cost of the printing was \$26,000, and . . . well I'll wait for the member's other questions. The total cost was \$51,000. The cost of printing the pamphlet I'm told is \$26,000.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. Now you spent the 26, it's printed, and the total is 51. Now that 51,000, would that include brochures that were sent out in other daily papers or weekly papers or were there other distributions other than the *Leader-Post* perhaps, like the *Star-Phoenix*, those kinds of things?

In total, how many brochures did you send out altogether when you finished up with the printing of \$26,000 worth of printing? How many copies did you buy?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — We got 300,000 copies actually printed and of course a goodly number of those have not yet gone out.

No. The answer to the member's question is no, this

does not include further distributions. It is anticipated we're going to send out some in the weeklies, and that'll be an additional \$15,000 we estimate, for a total of around \$67,000.

The member asked also if this had been budgeted, and yes, all this money was within budget in previous estimates.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well I'm glad to know that you did in fact budget for it so that we won't wreck the whole process.

But we've gone from 26,000 now to 51,000 and we're now at 67,000. So we've got 1,500 letters that were sent out, with this implied as the whole bag of goods in question period yesterday, but now we're up to 300,000 copies that have been printed, and we're distributing some rather significant figures here, Minister. I think maybe we'd better pursue this a little bit more just to see where we're going to end up here.

You're going to put this out perhaps in some other newspapers. I can understand that because some of the weeklies don't go out right away. But why won't you tell us how many copies of this brochure you've already distributed and how many you have left on hand and then tell us what you're going to do with the rest of this 300,000 copies that grew from 1,500?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — We estimate that this will go in most of the weeklies. I'm not suggesting all of them. That's a fair number and some of them are of a relatively simple nature, let us say. But we estimate that these will go in most of the weeklies.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. Now how many are you going to have left over when you finish with that process?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — We're not going to have any. This is just a best seller; that's all I can say. We've got people calling every day that want them. I'm sure this will go into many more printings. This is one of the real best sellers in Saskatchewan's history. I just doubt if we're going to have any left over.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well thank you, Minister. I'm sure that the general public are glad that you have a best seller on your hands. You are quite a salesman. I'm quite sure you'd sell your grandmother too.

But let's get it back to reality here now. How many more thousands do you anticipate that you might have to produce in the next run because you have this great demand?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Actually that was an attempt at levity. There's no present plans to go into a second printing. We have, however, had quite a demand for this information, not only within Saskatchewan but outside Saskatchewan. So we think that 300,000 was none too many. There's no indication at this point in time that a second printing will be necessary though.

But it might.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well that's probably just as well, Minister, because otherwise we'd likely have to take another look at the budget, seeing as how these figures seem to be growing so fast.

So now you've distributed your best seller and you'll get that all out for everybody to see in the short run. What other advertising tools are you using through your department for implementing the promotion of this particular legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — There was in addition a print ad which will be in a number of weekly newspapers — most of them, by the look of this document — the total cost of which was \$14,500. And that, apart from the letters of which we had discussed earlier and in the question period, is it.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Let me get this straight now. Does that mean that the 14,500 is added on to the 67,000, or is it part of that?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — No, it's part of the 51,000.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — And do we add the 51,000 to the 67,000 or is that part of the 67,000?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I can see why the members opposite were so creative in their own budgeting. No, the 51,000 is what's spent to date. We anticipate spending another 15,000, for a total of 67,000. You can't add the 51,000 and the 67,000 and come up with anything but nonsense. We've spent 51,000 to date; we anticipate another 15,000, for a total of 67,000.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Okay, Minister, I'm sure that it is for your benefit more than mine that we get this straightened out because there are all kinds of folks that would be out there calculating a lot of different things. And you know, just for the record, Minister, I've only had direct input into public budgets at the municipal level, and there I can report to you, over 12 years of work, we had a balanced budget every year, and some years a surplus.

And I anticipate helping you to make sure that that happens for the province. Because we can't wait until the next election, that would be too late.

On the back of this brochure, Minister, it states that for more information, call the department. If you live outside of the city, you are invited to call collect. If you require further information, you are invited to mail a coupon in and additional information will be sent to you.

What is the additional information, to start with? And . . . then we may as well let you answer that first.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — It refers to two things. One, we have fact sheets with more detail on it for those who have a particular interest in detail in a certain area — we're able to provide that. In addition, we

receive a fair number of individual inquiries, individually addressed letters wanting individual questions answered. So that's the kind of service they get if they utilize . . . if they take advantage of that invitation.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, obviously now we've got a second draft of information, and even though it may be faxed out, it won't be a high cost, I suppose. But there definitely seems to me like there might be some extra costs involved here. How much will this all cost?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well if we get as much interest in it . . . if the interest in this continues which we've seen to date, there may be a fair amount. There may be a fair number of inquires; the total cost however would not be significant. The cost of the first-class mailings are frankly not large; they're relatively small.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Perhaps you could just give us a little idea of what you consider to be relatively small.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well yes, a couple of hundred dollars, which was the . . . a couple of hundred dollars might be a wild guess. I'm sure the member will appreciate I can't give you a very precise estimate until the matter's done, but at this point in time with just starting, yes, a couple of hundred dollars might be reasonable.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. I can accept that as probably close to fact, but perhaps you would like to follow up by giving us that information when in fact you do wrap this thing up. And if you'd commit to that, well we'd be satisfied to go on.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, I'll perhaps give the member the undertaking that when the session's over — that's a couple of months hence — we'll give you an update on how much we've spent answering these inquiries.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — I'm sure there'll be some folks that'll be glad to know when we're going to wrap this up too. So in a couple of months hence, we will look forward to that.

