

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

**Clerk:** — I would like to inform the Assembly that Mr. Speaker will not be present to open today's sitting.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Ms. Stanger:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm so glad that we are here and we are still able to welcome the students from Cut Knife Elementary School. Mr. Len Dupuis usually brings a group of students down and I think it is very important that he does this every year.

We have teachers Len and Michelle Ramsay; and we have three chaperons — Louise Wismer, Glen Blackstock, and Joanne Maze. I'd like to welcome the students and the teachers and the chaperons to the legislature, and I will be meeting with them for questions and for drinks. Welcome here, and I'd like my colleagues to welcome them also.

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

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, a close friend of mine in the east gallery. Her name is Barbara Riegle. We've been friends for many years and she's passing through on her way to Ottawa. And I'd like to ask all members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming her today.

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

**Mr. Flavel:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the members of the Legislative Assembly today 35 grade 9 students from Robert Southey School seated in the Speaker's gallery. With them today is Mrs. Ritter, Mrs. Schultz, and Mrs. Dollah.

They've had to alter their schedule today to allow them to sit in and watch a little bit of question period. So I'm hoping that we can meet with them after if they have time. If not, we certainly appreciate them coming out and hopefully enjoy their day in Regina today. And I would ask all the members to please join with me in welcoming them here.

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

### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

#### Canada Ranked as Best Country by United Nations Report

**Mr. Cline:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are more things separating Canada from the rest of the world than three oceans and the 49th parallel. Canada is also distinct because of its record on human development, and I want to note that according to the recent United Nations human development report,

Canada ranks first among all other countries in terms of life expectancy, education, and purchasing power. It means that we all have both a secure and a high quality lifestyle.

The United Nations listed many factors that make Canada a better place to live. These include such facts as: 35 per cent of our national budget goes toward social spending, making for an enviable safety net; our school enrolment rate is 89 per cent, the highest in the world; expenditure on education is 67 per cent, second only to Norway in the world.

Now there's always room for improvement and that is what we legislators should try to work for. But I think it's good to know that the basis upon which our country operates is respected the world over.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in this country are very lucky and privileged, and not only do we live in the finest province on the face of this earth, but we also live in the finest country. Thank you.

### Thanks to Legislative Assembly Staff

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is my pleasure today to say some thanks which I'm sure reflect the sentiment of all members of the Assembly. A legislative session is meaningful because of the efforts of many more than elected members.

On day 81 of this session, I'd like to thank the Clerks on the floor of the Assembly for their consistency and patience when advising on procedure. To the pages, thanks for your service, always provided with a smile. Thanks as well to the staff of *Hansard* for excellent work, processing our words sometimes late into the night. Thanks to the Legislative Assembly and Speaker's office staff for your excellent administrative support, to library and legal staff for your prompt research support, to cafeteria staff for food with friendliness, to maintenance staff for keeping this place looking good inside and out, to the guide and security staff for treating both the public and us with professional friendliness and respect. And finally, we thank our own support staff for bearing with us through all kinds of days.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the most meaningful word in the English language is thanks, and that is what we feel for all the people who work in this building in support of the operations of government and the legislature.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Government Media Services

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, contrary to the prophecies of the Government House Leader back in February, this session has been anything but quiet. In fact most of the noise that has been created is by the government side, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And this is after simply two and a

half years. It shows us how lost . . . how much touch has been lost by this government with the people they're supposed to serve.

We have heard shouts of anger, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from rural Saskatchewan over health care, from taxpayers over tax hikes, utility rate increases, from small-business people over labour laws, from welfare recipients, from the unemployed. No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Assembly has not been quiet.

And perhaps it's fitting that one of the last issues to be uncovered by the official opposition is the one which is indicative of a government out of touch and out of control, an issue which brings disquiet to the Legislative Assembly.

My question today is to the Premier. Yesterday in estimates, Mr. Premier, you admitted that you had six — and I emphasize the word six — people on government payroll whose sole purpose is to clip newspapers, watch TV, and listen to the radio for the Premier, this at a cost to the taxpayer of \$360,000, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now, Mr. Premier, stand in your place, look at the camera so that your personal clipping service can get a good view, and tell the taxpayer what value they get for their \$360,000.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to look into the camera and address that question because I think it gives me an opportunity to show how much progress this government has made from the time that the former government was in office and how this government is doing much more with a lot less of expenditures.

Let me just provide the House this information. The department of Executive Council in 1990-1991 spent . . . let me just read it as it is so I don't make a mistake. In comparing the 1990-1991 expenditures to 1994-1995 there is a saving of \$1.005 million over that period of time in the expenditures that the Executive Council provides for those services.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — In 1990-1991 under the last year of the former administration, \$8.18 million was spent. In 1994-1995, \$7.14 million are going to be spent.

Mr. Speaker, this government is more efficient. We have done away with unnecessary services, we're only providing essential services, and that's why the people of Saskatchewan are saying it's about time. They're pleased with the way the government has brought some rhyme and reason and efficiency to the processes of government.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr.

Deputy Speaker, I guess what the assistant premier is telling us today that he's trying to defend his government's spending and the spending of the Premier and the Premier's office of \$360,000 just to gather information to make sure the Premier is kept up to date on what's happening in the media.

Maybe I could just help the Premier out, or the Deputy Premier, by informing him about what the media has been saying about your Minister of Justice. And what have they been saying? Well apparently what they have been telling you is that it hasn't been a very good year for the Minister of Justice.

Certainly the people of Saskatchewan are not satisfied with the way your minister has handled the Martensville trial; your minister has been named as the defendant for breaking a binding agreement with the Provincial Court judges; some of the media have even suggested that the minister should resign.

Mr. Minister, your Premier has spent \$360,000 to let you know that your minister has been having a lousy year, and I'm just doing that for free.

Mr. Minister, why did you do nothing in this legislative session to address the dissatisfaction that so many people have with your Justice department?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, let me add some additional information to which I added when I addressed the first question. Let me specifically speak to media services alone. The budget has been reduced over the last four years by — or the last two years — by 178,000 or 33 per cent from the budget that the members opposite had provided.

And let me tell you and the House, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of things that this government is not spending on: a clipping service that the former government had in which they expended \$32,000 . . . \$632,650 or \$3,000 a month for just a clipping service — we've done away with that; \$5,000 a month retainer for a Corporate Strategy Group out of Toronto, I believe it was, in 1991 — \$73,952 for the year; we've done away with that.

And all that service did, Mr. Speaker, was to advise a former premier on how to deal with the media.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, a contract that used to exist with Dome Advertising that provided the premier with a travelling sound system for his speaking engagements costing \$16,977 a year. That has been eliminated.

That's the example, Mr. Speaker, of this government doing away with unnecessary things — and this is being a good example — and providing only those . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Next question.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If there's one person that this \$360,000 clipping service is really wasted on, it's the Minister of Labour. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've had months and months of

news coverage telling him how destructive his Labour legislation is and yet he hasn't listened at all.

In today's paper, an article about the Dube family of Saskatoon with the headlines: "Long-time Sask. business forced to consider moving", due to your labour legislation.

Mr. Minister, you're not making very good use of this \$360,000 the Premier is spending on having your newspapers read to you. Why didn't you listen, Minister? After all that you heard, why did you plough ahead with this very destructive legislation anyway?

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I neglected to point out one other expenditure that the former government had which we eliminated, and that was the services of one Nancy McLean who did things like tell the premier how to dress, how to respond to media, all of these kind of things, Mr. Speaker. That was an unnecessary expenditure under the former administration which we have managed to do with.

The media services that exists in Executive Council now performs some very important functions. True, they prepare news releases, but there's nothing wrong with that; that's an important part of informing the public. They distribute news releases. They operate the radio and television room for news conferences and provide assistance to departments and agencies and Crown corporations and commissions.

But all of those services that they do are also available to the Leader of the Official Opposition and to the Leader of the Third Party, Mr. Speaker, because those facilities in the news room that we have are available to them. So it's a service that we provide which is as good as was provided . . . in fact better than was provided under the former administration but cost a considerable amount of less money.

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

**Mr. Boyd:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health whom I think, Madam Minister, who requires the clipping service probably even more than the Minister of Labour. And what the clipping service should be telling you, Madam Minister, is about the destructive things you're doing with health care reform in this province, particularly in constituencies like mine and other rural areas.

Madam Minister, local papers are saying that your reforms are destroying health care. Emergency service is insufficient, hospital closures have caused tremendous hardship in dozens of Saskatchewan communities and families, and still you refuse to listen. Local residents are demanding accountability through health board elections and you refuse them as well.

Madam Minister, your government has spent \$360,000 to tell you health care reform is a mess, and

your one-man election commission is another high-priced joke. Madam Minister, why don't you just hold the health board elections this fall, or at the very least, this afternoon would you commit to holding health board elections before the next provincial general election?

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, there are some interesting revelations that come forward through the information that is provided to the press. I'm just going to bring to the attention of the House one or two.

I look at one here, I believe it's from an Alberta newspaper and it says: Klein gives green light for profit-sharing health care. I think the people of Saskatchewan should know that, because I think the people of Saskatchewan should know that the alternative to the health reform that is being done in Saskatchewan today is profit for health care which is proposed by the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. So I think's a very valuable service.

But it doesn't only do that, Mr. Speaker. I'm reading an article from the *Star-Phoenix*, May 31, 1994, referring to our Minister of Health who spent a worthwhile time in Washington talking about our health care system. And when it was all over and during that conference, the clipping reports that:

But when health policy experts from Britain, the U. S. and Canada met in Washington this month, they wanted to hear from just one Canadian province — Saskatchewan.

Why, Mr. Speaker?

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Why, Mr. Speaker? Because everywhere in this country and even beyond this country, people who know anything about health care policy know that what is happening in Saskatchewan is breaking new ground; it's revolutionary, it's the right way to go, and they are looking at us once again as a model to change their systems to meet their needs.

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

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My media review is for the Minister of Agriculture. And unfortunately I don't have too much to report since your government has done absolutely nothing to help farmers in this province.

That's quite a bit different than all the newspaper clippings that there were before the last election, telling us how the Premier was going to get billions of dollars out of Ottawa to help those people out on the farms. The truth is, Mr. Minister, you aren't getting very much use out of the Premier's \$360,000 clipping service since you have done nothing to help farm families in this province.

Mr. Minister, why have we gone through an entire legislative session and you have done nothing to help farm families?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, the opposite to what the member says is the truth. This session saw many changes in our budget to agriculture. There is the hog stabilization fund, a beef stabilization fund, the changes to crop insurance, many other improvements. We have a hog strategy.

The agriculture scene in this province is improving very much. The strategy that the former administration had was to play politics with farmers. And the farmers are in a much better situation and much better shape than they were when we took over office, and we work very hard with farmers. We don't play politics with farm policy, as the former administration did, but we do work hard and we have made improvements for the farmers in this province and we are proud of our record in agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my report, my media report will be to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, I'm a little bit hurt. I've been providing you with newspaper clippings all through the session and I haven't got no credit for it, let alone \$360,000.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're not worth that much, John.

**Mr. Britton:** — Well the member says I'm not worth that much. That's a very good observation. I would suggest neither is the Premier and his staff worth \$360,000.

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

**Mr. Britton:** — Mr. Deputy Premier, I showed your Premier a clipping and the clipping said: Romanow vows to end poverty. I showed you that clipping. Then I showed you another one and it said: one in ten using Saskatoon food bank. Then, Mr. Deputy Premier, I showed you another one, and it said: over 80,000 people on welfare. And 30 homes in your own constituency not fit to live in — not even fit to live in. I showed you those for nothing.

Then, Mr. Premier, apparently you were not paying attention. Because after all of the clippings that I showed you, you haven't showed us one thing that you've done to lower these figures either in the welfare numbers or the unemployment numbers or those houses that people can't live in. Can you explain that, after spending \$360,000?

