

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Krawetz: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I present petitions today from people in the Kamsack and the Stornoway area. The prayer reads as follows, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

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.

I so present.

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to join my hon. colleague on behalf of citizens of Dubuc, Melville, Grayson, and Ituna:

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.

I so present.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise today to present petitions on behalf of people who are concerned about child prostitution:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reform provincial legislation that may help save the lives of children who are being exploited for sex in public places and stop prostitution which jeopardizes the safety of all citizens and their children.

This petition is signed by people from Saskatoon.

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

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reform provincial legislation that may help save the lives of children who are being exploited for sex in public places and stop prostitution which jeopardizes the safety of all citizens and their children.

Mr. Speaker, this petition has been signed by the people from the city that the Premier resides in, and that being Saskatoon.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to present a petition to create regional telephone exchanges. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays 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 that the petitioners are from is the town of Odessa, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the rebuilding of Highway 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.

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

And the people that have signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, are primarily from Ile-a-la-Crosse, and I so present.

Mr. Hillson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to present a petition signed by citizens of the city of Saskatoon:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reform provincial legislation that may help save the lives of children who are being exploited for sex in public places and to stop prostitution which jeopardizes the safety of all citizens and their children.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I so present.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I too have a petition from the many conscientious people throughout the province — and particularly this petition is from Saskatoon — who are gravely concerned about child prostitution in the province. And the prayer reads, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reform provincial legislation that may help save the lives of children who are being exploited for sex in public places and stop prostitution which jeopardizes the safety of all citizens and their children.

The petitioners are from Saskatoon and I so present.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Deputy Clerk: — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 12(7) they are hereby read and received.

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to urge the government to stop contributing to rising farm input costs;

Humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to establish a task force to aid the fight against youth crime in Saskatchewan;

Humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to reform provincial legislation to help children who are being exploited for sexual purposes; and finally

Humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the rebuilding of Highway No. 155.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to draw to your attention and that of the members, a distinguished group of visitors who are seated in the west gallery. This is a group of about 40 students from the grades 4 and 5 classes at St. Augustine School. They're accompanied here today by their teachers, Mr. Doug Devernichuk and Edith Seiferling, and also by Mrs. Sharon Lang.

I look forward to meeting with this particular group especially, because I had the opportunity to meet with them last week at their school. And I look forward to meeting with them because they ask very many excellent questions. And the members of the opposition may want to make note of that and they may want to attend this meeting that I've scheduled with them.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it's really a privilege to be able to meet with this group. I look forward to meeting with them.

I ask all the members to join me into wishing them a very warm welcome here today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Today we have some very special and very important guests that are visiting us in the Assembly. And I want to, to you and through you, introduce these guests.

We have a number of students from my home community of Ile-a-la-Crosse. We have 23 students in your east gallery. And they're accompanied by a number of people from my home community of Ile-a-la-Crosse.

The teachers that have put a lot of effort into bringing the kids here — and that effort's most sincerely appreciated — are Karen Schommer, Mark Zinger, Sharon Hoffman, and Bruce Downtown Brown.

And the chaperons we also have here attending the visit and the trip are Irene Gardiner, Heather Pinay, Shirley Laliberte, and Janice Bouvier. And I'll be meeting with these students momentarily, right after 2 o'clock, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'd like to ask the members to join with me in welcoming this very special group of people.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Murray: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I too am very pleased to introduce to you and to my colleagues in the House, a very special group of students on behalf of my colleague, the Deputy Premier, the member from Regina Elphinstone.

Seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker — and behind the bar here is Khira — are 32 grade 4 students from St. Francis School. They're accompanied by their teacher, Ms. Laurie Ruhr, and a chaperon, Miss Sherri Allen.

I know that they have had a tour of this wonderful building and will spend some time here with us, and I look forward to meeting with them later on and I know they will also have some very interesting comments and questions.

Please join me in extending a warm welcome. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Nilson: — Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the House, one of my constituents, Bob Axtell, who's in the back row of the Speaker's gallery; along with three of his friends — Jennifer Anderson, Carla Crossley, and Mark Oamek. All four of them are students at university in Pocatello, Idaho. Three of them are studying microbiology and one of them . . . Jennifer's studying to be a physician's assistant.

It's the first time in Saskatchewan for the Idaho citizens, and so let's all give them a big welcome here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Federal Leaders' Debate

Mr. Thomson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. So last night it was the big debate. And it was an interesting debate with views from both the left and the right and the right and

really far right.