How many local calls has your department received on this matter?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The resource centre received about 300 calls since the legislation was introduced — the vast majority of which, I may say, were fully supportive.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — You say these calls were supportive. They weren't inquiries for information?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Both.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Minister, how many out-of-town calls has the department received?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — We don't log them in that

nature. We don't log the calls by source. So I actually can't tell you.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well I expect that maybe, I guess, my next question would have to be then, Minister: do you set up an 800 number there that says you can call collect if you want to? Wouldn't those calls be charged to your department and therefore be automatically broke down for you?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — We're in the process of doing that now actually. We expect a fair number of calls about The Trade Union Act as well when it comes. The 800 number had not been finalized with SaskTel so the details aren't in the pamphlet. So that the calls which . . . anyone who reads that and calls will simply call collect and we'll accept the charges. We are however in the process of setting up an 800 number. I gather the theory is it'll be cheaper than accepting collect calls.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — So I suppose you could put a bit of an estimate on what that might cost us.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, we'll have to undertake to supply that to you; we don't just have that here. Indeed we don't have the 800 number in place quite yet.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well we can certainly wait, along with the rest of this. Because I think we're developing kind of a pattern of how things are progressing to cost a little more than most of us expect — not unusual in life, of course.

How many individuals requested additional print information so far?

(1600)

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I can only answer the member's question in the most general terms. There's been a fair amount of . . . there's been a fair number of people have asked for additional information. Most of the calls which we received were . . . most of the 300 calls were for additional information. Some were complimentary in passing, and the odd one might have called only to be complimentary. Most of those who called actually called for information. So the majority of the 300 would be calls for information.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well I'm sure that your track record will be a good one so far, Mr. Minister, seeing as how what you did was put out all of the information on those good things in the legislation, things that even I for the most part can agree with, until we read the fine print and find out the detail of the negative side, which of course there always seems to be a negative side.

How many staff members are dedicated to taking these calls, Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — There are five people in the resource centre, of which one mans the phone, or persons the phone continuously and the others assist. So call it five, with one person more or less on the

phone continuously.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — So we've got one person working pretty steady at this telephone here and everybody's helping out and that's good that they cooperate. How many staff members are dedicated to sending out the additional information that's requested?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well that's the same five people.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — But not the same one that's answering the telephone, I'm sure, because she's totally busy with all of this great interest and so we probably have one other person assigned to a full-time wage to do that job. If I'm terribly incorrect there, I'm sure you'll set me back on my ear here quickly.

While we're at it, maybe I should let you respond to that. You probably then have two people that are on full-time salary, and this will go on for how long?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The resource centre is permanent and is, I may say, much utilized. And also I may say we receive a fair number of compliments on both the quality of the material available and the service they receive. But the resource centre is a permanent structure within the Department of Labour. At the moment their time is, I would think, almost fully consumed with this project. But it's a permanent feature of the Department of Labour.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — So even though it may not necessarily be affecting the budget it definitely has tied up your crew. And then if they were employed full time doing a full-time job before, how do they manage to squeeze in all of this extra work without needing some part-time help?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I want to say for the benefit of members present and in the presence of the very few staff who are here, that they have worked long and hard, way beyond the call of duty in getting this legislation ready.

This portion of the public service have worked very hard. These Bills have been a labour of love, and they have worked nights and weekends. If we had only been able to command that level of services for which we were paying, the public would never have got a fraction of what they have got out of this department. This department has worked extremely hard on these Bills, and they're working just as hard to provide the service afterwards. They just work longer and harder when the demand comes.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well I certainly want to compliment your staff, Minister. It's one of the kinds of things that I can appreciate more than anything else is people that really do like their work and that will work hard to do their job. But reality is that we've been bringing in The Labour Standards Act here and we're bringing in The Trade Union Act pretty soon. It seems to me that the very nature of these Acts is to provide fair labour practices to people. Perhaps the union should take a look at how you're handling your people and making

them work all of these extra hours in overtime and cutting all these other folks out of their jobs.

I see the minister does want to respond, so I'll let him.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well it's conceivable that we may get complaints from the union. I think it's more likely to come, if it comes at all, about the contents rather than the hours which have been given us, you know, in some ways freely and voluntarily, above and beyond the call of duty.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I think we'll just let the union take care of you. I wonder though if you do have kind of an idea of the total cost now of the employees and what it's going to cost us, so that we could put together with that \$300 for other kinds of calls and that sort of thing, a little bit of a kind of an agenda of costs. And while you're at it, I do want to know, so that we don't double up too much here, I do want to know what the additional information consists of that you're sending out. Could you provide me with a copy of that so that I don't have to phone the 800-number.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes. I'm not sure if I've got a copy of it here. If not, we're certainly have it tomorrow when I gather the House leaders to reschedule these estimates. So we'll certainly have that here tomorrow. Perhaps we'll also have these other answers, these other questions.

There's been no increase in staff in the department. These Bills . . . I say again, these Bills have imposed an enormous additional load on this department which it has just simply carried in addition to all its other work. And that's what I say, for this department these projects have been a labour of love or they would not have been done at all. This department is one that has worked evenings and weekends, and the public have been extremely well served by this department. I am very proud to be the minister in charge of a department which has worked this hard.

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

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Someone found them so I'll ask one of the pages to table them, and he'll make copies available to you.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister, I appreciate that. Now I did want you to talk a little bit about the cost of all this sort of thing, if you happen to get it. I'll just check those over in a minute to see if they are much different than what we've seen before.

Could you tell me, Minister, have there been any past examples where your department or the department that you are now the head of under someone else's direction perhaps, has advertised proposed legislation that was going to be brought in?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, we did it last year. We had a publicity program last year. I invite the member to look at the material. It is factual; it is not partisan. I've not done the members opposite a disservice, for

instance, by including in the material their voting record on these Bills. It's silent as to that.