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

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question from the critic. And I have a newspaper

article here, in fact a whole page of newspaper; it hasn't been clipped yet. And what this newspaper article says is: "Job picture brightens"; "Oil, gas firm promising"; "Golden opportunity for Cameco . . ."; "Farm cash flow improves." A full page full of positive headlines that speak of this government and its ability to brighten the future and the job opportunities for the people of this province. And we do not recall those headlines emanating from the Conservative Party when they were in . . . or were in government from 1981, or 1982 to 1991.

So we think that things in this province are on the rebound, people are going to have jobs, and the future looks very bright according to this newspaper.

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

**Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy or his designate. I would also like to provide the minister with a little media report and, I add, free of charge. In today's paper the headlines read, "Majority back nuclear energy . . .". It says that 58 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan want to see the NDP (New Democratic Party) government develop nuclear energy and that industry in Saskatchewan.

Now that's how you can create thousands of jobs in the province. Earlier this year, the headlines also said, Mr. Minister, the Saskatchewan people wanted to go ahead with co-generation. But you stopped that, wouldn't listen, despite the clipping service.

Mr. Minister, your NDP Premier spent \$360,000 on a media clipping service to let you know the Saskatchewan people want alternative energy sources developed in the province. Why didn't you listen to the people?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, according to many clippings in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* and the Regina *Leader-Post*, the government is listening.

We are moving quickly with the expansion of uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan following a number of environmental studies that are done in order to make sure that there is safety involved in the expansion of the mining industry. We've established a commission authority in Saskatoon to review the next major power generation in the province, which includes the review of a nuclear energy-driven project, along with other alternatives such as thermal and hydro. And so the member may have, had he stayed in government after 1991, started the construction of a nuclear reactor which would have added another billion or billion and a half to the deficit of the province, for power which isn't needed. We intend to review all the options, choose the best one, and when it's needed, build the proper power station.

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

### Election Promises

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Premier, we just want you to know that the concerns we've raised in this session are not only coming from our opposition benches; they've been echoed in every corner of this province by concerned citizens.

And we thought it fitting that we would close this session the way we started it, with a question from a person in Saskatchewan who says, and this is from Mr. Al Chalmers of Carnduff, Saskatchewan: Mr. Premier, what right do you and your ministers sit . . . to sit as the government of Saskatchewan? You were elected because of the promises you made during your election campaign. You have proven time after time that these promises were untrue. It must follow then that you are sitting under false pretences. Please don't say that you've had to change your plans because the last government left such a financial mess. Parties have passed that buck since time began. From Mr. Al Chalmers of Carnduff, Saskatchewan.

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

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Let me, Mr. Speaker, respond to the question from the member from Thunder Creek because I think . . . who asks on behalf of Mr. Chalmers. And I respect Mr. Chalmers' question, and I really appreciate the opportunity to be able to respond to him.

And I want to say to Mr. Chalmers that this government has kept the commitments which it made in the last provincial election. I can say unequivocally, Mr. Speaker, that we will be able to go to the next provincial election with the program card which this government as a political party campaigned on and say to all of those promises that they have been delivered — promises, Mr. Speaker, to get the deficit under control. That's on track. Promises to bring about health reform — I just read you a story from Washington which praises what Saskatchewan is doing. Promises for economic development and job creation; that's on track — promises to bring about many other changes, Mr. Speaker, which are on that program card.

I want to assure Mr. Chalmers that that program card's promises are being delivered. I appreciate his question. And during the next election, we will be able to tell Mr. Chalmers on every one of those promises that we have kept them, and that people of Saskatchewan will judge us on that.

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

### Rural Saskatchewan Economy

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My question this afternoon is for the Minister of Economic Development. Mr. Minister, the success of Saskatchewan depends on our healthy economy, both in and outside of our major populated areas. We've seen zero evidence of your government's

commitment to rebuilding the economies of rural Saskatchewan which have suffered through years and years of agricultural crisis. Commodity prices are coming back exactly like the member has just crossed the floor to show you. Interest rates are down. And this, Mr. Minister, is the window of opportunity, the chance for you to plug those positive factors into a real strategy for rural revitalization.

Mr. Minister, we've just spent months dealing with legislation that addresses the priorities of the New Democrats — gambling, digging up fuel tanks, and labour legislation.

What have you done this session, specifically, that will produce any economic activity in rural Saskatchewan communities?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, to answer the member opposite who echoes the words of her Conservative friends and colleagues next to her, I want to say that part of our platform card — if you were to pick it up and read it — was to reform the labour laws of Saskatchewan which hadn't been touched in terms of The Trade Union Act for about 11 years and labour standards for 17 years. That was a promise we made, and it's a promise kept and a very important one to the working people of this province.

I want to say as well, when it comes to jobs in Saskatchewan, you may want to look at the *Leader-Post* from yesterday which talks about "Job Picture brightens" in Saskatchewan. And with almost every sector of the economy, with the exception of agriculture because of the restructuring occurring there, there are many more jobs than there were when we came into government in 1991, especially in the area of trade and export — up by 7,000. Even in manufacturing we have 2,000 more jobs than we had in 1991.

Now the member can preach gloom and doom, and she can go around the province saying how terrible this province is and how terrible a place it is to live, but I say you would have much more luck with the people of the province if you were to take a positive attitude.

Even the *Leader-Post*, even the *Leader-Post* . . .

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Next question.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Minister, let's put newspaper clippings aside; you may simply want to listen to the real people in Saskatchewan. The NDP SAMA (Saskatchewan Assessment Management Agency) legislation will increase municipal costs. The NDP health reform will close facilities and reduce employment. The NDP labour legislation is causing investors to think twice about Saskatchewan. And the NDP *Partnership for Renewal* has not delivered any tangible results in rural Saskatchewan at all.

Now my question to you, sir, has been about rural

revitalization. The only economic activity that is directly linked to your government policies is the sound of loonies plinking into thousands of VLTs (video lottery terminal).

And yesterday an owner of a rural hotel — a community, sir, of 527 people — said your government raked in more than \$500,000 from VLT machines in his small community. That's more than \$1,000 for every man, woman and child.

Mr. Minister, a piece of legislation your government passes, every piece, every policy that you have followed, has helped to drain the life out of rural Saskatchewan. I ask you again, what are your plans to revitalize rural Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I say again that there are a great number of things happening in rural Saskatchewan. And to the member, Mr. Speaker, she should travel to Humboldt or to Nipawin or to Meadow Lake, to name just three communities that are prospering and doing very well.

In yesterday's *Leader-Post* under the heading "Farm cash flow improves" I want to quote to the minister . . . to the member:

Saskatchewan farmers pulled in record amounts of cash from sale of farm products and government programs last year.

But they also . . .

and it goes on to talk about how the farm economy is improving in Saskatchewan — far away from what you are saying about the gloom and doom in rural Saskatchewan.

You are the biggest part of the problem of the recovery of Saskatchewan when you put yourself forward as a potential leader in this province with all the gloom and doom. In light of the fact that there is so much positive good news around about the economy, the only reason you can be doing that is for your own, self-serving political agenda. That can be the only reason and I would like you to stand up and explain to the people of the province why you're carrying on in that manner.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Let's talk about self-serving political agendas when your Premier and you, sir, went across Canada telling everybody we were the worst fiscal basket case in all of the country.

You did that for self-serving political reasons, to not have to put yourselves in positions of performance but blame the previous administration. Your smokescreen, sir, is quickly drifting away and you can use all the glossy pamphlets you want, the news conferences that don't really announce anything. Now that the smoke is clearing, the real people are looking for real evidence that your government knows how to create a healthy economy, that your

government knows how to not stand in the way of one, and that they are not finding it, sir.

Instead, I'll tell you what the real people are talking about. They're talking about vacant properties on their main streets. They're talking about the closing of their schools and the closing of their hospitals. They're talking about the decaying of their highways. And these are real concerns. These are tangible pieces of evidence that whatever strategy you have, if one at all, isn't really working despite what it is you're saying.

Before you escape the scrutiny of this legislature, tell us how you plan to stem the horrendous flow, the outflow of cash from rural Saskatchewan, rural communities, and how are you going to build a new economy for rural Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, this possibly being the last question of the session, I say that never before have I seen the princess of darkness use so much gloom and doom when it comes to the province of Saskatchewan.

What I have heard come from this member as she travels around the province, travels around the province preaching gloom and doom, while literally tens of thousands of people in rural Saskatchewan are sitting around coffee shops and around kitchen tables talking about regional economic development authorities, how they're going to get their economy going again after nine disastrous years because of the farm economy and the previous administration.

Here you are today, defending the actions of the previous administration, and trying to create gloom and doom to try to do what? To get yourself elected so you can sit possibly as next premier based on your gloom and doom.

I say again to the princess of darkness, try a little optimism. Saskatchewan is a good place to live, things are going well, getting better. Get on that bandwagon and I think you might have a chance of doing a little better. You might even win your seat in the next election.

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

**Mr. Kluz:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Kluz:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, 47 grade 5 and 6 students from the Foam Lake Elementary School, who are seated in the west gallery. They are with teachers today, Wayne Bugera, Ruth Nichol, Shirley Korpatniski, and Jim Hack. The bus driver is Melody Chaikowski. And I would like all members of the Assembly to welcome them here today.

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

# ORDERS OF THE DAY

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

#### General Revenue Fund

#### Executive Council

#### Vote 10

#### Item 1

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And to the minister, I want to spend a little bit of time on a topic that we were on last night during consideration of Bill 72, which sets up a corporation to legalize your gambling initiative in this province.

And during the course of that discussion, after much persuasion I was able to get, from the minister responsible for Gaming, a copy of the agreement that your government has made with the Saskatchewan Federation of Indian Nations. And I want you to take a look at the page 1 of that agreement — and I want to get your reaction to it — which says that the government agrees to place expeditiously before the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, either at its present session or its next session, legislative proposals creating the corporation, Mr. Minister. Now I want you to please inform the Assembly of the rationale that you had when you included that particular portion of this agreement.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Certainly I would love to explain to the member the rationale. In the process of arriving at an agreement, which is an historical agreement involving first nations in the casino policy and the organization of casino development in this province, which I happen to believe is probably the more appropriate and progressive way of approaching this issue then has happened in most other provinces, it was decided during those negotiations that it was important, since there was an agreement, to proceed.

And I think that that is one of the reasons why that was written into the agreement, because that was part of the agreement. I think that was appropriate. The legislature has had a considerable amount of time that they'd spent on the Bill.

I was here in the House and I watched some of it on television in my office. And I think that the exchange and the explanation by the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan liquor and gaming commission and the members in the opposition during some, a little over six hours, I think is an indication that the Bill received the appropriate kind of attention.

The agreement was a good one. It was agreed in the agreement that we should proceed with implementing it soon and that's why the Bill was before the House, in order to carry that out.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Well let's do this properly, Mr.

Minister. I'll ask the questions and I would appreciate it if you would answer them. Would you answer my question: why in this particular section do you say, that either at its present session or its next session? No sense of urgency there. Would you comment?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Chairman, there's certainly a good explanation for that. We did not know at the time of the agreement when the agreement would be signed. And therefore there were provisions in the agreement that made it possible to have the legislation in this session or, if it happened to be signed later, it would come later at another session.

In the end, because of the ability for all parties to agree, the agreement was signed earlier rather than later. The session was still in progress. There was every indication that the session was going to be longer than some of us, at least, thought it was going to be. And it was therefore quite appropriate to introduce the Bill as it was introduced, and proceed with the agreement and establish the casinos as are outlined in the Bill, establish the corporation as is outlined in the Bill, so that we could get on with this important initiative and have the casinos up and running before the Grey Cup that is coming next summer here in Regina.

