

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I present petitions on behalf of people in the North. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the rebuilding of Highway No. 155, thereby ensuring adequate access for residents of the communities linked by this road, including Dillon, Patuanak, Turnor Lake, and Pinehouse, and an access road to Garson Lake.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, the signatures on these petitions are from Ile-a-la-Crosse, Sandy Point, Green Lake, and Jans Bay. I so present.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on behalf of citizens of the communities of Melville and Yorkton, who pray the Assembly:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to establish a special task force to aid the government in its fight against the escalating problem of youth crime in Saskatchewan, in light of the most recent wave of property crime charges, including car thefts, as well as crimes of violence, including the charge of attempted murder of a police officer; such task force to be comprised of representatives of the RCMP, municipal police forces, community leaders, representatives of the Justice department, youth outreach organizations, and other organizations committed to the fight against youth crime.

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

Mr. Bjoernerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to present petitions to do with the creation of regional telephone exchanges. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to support the creation of regional telephone exchanges in order to enhance economic and social development in rural Saskatchewan.

The communities involved in the petition, Mr. Speaker, are Choceland, Nipawin, Snowden, Garrick, and Smeaton.

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I present a petition today that reads:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Hon.

Assembly may be pleased to call upon the Government of Saskatchewan to protect the Dore, Smoothstone lakes area by declaring it an accessible, protected wildness area, where sustainable, traditional cultural values and activities are maintained.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And the people that have signed the petition, Mr. Speaker, are primarily from Saskatoon. Some are from Melfort, from Swift Current, Warman, and Prince Albert. And I so present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have a petition to present on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take some responsibility for the ill effects of its gambling expansion policy, and immediately commission an independent study to review the social impact that its gambling policy has had on our province and the people who live here.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by citizens from the city of Melville, as well as from Esterhazy.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order the following petition has been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 12(7) is hereby read and received.

Of citizens petitioning the Assembly to establish a task force to aid the fight against youth crime; and

Of citizens petitioning the Assembly to support the creation of regional telephone exchanges

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next move first reading of a Bill, the maintenance of equality of senior staff employee raises (MESSER) Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and the indulgence of the members of the House, if I may be permitted a few extra seconds in the introductions. I want to begin by — I actually studied this all last night in order to get this quotation — a quotation from Aristotle.

An Hon. Member: — In Greek?

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — No, in English.

Aristotle once said:

We become just by performing just actions, temperate by performing temperate actions, and brave by performing brave actions.

I think it's a great quotation. And today we're honoured to be joined in this Assembly, in the west gallery and behind me in the east gallery, by some 160 young Saskatchewan people who by virtue of their actions, are becoming just, temperate, and brave members of our society.

I'm referring to the 160 school safety patrollers, grade 7 and grade 8 students from right around the province representing 24 communities of our province who are in Regina today for the provincial School Safety Jamboree.

Also joining them are 20 chaperons. Time of course does not permit introduction of each by name. But as School Safety Week comes to a close, I do want to express on behalf of this Assembly, I'm sure, and all the people of Saskatchewan, our appreciation for the efforts of these school safety patrollers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it takes a very special kind of person, especially a very special young person, to fulfil the important duties of safety patrol — a person who cares deeply about others, who takes seriously his or her responsibilities, who is both diligent and enthusiastic in carrying out those duties.

Or to paraphrase Aristotle: one who displays a sense of justice, a temperance of character, and a penchant for bravery. Day after day, rain or shine, these young people and others perform a tremendously valuable service — safely ushering young other children through the crosswalks and bringing peace of mind to parents, teachers, and others in the community, in their duties.

They really are heroes — examples of responsible citizenship at such a young age and role models for those who will follow in their footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the province and the Assembly, I want to commend them on their commitment to their communities, and to ask all members of this Assembly to join me in welcoming them here today with us.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join with the Premier in welcoming our guests today to the Assembly, and it's certainly a pleasure to see them out on the roads as you go past the schools. They are performing a valuable service to all of us, especially to parents and to the children who attend those schools. And I would certainly like to congratulate them and to encourage them to carry on with a worthwhile duty.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the official opposition, I too would like to add to the words of the Premier. We have a fine group of young people all across Saskatchewan who have done just a terrific job in the protection of others and ensuring safety for not only their own peers but

also, as the Premier's indicated, for peace of mind of parents and teachers.

And I want to commend them and wish them a very, very pleasant day.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mothers' Day Tribute

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you well know, Sunday is Mothers' Day, and while we have the press of our daily business to preoccupy us, it's right and proper to take a moment to honour our mothers and our grandmothers.

I think as well, that any observance has the importance that we give it. The fact that at times Mothers' Day seems to have been created as a subsidy for Hallmark Cards should not deter us. To some extent I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I'm in conflict of interest by making this statement because I am a mother and a grandmother.

Although I take pride and satisfaction in having done my bit to keep our particular species — and our peculiar species, I might add — rolling along, my pride goes far beyond the biological. I've got good kids, as do the other mothers and fathers in the legislature. And I'm happy to have them around. And I'm fortunate to still have my mother this Mother's Day. But we have a family double header because it's also my parents' 60th wedding anniversary this weekend.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Now I ask you not to blame her when I note that much of what I am today can be traced directly back to her. Her genes first, then her guidance, direction, discipline, inspiration, and many who know her would add, determination. She taught me persistence, gave me the lesson of compassion and responsibility, and showed me the necessity of learning. And she introduced me to Tommy Douglas.

I don't want to sound immodest, Mr. Speaker, but I think she did a pretty good job, as did all our mothers, and I'm glad to have our gratitude placed in *Hansard*, because nothing but the truth is spoken and recorded here. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

30th Anniversary of Melville Motors

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I'd just like to acknowledge Melville Motors in Melville, Saskatchewan, Canada, for their 30 years of devoted service to the citizens of Melville and area. They've become an essential part and have been an essential part of that community, Mr. Speaker.

Small businesses such as Melville Motors are a vital part of their communities. They are the major source of job creation

and offer quality sales and service to their communities. They also sponsor many local functions and contribute endlessly to various organizations. It's important that their devotion does not go unnoticed.

President Greg Kohnen read off a list of customers who have dealt with this business since 1967. This is a testament to the mutual loyalty that's developed between citizens and leaders of their communities.

I deem it a special privilege to acknowledge Melville Motors. And what I would like to say, as father and president, Greg Kohnen, turns the reins of the operation over to son, Greg, I wish them and every other small business who contributes to their small communities, success in all the years to come. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Emergency Preparedness Week

Mr. Whitmore: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The natural disaster unfolding in Manitoba is a reminder to all of us that no one is immune to natural, uncontrollable forces. Although many of us in this province have never experienced flooding of this magnitude, many people experience other disasters just as devastating.

In Saskatchewan tornadoes are one form of emergency situation that we experience. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Regina has the unpleasant distinction of being situated in the heart of the Prairies — tornado alley.

The possibility of a tornado or any other type of disaster happening in our community is very real. That is why everyone should be prepared to cope with these types of emergency situations when they occur.

Mr. Speaker, this week has been dedicated as Emergency Preparedness Week here in Saskatchewan. Its goal is to help and educate and encourage all citizens to prepare for emergency situations. Governments must do their part in ensuring communities of preparing to cope with these unfortunate situations.

Knowing how to react before, during, and after an emergency will help save lives.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot control nature, but we can be prepared to deal with most inauspicious predictions that may occur at any time.

As you and the legislative Clerk prepare for your journey today, I wish you the very best. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Tribute to Mothers and Families

Mr. Hillson: — Mr. Speaker, I was pleased earlier this morning when our Premier quoted Aristotle, and it seems to me that

Aristotle is also the one who said that nations are families writ large.

So conversely, of course, our families are the nation writ small. They're the cornerstone of our society, the cornerstone of our nation. And I am pleased also to join with other members of this House to recognizing our families and particularly our mothers on this occasion.

Our own mothers and the wives who share our lives and who have been mothers for our children, they are the cornerstone of our lives, they are the cornerstone of Canada. And I'm pleased to rise and join with other members in honouring this day.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Prince Albert to Host Major Sporting Events

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, Prince Albert has a remarkable history of success hosting major sporting events. And the 1992 Saskatchewan Summer Games and the 1993 North American Indigenous Games and the 1995 Senior Canadian Fastball Tournament were some of the more recent ones.

In 1999 Prince Albert will host the Western Canada Summer Games, an event that promises to be one of the best. And in addition to this event, Mr. Speaker, Prince Albert has recently been chosen as the site for the 1999 Midget AAA Air Canada Cup Tournament. The tournament will feature six teams from across the province, including the host Prince Albert Mintos, competing for the national championship.

Playing host to this tournament will require a great deal of community support. Hundreds of volunteers will be required during the planning and preparation stages as well as during the event itself. If the community support and volunteerism evident in the past events in Prince Albert is any indication, this event will undoubtedly be one of the best tournaments ever held.

I want to congratulate the promotional team headed by Jim Bristowe and Peter Gach for spearheading events and efforts to host the tournament. And I want to acknowledge the many volunteers who will make this tournament a success.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ranch Ehrlo Society

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity today to commend those involved with operational management at Ranch Ehrlo — a place just outside of Regina that assists troubled youth. I commend also all the youth at Ranch Ehrlo who participate in the many events throughout the year at the ranch that inevitably assist them in their own healing and recovery.

One such beneficial event revolves around the following of native traditions. The ranch holds a sweat lodge every month. With the help of an elder, the youth prepare the ceremony and build a fire. This direct participation gives the youth a better understanding of the native sweat lodge ceremony.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the staff and youth at Ranch Ehrlo come out in full force to volunteer in their community. They have lent their skills and enthusiasm to Habitat for Humanity, the Rainbow Youth Center, and many other appreciative organizations. I am sure that all members in this Assembly can appreciate the excellent work and the commitment of the staff and the determination of the youth at Ranch Ehrlo.

Again, my highest regard to the staff and their youth. Their program is one to be emulated. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Labour Force Increasing

Mr. Thomson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it's Friday and it's another member's statement, it's got to be good news day. And yes, Mr. Speaker, today the good news I want to share with members concerns jobs, jobs, jobs.

Well actually this should come as no surprise to the members opposite because if you've been following the federal election, you'll know that New Democrats are the only ones talking about jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the particular good news I want to share today concerns Saskatchewan's provincial economy and job market. And I'm very pleased to report our provincial economy has created 11,000 new jobs last month alone.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thomson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that means that nearly one in every eight jobs created in Canada alone last month — one in every eight — was created right here at home in Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased to report that Regina continues to have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. Mr. Speaker, as has been reported in this Assembly previously, our population is growing, our economy is growing, and jobs are being created. All of this, Mr. Speaker, points to the fact that our partnership plan with private business and labour is restoring hope, optimism, and confidence to our province's economy.

It also points to the fact that our business climate is indeed one of the best in Canada today. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Volunteer Award

Ms. Lorje: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Monday I was honoured to make a member's statement on Yom Ha' Shoah. Now on the last day of Holocaust Remembrance Week, I'm pleased to make a related but happier statement about a constituent of mine.

This week Marie King Forest was named the Sterling Award winner for 1997. This award is given by the Saskatoon Jewish community and Hadassah-WIZO (Women's International

Zionist Organization) at its annual silver spoon fund-raising dinner which I attended. The award recognizes a Saskatoon-area woman whose volunteerism has enhanced and enriched community life.

Marie King Forest is determined and dedicated. Saskatoon Constable Grant Obst calls her a "diminutive powerhouse of courage and caring" because of her efforts to have the rights of victims recognized and because of her unflagging support for those victims.

Marie is a victim of violence herself. She is the widow of an RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) officer killed on duty in 1978. This senseless tragedy was a springboard for her to work to correct a law she sees as unbalanced.

She refused to be silenced by her suffering. As a survivor, she said she was inspired by the belief that every life is a life to be valued. This is a lesson Jews have learned at a great cost. And as she said, she was honoured to receive an award from the Jewish community, a community that epitomizes survival and respect for life. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

SaskTel's Failed United States Venture

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the minister in charge of SaskTel has now shed new light on this government's involvement in the NST fiasco, or gigatel for lack of a better name.

The minister confirmed yesterday during a meeting of Crown Corps Committee that SaskTel originally purchased a 50 per cent share of NST but later increased its share to 87 per cent.