And I have to say I was impressed to see the leaders even got gussied up to share with us their vision for Canada over the next four years.

I note that the Prime Minister even donned his best pair of pyjamas for the event. Which was good, because it enabled him to keep sleepwalking right through this campaign without being bothered by any of the minor problems people might want to talk to him about. You know, problems like unemployment, or cuts his government's making to health care, or even that pesky GST (goods and services tax) promise that just won't quite go away.

Well I also noted that Mr. Preston Manning put on his best brown shirt for the event and took particular interest in hectoring and lecturing and chiding his opponents. Now far be it from me to say that hectoring and lecturing and chiding are bad things. Except I would note that he was doing so in a vain effort to goose-step around his ultra right-wing agenda that makes Jean Charest and the Tories look downright compassionate — which conveniently, is exactly what Jean Charest was attempting to look like.

I'd have to say he did his best to look repentant and un-Mulroney-like. He even showed just enough sincerity to make me think he maybe even believed it. Fortunately however, Alexa was there. And Alexa was there to speak out for ordinary Canadians and remind the Prime Minister that there are real issues real Canadians want debated.

I'm confident Alexa, and more New Democrats, will be joined in the House of Commons after this election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Buena Vista School Drama Production

Hon. Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are a lot of adult theatrical companies who shy away from Shakespeare because, as Huckleberry Finn said, "The words are interesting but tough." It's hard to do a good job on Shakespeare so most don't try.

Because this is so, it is all the more remarkable that the students of Buena Vista School in my constituency put on a production last week of *Romeo and Juliet*, and by all reports did an excellent job.

For those of us who have seen one of the recent movies of *Romeo and Juliet*, or remember studying it in school, we know that it is not only remarkable but appropriate that a group of grade 5 to grade 8 students performed the play. After all, the characters of *Romeo and Juliet* are not only star-crossed lovers, they are very young — a fact which makes the play all the sadder and more powerful.

The 70 or so students involved in the production were under the able direction of their teacher, Ken Marlin, and Mr. Marlin is to be commended for having the idea to mount this play and the

persistence to carry it through. As well the Buena Vista Community Association, parents, and the Gateway Players assisted in to build sets, make costumes, and prepare the desserts and coffee which were served before the curtain was raised each evening.

I'm proud to have these students, their teachers and parents, in my constituency of Saskatoon Nutana. I think that they've established an exceptional standard and I congratulate them all. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Science Fair Winners from St. Dominic School

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize Angela Possburg and Tracy Burton of Humboldt. The grade 8 students at St. Dominic School were chosen to attend the Canada-wide Science Fair this week, May 11 to 18, in Regina.

Now the girls teamed up for the science fair project in their study of how music influences sows in the farrowing room. The project, called "Musical Hogs", won them the first place award of \$1,000 from Saskatchewan Education at the Carlton Trail Regional Science Fair in Kelvington. Their study showed that sows and piglets that listen to vocal music over a two-week period proved to be more relaxed, gained weight more quickly, and were less susceptible to disease.

Not to be outdone, Richard Winters and Mark Possburg won honours at the science fair. They will take their "Tireriffic Cattle Guard" to the Saskatchewan Science Centre in Regina in October. It's their reward for winning the Saskatchewan Showcase Award and first for Junior Engineering.

Now their project recycled old tires into a cattle guard in which strips of rubber are bolted together in grids which are placed atop 6 inches of gravel as a cattle barrier. The idea got attention from prospective buyers, but they resisted, turned down lucrative offers, and are patenting the idea themselves. Their teacher is Peter Pavelich, who has had students qualify for the National Science Fair for the third straight year.

Congratulations, St. Dominic students.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Child Care Week

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the week of May 11 to 17 has been designated as Child Care Week, a week during which we publicly recognize those workers who provide care for our children — in the home, in day care centres, in schools, or in any other setting.

Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with those who say that proclaiming is one thing, doing is another. I believe that Child Care Week would ring hollow if it were not for some substantial evidence that our deeds match our words.

This is why I am proud to be associated with Saskatchewan's action plan for children — a plan that began modestly in 1993; that began after consultations with groups, organizations, and individuals from across the province. A plan that involves co-operative efforts of seven government departments and hundreds of organizations across the province.

I am proud that funding for this year will more than double, bringing the total for programs and services to nearly \$25 million. This additional commitment will allow for expanded child care programs and services; for expansion of teen-infant centres; for enhancement of wages for child care workers; for renovation of child care facilities; and for a host of other important initiatives.