(1415)

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Well, Mr. Minister, what it does is just underscores and underlines once more for the people of this province, your penchant for gambling dollars. Your last statement there just fortifies what I've been saying all along — the be-all and the end-all is money in your coffers, be it through gambling or whatever it happens to be.

At the same time it is quite obvious that you were prepared to wait until next session. Why then, Mr. Minister, were you not able to do that, so that in fact and indeed there could be proper consultation about this whole issue?

You do not have a mandate for what you're doing right now, because it's a fundamental shift in the values of this province that you're embarked upon. And you justify it by the means . . . you justify this means that the end is that you need money.

There could have been public consultation. And don't get up and tell me there was a lot of consultation; there was not. Any consultation you did was with the vested . . . the parties that had a vested interest in it, not open, rural-urban meetings asking for input from the general public. That's what I'm talking about consultations. The general public have never had a voice in this issue. Vested parties, yes, no doubt — no doubt, Mr. Minister.

What I want you to do now is turn to page 5, section 11 of that agreement. Section 11 states, and I'll read it into the record, Mr. Chairman:

It is the intention of the parties that within six weeks after the end of the first full year of

operation of the casinos, the corporation shall commence a review of the operation of casinos, their impact on other gaming operations in Saskatchewan, and the potential for additional permanent casinos in Saskatchewan; and shall provide a report and recommendations to the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority upon completion of the review.

Mr. Minister, I want to underscore that you are going to be reviewing the potential for additional permanent casinos in Saskatchewan. Is it not just all fluff what has been going on so far, Mr. Minister, that you're going to piecemeal this thing in a ramming fashion upon the people of Saskatchewan; that all along your full intention has been, as is demonstrated by this article, to have full-scale casino gambling in every outlet within Saskatchewan that can possibly have one?

Saskatchewan and Regina are the tip of the iceberg. Next year your full intention is to institute it across the province so that the proliferation of gambling opportunities will be complete, literally on every street corner throughout Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister.

As I said yesterday to the minister of gambling, we have a finite sum of money that's available and it will not support that kind of thing. But in your greed, you are fully confident in the ability of the minister of gambling to promote gambling, not only on the racetrack as he's doing, but throughout our entire society. There will be promos. There will be promos going out that will do precisely that, Mr. Minister.

And you know why I say that? You know why I say that? Because I want the public and I want the minister of liquor to be aware of what I am aware, of a news release that came out this morning.

You know back when we were discussing the Horse Racing Commission and the amalgamation of it, the minister went out in public and he said: the problem is there are not enough people betting and we've got to promote betting to get more people out to the racetrack. Well that's great for those folks, and I grant them whatever they get out of it.

Then I followed that up and I said: well, Mr. Minister, you're promoting gambling at the racetrack because it'll mean more money in your coffers. What's next? The promotion of liquor?

And you know, what do we find out today, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Chairman? I understand now that what you have instituted is the ability of people now to purchase liquor, beer, and coolers on golf courses. Now I can see a lot of golfers out there saying, hey, good for that, I didn't know that. They will now be able to purchase liquor in the form of beer and coolers on golf courses. That's a public, that's an open, arena for beer and coolers to be consumed in public.

And I suppose, Mr. Minister, that begs the next question: what's next? What's next? Our beaches, our parks, our playgrounds? There's no end, Mr. Minister,

to what your government is not prepared to do . . . or is prepared to do, in order to get money in your coffers. Gambling — oh, we're going to expand it, they're going to expand it. Liquor — my predictions have come to fruition. That's precisely what's going to happen.

And are you going to get up and say, well that's what the public is demanding of us? I don't think the public is. And I think the direction that you're heading is going to be the way future generations will look back upon your government. That's the legacy that you are creating for yourselves. And it's not a legacy, my dear friend, that your friend, Tommy Douglas, would be very proud of, I can assure you of that.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well I want to just . . . Because I don't often have an opportunity to speak to this, I want to say quite proudly that one of the reasons I'm here today was because of my friend, Tommy Douglas, who encouraged me to get involved.

And I'm quite confident that were Tommy Douglas still here with us, Tommy Douglas would approve with the process and the decisions and the directions of this government because in many ways what we're doing in Saskatchewan today is much the same as what his government had to do in 1944 when it was elected after another government had destroyed the economy of this province, ran up huge debts. And one of the things about Tommy Douglas which I think members opposite don't understand is that he learned from year to year what the issues of the year and into the future were going to be because he saw into the future.

But I want to address the comments, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . As soon as the member from Shaunavon settles down so that I can be heard, Mr. Chairman, I want to address the comments made by the member from Rosthern, who talks about the promotion of liquor.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the promotion of liquor in Saskatchewan began under his administration. It was his administration in the 1980s that allowed the advertising of liquor for the first time over the resistance of the then NDP opposition, the resistance of many people in the public. Now that's here now, but I just wanted to make it clear for the record where the promotion of liquor began.

The concept of allowing coolers and some forms of liquor at golf clubs and on golf courses is a means not to promote but to control and regulate. I don't know whether the member golfs now, but I do. I do when I do have time, and that's not much, but sometimes I do. And I can say to the member opposite that I'd rather have a means by which it can be controlled because it's visible and it's regulated, than simply what the process is now where it is all over the golf course in golf bags secretly, and on the 9th hole they open up whatever they do with it in a big hurry. So it's a means in which I think you can find a better system to control and regulate than the system that is there now.



I want to also address the comments the members made about the expansion of casinos. We have clearly said as a policy of this government that there will not be an expansion of casinos except and unless there is a market that shows that it's worth while to expand them. The reason there are two casinos established under this legislation and this agreement, Mr. Chairman, is because all of the market research shows that there should be two casinos in Saskatchewan.

Now over time, because the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Commission will be monitoring on a weekly and a monthly basis what is happening with this new venture, and there will be after six months a further review, government — and it would be this government or any government who would do the same — will look at what is out there and what should be the next step, if any, on making sure that the policy is being implemented appropriately. But at the present time there is no plan to expand those casinos and certainly won't be unless there was a good reason shown by good market research that that's something that should be done.

I want to also address the question, and I will use the word of the member opposite when he talked about the end-all — the be-all and the end-all of this agreement and the legislation and this approach. I want to say that the most important be-all and end-all of the process we have gone through is to make sure that there is complete accountability for the operations of this corporation and for the casino operations that will be established in Saskatchewan.

And that's why, Mr. Chairman, legislation was introduced, because that's one way in which one can be sure, from a policy perspective, a legislature perspective — and I'm talking about all the members of this House — to make sure that there's accountability, and that's to make sure it's in the legislation, with all the appropriate rules that are written in that the government or the people who administer have got to follow.

Mr. Speaker, there's the same kind of mandate that this government has had to proceed with this as the former administration had between 1982 and 1991, when the amount of money wagered in bingos increased from 4.5 million to \$112.4 million. I didn't see that published in anybody's election platform.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that would represent an increase of 2,500 per cent over an eight-year period. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that's pretty illustrative that the argument that has just been made about mandate is an irrelevant argument.

The point of the discussion is that there is a policy decision, with all wide consultation with all of the stakeholders, to establish two casinos in Saskatchewan. There is an agreement that has been put together between the FSIN and the Government of Saskatchewan which provides assurances to other sectors as well.

And most important, there is legislation to make sure that it is appropriately done and that there is accountability to members of this legislature, to the auditor, and through that process, to the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I thought I was finished with you, but obviously all you're doing is egging me on, and then we shall accommodate you.

You talk about consultation with all the stakeholders. That's exactly the problem. The only people that you have consulted are the people that can get gains from it directly. That's the stakeholders. You have failed utterly to consult the largest stakeholder in this province which is the general population. You have never consulted with them. All you've done is consulted with the people whose pockets could have money jingling in them. That's the only ones that you have consulted with.

Now don't give me this nonsense about your concern about accountability. I went through that yesterday with the minister. The only reason this is in here is because you couldn't find any loophole to get away from it. That's your sense of accountability.

Why in the world did you come on with the 76th day of this legislation? Because that's the only day that you could have the agreement signed? That's also nonsense, because that's what took your agreement so long. You wanted to make sure that you could do this in any other way than bring it out into the light of day in this Legislative Assembly. You wanted to do it through cabinet, that's all you wanted to do. So let's not get sanctimonious here and say your concern is accountability.

Your concern is that your lawyers have told you, left and right, that the only way that you can do this is to set up a Crown corporation. And now what do you do? You set up a Crown corporation in this legislature, and the very Act that sets it up says cabinet has the right to do away with it. Cabinet can do what it wants. Well, Mr. Minister, that is not flying out there at all.

And also don't give me the nonsense about the increase in gambling expenditures and bingos from '81 to '92. There was a big, big difference there, Mr. Minister, because that money went directly to charities. They are the ones that mostly benefited from that. And when I say that, Mr. Minister, when I say that, I am saying that there was not government involvement in that. The money did not flow directly into the Minister of Finance's pockets to do with what he wants, as it will do under your legislation here.

The difference, Mr. Minister, is that gambling in this province now is being promoted by the government. You are promoting gambling. Why are you promoting gambling just like you're promoting liquor? Because you have a vested interest. The more money people spend, the more money they take out of their milk pockets and out of their bread pockets and out of their shoe pockets, the more money you make. That's the

bottom line, Mr. Minister. We're running a government-promoted gambling industry. And don't you try to compare that with what has happened previously.

Now if we want to get into the political aspects like we have been doing, then we are going to be in here, Mr. Minister, for a long, long time — for a long, long time because the issues that you are bringing up are side issues to deflect from the main, major issue, which is that you are using gambling as a means to the end. That is all. You're motivated by that one end, and you will do anything to accomplish that end.

(1430)

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Deputy Premier, yesterday I didn't have the opportunity to bring this up with the Premier. As you know we have received a lot of correspondence from around the province from people with the "Mr. Premier I want to know . . ." questionnaires. We bring them up each week in this Assembly. I have a whole pack of them here which I would like to send across to you. As we have done with other ministers, rather than taking the time to enter them all in the record, what I would like from you is a commitment to respond in writing to all of these individuals who have taken the time to write us questions. And we also would like a carbon copy to my office on the responses that are sent out. Can I have that assurance from you, Mr. Deputy Premier?

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Absolutely I can give the member from Thunder Creek that assurance, Mr. Chairman. I have to admit that when the members of the official opposition first announced this process, I was somewhat sceptical. And I have to say now that every Monday opportunities to have those questions presented in the House, it actually worked quite well. And I have to assume that the members, and I'm sure they are, are good at their word and that they're mailing the answers that are provided. I'm sure that that's happening.

And any time a citizen of this province has a question of their government or any of us in this legislature, we should be responding. And so I can certainly give the undertaking to the member from Thunder Creek, the Leader of the Official Opposition, that if he provides us with those questions, we will make sure that a response is prepared under the Premier's signature. And they will get a letter from the Premier providing the answer as expeditiously as possible.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Premier. We even go so far as to send them the verbatim of little exercises like you and I are just going through because they find it . . . it's important to a lot of people to understand that this place has some realness for them. And I appreciate your response today and I believe that this exercise will grow in the future.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Item 6 — authorized by law.

Vote 10 agreed to.

**General Revenue Fund  
Executive Council  
Electoral Expenses  
Vote 34**

Item 1 — authorized by law.

**General Revenue Fund  
Loans, Advances and Investments  
Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan  
Vote 165**

Item 1 — authorized by law.

**The Chair:** — That concludes estimates for the Department of Executive Council and I would ask the minister at this time to thank the officials who have joined us here.

**Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Indeed I want to, on behalf of the Premier, on whose behalf I'm acting here today, and myself, to express our appreciation to the staff from Executive Council who have assisted us and members of the opposition in responding to the questions that have been asked here.

I think it's been a very good debate. It's an opportunity for the public to know what the issues are as they are thought to be the issues by members of this House and what the responses are to the questions here.