Will the minister explain why the Crown decided to increase its lame duck investment when it recorded a \$2.2 million loss in '95 and a further \$13.8 million loss in '96?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, as was explained yesterday in the Crown Corporations Committee, this was a longer-range investment which was expected not to recover profit in the first instance.

I'd like to remind the members opposite that we've increased . . . we increased our investment in the Husky upgrader. Very wise. Very profitable. Increased our investment in Crown Life. Very wise. Very profitable. We know how to manage the assets of this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well the one we're talking about this morning, Madam Minister, was not very wise.

Mr. Speaker, the minister has stated that business is business in trying to brush off this disastrous business venture, but her attempts at downplaying this sordid affair simply underline the arrogance of this NDP (New Democratic Party) government. Madam Minister, you're no better than your federal leader who stated yesterday that she would sign a deal with the devil. If this is your intention, at least let's make this deal good for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

The taxpayers of Saskatchewan have to be asking, why would you sink good money after bad into a project and increase your share to 87 per cent when your private sector partner was willing to go no higher than 13 per cent.

Madam Minister, if your partners were not prepared to increase their share in this lame duck venture, why were you? Why did you essentially gamble with millions of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, very careful and considered explanations were given in detail in Crown Corporations Committee yesterday. This is grandstanding. The member opposite knows that there's a reasonable, rational answer to every part of his question. It is upsetting, Mr. Speaker, to be asked these questions by the Bre-X party of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjornerud: — Mr. Speaker, I would say that what we are doing is trying to hold this government accountable to the people of Saskatchewan and if that takes grandstanding, then I'll do it.

Mr. Speaker, if the NST scheme had been well thought out, the B.C. (British Columbia) partner would have found the additional money to put up for their share of this project. If they could not afford to increase the original investment, one has to question why SaskTel would partner with this kind of a company in the first place. The impression is that this company was obviously a touch smarter than SaskTel management.

Madam Minister, it is easy to compete in the big business world when you're signing cheques with taxpayers' money. Will you finally admit that you and top SaskTel management do not have the capability of competing in the real business world?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite forgets to mention the \$300 million in profits that have been made by the diversified investments of SaskTel. He forgets to notice, he forgets to notice that . . . He doesn't want to know the answer, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't want to hear the answer.

An Hon. Member: — It's grandstanding.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — It is grandstanding. The proceedings of yesterday's meeting of Crown Corporations are carefully noted verbatim in *Hansard* for all the public of Saskatchewan to see, Mr. Speaker. The member opposite is so disappointed

that there wasn't any press there yesterday, although it's open to the press, that he brings his grandstanding to the House today, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SaskPower Proposed Project in Guyana

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You just heard about the mess that this government made with the gigatel fiasco and now they're putting taxpayers' dollars at risk once again with the deal to buy half the Guyana power corporation. This is a company that has been riddled with debt. The country is millions of dollars in the hole and it has one of the highest debt to GDP (gross domestic product) ratios in the world, Mr. Speaker.

The minister of SaskPower has refused to provide the public and this legislature with the information necessary for them to review this deal before it is finalized, if indeed it already hasn't been. This is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan taxpayers have the right to know if this government is jumping into another bad business deal using their hard-earned money.

Mr. Minister, it appears you're trying to hide something. Why don't you come clean and tell us what it is?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to respond to the member's question. I want to begin by saying that he should be aware of the fact that there are six international companies who also competed to enter negotiations with the Government of Guyana with respect to the purchase of GEC (Guyana Electricity Corporation).

And I also want to say that member opposite might have selective amnesia, because in terms of international dealings and other dealings outside this province, he forgets to recognize the fact that one of our Crown corporations netted \$114 million on a cable deal in Leicester. He forgets to mention the fact that there was a \$5 million profit made on the sale of Channel Lake Petroleum.

Mr. Speaker, he forgets to mention that SaskPower has reduced the provincial debt this year by \$124 million, and he forgets to mention that we put over \$50 million into the Consolidated Fund to deliver health care, highways, and education.

I say to the member opposite he should have a look at what the Dominion bond rating agency is saying with respect to the future of SaskPower and what's required for it to survive. Read the newspaper. Your selective amnesia is doing the assets of the people of this province absolutely no good, and I say to the member opposite you've got to look to the future . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McLane: — Mr. Speaker, France, Denmark, Holland,

Britain, and the United States have recently written off 71 per cent of Guyana's debt, which stood at 2.1 billion before the write-offs. All totalled, these countries have written off almost \$700 million of Guyana's debt. With this government's track record, will the residents of this province end up like these countries, having to write off the debt? Can this government guarantee and can the minister guarantee that this deal won't turn into another giga-Guyana?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I will tell the member opposite what this government will guarantee. We're not going to do what the Chrétien government did with the Bi-Provincial upgrader and write the deal off at 8 cents on the dollar. That's what we're not going to do.

I'm saying to the member opposite that this government has been good stewards of the Crown corporation assets and we're going to continue. There are some business opportunities for these Crown corporations. They have got to move into the future if they're going to survive.

Now those members might want to live in the 1960s and they might want to play the politics of the 1960s. This government is going to do all measure of due diligence to ensure that our assets are . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. All hon. members will recognize that the Chair, for obvious reasons, is having difficulty hearing the answers being provided by the minister, and I'll ask all the members to allow the question and the answer both to be heard. And I'll recognize the minister if he wants to conclude his question.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I very much want to conclude my answer. I want to say to that member . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Now I just asked all hon. members to allow the minister to be able to be heard and I already cannot hear him. I'll ask all the members to come to order.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say there are some differences between this New Democrat government and the Liberal governments, both anywhere in this country and nationally.

We are not about to take, as Chrétien did, a bath on Bi-Provincial or any other on an 8 cent on a dollar deal. That's the record of that operation.

We will do all measure of due diligence. If, Mr. Speaker, there is an investment to be made, we will ensure that that investment is protected in the best way possible when and if a decision is made, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Respite Care

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when the NDP government began closing down rural hospitals under the guise of health care reform, the people of Saskatchewan were promised a major increase in home-based services to help fill the void.

Celine Muller is a constituent of mine who has a six-year-old son who has a seizure disorder. He does not walk or talk, is not toilet trained, cannot feed himself, and requires around-the-clock care.

For four years Mrs. Muller has been going through the process of trying to get respite care which would provide her with occasional and necessary relief from the stress which accompanies caring for someone on a 24-hour basis.

Will the Minister of Health explain why anyone in this province must endure four years of attempting to find respite care, a process there appears to be no end to? What happened to your promise of proper home-based services?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — I regret to advise you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, that the member has not brought this matter to my attention.

If the member, as the representative for the family — which has obviously got a challenge in terms of the problem of caring for their son — if the member would like to bring the matter to my attention, I'd be happy to investigate it, Mr. Speaker, because one of the things we do want to do is to have adequate respite and home care services.

And I want to say to the member, Mr. Speaker, that we have doubled the amount of resources going into home care services in the last number of years. There was more money in the budget for home care, in the budget of March 20. We're doing more than any other province, Mr. Speaker. There can always be improvements. I'd be happy to look into the matter if the member would only bring it to my attention.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this matter has definitely been brought to the attention of the department through the official, Mr. Dwayne Haave, who I presume corresponds with the minister.

Mr. Speaker, Celine Muller is frustrated because some people are provided day-to-day home care on a regular basis in her health district. Yet each time that she has requested home care assistance for her disabled son, which would also provide her occasional stress relief, Mrs. Muller has been told that home care is not a babysitting service.

And her chances of receiving home care services are even dimmer because of a recent announcement by the Central Plains Health District that it will cut home care services by 2,000

hours this year. Is that providing more care, in your estimation?

Mr. Speaker, the minister . . . the minister's officials have indicated through their correspondence that this matter must be dealt with by the district health board. However, the local district health board indicates respite care . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order, order. Order. The hon. member has been very lengthy in her preamble and I ask her to put her question directly right now.

Ms. Julé: — I would ask the minister to clarify what kind of services, what kind of policy guidelines there are in place so that families like the Mullers and their disabled son have more services and do not get a bureaucratic run-around. What commitment are you prepared to offer to this family today and others who are in the same situation?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Mr. Speaker, if the member from Humboldt wishes to cut through what she calls bureaucratic run-around, I have to say it's a very short walk from where the member sits in this Chamber every day to where I sit. And if the member would just come around or ask me to come over there, I'd be happy to discuss the matter with the member, Mr. Speaker.

And instead of playing politics with a problem that should be worked out, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the member sit down with me, bring the matter to my attention, and we'll look into it. Because what we're doing in this province and through the district health boards is doing more for home care and respite care than any other province, notwithstanding the fact that the Liberal Party is cutting \$100 million out of health care last year and this year in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker; notwithstanding that, we're increasing funding for home care, for respite care, and other services to the people of the province.

But if the member would like to meet with me with respect to this matter, I'd be more than happy if the member would simply do that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SaskPower Proposed Project in Guyana

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's nice to know that the Liberal caucus is listening to our questions in Crown Corporations and that the government is praising the economic initiatives of the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for SaskPower. Mr. Minister, we have a few details starting out about your Guyana deal. Unfortunately, we have to go to Guyana to get that information. So much for your open and accountable government.

We now know why the minister didn't want to talk about the GEC bottom line — it's because the company is a perennial money loser, having lost 3 to \$4 million U.S. (United States) over the last two years.

Mr. Minister, why should we have to go to Guyana to get information about Saskatchewan taxpayers' money? Taxpayers deserve to know exactly where the negotiations are at. Will you release the letter of intent that SaskPower has signed with the Guyana electrical company?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, as is common business practice in many business deals, a letter of intent will have a confidentiality clause so negotiators have the ability to sit down and negotiate what they hope to be a mutually agreeable arrangement.

I want to say to members of the opposition, allow the corporation, allow SaskPower Commercial officials, to do their job. They're looking at a business arrangement by which they will make a recommendation that will come to the board of SaskPower Commercial for scrutiny. That hasn't happened yet.

Allow that to take its course. Allow the board to make a decision as to whether or not they agree that it's a reasonable deal. Allow that to happen, and then we'll make a decision as to whether or not we got a deal.

Mr. Speaker, the net worth of that corporation will be based on a number of things. It'll be based on the profit and loss of the corporation over the past. It'll be based on the ability to generate electricity for the people of that province and how much can be sold and what kind of a profit level can be achieved. Mr. Speaker, all of these things are part of the discussions, part of the negotiations.

I will say to the member opposite, I am not about to breach a confidentiality clause of an agreement that's been made by SaskPower Commercial with GEC. I don't do business that way. The member opposite may, but I don't.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — SaskPower officials may be trying their best. Unfortunately, we have to protect the taxpayers' dollars and we have no confidence that SaskPower is doing that with all the secrecy surrounding this deal.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. All hon. members will come to order. It feels like Friday today.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This deal makes no sense. First of all, taxpayers don't want SaskPower risking their money in Guyana.

Secondly, even the most optimistic projections from GEC officials show that this is not a good investment. The chairman of GEC says he expects a return of \$1 million profit in 1997.

So if SaskPower buys half the company, it will be entitled to half the profit — that's about a 2 per cent return on investment. You should be buying GICs (guaranteed investment certificate), not GEC, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, why are you investing so much taxpayers' money in a company that has such a small potential for return?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, this is almost laughable. Here you've got a member of the PC (Progressive Conservative) caucus who is responsible for this government paying \$17 million a week in interest on the public debt built by them. These business geniuses, with the credibility of goodness knows what, come in here describing themselves as the protector of the public purse. Well, Mr. Speaker, what a turn-around — what a turn-around.

They left the people of this province with the biggest per capita debt in this country, — the protectors of the public purse. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this is like putting the fox in charge of the hen house, as been said in this legislature before. The people of this province have had enough of their kind of business dealings. There's a new administration in here who has taken very, very seriously protecting the taxpayers' dollars. And we, Mr. Speaker, will continue to do that in spite of the opposition's attacks on the Crown corporations, and the people who work in those Crown corporations.

On behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, this I would suggest is a very shameful display, and a member with absolutely no credibility either from the riding or from within his political party, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And that sanctimonious message was just brought to you by the government that lost \$16 million on NST. Mr. Minister, your \$31 million initial investment is just the start. You'll probably wind up throwing good money after bad, just like you did with the NST deal.