This is factual material, non-partisan material. We're attempting to inform the public of Saskatchewan of what we're doing. And there is, I may say, a good deal of interest in what we're doing. So this is factual, non-partisan material, and I think it's a perfectly legitimate use of advertising dollars.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, obviously you would have to say that. You've already spent the money, so you have to justify it, and we would expect nothing less from you. And we certainly would expect nothing less from you than to be non-partisan because obviously you probably would be in conflict with some other rule some place.

But anyway, I will be checking this over and reading through it. Now you mentioned that we did this last year, and I'm presuming that you did this sort of exercise with The Workers' Compensation and The Occupational Health and Safety Act.

Now could you answer a few details maybe about that because that would have been into last year's budgeting, and we need to know what type of information was distributed at that time.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — It was more or less the same. It might take us a moment to put together the precise cost of that; we didn't actually come with that. This was more extensive, in part because our schedule of meetings was more extensive. At each of the meetings we had — and someone estimated there were a couple of hundred of them — we would pass around just a pad with lined paper on it and say, if you want more information, sign, name and address. It was rare that the pad went by anyone without them putting their name and address down; everybody wanted the additional information.

We took it from that there was a good deal of interest in what we were doing and thus we tried to carry through with that and inform them what we're doing. That was the source of all the letters which were the questions in question period and it's been the reason why we have carried on with this.

Last year, the tours — we called them labour tours, the meetings — last year the labour tours were much less extensive. And I would guess, without having the precise figures, that the cost of the communications may have been less expensive correspondingly.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. So you mention you had some tours. What kind of cost did we have involved with that?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I can provide you with a breakdown of that. It was not extensive. We did use the executive aircraft in part, and in part we used the ministerial vehicle which was provided to me. We all piled into the Buick and away we went. There were some hotel rooms and some meals. It was very minimal. We normally used halls which . . . didn't



normally have to pay for the hall. Normally someone would provide it to us. It might be a school, it might be an MLA's office on occasion, and so on. We rarely had to pay for halls, although we did on occasion.

The general cost of these was normally meals, some hotel rooms, and occasionally the use of the government aircraft where the travel arrangements were such that we could not drive from one location to another.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I'm glad to hear that nothing you do is very expensive. But unfortunately it does seem to be sort of piling up a little bit at a time here, sort of like stacking pennies. And the pile's getting kind of wobbly already; it's getting fairly high here.

So let's talk a little bit about this executive airplane. How many dollars an hour does that thing cost to fly?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I think I can provide the member with the cost. I have a sheet which sets out the cost from April 28, the first flight we made last year, to November 30, 1993 — and that was not the last flight which I made and it's not in a very convenient form. I could read it or I could have it ready tomorrow, or I could read this to you. I will be guided by the member's request. I can give you the total; perhaps that would make sense. If you add the figures of \$1,364, which was the cost from April 28 to November 30, of my flights, when you add to that the cost of \$1,142.27, those were the cost of my flights. And so I think that's perhaps the information you want.

If you want the detailed breakdown, I'll provide you with that as well, but I can't do it because it's not in a single sheet that I can tear out and give to you.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — If the minister would like to deliver that tomorrow, that would be just fine. We'll certainly appreciate having that. Were there other people that travelled with you on these plane tours and car tours? And who were they and what was their role?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, on many occasions, but not all, the deputy minister travelled with me. On most occasions there was a ministerial assistant as well with us who was responsible for arrangements and such not. So there were normally three people — myself and two others — on these labour tours.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — I think I heard you say two staff members, basically. Okay. Any other MLAs help you to sell this program or get involved with you on this?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, I think most of the members at one time or another were involved in this, none of whom, however, ever travelled on executive aircraft. And I don't think — well I know because you couldn't do it under The Legislative Assembly Act — none of whose expenses were ever paid by the department or by Executive Council, so the only . . . If this is a question about expenses, the only expenses which were charged was that of the deputy and the

ministerial assistant and of course, my own.

(1615)

**Mr. Goohsen:** — So when you included the other MLAs and your back-up minister and all of those folks, they basically then would have travelled by car. They would have to recover some costs somehow, and even if it were just through their own pockets, then there is a cost associated to selling this program.

However, it is the cost to the taxpayer that I'm concerned about. So what I'd like to know is if they travelled or if they ate out or if they stayed in a hotel, how would that be charged against the taxpayer and how much would it amount to? We just want to come up with a total figure of what your selling package actually cost the people of the province.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — As I think the member knows, under no circumstances . . . the member may not. When the former government was in office, everybody was either a minister or a legislative secretary and could therefore charge expenses.

It has been the policy of this government not to have any legislative secretaries, and therefore none of the members who participated with us could charge any expenses. It all came out of their own pockets. And that's the rule. If you don't have legislative secretaries, there are no expenses. The member cannot charge any expenses. What you pay comes out of your own pocket. All the taxpayer paid for was the deputy minister and the ministerial assistant who is responsible for the arrangements.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister. I'm glad to hear that you didn't run up the bill too high. But still, there seems to be a lot of cost involved here.

I'm wondering, Minister, you've kind of boasted a little, and I don't blame you, about the kind of good legislation you've brought in and how great you think it is. Do you really think it was justified to spend a lot of money selling something that you think was so good that it should have sold itself?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I certainly do. The success of the labour tours could be measured in a number of ways, but one way to measure them was the number of people who came out. I don't apologize for holding a meeting if a goodly number of people are interested and come out, and in almost all cases there were.

The labour tours also assisted us in knowing what people wanted, in knowing what would work and what wouldn't. Yes indeed, the tours were in some ways exhausting. You got sort of windy and sort of baggy in the knees after you went on with this for awhile, but when you talked to this many people you knew what people wanted, and people couldn't manipulate you because you knew the truth from fiction.