So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the officials for all of the assistance that they have provided here in the last several days.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too would like to thank the officials for coming in and helping us out in sessions and I would ask the Deputy Premier to pass on my thanks to the Premier for the time that he spent in here. I found the discussion very enlightening and look forward to next year.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Mr. Deputy Premier, I'm very pleased that you were able to arrange your schedule to be present for this important component of estimates review, and I am disappointed that we won't have the opportunity to question the Premier any further.

I agree that the opposition does control, to some extent, the length of the session, but I think it is incumbent upon the chief executive of government — the Premier of the province — to be . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — It's done, the estimate is done.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Pardon?

**The Chair:** — I'm not sure what it is the member's debating, but we've concluded estimates for the

Executive Council.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Mr. Chair, I would like to take this opportunity . . . I didn't think that 20 minutes out with the media would result in this being finished, so I will at this point thank, on behalf of the third party, the officials of Executive Council and the Deputy Premier for their attendance here today.

### Motions for Supply

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman, I move that it be:

Resolved toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1994, the sum of \$150,565,000 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Chairman:

Resolved that toward making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1995, the sum of \$3,219,639,000 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

### FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolutions now be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to and the resolutions read a first and second time.

### MOTIONS

#### Name Substitution on Committees

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the members opposite would mind if we were to, by leave of the Assembly, move a couple of motions that would change some of the members represented on committees from our side of the House.

By leave of the Assembly:

That the name of Mr. Kowalsky be substituted for that of Mr. Lyons on the Standing Committee on Constitutional Affairs. I so move, seconded by the member from Regina Churchill Downs.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Churchill Downs, by leave of the Assembly:

That the name of Mr. Cline be substituted for that of Mr. Solomon on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. I so move.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Churchill Downs, that by leave of the Assembly:

That the name of Ms. Bradley be substituted for that of Mr. Lyons on the Standing Committee of Crown Corporations.

I so move.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

(1445)

### APPROPRIATION BILL

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move:

That Bill No. 73, An Act to grant to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending respectively on March 31, 1994 and on March 31, 1995, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and the Bill read a first time.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, under rule 51(2), I move the Bill be now read a second and third time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill read a second and third time and passed under its title.

### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

#### Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Labour Standards Act

#### Clause 1

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Minister, you and I have spent a lot of time over this issue. I have stood in my place and brought before you and your government, the very real concerns of small business in our business community here in Saskatchewan. I have brought to you hundreds of letters. I have delivered to you hundreds of faxes. I have introduced petitions. I have reported to you on the resolutions from an emergency meeting of 500 business people and their employers. I have brought

forward dozens of suggestions for amendments and changes to this Act which would help to alleviate the concerns of the business people of Saskatchewan.

It has all fallen, apparently, on deaf ears. But I would like, because I'm an eternal optimist, Minister, I would like to try just one more time, Minister. And I'm wondering if you would be willing to consider amendments to this piece of legislation yet at this very last hour. This the 11th hour of this Assembly I ask to you, as I did a few weeks ago; I asked you in question period whether you would be willing to include a provision which would allow for the prepublication of the regulations to this Act. At that time, of course, you flatly rejected it. I'm prepared to move that amendment this afternoon in one last try.

And it would read:

That no regulations made pursuant to this section comes into force until a period of not less than 90 days has elapsed after it is published in the *Saskatchewan Gazette*.

And I ask you very simply, Minister, for a yes or no. Will you accept such an amendment here today?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — No one would fault the member from Maple Creek for lack of tenacity. By our count, this Bill has been before Committee of the Whole on 14 different occasions. If that's not a record for any Bill, I think it must be a very, very close to it — there can't be many in that rarified atmosphere.

Having said that and having in some ways enjoyed the relatively high level of debate actually, which I think has gone on over this Bill — I think those people who have listened to it have come probably . . . I think have come away with a better understanding of the two sides of the issue. Having said that and having given serious consideration to this amendment that you're proposing some time ago, I regret to inform you that we, as a caucus, have decided that we are not prepared to accept that.

While in the long run it is not the most noxious amendment which I could conceive of, neither does it contribute very much. There has been and will be ample consultation with these amendments, and we think the additional 90 days is simply, figuratively speaking, is carrying coals to Newcastle. So I regret to inform the member that as much as I'd like to return some of the civility which I think he's shown in this debate and accept the amendment, we are of the view this would not be an appropriate occasion to do so. So my words will have to suffice.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, that response doesn't surprise me, and so much for good faith and so much for building partnerships. A small amendment that would allow business time to review the regulations is nixed by the minister as being too onerous. And that simply, sir, is unconscionable. One can only wonder what disastrous regulations you plan on proposing, given your refusal to allow for a very short review period. It's simply frightening. I would

have offered dozens of amendments, Minister, but it appears that this would be a waste of time.

There's an old adage that says, if it ain't broken, don't fix it. It simply means that if there's nothing wrong with a particular thing, then don't mess with it because you'll screw it up. Well this is precisely what has happened with the labour laws here in Saskatchewan during this session. There was basically nothing broken. There was really nothing very much wrong with our labour laws, nothing that a few minor technical changes couldn't have corrected. In fact unions and labour enjoyed the most accommodating legislation in the country, as was evidenced by the fact of the statistical reports that showed we had the least amount of labour unrest in the past 10 years than we've had in a very, very long time before that.

The only thing broken around here was the political relationship between you and your union friends. And that's what you have fixed. You've fixed a political problem. Your reward for your actions will be continued political support for you from your unions, both financially, I expect, and on the campaign trails in whatever elections ensue. You have bought their support on the backs of business people and with taxpayers' dollars.

And for this political support you are more than willing to watch jobs and investment leave this province. This kind of ideological favouritism goes against your campaign promises. It goes against your *Partnership for Renewal* plan. And it goes against the common decency that the people of Saskatchewan expect from their governments.

Your government's initiative in this area is proof positive that communism may not be as dead as everyone had hoped it is. And I for one am grateful that there are still those who will take a stand against it for the good of the people.

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

**Mr. Goohsen:** — As one businessman put it in Saskatoon, the Russian people have experimented with this kind of left-wing radicalism for the past 70 years. And now they are trying everything possible to get away from it, while we reintroduce it into Saskatchewan — the only place in North America where it will exist.

The business community stood up against you. The employer communities stood up against you. Part-time workers stood up against you. The native community stood up against you. And the taxpayers of this province stood up against you. The only leader who refused to take a definitive stand was the Leader of the Third Party, who couldn't muster the courage to sign a petition asking you to delay this Draconian legislation.

Well I and this caucus will stand for job creation and economic development over and above union interests at every turn. And the business employers and workers of this community — the community of

Saskatchewan — can count on that.

It is with a mixture, Minister, of frustration and dismay that I will take my seat today and watch an NDP government — your government opposite — force these Bills through onto the people of Saskatchewan. But I guarantee you, Minister, that you will not have the last word on this issue. The voting public of Saskatchewan will not forget this kind of legislation.

The impact of this kind of legislation is not the kind that hits you over the head like a hammer, even though the business community has recognized it as such. It is an onerous thing that creeps up on you over time. And if your Premier is sincere and honest when he says that he's going to hold an election in two years' time, some of the full force of this legislation will in fact have had an opportunity to show its impact to the voters of Saskatchewan. And on the basis of these two pieces of legislation, I predict to you your government's downfall.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. After many months of extensive discussion and debate, Bill 32 is in the final stages of process. In developing this legislation the New Democratic government of Saskatchewan began with a conclusion and then set about to, I think, support its conclusion through selective listening and consultation.

From the outset the government has tried to convince people that this Bill was necessary, that somebody somewhere was actually asking for it. And to date I want us to be on record again for saying that we did not receive one letter — not one letter was sent to my office supporting this legislation. None of our caucus has had as much as one telephone call from a constituent asking us to vote in favour of this Bill, although we had had literally hundreds of letters, faxes, and meetings with people who see its dangers.

(1500)

So if nobody in the general public, in the vast group of women and part-time workers the government would have us believe our demanding this Bill, if nobody except the people that you indicate, union lobbyists, have spoken in defence of it, perhaps we haven't answered the most important question — why are we changing this legislation at all?

Saskatchewan already has labour standards that compare favourably with anywhere in this nation, and in fact the Minister of Labour has alluded to this. Indeed they compare favourably throughout the world. So why in these tenuous economic times are we tinkering with this legislation?

I am disappointed to observe that Bill 32 was intended from the outset to be a tool for organized labour to achieve through legislation what its negotiators had been unable to achieve through the time-honoured collective bargaining process. I've listened to the

government rail on about its commitment to part-time workers and women. I only wish there was evidence of that commitment where it really counts — in the results of a thoughtful and productive economic development strategy.

As society moves ahead, as the labour force changes and evolves, as people discover job-sharing, career change, and the freedom of being self-employed, it is incumbent upon government to provide policies which enhance rather than restrict the evolution of our workforce.

I know what the government is trying to accomplish with this legislation, and I know that is different from what they would like the public to believe. I think the government will shore up its failing political support to some extent. I do. However I flatly disagree that the women and students the government would like us to believe are the reason for this Bill will see any measurable improvement in their take-home pay, any measurable improvement in their employment opportunities or their quality of life as the result of this legislation.

And when the dust settles, the women, the part-time workers, the young people, will come to understand that any change that makes employers less competitive and makes job creation more expensive will hurt all of us and hurt them far more than it helps.

Therefore, Mr. Chair, there is no particular value in trying to fix bad legislation. I give tremendous credit to the willingness of public and private sector employers who spent endless hours and invested precious resources trying to convince government to modify its original proposals for Bill 32. And I compliment those people who have worked so diligently to steer the government towards a more acceptable piece of legislation.

This Bill 32 is more acceptable than the original proposal put forward by the government. But regardless of that, it should not be passed into law without the accompanying regulations and the vital costing analysis that we have pressed the government for time and time again during the course of this debate. People simply wanted time, and we didn't need to have to go through the antics in this legislature to try to provide them with time. They should have been given time.

I want to stress the point that Bill 32 by itself is virtually meaningless. Until the regulations are drafted, it will be impossible to measure the true impact of this legislation. We can only hope that the government will finally do the right thing when it creates its blue-chip panel — blue-ribbon panel I think it was called — to have input into the regulations.

We will be watching and hoping that this panel can finally return to the original challenge of building an employer-worker consensus about how to have amended The Labour Standards Act function in such a manner that it will protect the interests of workers without creating unsupportable pressures on the

competitiveness and validity of public and private sector employers.

I wish to say a word of acknowledgement to all of the people, the employers, even the labourers, aboriginal leaders, union representatives and Saskatchewan taxpayers in general who took valuable time to convey their points of view to our caucus, to meet with us and to offer their input when we sought to better understand the implications of this Bill.

My greatest regret with respect to this legislation is that the government was not more diligent in gathering and digesting that information at the outset of the process, rather than as an afterthought when the Bill was past the point of no return.

Mr. Chair, I do want to make comment as well on some of the statements made by the member from Maple Creek. I find it quite unacceptable that any members of this Assembly would sign a petition coming before this Assembly, and I think that should give them some pause, if we're talking about their roles as representatives of their constituencies. They're here to represent their constituencies.

Mr. Chair, I conclude my remarks with the sincere hope that the government will be respectful of Saskatchewan's position in the global economy when drafting the regulations of this Bill, that ultimately consensus will somehow be achieved in the process.

I remain committed to the belief that the way to better employment conditions, more choice and more flexibility and job opportunities, will not come at the hands of government through legislative improvements, but through a vibrant, healthy economy which is made possible, much more possible, when government does things differently and usually happens when there's . . . less possible when they do it through more regulation.

With that, I'm sure that the minister does have some final comments.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I thank the member from Saskatoon Greystone very much for that.

Before beginning I want to tell the member from Greystone that in an earlier session you had asked for the background material which went to make up our decision. I'm told by my staff that that is ready. It is not physically here, but it will be delivered to your office within a very short period of time.