The infrastructure of this company is falling apart. Guyana is plagued with constant blackouts and power shortages. In March a generator at Kaehne field collapsed, plunging the Berbice area of Guyana into a four-week power outage. This is the mess Jack Messer is getting us into, Mr. Minister.

This company is falling apart. It's going to cost SaskPower millions to fix it up. Mr. Minister, GEC has stated it's a company in crisis. How much more taxpayer money is SaskPower going to have to spend to get the infrastructure of GEC up and running?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying what is falling apart is the opposition in this legislature, and maybe it is time we adjourn, Mr. Speaker. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that opposition knows full well SaskPower just netted \$5 million on the sale of Channel Lake Petroleum in a business arrangement that was entered into in 1993 and consummated this very year.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite also knows that on a cable deal in Leicester, SaskTel netted a profit of \$114 million. But he forgets to talk about those kind of positive business deals that have been consummated by this provincial government and by the Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about a \$16 million loss. We could do 52

of those every year — we could lose 52 of those every year, and it wouldn't impact on the public debt if it wasn't for what they left us prior to 1982.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this government has not made a decision on Guyana. We will make a decision based on sound business principles once the arrangement is put to the board of directors, which hasn't happened. Whether or not we proceed on this will be whether it's a good deal for the taxpayer and the people of Saskatchewan, and we frankly don't need his advice.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Child Prostitution

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, yesterday you announced \$250,000 for youth outreach programs as part of your new strategy to fight child prostitution. The problem here, Mr. Minister, is that there is nothing new about this announcement.

In fact it seems you are just re-announcing money that was already allocated in the budget. I have here the budget edition of your Social Services newsletter announcing this funding back in March. Mr. Minister, why are you announcing this \$250 like it is new money when there is nothing new at all?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, there has been very little mystery in the minds of most members in the House that that money in fact was dedicated in the budget. Yesterday's announcement confirmed that that money will be in the communities, and decisions regarding the utilization of that money will be made in consultation with the communities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you what good things are happening in our communities in this province to deal with issues facing children. Mr. Speaker, I'm not a regular reader of the *Chatelaine* magazine, but this day it was brought to my attention that there is a significant article in the most recent issue of the *Chatelaine's* magazine on kids versus poverty.

And what should we find highlighted in this article but one La Loche, Saskatchewan, where, as a result of a preschool program developed in La Loche through the current Minister of Education and the community working together, great things are happening for the kids in La Loche.

Mr. Speaker, I can talk today about the Saskatoon Communities for Children, with the work that they're doing in Saskatoon, the inter-agency committee here in Regina. Mr. Speaker, communities are pulling together, there's great work happening, and we're very pleased to be a partner.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, we're pleased to hear that there are communities pulling together. But what is your government really doing?

Many critics of the plan announced yesterday said that not enough has been done on the prevention side — I think I brought that to your attention yesterday — to help children and

prevent them from getting involved in the sex trade in the first place. This shows you have no real new ideas with regards to prevention, and also no new money.

Mr. Minister, it seems like you're simply repackaging existing money to make it look like you're doing more than you really are. Mr. Minister, yesterday's announcement does not target one new dollar to fighting child prostitution.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, just a few short years ago in this province, there did not exist, there did not exist a child action plan. Didn't exist. We began the child action plan in this province — this government. It began with funding of in the neighbourhood of \$4 million. Mr. Speaker, the member suggests there is no new money in this budget. Mr. Speaker, the child action plan has now reached funding of approximately \$25 million — \$25 million.

And as a result, Mr. Speaker, as a result, as a result we find in Prince Edward Island, the Charlottetown *Guardian*, a headline which says Saskatchewan . . . "Saskatchewan boosts benefits for children." Right here from the Vancouver *Sun* — at the opposite end of the nation — a headline which reads: "Saskatchewan to sweeten benefits for poor children."

Mr. Speaker, across Canada, across the province, it's being recognized that this government and this province is taking the issue of the needs of our children and families very seriously. It's demonstrating this by . . . It's unfortunate that the only folks it seems, Mr. Speaker, who don't recognize this, sit on the opposite side of this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 66 — The Health Care Directives and Substitute Health Care Decision Makers Act

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 66, The Health Care Directives and Substitute Health Care Decision Makers Act be now introduced and read for the first time.

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

Bill No. 67 — The Agri-Food Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 67, The Agri-Food Amendment Act, 1997 be now introduced and read for the very first time.

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

Bill No. 68 — The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 68, The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act be now introduced and read the first time.

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

Bill No. 69 — The Police Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 69, The Police Amendment Act, 1997, be now introduced and read the first time.

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

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

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, with leave, to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, eight grade 8's from the Gainsborough Elementary School sitting up in your gallery, along with teachers Bev Needham and Pat Wolensky. I would like to ask all members to welcome them to our Assembly today, and I hope they enjoyed the proceedings and I'll be meeting with them later.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table a response to question no. 65 in the spirit of open, accountable, and responsible government.

The Speaker: — The answer to question 65 is tabled.

Hon. members, I am advised that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor is here to provide Royal Assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 10:50 a.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. 20 - The Small Claims Act, 1997/Loi de 1997 sur les petites créances
- Bill No. 27 - The Municipal Tax Sharing (Potash) Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 4 - The Municipal Board Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 19 - The Provincial Emblems and Honours Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 14 - The Water Corporation Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 29 - The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 53 - The Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, 1997

- Bill No. 54 - The Education and Health Tax Amendment Act, 1997 (No. 2)
- Bill No. 301 - The Lutheran Church-Canada, Central District Act
- Bill No. 302 - The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company Act, 1997
- Bill No. 35 - The Victims of Crime Amendment Act, 1997/Loi de 1997 modifiant la Loi sur les victimes d'actes criminels
- Bill No. 31 - The Public Trustee Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 33 - The Miscellaneous Statutes Consequential Amendments Act, 1997/Loi de 1997 apportant des modifications corrélatives à certaines lois
- Bill No. 32 - The Miscellaneous Statutes Repeal (Regulatory Reform) Act, 1997
- Bill No. 21 - The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 30 - The Personal Property Security Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 22 - The Justices of the Peace Amendment Act, 1997/Loi de 1997 modifiant la Loi sur les juges de paix
- Bill No. 7 - The Cancer Foundation Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 5 - The Saskatchewan Pension Plan Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 6 - The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 38 - The Municipal Employees' Pension Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 61 - The Corporation Capital Tax Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 8 - The Tourism Authority Amendment Act, 1997
- Bill No. 52 - The Community Bonds Amendment Act, 1997

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

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 10:55 a.m.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 55 — The Department of Agriculture Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — Mr. Speaker, The Department of Agriculture Amendment Act, 1997 is a very straightforward Bill. What it does is allows the removal of the agri-food innovation fund from Swift Current under ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan) into the Department of Agriculture. It's just a technical arrangement to make sure that that happens.

And I would move second reading of Bill No. 55, The Department of Agriculture Amendment Act, 1997.

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

Bill No. 13 — The Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 13, The

Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan Amendment Act, as you know last year we announced the wind-down of the Ag Credit Corporation.

And what this Bill does is facilitates that wind-down; it gives the government some options as far as at the end, at some point in time during the wind-down, we can do a few things. We can possibly sell the corporation if some group of bankers was interested in buying the portfolio. We could move the administration of that into the department. So it gives us the wherewithal to facilitate the wind-down of Ag Credit out of Swift Current.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 13, The Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan Amendment Act, 1997.

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

(1100)

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 50 — The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1997

The Deputy Chair — I invite the minister to introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Yes, Mr. Deputy Chair. I'm pleased to have with me this morning Darcy McGovern from legislative services, and Mitch Crumley, who is the director of law enforcement operations.

Clause 1

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Mr. Minister, welcome to your officials. It's a pleasure to see those folks again.

I just have some clarifications, Mr. Minister. When I spoke to this Bill initially and raised some concerns with respect to clarifications and some ambiguity with respect to wordings and some of the concerns with respect to specifics that we did not find addressed in the legislation itself but will subsequently be left to regulations. And I appreciate.

And I just would like to mention at this point in time that I will be proposing an amendment which will specifically set out that the regulations will in fact establish minimum requirements for the safety, the communications equipment, and personal security measures.

The Bill then as presented would allow for regulations. But it is somewhat vague on these particular subjects. What our amendment is more specific and clear about, the things is what we would like to see and ensure that's incorporated into the regulations.

One of the reasons for the amendment, and I'll speak to it just briefly, is not just that the Bill is somewhat vague and uses the

word “may” in instances rather than “shall,” but also, Mr. Minister, when you introduced the legislation into the House, your speech did not clearly commit to do those things. The speech contained somewhat of an unclear statement with respect to the increase of safety for security guards. And those are some of the concerns that we will address in our amendment.

However, before we go into . . . And I realize that will come later on. I just have a few questions that I’d like clarifications on. My first questions to you, sir, how many security guards are there in Saskatchewan currently and how many are in fact licensed?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — There are 61 firms licensed to do private investigations and security work. There are 908 security guards and 237 private investigators that are employed by these companies.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Could you just tell me briefly what the current bureaucratic structure is that governs these people, and in fact will it be changed as a result of this proposed legislation?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well I think practically, the present Act is administered by people within the law enforcement operations branch, involving Mr. Crumley, and that we’ll be assessing the effect of this Act, whether or not there needs to be more people.

But at this time we don’t anticipate that we would have to expand in a great measure, partly because the intention of the legislation is to work very closely with the people in the industry and also the employees and some of the unionized unions that are involved with them in a way that will allow for much more self-regulation within the industry with assistance from us.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you. Mr. Minister, once again when I spoke to this Bill earlier, I’d expressed some concern with respect to the very wide-ranging powers given to the registrar. Yet it doesn’t spell out what the qualifications the registrar himself or herself must have.

And I wondered if you do not feel that it’s important to set out qualifications for the registrar, such powers . . . because of such powers as revoking licences at will without formal hearings, conducting very detailed investigations, and so on.

I wonder if the qualifications for the registrar will be laid out or will it be completely up to the discretion of you, Mr. Minister, to appoint whom you may think is appropriate regardless of qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I want to remind you that this is a very serious area because of the broad effect throughout the whole of the province. And so anybody who would be appointed to this job as registrar would apply for the job and go through the normal processes within the department.

And I guess when it has it set up like this, this is an added check that the minister actually ends up having to sign the final

document that hires this person rather than it just being a typical civil service job in the sense that it doesn’t have the minister’s signature on it.

Now one of the things that we have here is, we have it within the same branch of the department that deals with police work and policing. And so we have the expertise of those people who are lawyers and former policemen, and then we also have people who work within the department now who are former investigators. And so we have quite a broad mix of people now. And that’s why we’re able to come forward with this legislation the way we have, because we have people within the department who can consult and work with this.

The other thing I would remind you is that there are methods of appealing the decisions of the registrar. And those portions of the Act are very clear, that people would have the right to challenge the registrar’s decisions and then go through the proper administrative procedures to have a decision overturned if it was inappropriate.

Mr. Osika: — I thank you for that. I guess the concern was that there is nothing spelled out as to what would be the qualifications required for that specific position in any broad or general terms. That was basically the clarification that I was looking for.

We see nothing anywhere that indicates a requirement that it be a former police officer, that it be a current investigator, or that certain qualifications and standards would have to in fact be met for someone that’s going to oversee that operation; would be able to complement at least with some experience and background in that particular responsibility, which would be a very serious responsibility, as the registrar with all these wide-ranging powers. That was the only matters that I wanted to clarify with you, sir.

The minister might further comment to that, but my question would have been, sir — and I apologize — would have been: will there be any guidelines, will there be anything outlined with respect to, for example, the criteria for filling that position?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well it’s not our intention to put it in the Act, but I guess what I would say is that it’s a long tradition within the Department of Justice, in fact within the civil service, that you hire people who have the skills to do the job. And in this particular case, I can’t see that it would be anybody other than somebody with that background doing this particular job. But it’s not our intention to put that in the Act. But I think practically, the person wouldn’t last at this job if they didn’t have the skills that are required.

The present situation involved with this particular legislation, we have sort of three direct people. One is a former police officer, one is a lawyer, and the other is a former investigator. Those are the people that are directly in line dealing with this legislation right now.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And forgive me for sounding cynical, but I guess in broad terms . . . and I

appreciate what you're saying, that under a normal process that in fact when there is an appointment to a responsible position that the person in power does make the proper choices. But on occasion that you may do that, there may be others that might not. I guess that was the concern, that if it's not spelt out or if it's not laid out, it gives a minister the right and the opportunity to appoint whomever.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well there's no intention to treat this position anything other than a professional spot. It's part of the public service; it'll go through the Public Service Commission standards. And basically that's the position that we're taking, because we see this as being an extremely important job and I don't think there would ever be any intention that would create a position for some other purpose.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I wish you would have said, there never will be, instead of, I don't think there will be.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I guess what I would say is as long as we are forming government, there never would be.