And I think the . . . We said this so many times among the two of us — the three of us — who were travelling:

it was a great shame that only the three of us could share the experience, because these tours across the province were one of the finest experiences in the 19 years that I have had a privilege to have a seat in this Assembly. These tours were one of the finest experiences I have had.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I'm glad that you had so much fun and enjoyed yourself. I'm sure that an extended holiday around the province would be something I'd enjoy myself.

Now we need to know what you've accomplished after having this road show, other than talking to your good buddies in the union. We need to know if you talked to any people who are going to have to pay the bills.

But I want to go back because we need to find out just how much money you're spending in all of your advertising. And I didn't quite finish off with getting the detailed figures that we're going to need for the cost of the advertising of The Workers' Compensation and The Occupational Health and Safety Acts. Now we were getting on the edge of the truth there and the pile of pennies was getting pretty high, but I wanted to know how many pieces of information did you distribute on that particular campaign, and what was the total cost per piece, and how much did that come to?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, we'll recreate the information as best we can. I'm not promising that'll be ready by tomorrow morning. That's not easy to recreate. That's a year old and those records are not readily available, and I'm not certain to the extent to which they actually will be available, given any amount of diligent searching. So we'll provide the information what . . . we'll provide the member what we can with respect to the 1992-93 fiscal year. It's not the year under review but we'll provide you with what we can, but I want to warn the member that that is old information and our records may not be complete. I just say that it was less extensive than this because our visits around the province were less extensive than this.

I don't want to let the cheap shot which the member took with respect to talking to a few of my union buddies . . . Every community we were in included a visit with the chamber of commerce, included a visit with the municipality. Most included visits with school trustees; most included visits with health workers where that was possible. A day spent on these tours was anything but a vacation. We started at 7:30 in the morning. A typical day starts at 7:30 in the morning with a chamber of commerce breakfast. The last meeting is at 7:30 at night. In between we would hold six, eight meetings with different groups. We just went quickly from one meeting to the next, met one over lunch hour, usually met one over the supper hour. This was anything but a vacation; this was an exhausting process.

If it hadn't have been so informative it would have been an impossible experience to endure. It was

rewarding, not because it was a vacation, but because it was informative and it was inspiring to see the people of Saskatchewan genuinely wanting to solve problems, genuinely wanting to work with each other to construct a Saskatchewan which doesn't just survive in the 1990s, but thrives in the 1990s. It was really a rewarding experience to see how much people wanted to work together and how little patience they have for members opposite who want to try to divide and conquer.

You don't have to look a long ways to find out why you members opposite have sunk so far in the polls. One of the reasons is your style of politics belongs to a bygone era. The future belongs to those who cooperate. The past belongs to those who want to fight. And the past clearly belongs to the Conservative Party. I think the future belongs to us.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well that's an interesting analogy, Minister. How many miles did you travel with your cars when you were doing this dog and pony show around the province?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The member may not be aware of this: with the ministerial vehicles it is not necessary to log miles because there are very few restrictions on the use of the vehicle. This is one of the perks of office, has been since sometime back in the '30s. The vehicles may be used for virtually any purpose by myself. And so no member of Executive Council actually logs miles. I actually can't tell you. I might be able to reconstruct it by simply guessing at the number of miles between Regina and some of these centres but I don't think I could honestly provide the member with anything that is accurate enough to be useful.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, you kind of have an itinerary of where you went to. Maybe you could give me a kind of estimate of the cost that it would take so that we will know how many dollars the taxpayer actually put into the advertising of this particular Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'll give you the miles; you can do your own math. How does that sound? Because we don't keep track of the vehicle in that fashion. So I'll give you the miles, you do your own math.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Minister, we'll accept that. And we'll dig out a calculator by tomorrow and figure it out for you.

Now we were wondering, when we got to talking into the area of the political gist of this thing, we got kind of sidetracked a bit from the line of questions. So I'd just like to go back and try to finish off the costs — you were alluding to the past and you said you didn't have the figures from last year all together. But just generally speaking if you could, by tomorrow, come up with an estimated cost of what the advertising program was for The Occupational Health and Safety Act and the one for The Workers' Compensation Act so that we could give the people a general idea of what's being spent to advertise.

Now obviously, Minister, the Labour department's brochure went out with pretty much a one-sided promotional labour agenda. Now I've read that and I haven't read the follow-up pieces just yet, but I'm presuming that you naturally are trying to sell your point of view.

Now I don't have to tell you that this legislation is somewhat contentious to certain people in our society. While people in the labour force are anxious and always glad to have rules in their favour, there always is a very ticklish area in labour relations, and that being the fact that you do, by necessity of the fact of the way the world works, have another side to the equation, and that is the employers, the people that have to somehow make enough money out of the labour, whatever it be, to be able to pay the wages and all of the benefits.

Now you've put out this brochure and you've followed up with telephone calls that are free to the public. You've got secondary information sheets that you're able to send out. The cost of this whole process, we don't know what it is exactly yet but it looks like we're getting into the hundred thousand area or very close for this particular Bill. If that were the case for four Bills, you could say we're getting close to 400,000. Who knows where it could go before we get finished.

Now if we start calculating all the costs of the mails and all of the time that the others members spent away from their normal duties attending these kind of meetings, it certainly could get to be a fairly expensive exercise. So you've presented your side of the story and you've done a fairly good job of it. You've told us how good you did. We accept that.

But the other side of the story hasn't been told — the side of the story that business and the folks that are going to pay the bills, the taxpayers of the province who are going to end up paying the bills because of the extra costs to their school units, the extra costs through their teachers and all of the educational programs, the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), all of their councils, employees, everybody in this province is going to pay more money.