I think when the final comments on this, certainly the final session . . . While I was waiting, absorbing the gems of wisdom which were being spilled upon the floor in the Executive Council estimates, I was cleaning out my desk. One of the things I found in my desk was something that I had completely forgotten about.

It was a book entitled *Labour-Management Innovation in Canada*. It speaks of two competing visions for the Canadian labour force. I thought it was

very useful. I thought, this is our view of these two competing visions I accept. Members opposite will have a different formulation of the two competing views of the labour force.

This, I thought, was an excellent formulation of our view of these two views. The author of the idea is the International Institute for Labour Studies, an affiliate of the International Labour Organization. The analysts of the International Labour Organization speak of the low road and the high road in industrial restructuring. From here on I'm going to read two paragraphs:

The low road is the strategy that relies on low cost and a deregulated labour market. While it may result in short-lived improvements in competitive performance on the part of individual firms, over time it is likely that the consequences are union avoidance, little investment in the employees, heightened labour-management hostility, reduced wages, reduced living standards for workers. It's hardly a trust-building strategy.

The high road to industrial restructuring is the strategy of high labour standards, worker empowerment, and promotion of joint problem solving and of high trust relations. It's the strategy that enables all parties to share in the benefits and the burdens of change at the firm and industry levels. It's the course being followed by a number of organizations cited in this report. For these organizations the workforce is not regarded as just another cost to be cut but as an asset in which to invest. They know that workers on the front lines have detailed knowledge of production processes, the customers, the markets, and that if a high quality, high value added model is to be pursued, partnerships between labour and management or at least a more cooperative and trusting relationship between labour and management must be formed. That is how we describe the two competing visions.

I may not have shared with the member from Saskatoon Greystone the author. The document is published under the name of the Hon. David Dingwall, the current Liberal minister of supply and services in the federal government.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well I found that most interesting, Mr. Minister, and I don't know why you would think that that was inconsistent with anything that had been said about Bill 32. Part of what had been raised as a concern by people who had worked on your occupational health and safety group to come up with the legislation that I indeed stood in this House and supported last year . . . although you keep claiming I did not, so I assume that what you had done since and subsequently is to look at the record.

What happened was people worked on that particular panel to work out a consensus, a consensus between those who are employers and those who are employees. And I could not agree more with the

analysis that was just made in a way to ensure that things are done in the best interest of people, all people.

I don't know why it is you're making the assumption that anyone would want to support employers who simply want to fire people or treat them in a poor manner. That doesn't do anything for an economy. It doesn't do anything for well-being. It doesn't do anything to do anything for economic recovery or it wouldn't be an intelligent way to be dealing with anything.

So I not only support what you've indicated; we have never not concurred with it. What we've indicated in these two pieces of legislation and primarily with the one that we're discussing right now, is that a consensus was not reached. And the people who in fact were working on that as employers and employees, the concern was that you did not . . . you did not bring forward proposals that were the result of consensus between employers and employees at all.

So do I take it then, do I take it, Mr. Minister, that as much as you're saying that employees should have great consideration and we should ensure that employees are consulted and that they are brought onside, can you say similarly for employers? Do you think that it's necessary to reach the right kind of management-labour relationships by ensuring that employers are involved in the process and they too are involved in helping to reach a consensus?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — This will remain the subject of disagreement between the member from Saskatoon Greystone and I because it is a . . . I do not have statistical evidence to prove this. It is my view that the majority of employers, the majority of employers who are moderates, the majority of trade unionists who are moderates, support our centralist approach — it has been centralist.

I recognize that there are people on both sides of the argument whom I could never get on board; it is definitionally impossible to get the extremes of both sides on board. But it is our view that the majority of moderates on both sides of the equation do support the approach we have taken. And I will predict that next year, whatever controversies the Department of Labour stirs up — and it seems to be our lot in life to carry this baggage along the road . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You won't be here too much longer. Don't worry.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — And the member from Kindersley may be correct in that as well.

But whatever is the subject of controversy next year, I'll make the prediction — and if I'm here, I will remind the member of it — that this legislation will not be the subject of controversy at the next session. At the next session, the members opposite will find some new horrors to complain about.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

**The Chair:** — The minister has given notice of House amendments — three amendments to clause 8 — and I'll ask the minister to move them separately.

(1515)

## Clause 8

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move:

That the Bill, section 8 of the printed Bill, be amended by amending section 13.1 of the Act as being enacted by section 8 of the printed Bill:

(a) By striking out subsection (2) and substituting the following:

“(2) Subject to subsection (2.1), the notice required by subsection (1):

(a) shall be in writing; and

(b) may be given by posting notices in conspicuous places where employees have ready access to read the notices.

“(2.1) The notice required by subsection (1) need not be in writing or posted:

(a) where posting the notice is impractical due to the small size of the employer's operation; or

(b) in other cases, where written notice is impractical”;

I so move.

**The Chair:** — I think if the minister will want to continue through (b), (c), and (d).

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Yes, I think I was a little premature in ending.

(b) By striking out “unless the change results in the employee working hours that entitle the employee to wages at the rate of time and one-half” in subsection (3);

(c) By adding the following subsection after subsection (4):

“(5) The director may permit a variation from the requirements of subsection (1) or (3) where the employer seeks and obtains the written consent to the variation from the trade union representing the employees”; and

(d) By striking out existing subsection (5) and substituting the following:

“(6) Subsections (1) and (3) do not apply where any sudden or unusual occurrence or condition arises that could not, by the exercise of reasonable judgment, have been foreseen by the employer”.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I further move . . . the member’s standing. No, I guess not; I guess the member can make any comments you want. Oh, just stretching, okay. I further move that section 8 of the printed Bill be amended by:

Amending subsection 13.3(1) of the Act, as being enacted by section 8 of the printed Bill:

(a) By striking out the portion that precedes clause (a) and substituting “An employer shall not grant to each employee who works six hours or more an unpaid meal break of at least 30 minutes within every five consecutive hours of work except”;

(b) By striking out the portion of the clause that precedes subsection (i) and substituting “where the director is satisfied that the employer and a majority of the employees agree that the employees may”;

(c) By adding the following clause after clause (b):

“(c) where the employer seeks and obtains the written consent of the trade union representing the employees”; and

(d) By renumbering existing clauses (c) and (d) as clauses (d) and (e).

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** —

Amend clause 13.4 of the Act as being enacted by section 8 of the printed Bill:

(a) In subsection (1):

(i) By striking out “Except as otherwise provided in the regulations” and substitute “Where required to do so by the regulations”; and

(ii) by striking out “seniority” and substituting “length of service”;

(b) by striking out subsection (2); and

(c) by renumbering subsection (3) as subsection (2).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clause 9 agreed to.

## Clause 10

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I move:

That section 10 of the printed Bill be amended by striking out subsection 10(1) of the printed Bill and substitute the following:

“10(1) Clauses 22(1)(a) and (b) are repealed and the following substituted:

‘(a) subject to clause (a), to a fine of not more than \$2,000 for an offence; and

‘(b) in the case of an offence that is committed within six years after the person is convicted of any offence:

(i) to a fine of not more than \$5,000 for a second offence; and

(ii) to a fine of not more than \$10,000 for a third or subsequent offence”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 10 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 23 inclusive agreed to.

## Clause 24

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. I move:

That section 24 of the printed Bill be amended by amending section 39 of the Bill as being enacted by section 24 of the printed Bill:

(a) by striking out subsection (1) and substituting the following:

“(1) The minimum sum of money to be paid for a public holiday or for any other day designated for observance of the public holiday by an employer to any employee who does not work on that day:

(a) where the employer pays to the employee the employee’s regular wages for that period that includes that day, is equal to those wages; and

(b) in any other case, is the amount A calculated in accordance with the following formula:  $A = W/20$

where W is the total of the wages earned by the employee during the four weeks immediately preceding the public holiday, exclusive of overtime”; and

(b) by striking out subsection (3) and



substituting the following:

“(3) For the purposes of this section, where an employee takes an annual holiday during the four weeks immediately preceding a public holiday, ‘wages’ includes the amount of annual holiday pay that is payable with respect to any annual holidays actually taken during that period”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 24 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 25 to 27 inclusive agreed to.

#### Clause 28

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move:

That section 28 of the printed Bill be amended in the following manner:

Amend section 44.1 of the Act, as being enacted by section 28 of the printed Bill:

(a) by adding “but subject to subsection (3)” after “sections 43 and 43.1” in subsection (1); and

(b) by adding the following subsection after subsection (2):

“(3) The notice required by subsection (1) may be given concurrently with the notice required by section 43 or 43.1”.

Amending section . . . I don’t know if the chairperson wants to vote on these individually or in mass. I suspect you want to vote on them individually. I will halt there.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** —

Amend existing section 44.2 of the Act, as being enacted by section 28 of the printed Bill:

In the following fashion; that is to say:

(a) by striking out clause (1)(b) and substituting the following:

“(b) either

(i) in the case of serious illness or injury, the absence does not exceed 12 weeks in a period of 52 weeks; or

(ii) in the case of illness or injury that is not serious, the absences do not exceed a total of 12 days in a calendar year, except where it can be demonstrated that the employee has a record of chronic absenteeism and there is no

reasonable expectation of improved attendance”; and

(b) by adding “or pursuant to *The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code*” after “at common law” in subsection (3).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 28 as amended agreed to.

Clause 29 agreed to.

#### Clause 30

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. I move that section 30 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion. That is to say by:

Strike out section 45.1 of the Act, as being enacted by section 30 of the printed Bill, and substitute the following:

“Provision of benefits

45.1 Where an employer provides a benefit to employees who work at least 30 hours per week or any other number of hours prescribed in the regulations, the employer shall provide benefits in accordance with the regulations to all eligible employees”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 30 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 31 and 32 agreed to.

#### Clause 33

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 33 of the printed Bill . . . once again I’ve got to do this, I suppose, in two halves, in two parts since they’re different actual sections of the Act — 33 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Amending section 60 of the Act as being enacted by section 33 of the printed Bill by striking out “14” in subclause (5)(b)(i) and substituting “21”.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 33 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Amending section 62.4 of the Act as being enacted by section 33 of the printed Bill, by striking out clause “14” in clause (1)(a) and substituting “21”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 33 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 39 inclusive agreed to.

(1530)

#### Clause 40

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move:

That section 40 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say:

Amend section 72 of the Act as being enacted by section 40 of the printed Bill by adding the following subsection after subsection (2):

“(3) Where a collective bargaining agreement entered into before the coming into force of this section contains a provision setting out a requirement that is less than a minimum requirement imposed by *The Labour Standards Amendment Act, 1994*, the collective bargaining agreement is deemed to be amended to provide for the minimum requirement imposed by *The Labour Standards Amendment Act, 1994*”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 40 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 41 to 44 inclusive agreed to.

#### Clause 45

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Once again this is in two parts, and I will move them . . . No, it's not. This is a single amendment. I move that section 45 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion. That is to say:

Amend clause 45(d) of the printed Bill:

(a) by renumbering clauses 84(1)(e.2), (e.3) and (e.4) of the Act, as being enacted by section 45 of the printed Bill, as clauses 84(1)(e.11), (e.2) and (e.21);

(b) by striking out “seniority” in renumbered clause 84(1)(e.2)(iii) of the Act, as being enacted by section 45 of the printed Bill, and substituting “length of service”;

(c) by enacting the following clauses after renumbered clause 84(1)(e.21) of the Act, as being enacted by section 45 of the printed Bill:

“(e.3) for the purposes of Part VI, requiring the observance of a public holiday on a day other than the calendar day on which it would otherwise fall;

“(e.4) authorizing the establishment by an employer of a uniform entitlement date for the annual holidays of employees and modifying the requirements of Part VII to accommodate the use of a uniform

entitlement date”; and

(d) by striking out clause 84(1)(e.8) of the Act, as being enacted by section 45 of the printed Bill, and substituting the following:

“(e.8) governing the provision of benefits to eligible employees pursuant to section 45.1”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 45 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 46

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move Section 46 of the printed Bill, the amendment in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Strike out clauses 85(1.1)(a), (b) and (c) of the Act, as being enacted by section 46 of the printed Bill, and substitute the following:

“(a) subject to clause (b), to a fine of not more than \$2,000 for an offence; and

“(b) in the case of an offence that is committed within six years after the person is convicted of any offence:

(i) to a fine of not more than \$5,000 for a second offence; and

(ii) to a fine of not more than \$10,000 for a third or subsequent offence”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 46 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 47 to 51 inclusive agreed to.