Mr. Osika: — As long as you're Justice minister. Thank you.

Mr. Minister, again when we looked at the Bill and spoke to it, we found that there was . . . the Bill itself is somewhat vague throughout its entirety as it's set out. There's a lot of subjective language, the very essence of the Bill.

And the reason it was brought forward once again is contained in the regulations. And that was the concern that we had; that we here in the House are supposed to be passing judgement of the value of this Bill, yet we have to do absolutely . . . we have to do it sort of blind because we don't know what's going to be in the regulations. Anything that has to do with training and safety is tucked away or will be tucked away in the regulations.

(1115)

Though this is the case in most of the legislation that we see presented here in this House, I think it's even more obvious here that some of those issues are important for us to be able to examine. Because while you're busy telling the people that this will make it safer for security guards, such as the poor unfortunate young man in Saskatoon, we don't know that; we don't know that here in looking at this particular Bill because anything that might make it a safer job will be in the regulations. And we have no idea what in fact those regulations are going to say, or in fact if they will be brought into place or if the appropriate ones will be brought into place.

And I'm just going to ask you that, do you not think it's important in cases such as this, to spell out such important detail in the body of the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well I think there's a bit of confusion in your question. One of the things is that, as it relates to some of the specific issues that you've raised, it's already law. Under the, you know, regulations in The Occupational Health and Safety Act there are some very clear rules about working alone

or an isolated place. And basically you end up having to set out — and I can read these for you:

(2) Where a worker is required to work alone or at a isolated place of employment, an employer or contractor, in consultation with the committee, the representative or, where there is no committee or representative, the workers, shall identify the risks arising from the conditions and circumstances of the worker's work or the isolation of the place of employment.

(3) An employer or contractor shall take all reasonably practicable steps to eliminate or reduce the risks identified . . .

(4) The steps to be taken to eliminate or reduce the risk pursuant to subsection (3):

Which I just read:

(a) must include the establishment of an effective communication system that consists of:

(i) radio communication;

(ii) phone or cellular phone communication; or

(iii) any other means that provides effective communication in view of the risks involved;

And then it goes on further to set out other things that may be included:

(i) regular contact by the employer or contractor with the worker working alone or at an isolated place of employment;

(ii) limitations on, or prohibitions of, specified activities;

(iii) establishment of minimum training or experience, or other standards of competency;

(iv) provision of personal protective equipment;

(v) establishment of safe work practices . . .

(vi) provision of emergency supplies for use in travelling under conditions of extreme cold or other inclement weather conditions.

So those are set out in the regulations in the *Saskatchewan Gazette* of October 4, 1996 at page 644.

Now in the Act we are going further, and working carefully with the industry. And as you note, in the regulations, as we work with the industry, we are going to be creating regulations that prescribe the minimum standards, qualifications, and training required to obtain a licence to act as a private investigator or security guard, or a licence to engage in the business of providing investigators, security guards, or an armoured vehicle service. And in that discussion, which has

already started, there are many areas that need to be talked about. And just to give you a bit of an idea of the topics of discussion, because I think it would probably answer a lot of your questions.

First topic, professionalism and public relations. Then the duties and responsibilities of these people: the legal duty, the legal authority and responsibility; alarm systems; physical security patrol; traffic control; how to deal with explosive devices, bomb threats; how to deal with sort of access control with various electronic means and others; how to write reports, take notes, and give evidence; how to deal with fire detection, prevention, and safety; how to deal with patrol procedures; various labour issues involved in this business; how they relate to other public law enforcement authorities; and how they deal with conflict and avoiding conflict; how to deal with the courts and legal systems; also first aid issues; self-defence issues; and a number of the equipment issues which are referred to in the occupational health and safety.

These are all the types of things that are intended to be covered, working together with the industry to set up regulations. So I think the plan is there and we want to work together with the industry.

I think what I would reiterate, and I think I've probably said this before, is that when we pass legislation we want to set out the principles and the clear guidelines of how an industry might work. But when you get into all the details and the things that may change in consultation with a particular industry, that's the kind of thing we put in the regulations. And that's how we've designed this Act.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you. I appreciate that. And I understand that the regulations come after the law. And that's what gives us . . . has given us some concern, that we don't have an opportunity to debate that on behalf of the public, whether those are the adequate, proper regulations or not. And I appreciate that you'll have people from the industry, and that leads me to my next question.

You indicated a committee would be set up to study, to make recommendations on the regulations. Could you please tell us the make-up of that committee?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well I'll be pleased to give you quite a detailed answer to this question. There's ongoing consultation as we've developed the Act and then consultation will continue. And we basically have two groups, one in the North and one in the South, basically around Saskatoon and around Regina.

The northern group includes these companies or groups of people: Flaman Investigations, PADC Security, Robinson Investigations, Spectre Investigations, Spencer Investigation, Central Security, Argus Guard, Metropolitan Security, Pony Express, UFCW Local — that's the union; the Corps of Commissionaires, northern division. Also in the Saskatoon area, we had discussions with the Nicolichuk family as we developed this legislation.

In the southern area we have ALBA Investigations, Barnes

Security, Trojan Security, Group of Five Security, Loss Prevention group, CR Security, Century Security, and IAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology), Vision Security, SaskWest, Argus Guard, Regina Police Service, Brinks, Loomis, the occupational health and safety branch of the provincial government, and the Corps of Commissionaires, south division. There's also a group that we've been in contact with called the Canadian Society for Industrial Security.

Another thing that I would point out is that Mr. Mitch Crumley, who is here, is a member of the national standards council for Canada in this particular area.

So what we have . . . these are the kinds of people that are assisting us as we develop this legislation.

Mr. Osika: — That's certainly a broad range and should bring a lot of expertise and ideas and suggestions and some good stuff out of all this. With that wide-ranging number of people from the various organizations, will this be a lengthy process? Or are there some strict time lines set that this committee will meet its mandate? And I was going to ask you what the mandate of that committee — and it's a seriously large one — what that committee's mandate will be and will there be any strict guidelines placed on when these regulations will be in force under this particular law?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — We haven't set a strict guideline because we know the kind of time that it sometimes takes to get this, but our goal is the fall of 1997 to have all of the regulations complete and the Act wouldn't be proclaimed until the regulations are complete. So we're looking at sometime this fall as our plan.

Mr. Osika: — Mr. Minister, I guess that causes another concern, that since that tragic incident in Saskatoon, it's been over a year that some committee, somebody should have been working towards the details surrounding the safety features and aspect. The process may very well have been started months ago, before even coming up with this legislation.

That's a concern, why it would only be starting now and it's obviously going to take considerably more time to come up with those regulations. Would you be able to make a commitment here that they will be in place within six months?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well I think what I would first do is correct the impression you left with your question. Because many of the concerns that arose around the incident you talk about have been addressed under the occupational health and safety regulations and those are already law and they're there. And so much of that has been answered.

But now we're moving into a bigger, broader area and we are working and fully anticipate that by this fall we would have everything in place and it would be ready to go.

But we know, given the numbers of the people involved and sometimes the discussions that are necessary to get the appropriate balance, that it's hard to set specific deadlines.

So I'm not able to give you a commitment of six months, but if everything goes well it could be five months. If it's longer it'll take that extra time. But I think it will be well worth it to get the right balance in what we're doing.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you. I would assume that you've had considerable discussion with all the interested parties and those organizations that you've mentioned that will be forming part of these committees. Have you had a considerable amount of discussion with these parties up to this point in time?

Mr. Nilson: — I'm not just certain if your question is referring specifically to me or to the department, but I mean practically, I have met with some of the groups that have had specific concerns personally. But most, obviously most of the consultations have taken place with the department officials. And these have been ongoing for, I guess at least a year.

In addition to all of this discussion that's going on with the proposed amendments that we are making, that we're discussing now, these were sent out to all of the licensees under the current Act. So that means that everybody who is presently licensed under the existing legislation received a copy of the proposed amendments.

Mr. Osika: — I guess that's . . . If this kind of consultation has been ongoing, then at this point in time there may very well have been already some ideas for regulations that could have been put in place. And has that in fact happened or are we starting from square one now?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I think practically, we can't put the regulations in until we have the Act, but I think we should say that we're building on experience of many people. I mean, for example, by including the Corps of Commissionaires in this particular legislation. We're pleased to have them included because they have a long tradition of education and training of their people, which we think will be a valuable asset in the whole business.

And so I suppose if we wanted to try to piecemeal the regulations, take little pieces here and there, we could have done that. But that's not how we usually do things. We like to try to set out the whole thing, get the regulations together, and then the Act will be proclaimed when the regulations are ready.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you again. As far as I can tell in this particular Bill, Mr. Minister, the Bill will regulate employers and not front-line workers and I'm just wondering if you would not believe that by administering individual testing and individual licensing that you would be doing more.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well I think that if you read the legislation, it does both. It has the aspect of registering the businesses, but then if a person is going to work in this business, each individual has to be licensed as well.

(1130)

Mr. Osika: — In subsection 8(2), it appears to clearly state that those people employed by others as security guards do not have

to make application to the registrar. And I wonder if you had not considered perhaps to just impose individual licences on individuals, develop a government-administered testing procedure and make sure that these people are qualified.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I think, if you just go, turn the page, page 9, read the next sentence, it answers your question. It says:

Every person who is engaged in the business of providing private investigators or security guards shall apply to the registrar in the prescribed form for a licence for each employee . . .

So each employee has to be licensed.

Mr. Osika: — Just a couple more questions, Mr. Minister; the first one being, there appears to be no requirement in the legislation for an agency or an individual to surrender their licence upon conviction of a criminal offence.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Once again, if you would look in the Act itself, section 14, it basically says:

The registrar may amend, suspend, or cancel a licence on any ground on which the registrar might have refused to issue or renew the licence . . .

And then it lists . . . So you refer back to section 12, and quite clearly it sets out in section 12:

(2) The registrar may refuse to issue or renew a licence where:

(f) the applicant or licensee is convicted of an offence pursuant to any Act, Act of the Parliament of Canada or regulation made pursuant to any Act or Act of the Parliament of Canada;

Which is the Criminal Code, includes the Criminal Code.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you for that clarification. Again it uses the words "may" and I can appreciate that it's as a result of the circumstances that may be surrounding that incident.

Clarification perhaps, and maybe I've missed it in there somewhere, but there appears to be nothing to prohibit out-of-province private investigators who come into this province on a temporary basis to perform their duties, to obtain a licence. He or she doesn't even have to inform the registrar about this or at least . . . again, perhaps I've missed something, but would that not be a concern?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — If you would refer to section 5 it says:

5(1) No person shall act as a private investigator or a security guard without a licence.

And that definition, in section 2, of licence, means a valid licence pursuant to this Act. So a person coming in from another province can't act as a private investigator in Saskatchewan unless they've made the appropriate

arrangements to get a licence under this Act.

And that probably wouldn't be a problem if they're licensed in another province and there's a, you know, clear arrangement with the other . . . But this is how it's done and it's quite clear you can't do this job in Saskatchewan without a licence under the Act.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

Mr. Minister, a number of concerns were raised with us, as with the member from Melville. And one of the big concerns was the issue of the fact that in a number of cases . . . a number of clauses, some of the wording as to the implementation and what have you seemed to be quite vague; the industry feeling quite concerned that some of the wording just really wasn't clear enough and was quite open for interpretation, and it would be important to make sure it was a lot clearer.

And you indicated to the member from Melville that you have a process in place where there will be ongoing debate as you define the regulations regarding the implementation of this Bill. I think you also indicated that this Bill would not be proclaimed until the regulations were ready to be brought forward.

And in your discussion, Mr. Minister, while you've talked about meeting with a number of organizations, as you're bringing this Bill forward, does it comply with . . . or are there other jurisdictions across the country that have similar pieces of legislation in place?