And we've seen figures from a few million to several millions. Many millions, in fact, that it could cost. And it's pretty flexible and variable. It's almost as variable and flexible as the costs we were talking about when we started out with 1,500 brochures that grew today to 300,000. And those figures are getting pretty long and stretched pretty hard. So we've got to try and track this down a little now.

From the business point of view, what are you going to do to square the argument on behalf of them, to get their side of the story out? Are you going to do a brochure that tells their side of the story? Or are you suggesting to them that they should . . . or maybe you're encouraging them that they should put out a

campaign of some kind to tell their side of the story and how much it's going to cost the people and where the downside is and the loss of jobs rather than the creation of jobs.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I just want to say that these Labour tours were done on a shoestring. We didn't fly if we could drive. We didn't rent halls; rather, we begged and borrowed halls. We didn't stay in the most expensive accommodation in any community. They were done on a shoestring.

I have absolutely no apology for travelling around this province listening to people, and no one ever suggested we should. This department is the subject of a fair amount of criticism, given the very nature of the work and the area it's in. But in all the criticism which is levied at the Department of Labour, you're the first person to suggest that we should not be travelling around the province listening to people. That's a new way to approach politics, I must say. I give you an A for innovation, if nothing else.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I'm afraid you got it all wrong. You see, you're not listening to the people. Nobody in Saskatchewan believes that, absolutely not. You couldn't convince one person, whether it be your own supporters or somebody else's even. You got a dog and pony show on the road to try and sell something here and that's what you're doing, nothing else. You're selling a product. You're a marketer and you're out selling your marketable product, and you're not out there listening to folks on this trip. You were telling them what you're going to do for them that's good for them. You were selling a package.

And what we're saying to you is that you are being one-sided and unfair in the way that you do this because you have not told both sides of the story. You've spent a hundred thousand dollars on one Bill that you're bringing in and the changes to one Bill. That could go to 400,000 for four Bills. And you haven't spent one dime to offset that by telling the truth about the problems that it may cause for the business sector.

And what I've asked you to tell us is, would you encourage the business sector now to promote and go out and tell their side of the story? And in fact when you do that, don't you think you should actually even financially assist them to provide their side of the story to this issue?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'm sorry to be so disrespectful of an elected member, but you're right off the wall. You really are. What we would do is go out, I would give a talk of about a half an hour, then a question period of about an hour, which followed. When I met with the chamber of commerces — and I met with them in every community — the question I ended on with: how is this going to work for you? And they'd tell me and that was a very useful thing to hear.

And the proposals which we initially went out with were greatly modified as a result of those conversations. So it was a fact-gathering . . . it was a

fact-finding tour, more than anything else.

I really regret that the hon. member speaks from abject ignorance, and you do, because you didn't attend any meetings. You don't know what you're talking about, quite frankly. If you'd attended a single meeting you'd be just as big a fan of these meetings as I am. Regretfully, I went to the meetings and you didn't. I say quite frankly to the member from Maple Creek, you don't know what you're talking about.

(1630)

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I'm not going to stand here and trade insults with you. The level of my intelligence is not on trial; yours is, you're the minister. And I expect that probably the ratings are going down because you haven't answered the basic, fundamental question here which is: how are we going to stop a confrontation between labour and management now that you have fuelled the fires by putting out a hundred-thousand-dollar campaign to promote one side of the issue without promoting the others, and leaving the business community in no other position except to have to fight back with an expensive campaign against your retroactive legislation that puts this province in a distinct disadvantage in competition with Alberta, Manitoba, and Montana and North Dakota as far as labour centres are concerned?

You have placed them at a distinct disadvantage in many ways and they cannot do anything now but fight back.

And you have fuelled the fire of discontent. And you have done, Minister, very deliberately that act because you know it's good politics to have the labour unions mad at everybody so that they side with you and vote for you in the next election. And it's nothing but politics, and you don't give a darn about anybody in business or anybody having a job, only getting re-elected for yourself in the next term.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — No, you've missed a step in this process. That was the approach of the former administration when they were in office. When the minister of Labour sat at that end of the front bench, whose name was Grant Schmidt, that's exactly what he did — attempted to set the province against organized labour so that he would appear to be the defender of the province against the viciousness of organized labour.

When we ran in 1991, we ran on a platform which would end that. And the member from Riversdale, the now Premier, went through the province talking about the need to end confrontation and the need to get people of this province working together to resolve our problems. We were elected on that basis with an overwhelming mandate and we have stuck to it.

And when I went around this province, I spoke repeatedly of the need to end the confrontation between management and labour. And I gave that speech innumerable times. And I say it's a great shame

that the members opposite weren't the beneficiaries of that speech because I think they'd have a whole new outlook on life if only they'd heard it.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, if I want a new outlook on life, I don't think I'll be coming to ask you for it because the outlook on life that you are presenting to this province is one of confrontation that is deliberately driven and cannot now be avoided.

Because, Minister, quite frankly why would you, why would you as the government have to engage in a public relations exercise to sell a piece of legislation? You're the government. You have a heavy mandate. You've got 50-some-odd members that would show up to vote most days if you really needed them.

Now having that kind of strength in this legislature, why would you have to spend one red cent promoting a piece of legislation that you believe is so right, that you believe is so correct? If you believe that this is needed so much by the people of Saskatchewan, why wouldn't you simply have put it through this Assembly and have it passed and not waste all of this money and deliberately cause the confrontation of promoting business interests to the point of having now to defend their position because you've made them look like some kind of bunch of ogres who haven't been holding up their end in trade relationships within our province over the years.

You've made them look bad. You've given them a black eye in public and now they're going to have to fight back to preserve and retain their prestige and their honour and their dignity. You've taken that away from them. And you didn't have to spend one red cent because you've got the power of this Assembly behind you. You could have passed it without any confrontation and you wouldn't have had to go out and do a road show.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The labour tours around the province were undertaken, not with the view to selling legislation. That's not an easy thing to do before it is in fact developed. The labour tours were undertaken with a view to developing the legislation, and that's what they did. The views which we got — working people and business people around the province — went into making up The Labour Standards Act.