**The Chair:** — If the minister would like to move that the Bill be reported with amendment . . .

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I will do so. But before doing so, I am remiss in overlooking one thing. While this is the 14th appearance before Committee of the Whole with this Bill, I do think this is the first time we've had our head of planning and priorities, our head of planning department here. John Boyd is with us today, has assisted us ably. Although his role today was somewhat minimal, his role in the preparing of this legislation was not. I publicly want to thank him. I also want to thank all of the officials who gave such valuable service to the Government of Saskatchewan in achieving this goal.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think first of all I should join with the minister in welcoming the addition of his officials here today. Obviously you've all done a lot of work, those of you who have been here through the whole stretch as well as the new member. It has been, without question, a heavy

load of work for you people and for your department. I can attest to that by the amount in volumes of work that have hit my desk.

And I want to say that I'm happy to have done this. It wasn't easy, and certainly we have been somewhat torn at times as an official opposition as to the stand to take because we're not against the concept of labour standards for working people.

We obviously believe that people who work need some protection in society. What we have objected to, quite simply, has been the approach that was taken in process and the extremes to which you went.

And just to comfort, Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be short, but they are timely and appropriate. I want to take this opportunity to thank some folks who helped us. Obviously the minister's officials are visible, and everyone knows who did a lot of the work, and they will know that there will be a large team behind them.

But we too have had a large contingent of people working very hard on this extremely long and difficult piece of legislation. I want to thank our research team for all of the work that they have done. Much of the work that I have displayed here was a result of their efforts. Much more of it was a result of the contribution by the business community itself and the people through the province who have contributed, and I want to thank them.

I also want to thank the workers of Saskatchewan who have taken the time to report to me their views, and while the third party says that they haven't had any input on the other side of this issue, I will admit freely that I have had some representation on the opposite side of the coin to the business community. I believe that that came to me, Mr. Chairman, because the working people of this province felt that we would be fair and understanding and try to find the balance needed between workers and labour, and I am committed to that as my party is.

And even if we were to form government next time, the workers of this province can be assured that we would not radically destroy this piece of legislation in one fell swoop. We would certainly bring it back for examination and try to bring in a balance that will allow our business community to thrive so that we can in fact build a job base and a tax base with confidence in our province.

And that commitment, Mr. Chairman, I give to the people of this province today. As we watch this legislation enacted, we will certainly pledge to watch how it works and we certainly do believe that there will be changes needed. And I wouldn't really be surprised if this minister ends up bringing this particular piece of legislation back before the next election in order to try to save the day at the polls. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Rather than to try to get into this obvious collusion of somehow always pointing out the third party as being

remiss in something, I would like to simply take this opportunity to acknowledge that I know that the deputy minister of Labour has done tremendous amounts of work on this. I have heard that on many occasions that you've been meeting with people throughout the night. And I know that there must be other officials who accompanied you. That means that there was a strong commitment in wanting to work through what you believed in. And I think that that should be acknowledged.

Simply because we have a difference of opinion does not mean that I should not respect what it is you believe in. And I want to commend you and the people who have worked with you to defend and uphold what you think is in the best interests of Saskatchewan people.

So with that I would like to also acknowledge the hard work of many other people who were fighting diligently on behalf of their beliefs.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I want to thank the member from Greystone for those very gracious remarks.

And in conclusion . . . just one comment in conclusion. People have seen me coming into the legislature virtually every day with this enormous briefcase. To fill a briefcase that full of paper, and it's heavy, that has been almost exclusively mail to be signed. And it'll come as no surprise to members of this Assembly to know that I don't answer those letters; it's done by the department. Virtually every day we filled that briefcase up with mail and I bring it in here and sign it. These are the people who have done all the letter writing; I've just got to put my name at the bottom.

That's the tip of the iceberg, of the work this department has done on these Bills. This has been an enormous workload. This is the smallest Department of Labour in any province west of the Maritimes and to have brought before this legislature two Bills of this controversial nature truly is a remarkable feat for this department. I do want to acknowledge it before I sit down.

With that, Mr. Chairperson, I shall move that the Bill be reported with amendments.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

#### **Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act**

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

#### **Clause 3**

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Enjoy it because this is by far the shortest of the amendments. I move section 3 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Amending section 3 of the printed Bill:

(a) by striking out clause (a); and

(b) by renumbering clauses (b), (c), (d) and (e) as clauses (a), (b), (c) and (d).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 4

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I move that section 4 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Amending section 4 of the printed Bill by adding the following subsection after subsection (9):

“(10) The following subsection is added after subsection 4(12):

‘(13) Notwithstanding subsection (1.1):

If anybody in the audience is still following me after those series of numbers, I’m sure they’ll be fascinated to know the amendment reads as follows:

(a) persons who are members of the board immediately before the coming into force of this subsection are continued as members of the board on an acting basis until new appointments are made pursuant to subsection (1.1);

(b) persons who are alternate members immediately before the coming into force of this subsection:

(i) are deemed to have been members on and from the dates of their appointments as alternate members; and

(ii) are continued as members of the board on an acting basis until new appointments are made pursuant to subsection (1.1); and

(c) all matters pending before the board as it was constituted immediately before the coming into force of subsection (1.1) are continued before the board as constituted pursuant to clauses (a) and (b)”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 5 and 6 agreed to.

(1545)

#### Clause 7

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 7 of the

printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say:

Strike out sections 10.1 and 10.2 of the Act, as being enacted by section 7 of the printed Bill, and substitute the following:

“Certification after unfair labour practice

10.1 On an application pursuant to clause 5(a), (b) or (c), the board shall make an order directing a vote to be taken by secret ballot of all employees eligible to vote, and may make an order pursuant to clause 5(g), where:

(a) the board finds that the employer or the employer’s agent has committed an unfair labour practice or has otherwise violated this Act;

(b) there is no evidence before the board that shows that a majority of the employees in the appropriate unit support the application; and

(c) the board finds that evidence of majority support would have been obtained but for the unfair labour practice or violation of this Act.

“Decertification after unfair labour practice

10.2 On an application pursuant to clause 5(k) for an order rescinding an order made pursuant to clause 5(a), (b) or (c), the board shall make an order directing a vote to be taken by secret ballot of all employees eligible to vote, and may make an order pursuant to clause 5(g), where:

(a) the board finds that the trade union or an employee has committed an unfair labour practice or has otherwise violated this Act;

(b) there is no evidence before the board that shows that a majority of the employees in the appropriate unit support the application; and

(c) the board finds that evidence of majority support would have been obtained but for the unfair labour practice or violation of this Act”.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Does this in any way — the changes that you’ve proposed here — does this in any way change the circumstance as was evident at the Moose Jaw Woolco store? What you’re proposing here has a little bit different connotation as far as the ordering of votes. Does it change it in any way?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — This clause deals with automatic certification and decertification. I do not believe that there were any grounds in Moose Jaw which would have given rise to such a thing. So I think the answer is no.

I'm not, however, intimately familiar with all of the details of that dispute. But if you want an opinion, I think the answer is no. This would not have affected that matter because I don't think there were any grounds for automatic certification. There were no grounds for automatic decertification there.

**Mr. Swenson:** — Mr. Minister, as I understand the situation the reason the application for a vote was denied was because of an unfair labour practice against the employer in that situation, and it just sat in limbo.

Now what you're saying here is that either the employer or the bargaining unit, if there's something, that you can force a vote. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Well, you have to meet both . . . you have to meet all the tests. These things are cumulative and they're very high. And the experience of other provinces has been, in Manitoba and B.C.(British Columbia) where they have them, is they are very rarely met.

There has to be an unfair labour practice. It also has to be such that it prohibited the free expression of the will of the employees, and on decertifications that's extremely rare. And it's my understanding, and I put it on no better basis than that, my understanding is there were no such grounds in Moose Jaw.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 8

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. Again, one of the shorter ones. I move that section 8 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion. That is to say:

Amend subsection 8(1) of the printed Bill:

- (a) by adding "and" after clause (a);
- (b) by striking out "and" after clause (b); and
- (c) by striking out clause 2.

**The Chair:** — That final line is by striking out clause (c).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

#### Clause 13

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I want to get the attention of members. It's kind of tricky. This amendment is that we're going to strike out the clause, so I will be asking all members — opposition and government — I will be urging all members to vote against clause 13. It will

then be struck out, and that is the amendment we're proposing.

So I will ask all members of the Assembly, government and opposition, to vote against clause 13.

Clause 13 negatived.

#### Clause 14

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 14 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion; that is to say by;

Renumber section 14 of the printed Bill as section 13.

Amend subsection 25(3.5) of the Act, as being enacted by renumbered section 13 of the printed Bill, by striking out "Subject to subsections (3.6) and 26.1(11)" and substituting "Subject to subsections (3.6), 26.1(11) and 26.1(12)".

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 15

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move section 15 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion; that is to say by;

Renumber section 15 of the printed Bill as section 14.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 15 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 16

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 16 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion. There are three different sections affected, so I will read these in three parts. I move that 16 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion; that is to say, by;

Renumber section 16 of the printed Bill as section 15.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 16 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion; that is to say by:

Strike out subsection 26.1(11) of the Act, as being enacted by renumbered section 15 of the printed Bill, and substitute the following:

"(11) Where the chairperson of the Labour Relations Board appoints a member of his arbitration board pursuant to subsection (7),

the party who failed to make the appointment shall pay the remuneration and expenses of the person so appointed.”

“(12) Each of the parties shall pay an equal share of the remuneration and expenses of a person appointed pursuant to subsection (6) or (8) as the third party of an arbitration board”.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** —

Amend section 26.5 of the Act, as being enacted by renumbered section 15 of the printed Bill, by adding the following subsections after subsection (7):

“(8) Notwithstanding section 33 but subject to subsections (9) and (10), the expiry date of a collective bargaining agreement concluded pursuant to this section is deemed to be two years from its effective date or any other date that the parties agree on.

“(9) Notwithstanding section 33, not less than 30 days or more than 60 days before the expiry date of a collective bargaining agreement concluded pursuant to this section, either party may give notice in writing to terminate the agreement or to negotiate a revision of the agreement.

“(10) Where a notice is given pursuant to subsection (9), the parties shall immediately bargain collectively with a view to the renewal or revision of the agreement or the conclusion of a new agreement”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 16 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 17

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 17 to 20 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Renumbering sections 17 to 20 of the printed Bill as sections 16 to 19.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. Swenson:** — The minister was talking awful fast. He hasn't had a last-minute recantation on 33.4 on the terminations of agreements here, have we?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — We've had no last-minute recantations.

**Mr. Swenson:** — I just wanted to make sure that that queasy feeling in the pit of your stomach didn't tell you to do something different at the last minute.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — No, it was my exuberation for finally enacting some of the finest labour legislation of this country.