So that when different sectors in the industry, looking at coming to Saskatchewan, they will be coming on the basis of providing a service here or maybe even setting up a security section of their different business in the province of Saskatchewan, that they would know that the amendments and the clauses and the regulations being set up in this province would basically follow guidelines that we do have in other jurisdictions of Canada. Or is this something quite new in addressing the concern that has arisen as a result of the tragic incident in Saskatoon?

I've thrown a number of things out there for you to address, but I just want some clarification. Because certainly the industry and a number of groups in the industry, do have some concerns yet. While they want to see some guidelines and see certainly regulations and legislation address some of the issues that arose as a result of the Nicolichuk affair, they are concerned as to the process that is followed to date. I'm wondering if you could respond to some of those questions and concerns.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — You've asked a number of very good questions, and I think the most important one is how this fits into the national scheme. What we're doing here . . . we're not the first ones doing this. In British Columbia they already have legislation which includes these provisions around training, which are the, sort of, the new part of it, and setting some standards around training.

But we know that some of the Maritime provinces are in the same . . . are in the process, just a little bit behind us, to have

this further definition of the training and requirements to work in this industry. And one of the advantages of having Mr. Crumley on the national standards council is that he is able to hear from the other people who are representatives across the country what progress is being made. So we are not first but maybe second in this process.

We know what British Columbia has done and the industry knows the kinds of things that are being done in British Columbia. And that will be included in the discussion as we are preparing the regulations.

I think that for us in Saskatchewan, clearly the Nicolichuk situation ended up focusing attention on this. But I think practically too, right across the country there have been some concerns which the industry has attempted to address, and then some of those worker organizations and the unions that are involved have wanted to address.

And so what we have here is our, I guess, Saskatchewan way of doing this. But clearly the plan isn't to be way out of whack with the rest of the perspectives across the country. And the goal is that we will provide the best training and education for the people who do this job and the best system we can that allows the industry to do the job that they need to do as well as protect the workers.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Minister, when you talk about training, what are you specifically referring to? Are you going to . . . is the department going to design a training plan? Or are there going to be some guidelines set in place that each individual company then will be able to follow, and will they then be allowed to train their own personnel?

Or is this a provincial program that every company is going to have to have personnel or individuals that are working for them go through, a provincial training program that's out of their control.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well I think that in British Columbia they went forward with a mandatory school that was set up in one place and everybody had to go to that. And there were a number of complaints that that was the process that's set up. Here in Saskatchewan we know that the Corps of Commissionaires have a good training program now and so it's not our intention to in any way cause a problem for them.

We know that some of the larger companies have training programs that are very effective and we don't want to cause a problem there, but we know that some of the smaller companies maybe don't have the resources to set up their own training programs. So we would be encouraging the industry, or members of the industry, to work with SIAST to have the appropriate courses that would allow whoever takes the courses to pass an exam which would be set through the . . . under the Act.

Mr. Toth: — What you're saying, Mr. Minister, is we're basically, through regulations, going to set up some standards; that there will be training programs offered; that there are certain groups and sectors in the province already that do have

training programs in their own individual enterprises.

The other issue I guess, is for companies that are already operating and maybe don't have that training program that you talked about. And while they may feel that they are conforming to what they would have in their own mind — a set of guidelines — if they don't quite comply with the guidelines that will be set down in the legislation and through regulations, is there a time period that would allow them then to bring their standard of . . . and level of training and expertise within their specific operation up to the guidelines that are set here? So that we don't put them in jeopardy of possibly losing contracts that they're already into and allow them to come up to speed over a period of time? And that way not taking away from the contracts they're already entered into and therefore losing business and possibly losing opportunities down the road to enter into business transactions because they weren't available at the time they were under contract.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I think that what we are planning to do is make this as seamless as possible. We don't want to disrupt the industry. So the plan would be that the training would be a requirement for new people, but for the existing people, that we would continue consultation with the industry to allow them to get up to standard, to use your words. And the whole plan then would be that we know that experience is a good teacher, and so that there may be some people who are quite experienced who haven't taken the course but they maybe teach . . . would help teach the course based on their experience on the job.

There are also transitional provisions in the Act, if you look at the end of the Act, which allow for some of this movement.

(1145)

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, or Deputy Chairman, just for the sake of other members, for the minister, and my colleague, the member from Melville, we do have a number of amendments, and I haven't got into discussing some of the issues regarding the amendments specifically. I think when we get to the different clauses, we can certainly address them.

But so that your officials get a chance to review them and the member from Melville, I would ask that amendments be passed out to you and you can take a look at them before we get into those specific areas of discussion.

The other question I was going to raise regarding training — for companies that do have a pretty good training program already in place, Mr. Minister, would you be looking at possibly including them in some of the training, and offering the service to smaller companies that don't really have the wherewithal or the personnel to conduct the training, provided the training certainly falls within the guidelines that you intend to bring out under the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I think that there will be standards that will be set, and if people can deliver that training course, then — and they can meet the standards — well then that would be appropriate. The idea is to make this as cost effective a training

program as possible.

I would point out that SIAST already does have a security officer basic training course that they do teach, which is a course that runs three hours a night for once a week for 13 weeks. And it's the kind of . . . there are some opportunities already.

For example, if there was need for security officers out in your constituency, for example, and if somebody wanted to set up a course, well I would think there would be an ability to do that in conjunction with people within my department, and also working with the industry.

The Deputy Chair: — Why is the hon. member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley on her feet?

Ms. Murray: — With leave, to introduce a guest, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and my thanks to the Minister of Justice and the member from Moosomin for this courtesy.

I notice sitting in the west gallery someone that all of us will recognize, Ken Dueck, who was a page with us last year. And he tells me he's just finished his university classes and has just come to spend a little time and see whether we're behaving or not.

So I welcome him and ask all members to join in that welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 50 (continued)

Clause 1

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. As I indicated earlier, Mr. Minister, there are a number of areas with some specific issues that were raised with our caucus by the individuals representing the Securities Commission and businesses. And I think rather than going through them fairly general right now, we'll raise them as we enter into clause-by-clause debate on this, and we can address them then. Thank you.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 12

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Section 12, this section uses — and this is one of the issues that was raised

by the individuals we've met with — uses, and they felt, some words that were quite vague, like integrity, and prejudicial to the public interest, which do not give specific guidelines to members of the industry on how to conduct themselves.

And they feel the government should take the initiative to set out such guidelines in the regulations rather than leaving them to the discretion of the registrar. I think the member from Melville mentioned some of this in his debate earlier on.

And therefore we'd like to propose an amendment to clause 12 of the printed Bill:

... by adding, immediately after the word "integrity" where it appears in subsection (2)(c), the words "in accordance with the regulations".

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I'd just like to say I think I understand the intent of the amendment, but I don't think it's necessary and so I'll be opposing it.

And the reason I say that is that in the regulations section, section 51, we have the ability to set out rules about cancelling licences or dealing with all of those things. As well, with the industry, we're going to be working on a code of professional conduct. And that'll be . . . that's set out in the regulations. And I think it'll address the issue that I think is being raised here.

So our response would be that we would be opposed to this motion.

Amendment negated.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clause 13

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, this . . . in clause 13 here, this clause gives the registrar complete discretion to issue licences on any terms he sees fit. And the industry would like to see specific guidelines and industry standards put in place. And therefore they've asked that we address this and we're proposing this be amended to allow the Lieutenant Governor in Council to set regulations establishing licensing criteria. They feel that they have a greater input and involvement and feel that there would be . . . they would have more say. And therefore, we would like to:

Amend clause 13 of the printed Bill by striking out clause 13 and substituting the following:

"13 The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall issue regulations establishing the terms and conditions by which the registrar may issue or renew a licence."

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Once again, I think this is something that we can already do under the existing Act. And if you look at the section 51(a), it allows us to define the terms and conditions in the regulations, which is, I think, exactly what you're wanting us to do, by defining those words. And clearly the plan would be to set out methods in the regulations which would give

guidelines for the registrar.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Deputy Chairman. What you're telling me, Mr. Minister, is that in another section and in regulations that you will be addressing this concern — that indeed the concern that's been raised — will be addressed in another format. So that the individuals who have raised the concern certainly can feel that their voice has been heard on this issue?

I think the concern here is that, while you talked about a lot of consultation, the feeling was there were a number of issues where they felt that things weren't spelled out clearly enough, and it was important to have that there. And I just want a clear understanding on that line, that indeed this is one issue that isn't just washed under the . . . or flows under the river — or the bridge — without even really being looked at.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — No, I can give assurances on that — that there's no intention to do that at all. And practically, what we want to do is set up the system in a way that allows the registrar some discretion to deal with particular facts of a particular situation under the framework of the Act and the regulations. And ultimately, if there's a disagreement over that, it would go through the appeal procedures, and decisions could be dealt with that way.

But there's no intention to set up a person here who isn't abiding by the terms and conditions of the regulations in the Act.

Amendment negated on division.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clause 14

Mr. Toth: — In clause 14 here, the phrase that has the industry somewhat concerned is the term that says ". . . no longer a fit or proper person . . ." And the industry feels this is too vague a reason as a reason given for revoking a licence. And they feel it should be a clearer definition and that it should come in compliance with the regulations.

And on clause 14 they would like to see the clause 14:

Amend clause 14 of the printed Bill by adding, immediately after the words "no longer" where they appear in subclause (c), the words ", in accordance with the regulations,".

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Yes, I would just clarify that the same comments I made about the previous amendment apply here. Once again it's a term that's in the Act. There is the power under section 51(a) to do what you're talking about, which is to define what "fit and proper" might be, and that would be done in consultation with the industry.

I think practically, what you're also talking about is the code of ethical conduct and how that interplays with the Act and the job of the registrar. I think ultimately you end up having to give the registrar some discretion to deal with the specific circumstances

that might arise, but clearly that would be done under the umbrella of the Act and the regulations.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Deputy Chair, just one question of the minister. Mr. Minister, you've again indicated clause 51 kind of covers it. And if it isn't a problem, does it create a problem . . . or why should it create a problem just to have it clearer even in section 14, through the amendment, rather than having to move to section 15 . . . or 51, pardon me, in regards to this item?

It seems to me that that really doesn't change the clause but just makes it clearer and a better understanding for the concern that's out there. And I guess the feeling is we should have it identified up front rather than going to an all-inclusive clause 51.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well I think I have a very simple answer for you. The Leader of the Third Party stood up the other day with a big book and it had a lot of words in it and he was complaining about a lot of words. We think what you are adding is a redundancy because the power is already there. We do it in one place for the whole Act so that we don't have to use those words every time. Therefore the Act is only 14 or 15 pages long . . . 14 pages long, instead of 23. That's why we do it.

(1200)

Mr. Toth: — I just have to bring to the minister's attention that a couple of word changes doesn't add a lot to the Act. It just brings it a little clearer.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I would just say that if you added these words every time you had a word that you had some question about, it would add a substantial length to the Act.

Amendment negated.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Clause 15 agreed to.

Clause 16

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. In discussing this with the committee — and here's one I think the minister would have to agree with me on — I believe it's deleting a couple sections, and that would certainly cut down on the regulations.

Members of the industry object to the proposals that their licences could be revoked without a hearing, and this has the potential of unnecessarily disrupting the business activities of the companies and the lives of the employees. And so therefore, they're suggesting we delete a couple sections. And we:

Amend clause 16 of the printed Bill:

(a) by deleting the words "Subject to subsection (2) to (4)," where they occur in subsection (1) and substituting the words "Subject to subsection (2)"

therefore;

(b) by deleting subsections (2) and (3); and

(c) by renumbering subsection (4) to be subsection (2).

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — I do not agree with this amendment and I'll just explain why. This relates to the emergency powers of the registrar to address a problem that arises. And a simple example is, if we were notified by the public that a security company that's licensed here was all of a sudden handing out guns to its employees, we would want to have some kind of immediate power to step in and stop that business.

The other thing is, subsection (3) of section 16 says that there has to be a hearing within 15 days, and probably sooner.

But this is to protect the public; that's why it's here. And there may be situations that arise where some immediate steps have to be taken. And I think there would be a fair outcry if there was some great abuse of the people who run one of these businesses and there was no way to step in and do something.

So that's what this is and we want this in here.

Amendment negated.

Clause 16 agreed to.

Clause 17

Mr. Toth: — Again this section gives the registrar the power to investigate persons related to a complaint against the security company. The industry feels that this is unfair and gives the registrar the power to investigate their personal lives. And I think we've had this concern raised in a number of other circumstances even outside of this specific piece of legislation.