The action plan for children, in short, gives voice to Child Care Week. We honour those who provide the care and, Mr. Speaker, we also support them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Working Women's Share in the Economy

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In 1995 the NDP (New Democratic Party) government stated categorically that women don't share equally in the economy. On that point I agree with them. The Women's Secretariat has now collected the facts to prove that women don't share equally in the provincial economy. To address these inequities, the NDP promised to set up a task force to examine family-friendly work. They promised to make it easier for women to balance work and their family responsibilities. Obviously they have failed to do this.

Thirty per cent of the women in this province work part time. This compares to an overall number of 7 per cent. The main reason women say they work part time is because they can't find full-time work. We have hundreds of women in this province working at minimum-wage call centres. These are the types of jobs this government is creating.

Women are also saying that they have to take care of their families first so they work part time. If the NDP had fulfilled their promise to help create family-friendly workplaces, the women would not be faced to have to . . . to choose between work and family.

And when we look at the record of the NDP government, we find it astounding that they claim to stand up for people in need, for fairness and equity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 60 per cent of the temporary and part-time employees the government bureaucracy has are women; 82 per cent of government clerical works are filled by women. I believe this demonstrates that the government is not willing to commit to women who work for them, let alone to the women in the rest of the province.

On behalf of the women in this province, we ask, please give this very important issue . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Ali Rajput Selected for World Health Organization's International Committee on Parkinson's Disease

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the United Nations' World Health Organization decided to make a special effort recently to combat Parkinson's disease on a worldwide basis, they looked at Saskatchewan and they selected — as part of a committee of 12 individuals worldwide to address the scourge of Parkinson's disease — an individual from Saskatoon, Dr. Ali Rajput, who is professor and head of neurology at the University of Saskatchewan, an expert on Parkinson's disease worldwide. And so the envelope from the World Health Organization arrived at his home last Tuesday, a week ago today.

Dr. Rajput will be the only Canadian on this prestigious international group of medical researchers, and he will attend his first meeting of this consultation in Geneva, Switzerland later this month. Dr. Rajput is known for the international scale of his research, for his international reputation, for the international scale of scholarship that comes to Saskatoon because of his presence at the University of Saskatchewan, and also for the international funding that comes to Saskatoon because of him.

As the 1993 Order of Merit citation for Dr. Rajput read, he is "a world-class medical scholar and teacher, truly committed to the search for knowledge, a man of compassion and generosity."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Teachers Enrich Students' Education

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take a few minutes just to acknowledge a very special group of people that have done a tremendous amount of work for our community through the school system. And that, of course, are the teachers that have made an extra effort to bring students all the way to our capital city and to view the Assembly.

While a trip to this Assembly for most students may only mean a trip that will last a couple of hours, students from my constituency are looking at a trip that will last eight hours one way. Planning a trip from the schools takes personal sacrifice on the part of the teachers, and I want to take this opportunity again to pay tribute to those teachers in all the schools of Athabasca constituency.

I do so not only to call the members' attention to these teachers' great efforts in bringing students to visit the Assembly, but for all their good work during the school year — much of it done on their own time.

These teachers organize fund-raisers for our schools and take part in many other extra-curricular activities that benefit students and the entire community, not because it's part of their job description, but because they truly care about enriching the

education of their students.

Other teachers throughout the North, and especially teachers from Ile-a-la-Crosse School Division, which include Mr. Ahenakew, Ms. Favel, Mrs. Zinger, Mr. McJannet, Ms. Bast, all do their part to enrich Ile-a-la-Crosse and the school spirit.

Schools in my constituency thrive on this type of activity on the part of the teacher the same way many small schools in southern Saskatchewan communities do.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all the members to remember the contribution of the teachers such as those in my constituency, for whom teaching isn't simply a job, but a true calling. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Producer Marketing Boards

Mr. Aldridge: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the leader of the federal New Democratic Party has made no secret of the fact that she is basing her campaign on this provincial NDP government. But let's look closely at what this NDP government is doing when it comes to single-desk marketing boards in Saskatchewan.

Bill 67, The Agri-Food Amendment Act, which is presently before the House will give this government the power to wipe out every single provincial farm marketing board without even giving producers a vote — without even a democratic vote.

Will the Minister of Agriculture explain why he wants the authority to dissolve marketing boards which manage poultry producers, pork producers, and a long list of others?

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'll answer that, thank you to the member of the third party, but I'll be happy to answer this question.

And you'll be able to, Mr. Member, get to ask all these questions in Committee of the Whole if you just move it into Committee of the Whole; you can find out exactly what it's all about. But I can start now.