I may say to the member from Maple Creek, it seems since we've introduced that, there's been no need to sell it. The legislation's selling itself. It's obviously an idea whose time has come.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, what is selling — as I pointed out to you earlier — is the good points in the legislation. And we didn't ever tell you that we don't agree with some of the things that you're doing. What you haven't done though, is to tell the whole story.

You've got the same situation developing here as we had last year with The Workers' Compensation Act. You told everybody it was going to cost them 10 per cent. Then when the regulations came out it ended up

I get a call from the head of, I think it was the Law Society — one of those big groups in Saskatchewan anyway, if my memory recalls it. They had a 2 or 300 per cent increase. And even after a whole lot of discussion, they were only able to get that broke down a certain amount.

They were very unhappy because, you see, you hadn't told them exactly how it was going to work when you brought it in. You made it sound all nice and acceptable, but it wasn't in the end. It was totally unacceptable to most people after you got finished with it. And it continues, as these regulations go into effect, to be more and more onerous on the ability of this province to compete in the job market and to provide a job base for Saskatchewan people.

Now that is our interest here. Now you've told the good side of the story and that's fine. But you haven't told the whole story. And there's a downside, and we need to work on that downside and try to correct that, so that we don't destroy our province in terms of having all of the big businesses and all the little businesses ending up in Alberta or Manitoba. And that's where they're going by the hordes. You know very well what's happening.

Now I want to know, Minister, how many committees — seeing as how we're talking about legislation here right now and the way it works — how many committees were established and appointed by the government to develop this legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'm not sure what you mean by this legislation. If you mean The Labour Standards Act, there were no outside committees outside the government. There were any number of internal committees but no outside committees. If you're referring to The Trade Union Act, there were two — the committee chaired by Professor Dan Ish, and another committee chaired by Ted Priel, also of Saskatoon.

So that is the answer to your question as to how many committees there were.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Just for the record, perhaps I should ask you to provide us with the names of all the people that were involved in those committees that you have named outside of government. And I would also like to know how many committees then within government were established and who actually sat on them and what was the purpose of their work.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The Trade Union Act was . . . there are two organized groups on either side. The Trade Union Act provides a framework within which organized labour and the management with whom they deal negotiate their differences, and negotiate the relationship between them. You are there dealing with two groups, both of whom are well organized, both of whom are represented by organizations, most of which are quite democratic.

And so we sought to set up committees which would get those two groups together and to see what form of

consensus might be arrived at. The persons involved: the first committee was the Ish committee, chaired by Dan Ish. The persons on the committee were Daniel Ish, Joan Fockler, Pat Gallagher, Denis Lesage, John MacLeod, Ron Miller, Fred Rayworth, Gavin Semple and Len Wallace.

Persons involved in the Priel committee were three in number: Ted Priel, Hugh Wagner and Mike Carr.

The expenditures on the Ish committee were, actual, \$98,734; the expenditures of the Priel committee were \$55,645, for a total of \$154,379.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, the penny pile that I'm stacking up here to try and keep track of your expenditures is getting really high, and it's really getting wobbly now because it wants to tip right over it's getting so high. You're costing us more and more money all the time here.

Now we've got the committee at \$154,000. We've got the road show where you came back looking so fresh and healthy after working so hard. We've got MLAs taking off their regular duties and going out to promote this whole exercise. This is getting to be rather an astounding cost to the people of Saskatchewan, Minister.

Now these committees, when they made their recommendations, I just want to follow up here a bit. Did you get unanimous agreement from those committees on direction that you should go?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — No, not in either case. And I think a major part of the reason for that was because we'd just come through 10 years of Tory government in which it sought to divide and conquer, an agreement very hard to come by between the two. The objectives of this government were to get labour and management working together for what at the end of the day is a single goal — the success of the enterprise in which they both work.

I want to say, this may sound to the member opposite like an astounding figure. Well I say it isn't as astounding as the cost of a single trip by the current member from Estevan to China when he was premier. All of this is considerably less than the premier of the Conservative government spent on a single trip to China.

This was a barebones operation. Not done because I think the public of Saskatchewan demand it when you're in Saskatchewan — I think they're not terribly sensitive about travel expenses in the province — it was done because that's the way the Department of Labour does business. We look after the taxpayers' dollar to the maximum extent possible. Simply a matter of conscience — something that was noticeably absent when your party was in office.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, you raised some rather interesting questions in your preamble. Now how did you, when you determined that these boards were not going to give you unanimous approval for

one direction or the other, how did you determine that they didn't make their judgements based on information they had now, but rather on the fact that the previous administration had corrupted their minds? How did you determine which ones of those members had had their minds corrupted by the previous administration and which ones were actually the smart guys that had an intelligent overview of what was going on?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — The minds which were poisoned were the members of the minds which were in office at the time. I have no other explanation for the kind of behaviour which the former administration exhibited in office. The members opposite did not poison anyone's mind, they poisoned the atmosphere. And we're going to be a long time undoing the damage which your party did in office, both federally and provincially.

And if you are extremely low in the polls, from the point of view of someone who's trying to do something in the area of labour, you're just about where you deserve. If you're at 4 per cent in the polls then you're within 4 per cent of being exactly where you deserve to be because you have made a mess of the whole area of labour management relationship — poisoned it for years to come.

And we're attempting to undo in this area the damage you did, just as we're attempting to undo the damage you did in Finance and in Education and in Health and in Highways. And I could go on and list every department in government. You poisoned the atmosphere, and this province is paying the price for it.