And they would like to see the amended . . . clause 17 be amended by:

. . . 17 of the printed Bill by deleting the word "person" where it appears in subsection (2)(a) and substituting the word "company".

It seems that it's only fair that the company be investigated, not the person. And that's the concern they have, is that it relates to an individual rather than the company providing the service. And that's why they would like to see that term "company" added over the word, person.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Unfortunately I do not agree with this amendment either, and the reason for it is that we have legislation in Saskatchewan called The Interpretation Act, and when the word person is used in legislation, that includes person, partnership, company. So that word there, even though it says person, means company.

So there's no necessity for this amendment. And I think that relates to the next two amendments that you're going to

propose. So we're opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Toth: — I did have two further amendments and basically they are along the same lines. I will submit them so they can be reviewed all at once. But I guess the concern is, while the minister says that generally speaking when we have the word person referred to and he's suggesting company, that opens up the door for interpretation. And that's the concern, the concern being that while the minister interprets person to mean company, the fact is that will an individual, will the registrar, interpret it on the same regards?

And I think that is the major reason that the concern is with the word, and it would seem that it would be a lot clearer to put company rather than person. Following what the minister has said, it just makes it a little clearer, a clearer determination of what that term really means. And that's why it's been brought to our attention. We bring it to the attention of the minister.

The Deputy Chair: — For the hon. member for Moosomin, you can move one amendment at a time. I understand you have moved one. The two subsequent . . . the subsequent pieces of paper we have no way of dealing with at the Chair. They're not a motion, not in the form of a motion, and we have one motion before the committee at the time. Should the hon. member wish to move them as amendments, they will be in order when we're done the first of the amendments.

Mr. Toth: — Yes, Mr. Deputy Chair. I realize I could have read them here. And basically they're saying the same thing for the two different . . . three sections of the clause there. And I would just, basically to move the process along, I just handed them in. I could have read them all at once.

The Deputy Chair: — I appreciate that. We'll still require you to move them one at a time after we deal with this first amendment.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Just to further clarify and deal with the concern that seems to have risen. If you look at section 17(1) — and it sets out where and in what situations the registrar can make an investigation — you'll note that the investigation can be into any matter respecting:

- (a) the administration of this Act or the regulations; or
- (b) the provision of any security guard, private investigator or armoured vehicle service.

So those are the only areas that they can deal with.

Then in subsection (2), "For the purposes of an investigation . . ." — and the investigation is what's described in (1) — you can look at "the business affairs of the person . . ."

It's specifically related to this Act. It's not sort of a broad-based investigation into all of the business affairs of a person. It's only as it relates to the administration of this Act.

I think that the way the legislation is drafted covers the concern that you're worried about. So we're opposed to the motion.

Amendment negated.

Clause 17 agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 23

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. I have one more section here, one more amendment to this Bill, before we get to one that the member from Melville has.

In section 23 . . . The industry has several concerns about this section. For starters, this section does not allow them as portraying themselves as doing anything connected with the police. As they point out . . . In our discussion with them they point out, security services generally have close working relationships with the police services and clients are entitled to know if a particular service has a good relationship with the police or not.

However in this clause their more pressing concern is section 23(b) that prevents them from advertising whether or not they are bonded. Obviously it is in the public interest to know if a security service is bonded and licensed. And therefore they would like to:

Amend clause 23 of the printed Bill by deleting subclause (b) in its entirety and renumbering subclause (c) as subclause (b).

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Well we're opposed to this motion as well and there's a simple reason — the existing Act has this exact provision. So this is not new; this is the existing law right now.

And the reason it's there is, all people who do this work have to be bonded, and so it's a consumer protection issue. If you have people advertising that they're bonded, it doesn't really add anything to their designation because everybody who does this work has to be bonded. And so we're opposed to the amendment. And basically it's the same provision that we have now.

Amendment negated.

Clause 23 agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 50 inclusive agreed to.

(1215)

Clause 51

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. Very briefly, our amendment is different from this particular Bill in two respects. Our amendment says that the minister shall make regulations within six months; the Bill says the minister may make regulations. Our amendment specifically merely sets out that regulations will establish all the minimum requirements as we discussed. I so move.

Amendment negated.

Clause 51 agreed to.

Clauses 52 to 54 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Yes, I'm pleased to thank my officials who have been here plus all of the members of the industry who have assisted us in this legislation so far and we look forward to further consultation with them as we develop the regulations.

And so it's now my pleasure to move that we report this Bill without amendment.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I'd like to certainly thank the minister and his officials. While we didn't get agreement on any of our amendments, based on what the minister was saying we understand that they are addressed in different forms.

And so we trust that just bringing it to the attention of the minister, that the industry and a number of security companies in the province that had some concerns with the Bill, certainly will be able to understand, and that by working together we can come up with a piece of legislation and regulations that certainly brings some security to this industry in our province as it provides a major resource and a business and provides a service to many people in the province.

So thank you to the minister and his officials.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. I would like to add my voice of thank you to the minister and to his officials and to echo what my hon. colleague from Moosomin has indicated.

We look forward to seeing the regulations and seeing that the law, when it does go into place, will have the desired impact on a very important industry in this province of ours. Thank you again.

The Deputy Chair: — Why is the Leader of the Opposition on his feet?

Mr. Krawetz: — With leave, to introduce guests, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Chair. To you and to all members in the House, Mr. Deputy Chair, I'd like to introduce a number of people in the gallery who've been sitting and waiting patiently all morning. And I'd like to recognize a number of people who have worked very hard for the association of technologists and technicians. Many of these people have served as past presidents or are currently involved in the organization.

I'd like to introduce — and if they could all rise very quickly — Brian Cobbledick, who is the current president; Neil Johnson, Dan Crites, Jim Brandt, Ron Smith, Moe Zimmerman, and Bob Turner.

I'd also like to introduce Jamie Britz. Jamie is the current executive director and registrar of SASTT (Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians). Welcome to the legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Chair : — Why is the member for Arm River on his feet?

Mr. McLane: — With leave, to introduce guests, Mr. Chairman.

Leave granted.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand in our gallery today, we have a couple of people from Hawarden. Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman, of course Hawarden is in the constituency of Arm River and that would make them my constituents. So I would ask all members to give a warm welcome to them, and I'd ask them to stand and be recognized. Norm and June Feltis are here from Hawarden and I'd ask the members to give a nice warm welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McLane: — While I'm still on my feet as well, there's another gentleman in the Speaker's gallery today. He's already been recognized by my colleague. This gentleman also is past president and comes from my home town, and even though he may have been just a tad younger than I am, he had brothers that were about my age and we kind of grew up together. So it gives me pleasure today too to welcome Neil Johnson here to the Assembly and ask the members to give him a welcome on my behalf.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 18 — The Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians Act

The Deputy Chair: — I invite the minister to introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My officials with me this morning are, to my immediate left is the president of the corporation, SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation), Mr. John Law; and seated behind Mr. Law is our legal expertise, Leslie Krug.

Clause 1

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Chair. Mr. Minister, and to your officials, welcome. I have a couple of

comments to make, Mr. Minister, before we get into some clarification that I require.

First of all, I guess it's the original introduction of this Act goes back, I think, to about March 17, so we've been at this one for awhile and we've had a chance to hear from not only the people that are affected within the technicians and technologists group but from others as well. And as I've stated before in this House, Mr. Minister, I think that the fact that we have a very mobile and fluid labour force and the fact that people are moved from one part of the province to the other to secure employment makes this Act a critical move.

I'm also very pleased that we see standards and guidelines that are going to be in place to serve the public safety, number one. And I think secondly, they will serve the professional interests of all of the members of the Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians. So I think that is a very positive move, Mr. Minister. But when we've had the chance to look at some of the sections, Mr. Minister, we have some, I think technical questions that we'd like to pose for clarification purposes.

Mr. Minister, can you tell me if a similar Act of legislation has been passed in any of the other neighbouring provinces?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. To the member opposite, I want to first of all supplement his comments by indicating that there has been a significant amount of time that has passed since the Bill was first introduced into the House. And certainly as the member opposite knows, that this piece of legislation has been looked at and worked on, I believe since about 1980, has been the request of the Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians. So a great deal of time has passed as this Bill has . . . as work has proceeded to bring this Bill to fruition, hopefully this afternoon.

The question that you asked specifically is which provinces, outside of Saskatchewan, have this Bill proclaimed. And they are in Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia currently.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. As you've indicated, there's been a strong lobby of not only months but years in terms of getting recognition, right to title for the group of technologists and technicians. Do you see, Mr. Minister . . . have you had any complaints raised to you by the public that would have been dealt with by this Act over the last few months, few years, that now that this Act would be able to handle as concerns raised by the public?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — I think it would be fair to say to the member that in the short space of my tenure, which is about a year and 18 months or 19 months, that I haven't had particular concerns that have come forward to me directly in relationship to people who work in this professional area suggesting that maybe the kinds of work that they undertake are not the standard or are not the quality.

But I think what's important to recognize here is the designation of the title of the individuals who work within the

profession so that we can keep those kinds of separations in mind into the future. And that's really what the whole issue of title protection is all about.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And just for clarification, I understand that this Act will actually have far-reaching effects on a number of people in the technologists and technicians area. Do you know, within a particular range, as to the number of people that will be affected in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Well there are, Mr. Chair, to the member, about 1,800 technologists, technicians, who are practising across the province. And of course, as you indicate, they're involved in a variety of different areas of responsibility. And as I outlined earlier and can outline again, in areas like environmental monitoring and analysis, quality control and analysis of construction sites, geo-technical investigation of proposed sites, corrective maintenance and safety inspection of chemical, medical equipment.

So they're currently of course employed in a vast variety of employment opportunities across the province. We have them working in our cities, they work in our mines, certainly work on many of our environmental sites. So we find this particular discipline working in many, many environments across the province.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, if I could refer you to clause no. 8 in the Bill which is entitled, public appointees. You indicate there that the minister or the order in council, which is cabinet, after consulting the association, may appoint two persons.

Two questions related to that, I guess, Mr. Minister, is why did you feel that this was necessary to have cabinet appoint; and then secondly, what guidelines and what criteria is there around the consultation process that you wish to put in place?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — The way in which the Bill is designed is consistent with what you would see in other professional designated legislation. And of course what would happen here is the consultation of course would be with the body that's applying for the designation.

And what we would see here of course is the . . . in this case SASTT would provide us with the names of which they would wish to see on the board. And of course we would then take those nominations from them. They would provide that to us and through order in council then we would make those approvals, based on their recommendation.

Mr. Krawetz: — Mr. Minister, the only criteria though that I did see there is that the person must be a resident of Saskatchewan. Are you looking for any specifics? Does it have to be a member of the technologists and technicians association? Does it have to be someone who was involved? What kind of guidelines do you expect the people to have, before they are submitted as names by the association?

(1230)

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Well as I said earlier, Mr. Member, that what we would be expecting of course is that the list of names would come really from the professional body. They would provide that to us. And in their submission of those names, I expect we would be looking for then, on their guidance, the fact that those individuals would have the kinds of expertise and skills that would be necessary to serve in that capacity. And having received that from them we would, in all likelihood, support that position and make those designations through order in council then, based on that recommendation.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Clause no. 18, Mr. Minister, deals with registration, and it refers to fees, etc. Do you have any idea as to what the approximate cost will be for an applicant to be registered with the association? Will that be something that you will control, or will that be in the control of the association's executive?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — The control of the fee, Mr. Chair, would be that of the association. And I believe that those registration fees currently would be set at \$125.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. In clauses 24 and 25 we have reference to disciplinary actions that may be taken for unprofessional conduct, I guess is the best way to describe it. Mr. Minister, can you give me examples that would show the range of disciplinary action that may be levied against a member of the association because of this unprofessional conduct? What would be the range of disciplinary actions that could be taken?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Well there would be in my opinion a variety of different responses that I could give to that, but I think the range would be significant. It could be from a suspension of an individual from the work that they're currently doing; they could certainly be placed on some type of probationary periods; or in fact they could be relieved of their duties . . . would be the, I think, the range of kinds of actions that they could take against a particular member of the association.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. A couple of concerns have been raised around clause no. 40, and clause no. 40 of course is the report of termination of employment. This clause imposes upon an employer the responsibility of reporting the member of the association to the association for firing, I guess, for leaving employment.