This legislation, that every other province in Canada has, and what Saskatchewan had prior to 1990 when it was inadvertently removed by an amendment to the Act, this will facilitate requests from groups that have marketing boards that decide that they no longer want that board, and if they don't want to have a vote with their members when we can do it for them, or in the case of an economic decision by government, that is also possible.

But the fact of the matter is — the fact of the matter is marketing boards for the most part are looking internally. They're deciding if their current system — a system that was put in place many years ago, a system that has served them well — if that is still the system they need to go into the future. I think they're being proactive by looking at themselves and I

commend them for doing so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Aldridge: — Well here we go, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There's the two faces of this argument that the government would present. This NDP government portrays itself as the defenders of farmers. In fact it recently ran ads at taxpayers' expense defending the Canadian Wheat Board. It even criticized the federal government for holding a vote on whether wheat boards should continue to be the single best marketer of barley.

Well look at what you're doing, Mr. Minister. Under your legislation you have the power to wipe out marketing boards. And farmers are provided no vote, no say whatsoever. How can you possibly look a producer in the eye when you're taking away their democratic right to determine the future of their marketing boards?

Mr. Minister, the Liberal opposition will be proposing an amendment that requires a democratic vote of producers before a marketing board can be eliminated. Will you support this amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — If this amendment is like most of the other amendments the Liberal Party has put forward it really isn't worth looking at, but I will certainly look at it. But this legislation does not stop — does not stop — the Agri-Food Council from conducting votes. It doesn't take the vote away at all. They can still have a vote if they so wished.

This legislation, like I said, is the same in every other province of Canada. We had it in Saskatchewan prior to 1990. I know they want to do a little grandstanding on it. I'd ask the member, what's your position? Do you agree that the other provinces are . . . Are you saying all the other provinces are wrong? That they should not have that?

But I ask this member . . . I'll tell this member this, is we in Saskatchewan have done more for agriculture than Ralph Goodale and the federal Liberal government have done in the four years they've had it; \$320 million out of farmers' pockets with the Crow; \$250 million in reduced crop sector programing; 80 to 100 to \$150 million in lost grain sales because the federal Liberals and Ralph Goodale don't have the fortitude to take . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Aldridge: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government does not appear to understand the impact that its decision is already having on hog operations in this province. Saskatchewan Pork International has issued lay-off notices to more than 100 employees in its Moose Jaw plant. These have been described as precautionary lay-offs by Jim Morris, the head of SPI, who says this legislation has created a great deal of uncertainty in

the hog market.

Until such time as this government comes clean on its intentions, the Moose Jaw plant will remain closed, and its employees will be out of work. Mr. Minister, what is the intention of your legislation? And if it's not to override the wishes of producers, make a commitment in this House today that you will support our amendment that gives farmers a democratic vote.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — That member knows full well this legislation has absolutely nothing to do with the Moose Jaw plant — nothing. Your credibility and integrity sank to the bottom of the floor in this cabinet. And you can try, I'll tell you, Mr. Liberal, you can try . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Now the Chair is having trouble hearing the minister respond and I'm sure that other members are wanting to hear the response.

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that member and that Liberal caucus can try all they want to disrupt the increase and production of hogs that's planned for this province. They can try all they want, but I'll tell you they will not be successful.

They will not be successful because we got hundreds and hundreds of producers from small units to large units who understand this hog industry is going to be growing. And you can play your little negative politics all you want, but I'll tell you, in the dairy industry they went to western Canadian pooling, a good step forward, a move off the old.

The SPI is looking internally to decide if they should continue single desk; these people are being proactive. I don't care who says, who says, or what ties you make. This hog industry is going to grow in Saskatchewan. It's going to be grown by all levels of producers from small to large, and we on this side of the House are going to be there to assist them, to make sure we are major players in this industry.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Chief Electoral Officer Report

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have a simple question for this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And if it answers honestly it could give the NDP a chance to restore public confidence — something it has done little of during this legislative session.

On March 10 the Chief Electoral Officer indicated the Kuziak report, which was launched to look into election fund-raising practices, would be released very shortly. Well it's conspicuous by its absence. It is now two months later, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan are still waiting. In essence, the Chief Electoral Officer is an employee of Executive Council and the report should be submitted to the Premier's office. Is the report completed; and if so, why has it not been made public?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The report has not yet been received by the government. We do not know whether it has been completed or not. We take it it has not, because if it had been completed it would be in our hands.