Clauses 17 to 20 inclusive as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 21

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Once again there are three parts to this. I move that section 21 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say:

Renumber section 21 of the printed Bill as section 20.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 21 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say:

Strike out subsection 37.1(1) of the Act, as being enacted by renumbered section 20 of the printed Bill, and substitute the following:

“(1) In this section, 'services' means cafeteria or food services, janitorial or cleaning services or security services that are provided to:

(a) the owner or manager of a building owned by the Government of Saskatchewan or a municipal government; or

(b) a hospital, university or other public institution”.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 21 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say:

Strike out section 37.2 of the Act, as being enacted by renumbered section 20 of the printed Bill, and substitute the following:

“Application of section 37 to certain businesses  
37.2 Unless the board orders otherwise, if collective bargaining relating to a business is governed by the laws of Canada, and the business or part of the business becomes subject to the laws of Saskatchewan, section 37 applies, with any necessary modification, of the person owning or acquiring the business or part of it is bound by any collective agreement in force when the business becomes subject to the laws of Saskatchewan”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 21 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 22

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move section 22 to 24 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say:

Renumber sections 22 to 24 of the printed Bill as sections 21 to 23.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 22 to 24 inclusive as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 25

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Again there are three parts to this, the first of which is as follows. I move that section 25 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Renumber section 25 of the printed Bill as section 24.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 25 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Amending subsection 46(3) of the Act, as being enacted by renumbered section 24 of the printed Bill, by striking out clause (b) and substituting the following:

“(b) provide to striking or lock-out employees who are not reinstated notice of lay-off or pay in lieu of notice:

(i) in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement;

(ii) in accordance with a back-to-work protocol agreed to by the employer and the trade union, notwithstanding The Labour Standards Act; or

(iii) where there is no collective bargaining agreement in force, in accordance with The Labour Standards Act”.

Amendment agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move that section 25 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say:

Amend section 47 of the Act, as being enacted by the renumbered section 24 of the printed Bill:

(a) by renumbering subsections (1), (2) and (3) as subsections (2), (3) and (4);

(b) by adding the following subsection before renumbered subsection (2):

“(1) In this section, ‘benefit plan’ means a medical, dental, disability or life insurance

plan or other similar plan”;

(c) in renumbered subsection (2):

(i) by striking out “normally payable to those employees” in the portion that precedes clause (a); and

(ii) by striking out “entitlements to benefits” in clauses (a) and substituting “membership in a benefit plan”;

(d) by striking out “subsection (1)” in renumbered subsection (3) wherever it appears and in each case substituting “subsection (2)”;

(e) in renumbered subsection (4):

(i) by striking out “benefits” and substituting “membership in benefit plans”; and

(ii) by striking out “subsection (1)” and substituting “subsection (2)”;

(f) by adding the following subsection after renumbered subsection (4):

“(5) On the request of the trade union, the employer shall provide the trade union with any information required to enable the trade union to make the payments mentioned in subsection (1)”.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 25 as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 26

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move section 26 of the printed Bill be amended in the following fashion, that is to say by:

Renumber section 26 of the printed Bill as section 25.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 26 as amended agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — If there are no other comments which members opposite want to make, I will therefore move that this Bill be reported with amendments.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well obviously there are a few words that have to be said as we waived our opportunity in first clause today in order to allow the amendments to be gone through so that the general public can hear them and understand something of what is happening.

A couple of observations would have to be made. First of all, when two Bills as serious as these two are to our province require some amendments, that’s not surprising. But when they require as many

amendments as these two have seen, then you've got to seriously wonder about what kind of chaos this government and this province is heading into.

We have said from the beginning — and we will say again — that this Trade Union Act is and will be the Achilles' heel of this government. Because unlike The Labour Standards Act where there is some benefit to workers in protecting them, The Trade Union Act is nothing more nor less than a philosophical shift in direction for this government and for this province orchestrated by a government desperate to move back to its left wing in philosophy. This is a philosophical power shift.

This has nothing to do with good government. It has nothing to do with building or creating the province, either in terms of jobs or tax base or fairness. This is straight, cold-hearted politics. This is left-wing philosophy at its absolute worst. This is a radical power shift. It is a radical power shift of democracy to the trade unions, a power shift of the ability of the people to determine the destiny of the province, shifted to an organization that cannot be challenged at the polls as the government can be.

Once you shift power through government legislation to the trade union bosses, who do they answer to? They may answer to a few people who elect them originally as the leaders of the unions, but once they have achieved that power base, the general public of the province, the taxpayers of this province, have absolutely no say as to whether those people will be in charge or not.

And this is the philosophical power shift, the shifting of the rights of the people of the province as a whole to have a say about what the trade union people do in our province. In other words, we have stricken out the ability for democracy to work. We have taken away the ability of the people to determine who will do to them whatever is done to them.

We have in fact orchestrated a left-wing dictatorship, the very substance of direction that Russia went to 70 years ago, the very substance of the way that they brought about the control of the people in the Soviet Union was through this kind of power shift away from the democratic base. And that is what the people of Saskatchewan will have to learn to live with for the next two years. That power shift of left-wing radicalism will certainly bring this government down because now they are coldly identified for what they truly are — the left-wing government of extreme socialists that they are.

Nothing like the kind of moderate compromise that we saw . . .

**The Chair:** — Order, order. I would ask that all members allow the member for Maple Creek to make his statements. He's legitimately debating the motion before us. And I ask members to come to order to allow him to make his statements.

**Mr. Goohsen:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will

repeat. There is nothing here like the kind of compromise that we saw demonstrated by some of the back-benchers of this very government. The member from Indian Head-Wolseley very courageously stood up in this Assembly and helped us to orchestrate a change to the wildlife habitat Bill where the aims of the government were directly turned around to the aims of the people of this province — a courageous man who stood up against the things that were wrong.

And yet today we see a Bill that so dramatically and drastically changes the power shift in this province that every one of those back-benchers ought to have the courage to stand up and bolt this government and leave it once and for all behind them. There is absolutely no excuse for those of you in the back benches to allow this shift in democracy, especially when you take note of the fact that, when we pointed out that the democratic process to the right to vote in certification had been taken away, you stood up in your caucus and you fought for it and you got it back, and the amendment is here today to prove it. You did have that courage when you understood what was going on.

Once again I say to you that your front bench has snowed you. You have allowed them to do a power shift away from democracy, the very thing that you people believe in. You've been snowed by the trade union bosses and you've been snowed by your front benches. And this province will suffer serious repercussions as a result of this kind of legislation.

No one will come to this province with any kind of a business investment without checking what the labour laws are. It absolutely will not happen. They will check these laws before they bring their money and themselves and their businesses here. And they will pass it by, as quickly as a jet can fly to Alberta. Absolutely without question.

Having said that in frustration and despair for my province, I will have to say again that this Bill has been a tremendous lot of work and there are some people that I want to thank for the work that they have helped me to do to try to bring some sanity to this government, from the people of this province. As the spokesman who was able to be here, I am proud to have done my role, but it was only as a result of the material that those people provided me with.

I want to thank the research people who work in our offices and throughout the province. In this situation this runs even further abroad and goes to each of the constituencies where members of our party work diligently to gather the information necessary. The business community obviously contributed and we thank them.

And we thank the umbrella groups, the business leaders, and we also particularly thank the individuals who had the courage to stand up on their own and put into jeopardy their very own business existences in this province to voice their concerns publicly. That took a lot of courage, because some of them may now have to move as a result of pressure that this



government will put on them.

I again will thank the workers of this province who have come through with an understanding, an understanding of how this kind of legislation will destroy the very job base that they require in order to live in this province. They have understood that and they have begged for some compromise so that the job base and the tax base of this province can remain. Because they do believe that this is a beautiful and productive and wonderful province to live in if you allow that to happen without such onerous legislation.

You cannot expect people to stay here just for the beauty of the province or for the opportunities that you shut down. The vastest natural resource base in all of this country, and you are destroying the ability of the people themselves to develop it and to enjoy it, and they will have to, reluctantly, leave it behind. Not you, not I, but our children and our grandchildren will have to find opportunities somewhere else as we take this province into this dark, dismal trail of left-wing politics, pure, crass politics. No building, no creation, just philosophy, a need to satisfy your supporters at the polls and absolutely nothing else.

But I do thank the officials who helped us, and I say to you that in spite of the very, very detrimental effects that this legislation will have. Obviously you and your workers have done a lot of work and I congratulate them for the work that they did.

There is some sanity in some of the amendments, but for the most part it leaves way, way too much undone and unsaid. And we will certainly have to fix this legislation, if not before the next election, immediately after. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Bill 54 is going to receive Royal Assent this afternoon. And it is unfortunate, I believe, that the government chose to alter the course of the people's future in our province by changing the legislation without taking the responsibility to measure the possible consequences of those changes beforehand.

The amendments that have just gone through this afternoon will potentially alter Saskatchewan's place in the economy. And I don't think simply Saskatchewan's place in the economy of our province ... or our country, but also the North American continent and potentially the globe. Making changes to the direction of the economy is not like turning the steering wheel of a car, where the slight movement of the wheel is going to produce a dramatic change in the direction instantly.

I actually believe, Mr. Chairman, that a more appropriate analogy is that changing the direction of an economy, which this particular government policy does, is like changing the direction of the Queen Mary. In other words, steering the Queen Mary, a movement in labour legislation, a change in taxation

policy, like a movement in the rudder of a giant ship, can take a long time before the change actually changes course — the ship actually changes course.

But once that course has been changed, it takes an equally long time and an equally significant change in direction to bring things back on course. And that's really what we've been most concerned about, that there are changes here today that it won't have an immediate impact but it will have a long-term impact and then we won't be able to change that course readily.

As of today, the New Democratic government has indeed plotted a different course for us in our province, different from where we were heading, different from where the rest of the competitive economies are heading. And as other economies head toward less restrictive environments for business, committed to creating jobs and staying competitive, Saskatchewan's captain of Labour has caused us, I think, to steam off in a very different direction. I hope they're good, they look very good actually.

And perhaps he is right. I give him that. Perhaps our captain of Labour is right. Maybe this is cutting-edge legislation. But this is not the time in our economy when we can afford to be wrong and that's really the point that I was trying to make in our debates in this legislature, Mr. Chairman.

I contend that the amending of The Trade Union Act has been a mistake and that it could well contribute to the Saskatchewan economy running aground under the stewardship of this government or one that follows it.

And I regret that the government of the day has disrupted our economic recovery with what has been seen outside of the province as a negative signal. It has sent shock waves resonating throughout the Canadian economic community, and it has diverted attention of the job creators in our province during a time when their focus should be squarely on doing business and creating work for people.

I can only hope that the government will give pause and will give sober thought, sober second thought — I don't know why I'm using sober as a word on a day like today — to this legislation before the regulations are passed.

I find it most intriguing with some of the people with whom I've met, the IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) and other unions are now recognizing a reality that it appears that the government has not recognized.

And I do hope for the sake of the province and all of us that what has transpired here today will work in the best interests of Saskatchewan and not against it.

(1615)

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I join with the member from Saskatoon Greystone in expressing the wish that what

we've done this afternoon will work in the best interests of the province of Saskatchewan.

That, I think, is an appropriate note on which to move that I move that this Bill be reported with amendments.

The division bells rang from 4:16 p.m. until 4:21 p.m.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 26

Van Mulligen	Murray
Simard	Hamilton
Tchorzewski	Trew
Lingenfelter	Sonntag
Shillington	Flavel
Johnson	Cline
Kowalsky	Scott
Carson	Crofford
Penner	Stanger
Cunningham	Kluz
Lorje	Keeping
Lautermilch	Jess
Renaud	Langford

#### Nays — 10

Swenson	D'Autremont
Devine	Goohsen
Neudorf	Haverstock
Boyd	McPherson
Toth	Bergman

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Labour Standards Act

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — With leave, I move the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Leave granted.

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

#### Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move the Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Leave granted.

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

### MOTIONS

#### House Adjournment

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Churchill Downs, by leave of the Assembly:

That when this Assembly adjourns at the end of this sitting day, it shall stand adjourned until the date and time set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government, and that Mr. Speaker shall give each member seven clear days notice, if possible, of such date and time.