And my question . . . the concern that has been raised to me, Mr. Minister, is whether or not this may be seen as a bargaining chip by the employee who has been terminated, in respect of further employment in another province or in another concern.

Could you clarify why that provision would be important in terms of the employer having to report the dismissal of an employee to the association?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — I think, Mr. Chair, the responsibility, of course, in terms of the conduct of the individual who's registered under the association, the association would have certainly an investment in knowing that the people who are

registered members of their association in fact are practising in a fashion that would be acceptable to the public. If in fact you had here an individual who was not performing to that particular capacity, it would be I think, prudent for the association to know that that type of an individual in fact is employed and is a member of the association.

And what this part of the legislation really assures here is that the employer then would provide that kind of information notice to the association, and then the association of course would then act as the legislation is crafted.

And so as much as it is to ensure that you have people who are involved in the association who meet the sort of the standard expectations that are set by the association, so is that of public protection.

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, my final question is around three of the last four sections, and they're all very similar of course. They deal with consequential amendments to other Acts. And there has been some concern expressed by the other professional groups that are affected — of course we're talking about the architects and the engineers and the land surveyors.

For clarification, Mr. Minister, I see the Act as of course a right to title legislation that grants the professional status to this group. The concerns raised by the other people seem to indicate that there is this possibility of description, job description, and the change that may occur in their particular interest. Could you clarify what the three consequential amendments will do to those three particular groups?

Hon. Mr. Serby: — Well clearly the member is correct that there has been, and I've received from three of the other professional organizations, some concern raised around the consequential amendments as they relate to the issue of title protection.

I think what's important here to recognize is that this piece of legislation clearly only demonstrates that this is title protection. Really, what that means is that it recognizes that there are people who do work related to the services of architects and engineers and land surveyors. These are the groups that have expressed the concerns and this is where the consequential amendments will lie. And they of course practice . . . may not require of course the same kinds of expertise and don't.

And really what this legislation is intended to do here is it has no attachment at all to that of scope of practice. The Bill provides protection to members of SASTT, and has no impact, in our opinion, on the scope of practice for all of the other related professions.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, just a follow-up I think to the last concern raised by the member from Canora. And that is most organizations we have chatted with . . . And certainly when the legislation came forward we certainly didn't have any opposition to it. We felt it was certainly imperative that regulations and professional recognition of technologists and technicians was brought

forward. And I think most people agree and we felt an agreement with it as well.

However as recently as May 8 . . . or May 7, which was just a couple of day ago, where it was brought to our attention that some concerns the land surveyors had were brought to our attention and the feeling that this legislation may interfere with this industry. Now if I understand you correctly, you're saying that really it doesn't interfere; it doesn't create a problem for them.

And I think it's imperative that that is made clear — that the legislation just enhances, and may even enhance their industry and their sector as well. And I think it's imperative that there be a clarification on this.

As I understand, on April 4 you received a letter from President Putnam, outlining some of the concerns and . . . where he says he wrote to the Hon. Clay Serby, minister responsible for SPMC, expressing concern about the lack of consultation which had occurred — and I think that was one of the concerns they had — and restating our opposition to the Bill.

Now this may be even before your involvement as minister. I think some of the earlier correspondence went to Mr. Mitchell. Similar letters went to the minister from the presidents of the other two associations. And the response which we received on April 16 was essentially that the Bill followed the model that had been developed by the Department of Justice and that we need not be concerned.

The issue is certainly that they raise, down . . . further paragraph:

One of the most poignant points raised by President Putnam was that the proposed amendment to our Act would give members of SASTT, none of whom are currently employed in the survey industry in Saskatchewan, more status in the Act than the members of the association of certified survey technicians and technologists.

So I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, what you have done to date to address this concern. And just to make it clear that if what I hear from you today, this certainly doesn't take away from their certification and their certified survey technicians and technologists.

Hon. Mr. Serby: — I appreciate, Mr. Chair, the member's question, because I think that throughout the process, and any time that you're bringing forward professional legislation of this type, that we want to make sure that in fact the consultation process has been well concluded and ensured.

And I think through the examination of some of the work that I've seen done on this particular piece there was fairly substantive, in my opinion, consultation with all of the groups. However, I think any time that you can do a better job of ensuring that that's done, that's important for us to continue to realize.

I know that as late as . . . From the information that you've been certainly speaking of, as late as the end of April, what I've had is my officials from Saskatchewan Property Management in particular, the president of the corporation, sit down with the professional organizations that certainly have raised the issue of whether or not there's been due diligence on process. And it is my opinion that in conclusion of where we are today, that some of that has now been achieved.

I guess what I also want to reiterate here again is that this is not about scope of practice for the Saskatchewan Association of Science Technologists and Technicians. It's not about that. There will not be any really intent here; there's no intent at all in this language of the Bill to provide any scope of practice for this particular group of individuals. And as I've said, this is only about title protection. And that's really the process that we've undergone — the bringing forward of this legislation from the beginning.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'm certain, as we see by the evidence of the individuals in the gallery here, that there are a number of people certainly interested. And I think your Bill is attempting to bring in some clarification and allow for the professional regulations and professional recognition of technologists and technicians.

And I know that there has been a fair bit of consultation. I think as I've indicated earlier, it's just important that all sectors of the industry at least be aware of the fact that if they do have concerns, that they've been adhered to, that they've been raised, and that the legislation doesn't certainly create a problem for one sector over the other.

I think it's important that this type of legislation come forward. And so I can just rely on the fact that your officials and you . . . you and your officials certainly will be working together with the land surveyors to let them know how they fit into this and that this will not interfere in their industry.

And I don't have any further questions. And I'd like to thank you and your officials for being here to respond to the questions and concerns.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 51 inclusive agreed to.

(1245)

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much. As I was indicating, I'd like to thank the minister for his responses this afternoon and to your officials for being here and helping us understand the Bill further; as well as the public to understand the quality of this type of a registration. Thank you.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 65 — The Income Tax Amendment Act, 1997

The Chair: — I would ask the minister to introduce his officials please.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Chair of committees, I would like to introduce Kirk McGregor, the assistant deputy minister of taxation and intergovernmental affairs, and taxation policy analysts Arun Srinivas and Eric Johnson. Arun is behind me and Eric Johnson is behind Mr. McGregor. Welcome to the Assembly.

Clause 1

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This Bill is a fairly recent addition to the Assembly, and I'm wondering if the minister could just give more of a clarification as to the intent of the Bill 65, The Income Tax Amendment Act.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Let me just say briefly if there are more questions of detail, you can ask.

In summary, this Bill introduces the extension of the manufacturing and processing tax credit for used equipment, which was not there prior. It was identified to us as a disincentive for people who were bringing in used equipment instead of new equipment for manufacturing purposes; and then some technical detail in the Act just to bring our rules in sync with constantly changing federal rules in the income tax area.

Mr. Toth: — So, Mr. Minister, based on that comment is this Act then just isn't ongoing, it addresses some concerns there. It's not something that will have to be addressed on an ongoing basis? Are we addressing this as a one-time change to conform to federal regulations? Is that what I understand?

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Yes, that's the correct interpretation. On the tax relief side, of course, it's part of the ongoing consultations we have done with the business community in Saskatchewan in trying to keep our manufacturing sector ahead of those in the rest of Canada by keeping our tax rates the lowest in Canada.

With respect to the income tax provisions — let me just read the details of them: administrative improvements are set out in amendments to section 3; provincial and foreign tax credit and new provisions would set out the provincial taxation of mine reclamation trust funds, section 7.5; to deal with tax avoidance transactions, section 7.6 and 53.1; and delegate limited remission authority to the Minister of National Revenue, section 32.1.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

The Chair: — I thank the minister and the officials for their time.

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members opposite for their questions and for their cooperation.

Thank you very much.

Bill No. 62 — The Psychologists Amendment Act, 1997

The Deputy Chair — Will the minister introduce his official?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Yes, Mr. Chair, with me is Drew Johnston, who is with the health planning and policy development branch.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just before I do that I'd like to thank Mr. Johnston for his assistance. And I'd also like to thank the opposition for their cooperation in amending the Bill we recently passed and amending it in this Bill. It's very helpful to us in dealing with the psychologists and the opposition is aware of the negotiations that have taken place in that regard. And with that, I'd like to move the Bill without amendment.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1300)

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 50 — The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1997

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

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

Bill No. 18 — The Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians Act

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

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

Bill No. 65 — The Income Tax Amendment Act, 1997

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

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

Bill No. 62 — The Psychologists Amendment Act, 1997

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

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

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**General Revenue Fund
Social Services
Vote 36**

The Deputy Chair: — I invite the minister to introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With us today is Mr. Con Hnatiuk, deputy minister of Social Services; Mr. Bob Wihlidal, who is the director of our budget management branch; Mr. Richard Hazel, who is the executive director of family and youth services; and Mr. Phil Walsh, executive director, income support.

Item 1

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . Mr. Chair, rather. Welcome, Minister, and welcome to your officials today.

If I may, Mr. Minister, I would just like to start my questioning today with a little bit of clarification that I would appreciate surrounding the welfare fraud situation. From some of the questions that have transpired in this House in the last couple of weeks, my understanding is that right now the province is not monitoring welfare fraud through verification workers at all. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — No. No. Absolutely not, Mr. Chair. We are dealing with the issue of abuse and fraud with a group of 30 verification officers who are placed in every region of the province, who are at work on a daily basis. And much as the result of their work over the last number of years, we've seen a significant decline in what some would describe as welfare fraud.

Ms. Julé: — Okay, thank you. You've mentioned that there are 30 verification workers throughout the province. Could you tell me how much money has been spent on those measures, the verifications workers, in total, please?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, we don't have the, sort of, the total. Each of the verification officers would be of course a salaried employee of the Department of Social Services. We can get the salary ranges there and multiply that by the 30 verification officers.

But I can report we have tracked and monitored this very, very closely since the verification officer program was put in place some years ago now. It is calculated that we have saved between 3 and \$5 for each dollar invested in a verifications officer's salary.

So it's been a good return to the department, and therefore a good return to the taxpayer and a good return therefore to people who require those funds; that they're now being directed to the people in real need as opposed to going to some who may not be in that same circumstance.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Yes, Mr. Minister, I would certainly appreciate a cost outline of the salaries of those

verification workers if you could forward that to me in the next while.

And I would like to move right now to some questions surrounding the programs that are in place in the province, or will be put in place in the province, to serve needy people. With the new federal money that is being pumped into the child tax benefit and basically additional benefits from the working income supplement . . . or for the working income supplement, can the minister tell me how much money that the province will be saving? I think you've indicated that the money that you will be saving will be redirected into other programs for children.

So could you tell me how much money you estimate will be available for those other programs because of these savings.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, as the member will know, the commitment made by the federal government is to inject a new \$600 million into a national child benefit beginning July, 1998. The WIS (working income supplement) changes which have occurred now, will become part of that in July '98, which then would represent at that time, if the federal government moves on its commitments here, that would indicate for the nation a commitment of \$850 million. If we prorate that to Saskatchewan, that would represent, on an annualized basis, 17 million that would be available for our purposes.

However, because the commitment has been made to begin July 1998, in that first year of course we wouldn't see the full benefit in that year. And so the dollars in 1998, in our budget year '97-98, will be smaller because the program — unless we can move to get it going earlier — would be something less than 17 million. And then we know there are going to be some start-up costs for the new programing and we're in negotiations with the federal government now about how those monies will be accounted for.

Once the program is in place and those federal dollars start to flow, we have made the solid commitment to the federal government, as we expect the federal government would want us to, that each and every one of those dollars, the dollars that we are able to save, will return back to children and families in need in our province.

We've also been saying quite consistently, with the federal government, while this serves as a down payment — as the federal government has described it — we would want to see the road map to take us to the, at least 2.2 billion that everybody across Canada agrees is required for this program.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I can appreciate your directing the comments to the 17 million that will begin flowing in July of 1998, etc., but I think both of us need to talk about and clarify the fact that I certainly have read in documents coming to us from the federal government that there is 195 million in July of this year, 1997, that will be directed to all the provinces in Canada.

So when we break that down, it should come to, I'd think, a very significant amount for Saskatchewan by July 1997. And that's supposed to be transition money. Are you using that

money or have you been given some absolute indication by the federal government that you are going to be getting that money in July, 1997?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, just so the member is very clear. The program that has been amended by the federal government, the WIS, the working income supplement, beginning July is not money that comes to the province of Saskatchewan. That is a program that's delivered to individuals in our province. It's not money that comes to the province that would be in any way available for us to compensate any expenditures we have. That is a program that provides, I think it's between 40 and \$50 to working . . . to support working families in our province.