And whatever we spent on these labour tours is a minuscule fraction of the cost of the style of labour management relations which you exhibited with such crassness when you were in office.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I just want to go back to your second last deliberation of why things happen.

Now you said the committee members didn't all agree. And you suggested — and I think I heard you correctly — you suggested that those members that voiced a different opinion on those committees did so because their minds had been somehow brainwashed and corrupted by the previous administration. I'd like to know which members on those committees you thought had their minds corrupted, and how did you determine which ones were corrupted?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I said no such thing, nor will any reasonable interpretation of my words bear that meaning.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well we'll just read the Hansard tomorrow and we'll check that out for ourselves. We'll be at this for a long time, not a good time.

How much money, Minister, has been expended studying this legislation to determine what you were going to do with it? I want to know specifically for the

committees — the total — all committees; and then a package for the whole process.

(1645)

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I don't know that we can give you that. I've told the member previously there were no additional staff. This was done by people in the department. And I mean we don't think we can estimate what percentage of their time has been spent on this legislation.

The outside cost, the cost of advertising and committees, you've already got. But if you want the total cost of doing it, including staff time, I don't think we can give you that. I don't think we can, with any degree of accuracy, estimate what portion of the time of this department has been spent on this legislation. So I don't think the figure you want is available, if I understood your question correctly.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I think that we've already piled up a sizeable number of dollars that it cost. You could obviously take those, gather them together . . . if you can't remember them, you can go through Hansard tomorrow and pick out what you told me and add that up, and that'll give you a start.

You've got a lot of fairly good officials with you there. I suspect that, you know, given a little bit of latitude by yourself like a suggestion — get your calculators out, boys, and go to work — maybe they could come up with a reasonably good estimate of what those costs were. Would that be too much to ask from the Minister of Labour?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well the member can do his own math. The Department of Labour doesn't have any hammerlock on mathematics; it's a science available to anyone. I know you didn't make much use of it when you were in government, but the science of mathematics is available to you as it is to us; you can do your own sums.

You asked me what the committees cost; I told you. You asked me what the advertising cost; I told you. You asked me the total cost; I said we can't give it to you. You can do your own sums. The Department of Labour will provide you with the facts but you can do your own sums.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — So I take it, Minister, you are refusing to give us the cost?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the member's comments.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Are you refusing to give us the costs?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — No, I'll answer any question for which we have the information, but if you want the total cost including the PYs (person-years), I don't think we can give it to you with any degree of accuracy. We don't log time in that fashion. We just don't log time. It's like the miles on the car; we don't log it and we don't have it. All I can tell you is a fair

portion of the time of this department was spent on this legislation — I'd be ready to admit that. If you want anything which looks like a precise estimate, I don't think we can give it to you.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, it seems to me that you've got a pretty healthy budget here. You've got a pretty large crew of folks around you to help you to figure out what's going on. You bragged a little earlier about how efficient your staff was and how they'll work day and night for you without compensation and without union benefits. Non-union workers, I understand, because certainly they couldn't do what you said if they were unionized; they wouldn't be allowed to.

So you've done all of this and you've bragged about all this, and yet you don't have the competency available to come up with a figure of what it would have cost you. Now that doesn't seem natural to me. Are you really sure that you're the Minister of Labour, or are you running under the guise of something else here?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — No, I'm just telling the member opposite, the information you want doesn't exist. We don't log time. We don't know how much of the time of this department was spent on this and how much was spent on other activities. You want to know how much the department spent; it's in estimates. That's easy. I know you don't have to ask that.

If you want to know what percentage of it was spent on this, I cannot be any more precise than to tell you it was a significant portion of the time of this department was spent on this legislation. These we regarded as important projects and we put a lot of time into them. I can't give you a percentage and thus I can't give you the information you want.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well maybe you could give us your best guess.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well I could. All right, the best guess is somewhere between 10 and 90 per cent.

I mean we don't have it. The member wants something which doesn't exist. We didn't keep track of it, nor is it relevant to any purpose. No additional staff were hired for this. There might have been some additional costs involved with drafting this legislation now that I think about it. The member hasn't asked that, but I'd be happy to provide the extra cost of drafting if we hired outside counsel to do it. That might be an additional cost.

But really what the member is wanting to know is what percentage of our time was spent on it. We didn't keep track of it and therefore it's information which doesn't exist.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — So, Minister, you don't have a best guess. You don't have an estimate. You certainly don't have real figures. Who do you suppose in your mind, puts up the dollars that runs your department? Do you not think that this would be the taxpayers of

Saskatchewan that would be putting up those dollars? And don't you think that you have a responsibility, as a minister of the Crown in the province of Saskatchewan, to explain to the people in Saskatchewan how you are spending their money?

Now you've put on a great exercise that has cost your department between 10 and 90 per cent of their time for Lord knows how long, maybe a couple of years now since we've started this. We could be in the neighbourhood of millions of dollars now promoting one side of an issue that you are asking all of the taxpayers in the province to pay for, while 50 per cent of them are probably on the other side of the equation and not getting any direct benefit from the work that you're doing. In fact, are being asked to pay twice. First of all as taxpayers they are being asked to pay for your department to run against them, and then as business people are being asked to put up the costs of your new programs. So you're double-charging half the people of this province and you have no idea what it costs.

And you belligerently stand in your place and say it's not available, like they shouldn't have it, like they shouldn't be entitled to it. Well I say to you, Minister, quite frankly I believe they are entitled to it. And I think you better do better than this. I think you better give us some figures or the people will want a new minister. Someone that can figure out what the costs are and who's paying the costs.