I so move.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

### ROYAL ASSENT

At 4:31 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

- Bill No. 28 — An Act respecting Public Health
- Bill No. 29 — An Act respecting the Health Services Utilization and Research Commission
- Bill No. 45 — An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act
- Bill No. 52 — An Act to amend The Education Act
- Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Natural Resources Act and to enact a Consequential Amendment to The Forest Act
- Bill No. 3 — An Act to Create, Encourage and Facilitate Business Opportunities in Saskatchewan through the Establishment of the Saskatchewan Opportunities Corporation
- Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend The Parks Act
- Bill No. 8 — An Act respecting Fisheries
- Bill No. 71 — An Act to amend The Provincial Auditor Act
- Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend The Research Council Act
- Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act, 1993
- Bill No. 64 — An Act to amend The Credit Union Act, 1985
- Bill No. 66 — An Act respecting the Superannuation of Teachers and Disability Benefits for Teachers
- Bill No. 47 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Act, 1980
- Bill No. 61 — An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act
- Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Assessment Management Agency Act

- Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984
- Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act
- Bill No. 70 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act(No. 6)
- Bill No. 33 — An Act to amend The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Act
- Bill No. 72 — An Act to Establish the Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation and to enact certain Consequential Amendments arising from the enactment of this Act
- Bill No. 32 — An Act to amend The Labour Standards Act
- Bill No. 54 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act

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

- Bill No. 73 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending respectively on March 31, 1994 and on March 31, 1995.

**His Honour:** — In Her Majesty's name, I thank the Legislative Assembly, accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill.

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 4:35 p.m.

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the Assembly, I just want to take this opportunity to thank the many people in the building who helped make this legislative process work, starting with you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the staff surrounding your office, the Clerk and staff at the Table who on a daily basis work with us; obviously the staff of the official opposition and the third party, who work diligently preparing for question period and debate every day. I notice Lorraine and her staff are in the gallery today. I want to thank them for all the work they do in bringing groups through this Assembly. That's a very important part of what happens, is learning by students who come here. And all the other people who work here with us, the Sergeant-at-Arms and his staff who do an excellent job of working with us as well.

I want to say as well to all members of the Assembly, I think we had a very successful session, and I wish each and every one of you a pleasant summer and urge you all to take some time with family and friends in your constituency and have a good holiday. And we would very much like, as minister of tourism, for you to spend it in Saskatchewan. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Swenson:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm going to beg the House's indulgence for a moment. This is sort of out of the ordinary, but I want to thank

the Legislative Assembly staff, the Speaker's office, and people from the Assembly who do so much. This will be my last session as the Leader of the Official Opposition, and over the last two sessions it has been very enjoyable working with everyone connected with this building, with the governing party, with the third party in the Assembly. And it has truly been a privilege.

And the process will unfold and my party will select a leader sometime this fall. There will be a new leader of the opposition, I presume, come the next session. But I did want to take the opportunity to say thank you to everyone, because that role is one that is necessary to the House, and people have been very cooperative in helping me fulfil it and I didn't want to miss the opportunity.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to take a few moments as well to say a word of thanks to all people behind the scenes whose hard work and dedication make our jobs easier.

On behalf of my caucus, my staff, and myself, I want to express our sincere appreciation to the hundred or so people who work behind the scenes. I mean they really do work so very hard during this past session and previous ones to ensure that things run smoothly and efficiently.

And I'm personally grateful for the non-partisan, but valuable advice that these people have shared with me and our caucus on matters of procedure and protocol. Without the benefit of their knowledge and their experience, I know that my job would have been far more difficult than I have found it.

The Clerk and her staff, in particular, provide valuable advice and insight and assistance into many procedural matters, all of which is, I think, delivered with their traditional trademark of professionalism and cheerfulness. And we are truly grateful, very fortunate in fact, to have such high-calibre individuals with us.

The pages, Melissa and Lilia, Scott, Lesley, Daryl, and Troy have been especially helpful, and I want to thank them for all the tasks that they do for us, and for me in particular. They keep in shape by running down to room 140.

In the Legislative Assembly Office, directors Linda Kaminski and Marilyn Borowski, and their staff in administration and financial services are all very committed, very capable people who exemplify the very best in our public service. And many thanks to them for their continued hard work.

Our Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk, Bob Cosman — I don't know if he's in today — and his secretary, Allison, have been of great assistance to us as well in our attempts to keep up with 72 Bills that have been before the Assembly in this session. We're grateful for

their assistance in proposing amendments to legislation as well as giving advice and guidance.

I want to make special mention of broadcast services. The staff in particular, director, Gary Ward, and technicians, Kerry and Ihor, provide the window on this Assembly for the many Saskatchewan people who watch us do our work. And they spend as many hours as we do, except that they observe the proceedings from a space that's no larger than just a slightly more large closet than normal, and I thank those gentlemen very much. The Legislative Library staff have been a great assistance to my office again this session. Their expertise in locating news clippings, and books, and other research documents is really remarkable.

A special word is owed to the staff and *Hansard* for their work in transcribing the procedures of this Assembly. Why we would want it for posterity one often wonders, but they definitely do their work in an exemplary fashion.

And finally a comment about our Sergeant-at-Arms for his due diligence always. The security staff and visitor services, they're the ones who make the wonderful first impressions of the thousands of visitors, many of whom are school children who visit our Assembly every year, and it is their friendly manner and helpful nature that adds a great deal more in making our stay here, our long, arduous days much more pleasant.

Now this building, as you know, is a world unto itself, but it does not go unnoticed that because of the demanding and also unpredictable hours that we work, that all of the people within these walls often give up spending time, precious time, with their families. And I hope that as these days that are going to be following come before us, that some of them will be mosquito free and will be warm, and that we will be able to know that the people who work and go unnoticed here will be able to spend more precious moments with their family.

Outside of this building there are thousands of public servants who work behind the scenes in departments, in agencies, and Crowns throughout the government to support the work that we do in this Chamber, and I want to applaud their commitment to the province of Saskatchewan, through the work that they do, and to say how fortunate we are to have within our ranks of our public service, so many dedicated and talented people.

I'd be remiss if I did not indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we very much appreciate the excellent work that you have done in this Chamber; and in particular to single out the Speaker who has, I believe, been most fair and has worked very, very hard.

I do hope that he is going to enjoy his granddaughter's birthday next week as much as I'm going to enjoy my granddaughter's. He beat me the last time in having a grandchild born, and now he's all pumped up, being very proud that he's going to beat me to the second one. There's going to be even more time in between — I think two months lapse for the second one.

I do want to wish the Leader of the Official Opposition well. I think that he has been a wonderful addition to this Chamber. And on behalf of the third party, I do want to thank our own staff in particular and acknowledge the hard work of people who work on the staffs of the official opposition caucus as well as the government caucus.

So I give my personal best wishes to each and every one of you. I hope you have a very restful, relaxing summer. I think we've all earned it, and party down. Thank you.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I wonder if the members would permit me to just make a few brief remarks — brief. I would be remiss if, on behalf of Mr. Speaker and the Deputy Chair, I did not convey our thanks to the Clerks at the Table. I know that to the members and to those who view the proceedings that the proceedings always move smoothly and flawlessly. That is because we have the expert and tremendous assistance of the Clerks at the Table.

I also want to thank the Journals branch, the people who provide us with the blues and the *Votes and Proceedings* and who ensure that there is an accurate record of what it is that we do here; to *Hansard*, and broadcasting and the printers who convey our words to a much wider audience than in this Chamber; to the Law Clerk for helping us to separate our clauses from sections; to the Sergeant-at-Arms and the security staff, not only for the service to the members, but the very valuable service that they provide to the public who come to this building; to the guide service who provide an excellent service in helping our constituents to see us at work; and finally to the pages who in a world of high-tech communication provide a wonderful, friendly, efficient, and effective low-tech communication service for the members. We thank them all.

Finally I want to, on behalf of Mr. Speaker and the Deputy Chair, thank the members for their cooperation and tremendous assistance. Without that, it would be very difficult to have a smooth, functioning Legislative Assembly. But because you have assisted and cooperated, we've worked tremendously well, and we thank you for that.

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

(1645)

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would not want to fail the tradition of the House of the Opposition House Leader having the opportunity to give his assessment of what the session was all about. However, before I get into that, the barbecues are all going, I know, and 23 minutes isn't that long, so please bear with me.

**An Hon. Member:** — He's in the pool.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I am in the pool, yes I am, and I was looking at the time to make sure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the PC (Progressive Conservative) caucus and as the caucus chairman and House Leader, I want to also add my voice to the thanks of the people that have stood in their place. And I've learned one thing in public life — as soon as you get up to start thanking people, you're on dangerous ground. So I got my staff to make me a list of everybody. And I don't think I just want to say thanks to everybody; I want to make everyone cognizant of who these individuals are. Most of them have already been mentioned by other members.

But I would like to thank the employees of the legislature who have made our jobs in this Assembly so much easier. And this includes the Speaker — in his absence, the Deputy Speaker. And having had the position of the deputy chairman of committees, I would also like to thank all of this arbitrators of this Legislative Assembly for a job well done.

I want to also thank the security staff, the library staff for very helpfully keeping all members informed. And Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can assure you that they provide free clippings to MLAs.

In addition to that, the Dome Cafeteria staff, who keep our engines fueled for some of the fiery debate that we have in here; the hard-working pages, Sergeant-at-Arms, the Clerk's office, the broadcast services; the very hard-working *Hansard* staff, whom we always keep hopping trying to interpret our various speaking styles; the tour guides, the janitorial staff, who keep up the polished image of our Assembly; the maintenance staff; Bob Cosman and the Law Counsel staff; the clever and efficient research staff, particularly those working in the PC caucus office — who added that line in here? It must be the caucus staff. And certainly, I think we would all agree that they're very important in the operation here.

And simply, Mr. Deputy Speaker, everyone who is involved in keeping this legislature running smoothly.

Now what I want to do is just give a little bit of a brief overview of how this session started and I will go on from there. I have already decided that I would not go through the 17 pages that I have here but I want to give a synopsis of a couple of minutes, if that's all right.

My feeling is, Mr. Speaker, that at the beginning of the session there was a particular media guru and I will maintain his anonymity. I won't recognize the individual who said that this would be a stormy session. It had to be a stormy session, Mr. Deputy Speaker; it simply didn't work any other way with guys like Link and Neudorf around. These old-style politicians would not let it be any other way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think quite frankly that we have proven him wrong. I think that on behalf of all of the members of this legislature, we have had a reasonably productive session, albeit that we don't agree with

what has happened here necessarily. But I do think that the opposition — if I can just blow our own horn here a little bit — it is the opposition that sets the tone of the Legislature; and I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is reminiscent of what happened in previous times when we had some very raucous sessions.

I think it also proves one thing. I think that it proves that all legislators, in the province of Saskatchewan in particular, are beginning to listen to the people of the province. And the people of this province are no longer content to have old-style politics running rampant in this area. And I do think that we have given the people of this province some hope simply by the conduct of members present and the relatively docile proceedings as they have been.

Now that does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we have had not had eloquent debate, that does not mean that we had not had hard debate, but it was debate that was not filled with the rancour and the ill feelings that have been here in the past. And I think, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the bad things that are being said about politicians, that we have given the public of Saskatchewan a glimmer of hope.

I think with that, I think all of us can leave from here, depart from here, with a sense of accomplishment and a sense that we have contributed to the democratic process within this province, Mr. Speaker. And quite frankly, I'm proud to have been part of that process.

And so just before I take my seat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to wish all of the members in this Legislative Assembly here an enjoyable summer. Get home to your families, enjoy yourselves, take a break, don't do anything until next Tuesday, and have a good summer. We'll see you in the fall or in spring, depending on what the Premier decides. Thank you.

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

The Assembly adjourned at 4:53 p.m.