But that money is not coming to the provincial government — that's coming straight to the citizens of our province.

Ms. Julé: — From what you have said in the past few weeks, that the province will be putting money towards an income . . . enhancing the working income supplement, what I'm gathering here then is if the province is doing that and the federal government is doing the same through working income supplements, that there should be a significant increase in the cheques of people that are working — those people that have children.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Yes, the member is correct. We have made changes, announced them — and they were initiated May 1 — to provide new benefits to families who are eligible for the Saskatchewan Family Income Plan. That's based on the number of children; it's a per child benefit per month based on income. The money that we have dedicated to that purpose is brand-new, brand-new money.

Now the federal government has made a change with the WIS, but we recognize that this . . . we're talking here about \$195 million across Canada — across Canada. So if you divide that to all of the provinces, all of the people who are supported by that program, it is some increase, but it's not a large increase because of the change in the WIS.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, I'd like to just take you in a bit of a different direction here. And Social Services has come under some criticism from the Provincial Auditor in his spring report. Mr. Strelieff points out that Social Services made \$43 million in payments to community-based organizations last year. And I quote from what I've read, that the programs receiving the money do not clearly set out the department's operating objectives.

Can the minister respond to that comment for me, please?

(1315)

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, we recognize the concern that the auditor raised and have accepted his concern, and so what we have done in response to that concern is to now clarify, I think in a fashion that the auditor will approve of, we've clarified those contracts with our funded agencies so they will meet his concern and a concern that we felt was well taken.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you. I'm glad there was some clarification but I would directly like to know what is being done to improve the reporting mechanisms with community-based organizations that are receiving department funds.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, I thank the member for the question. In response, these sort of . . . these three at least, we have now amended the contracts so that the contracts clearly state the objectives that we have, and so that clarity is now achieved.

We have for some time, but it's being completely regularised, so that there's a regular evaluation that goes on at the community or regional . . . at the regional level. And to assist, in addition to sort of the more formal evaluations, we are now having very regular meetings of our regional staff people with the funded organizations to ensure that the objectives are being met. And I can say to the member that even in just very recent times, where we felt there was some real difficulties in a circumstance, we've moved to terminate the funding.

So the process I feel is very accountable, and we believe will be seen so by the auditor.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, you mentioned that there are — I believe your words here were that there are regular meetings to ensure that the objectives are being met, and that there are reports coming back from the community-based organizations to you. Are these being documented, those reports? Will they be down on paper so that I might be able to have a look at them and concerned citizens subsequently having a look at them? And how regular are those meetings?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Yes, Mr. Chair. The answer is yes. We keep the documentation, and they're available for scrutiny. And I forgot to mention earlier of course that we also received from our community-based organizations, the audited statements from the auditors. But yes, we do keep record of the evaluations and they're available.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you. I would appreciate if I could receive those on a consistent basis please.

And, Mr. Minister, how regular are the meetings that your department has with these . . . how regular are the meetings? Is there a specified amount of time whereby the organizations and your department has got to have meetings?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, this will vary. I think as the member will understand, this will vary rather widely. There are some community-based organizations that have been funded by Social Services or by the province for many, many, many years. They have a long track record. They are solid and they're just widely regarded and accepted. The kind of evaluation in that circumstance and the opportunity to meet will, understandably I think, be less frequent than in some other examples.

Now there may be other examples of newer programs or services or where there has arisen some difficulty, where the meetings may be occurring as frequently as once a week. These

meetings are usually held by our community service consultants. In fact on occasion, well very often I'm involved in such meetings myself. I'll be attending annual meetings, annual meetings on a regular basis, of community-based organizations. So the frequency will vary a great deal.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, I find that the same concern as far as reporting back and ensuring that objectives are being met and that these plans are actually working is true for the child action plan. Now I do want you to know that I admire any endeavours that the government is doing with helping children, through any plan, as long as the plan in fact is reportedly and proven to be working. And I believe that we'd have to ensure that we have got a constant two-way reporting, I guess I would say, happening, to ensure that these programs are effective. Because monies can be used in certainly other ways if programs are not being effectively reported.

In the case of the child action plan, we always see an outline of who is getting what. And you have provided me with those papers that give me an indication of what the organizations are, and I thank you for that. But how do you know that the objectives on those . . . that you have set out for the child action plan with different communities are in fact being achieved? There's 250 of them and are they regularly reporting back to you and are you satisfied to their effectiveness at this point?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, I, and I think the senior officials of the department, are indeed satisfied that we have the processes in place to do appropriate evaluation.

I just want to say that I share with the member entirely the view that we want to ensure that when we're investing precious dollars into programing for children or families under the child action plan or indeed in anything else we do in the department, that we are achieving the goals that we share and that monies are not finding their way into areas that are not serving as we would hope they would serve and so on.

Now with the child action plan, and as the member pointed out the numbers of programs and projects that are happening, it has meant some real diligence in having to evaluate and watch. Some of the programing of course is relatively new — six months, a year — and so we want to give some of the programs an opportunity to function a sufficient period of time that you can do an accurate and appropriate evaluation.

But I do want to say to the member, we share her view entirely that when we have these resources to provide to our communities we want to be sure that they're doing what we hope they do.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you. I know that that's one thing I would appreciate, along with the Provincial Auditor and so on, is a continual reassurance that we know that the child action plan is working, that it is effective, and it is doing what it was set out to do. And so I hope there is close monitoring going on with that.

Mr. Minister, the government says it's redesigning social

assistance by putting in place a plan to alleviate child poverty, and Social Services is pledging \$13.8 million to initiatives for children in need. But what they don't elaborate on is that there has been a \$5.04 million increase in the Social Services budget . . . decrease, rather, in the Social Services budget which has come at the expense of seniors and social assistance recipients.

Income security . . .

An Hon. Member: — How do you figure that?

Ms. Julé: — Like this. Income security and support, that's the total of SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan), FIP (Family Income Plan), and SIP (Saskatchewan Income Plan) for seniors, has dropped \$17.4 million from the last year. Payments to SAP recipients has decreased by \$20.7 million and payments to poor seniors has remained the same, around 14 million. So my question is, where has all the money gone?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Chair, there's quite an easy explanation here. The money that has been dedicated to meeting the needs of some of the 18- to 21-year-olds in our province has now been shifted to post-secondary education for the Youth Futures program. And so their support in our pilot in Prince Albert around the Youth Futures program will be monies that they used to receive under the welfare system, now will receive their basic living allowances and support under the Youth Futures program, because we believe that we need to encourage and assist our young people into training and education and so on through a different program. So some of that money goes there.

The rest of that money has gone into Post-Secondary Education and Training to provide for the provincial training allowance, again providing basic supports for individuals who will be improving their education in post-secondary training. And so some of the money has gone to the Youth Futures program; the other has gone to the provincial training allowance. That's the difference.

So if you tracked over to Post-Secondary Education, you would see that money in that budget now.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I recognize that the money is in that budget, but I also recognize from what I've heard before that Post-Secondary Education training programs are going to be developed over the next two to three years I believe is what I heard. And so the great amount of money that has been cut from the Social Services budget, from income security and so on, seems to be a larger amount of money than what the government will be expending this year on training programs.

The pilot project in Prince Albert I have been told, is a pilot project and is being developed. And I think in this House the last time I had a chance to ask some questions regarding this, the indication was given to me that that would be probably developed over . . . maybe within the next six months. And so again we have a time period here where, within the framework of the year, where there's not a great deal of money being used as compared to the money being taken out of this budget for

this year.

So I would like the minister to reconcile the fact that it's not possible to use as much money as has been stripped from Social Services for training programs and this pilot project within this year.

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Well, Mr. Chair, I differ. I differ in my opinion. That in fact that is exactly how we have crafted and calculated the budget, recognizing that the programs wouldn't be beginning the day the budget was announced but in the course of the coming year.

The officials within the department, who have done this for years, indicate that this is the appropriate transfer of monies to fund these new programs as they are up and running. We're here talking about a total transfer of about \$20 million from the SAP budget over to these programs. And I would hope that the member wouldn't argue that the money should be left in the SAP budget. We should be trying to develop these new programs. We think these are better mechanisms to deliver these basic supports to young people and people who want to do training.

But what is even more I think important is that not only have we transferred those amounts from the welfare budget, from social assistance over, post-secondary is adding resources of its own. And so there in fact will be greater resources available to those people under these new programs.

Ms. Julé: — There is a number of questions surrounding this whole issue of training, etc., for people that are on social services that would be entitled to training. We haven't really got an indication of the number of seats and spaces that will even be available to accommodate the number of people that will suffering from decline to themselves in assistance through this.

And so I really feel quite concerned about the number of people there that can't get into training programs immediately that would benefit of course from that. But when there's a great deal of money cut from income security that's shifted over, it's got to mean that there are people out there that are going to be struggling. Because they can't get into training programs and still the money is not available for them to live in a fairly basic, healthy life style.

I would like to thank you for your answers today. And we will be continuing with our line of questioning, it is my hope, within another session with Social Services estimates. But at this time I would like to take my seat and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . what?

An Hon. Member: — Recognize the clock. Call the clock.

Ms. Julé: — Oh, I don't know what you mean . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I guess I would like to call the clock.

The Deputy Chair: — It being past the normal hour of adjournment, the committee will now rise, report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Deputy Speaker: — It now being past the hour of adjournment, I want to take this opportunity to wish everyone a good weekend and to enjoy some of the spring weather with your family and friends. This House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday afternoon.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
PRESENTING PETITIONS	
Krawetz.....	1505
Osika	1505
Bjornerud	1505
Belanger	1505
McLane.....	1505
READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS	
Clerk	1505
NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS	
D'Autremont	1505
INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS	
Romanow	1505
D'Autremont	1506, 1513
Krawetz.....	1506, 1524
Murray.....	1520
McLane.....	1524
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS	
Mothers' Day Tribute	
Crofford.....	1506
30th Anniversary of Melville Motors	
Osika	1506
Emergency Preparedness Week	
Whitmore.....	1507
Tribute to Mothers and Families	
Hillson	1507
Prince Albert to Host Major Sporting Events	
Kowalsky	1507
Ranch Ehrlo Society	
Julé.....	1507
Labour Force Increasing	
Thomson	1508
Volunteer Award	
Lorje.....	1508
ORAL QUESTIONS	
SaskTel's Failed United States Venture	
Bjornerud	1508
Teichrob.....	1508
SaskPower Proposed Project in Guyana	
McLane.....	1509
Lautermilch.....	1509, 1511
D'Autremont	1511
Respite Care	
Julé.....	1510
Cline.....	1510
Child Prostitution	
Toth.....	1512
Calvert	1512
INTRODUCTION OF BILLS	
Bill No. 66 — The Health Care Directives and Substitute Health Care Decision Makers Act	
Nilson	1513
Bill No. 67 — The Agri-Food Amendment Act, 1997	
Upshall	1513
Bill No. 68 — The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act, 1997	
Teichrob.....	1513
Bill No. 69 — The Police Amendment Act, 1997	
Nilson	1513
ORDERS OF THE DAY	
WRITTEN QUESTIONS	
Kowalsky	1513
ROYAL ASSENT	
	1513
SECOND READINGS	

Bill No. 55 — The Department of Agriculture Amendment Act, 1997	
Upshall	1514
Bill No. 13 — The Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan Amendment Act, 1997	
Upshall	1514
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE	
Bill No. 50 — The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1997	
Nilson	1514
Osika	1514, 1523
Toth	1519
Bill No. 18 — The Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians Act	
Serby	1524
Krawetz	1524
Toth	1526
Bill No. 65 — The Income Tax Amendment Act, 1997	
Wiens	1528
Toth	1528
Bill No. 62 — The Psychologists Amendment Act, 1997	
Cline	1528
THIRD READINGS	
Bill No. 50 — The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1997	
Cline	1528
Bill No. 18 — The Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians Act	
Serby	1528
Bill No. 65 — The Income Tax Amendment Act, 1997	
Wiens	1528
Bill No. 62 — The Psychologists Amendment Act, 1997	
Cline	1528
COMMITTEE OF FINANCE	
General Revenue Fund	
Social Services — Vote 36	
Calvert	1529
Julé	1529