Now I want to know, Minister, do you feel that there is a balance of input on these tours that you've been taking, between both labour and business?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, I think there was. We, in all occasions, contacted the chamber of commerce and said, we'd appreciate an opportunity to meet with you. Would any one of these days work? Our experience was in all communities the local chambers of commerce, or sometimes they're called the board of trade, but the local chambers would as quickly as they could arrange a meeting, which was usually fairly well attended. In all cases, without any exception, we met with the local chambers. There were the odd community where we did not really meet with the workers because there was no such organized group. But I think we did achieve a balance.

We particularly wanted to hear from the business community; we particularly wanted to avoid creating unnecessary problems for them. And I think to a large degree we've succeeded in that. So I thought there was a balance in who we met with. If there was any balance one way or the other, we undoubtedly met with more business people than we did working people. And in every community they're organized; the workers aren't organized in every community.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Minister, I know that you feel it's a balance. I'm quite sure that if the business community had had five minutes of time to talk to you and labour had 45 years, you'd say that was balanced enough, because we know which side you're on in

this equation.

But it is our duty in opposition to try to bring balance to those things that happen in the province so that people can continue to live in this province and can continue to exist.

If you want to have a state-run province where only the labour force feels comfortable, then you must also accept the reality that you will have to supply the job base as a government, because private industry and private business will not stay here because they don't have to stay here. We happen to live in the middle of a land-locked part of a big country and a big continent, where business can quite easily escape if they feel that they are being ill-treated.

And I'm saying to you that while you claim there was balance, there isn't. And what is more important is that you've got our province out of synchronization with the provinces and the states and countries around us. We are out of balance, sir, and that is what's going to be devastating.

Now we've asked you a lot of specific questions to try to encourage your mind to work and think about where you're going, and we're going to continue to do that because we think you are out of balance here. We think you've got to draw some different conclusions, especially before we end up in the next week or two, going into the other part of the labour Act that you're planning to bring in, The Labour Relations Act, because obviously you know that that is the more critical Act as far as confrontation is concerned and the people not wanting to agree from both sides.

Now we need to know, Minister, how we're going to get that balance back in here. And I've been trying to demonstrate to you, as we've gone along, that by putting on such an exertion of selling campaign for how good your programs are, you have destroyed the balance by not also providing the business community with an opportunity to express their points of view to the general public if you're going to go public with the issue to begin with.

Now I've tried to point out to you both the fact that you could have put this legislation through simply by talking to business leaders and labour leaders and not taking it on a public road show, but you chose to go that direction. Once you made that choice then you had a responsibility to the taxpayers and to the business community to present their side of the picture as well as just the labour side of the issue.

And I'll repeat once again so that nobody gets misconstrued about where we're coming from here. We don't oppose all the things that you're suggesting to do or that you are doing in The Labour Standards Act.

We don't like the way that you gouged the people of Saskatchewan with The Workers' Compensation Act after the fact. We don't like some of the police-state attitude in your Occupational Health and Safety Act, and we don't like what we hear is going to come in

The Labour Relations Act. But we do agree that workers do need some protection in The Labour Standards Act. However, it's the regulations that are coming, as you bring those in, that people are fearful of.

And the people of Saskatchewan want to know where their comfort level comes from in all of this. Where is their comfort level that this Act won't in fact turn out to be their worst nightmare when the new regulations are all put into effect and we find ourselves waking up, as we did with the workers' compensation regulations, putting everything a way higher than anybody had ever expected?

You see, you haven't provided that comfort level, sir, and I think it is incumbent upon you to do that. You must provide a comfort level. Nobody trusts your government any more. People just simply don't believe what you say when you tell us it's going to cost \$1,500 to put out 1,500 brochures, when in reality now it turns out that it's not a few hundred dollars but it's now actually millions of dollars we're spending, that we've got 300,000 copies, of which maybe 47,000 of them might end up rotting in some back porch somewhere. We don't know if they'll ever be asked for because certainly the kind of demand that you have said is out there for them is absolutely a joke, my friend. It's a total joke.

You stuffed these things into newspapers so people would be forced to take them home without knowing that they had them. They'd be sticking them all in the garbage can in the Gull Lake post office if they fell out of the paper. No way they'd even pick them up and take them home. They'd chuck them straight in the garbage can. I could guarantee you could probably pick up 75 to 200 copies if you go out there and want to pick them up. You can recycle them and use them over. They're not going to read them, they don't want to see this stuff. It's all one-sided and the people know that.

You forced this literature on people. They didn't ask for it. They don't want it. I never heard anybody call up and say, I want a brochure from the government so that I can find out how great their new legislation is going to be that's going to cost us a lot of the jobs that our students in this province are going to need and want and won't any longer have.

The old folks in our province won't be able to get jobs any more — your own report, your own big blue book here. I'm glad it's blue but the reality is that it tells the whole story if you read it. It's an inconclusive document at best, is what it says; it can't be held responsible for the results of it. The first thing the book does is a disclaimer for any responsibility.

The second thing it does is show that only 1,400 people responded out of 6,400, I think it was. And you call that a report of the people? And the whole report is based on a handful of responses by probably people in your own department who are the only ones that would take the times to answer it.



And then you expect the people of Saskatchewan to have a comfort level because you show them, once again, the nice things that are going to happen in the legislation; and then with the regulations coming in later, you bash their heads in with regulations that will totally destroy them.

Minister, you've got an obligation to this province and you're not living up to that obligation. You're costing the people of this province their jobs. This summer the students of Saskatchewan will have no place to work. The disabled people of this province and the old people will have no jobs. And the job base in this province is going down, not up. You're destroying our province, you're not building our province, you're not creating. You've got to take a different direction.

And we're going to stand in this Assembly, sir, if it takes until next July, sun beats down, 110 degrees hot, to convince you in order to save this province and bring about some common sense . . .

**The Chair:** — Order. It now being 5 o'clock, the Committee of Finance will rise and report progress.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.