The member will know perfectly well from the long debate we had about this last year, that the Chief Electoral Officer is a position of some independence and we respect that independence. We don't treat this person as though he were an employee of Executive Council or any other part of government. We try and respect his independence in every way possible.

We have not asked him directly when he intends to file his report, but he will know from following the debates in this House that there is some wish all the way around that this report be delivered to our hands and be made public.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Osika: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we need a little better answer than that from the government. We understand that the report has been completed. The Chief Electoral Officer launched the investigation long time ago. He launched it after it was revealed that the Progressive Conservatives had access to a two and a half million dollar trust fund. Shortly after, we found out Tommy Douglas House had contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of secret donations to the NDP.

This issue was raised a year ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the people have a right to know the results of this investigation regardless of whether or not it has in fact been totally completed. We understand it has been. This is a provincial matter. The people of Saskatchewan deserve to know what's in that report. Will this government be accountable to the people of this province and table this document by Friday, May 16?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine, I can't imagine where that date comes from. I can't make any such undertaking.

The fact of the matter is that we haven't got the report; it hasn't been filed with the government. We have no indication that it is ready, that it has been completed.

The member says it has. He knows more than we do then. He knows more than we do where that report is and perhaps he'd tell us if it's ready and when it will be delivered to us, because we simply don't know.

Now that member is a reasonable person most times, Mr. Speaker, but there's something about this issue that drives him right over the end. And all of a sudden we see him engaging in rhetorical outbursts that have no relation to the facts at all. That's the truth of the matter.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Main Farm Access Road Program

Mr. Bjornerud: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, thousands of Saskatchewan farmers have spring seeding under way. The amount of traffic is drastically increasing on Saskatchewan rural road systems right now, and the wear and tear is showing.

Unfortunately many RMs (rural municipality) are struggling to find money for road maintenance and rebuilding projects because of the massive funding cuts by this NDP government. Adding to the headaches for rural administrators and councils are the minister's cancellation of the main farm access road program.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, now that the minister can see what devastating effects her cuts are having on rural and urban municipalities, is she giving any consideration to reinstating the main farm access road program?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, the intent of not funding the main farm access road program is so as not to add to the 53,000 kilometres of rural roads that we have. It is felt that at this point in time that the construction . . . adding to the network shouldn't be necessary. The maintenance and re-gravelling assistance remains intact.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bjornerud: — Madam Minister, what those roads, the main farm access system was doing is not building new roads where there was no roads before; it was rebuilding roads that have been wore out, that have been there for years. If you don't understand that, I'm afraid we're in big trouble in rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that by cancelling the farm access road program without any warning, many RMs have unfinished projects. This creates problems for people living in the area and for contractors who are left in the lurch while RMs scramble to find money to finish farm access projects.

Madam Minister, will you explain why you are forcing nearly all rural governments to put road construction on hold and are you waiting until you have driven everyone out of rural Saskatchewan and we have no need for roads out there?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, in addition to the money that remains in the revenue-sharing pool for rural municipalities, there is also \$20 million in the Crow benefit. There is infrastructure money. And there is . . . the futures are being paid out — probably this week — to the tune of \$16 million. There is not a shortage of money for tending to the rural road system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SaskPower Proposed Project in Guyana

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the SaskPower minister. Well we now know what the Guyana power company is worth — sort of. It is worth somewhere between 90 million U.S. (United States) and a negative 15 million U.S. So it's like Bre-X stock a couple of weeks ago — could be worth something, and then again, it could be worthless.

And we all saw how that turned out. The paper certificates are now worth more than the company is.

Mr. Minister, if you want to gamble and live up to your nickname of Lucky, go to a casino, but take your own money. Taxpayers don't want you dropping \$31 million of their money in a crap shoot in South America.

Mr. Minister, will you quit playing Monopoly with taxpayers' money in South America?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the member's researchers spend a lot of time perusing the newspapers. What they haven't done though, is accurately report it in the papers.

And I want to say to the member opposite that we have indeed signed a letter of intent to Guyanese officials; that there has been no agreement reached; that there has been no money spent on the purchase of GEC (Guyana Electricity Corporation); that before any decision with respect to that would be made, I've indicated the process in this legislature ad nauseam.

But I'm going to do it just one more time, Mr. Speaker, just one more time. Before any agreement is reached, it will have to be perused by the SaskPower Commercial board and by the SaskPower board of directors. And I just want to say to the members opposite that that process has not taken place. So I can report to him that no agreement has been reached.

And I can also report to him that there will be, if an agreement is made, an agreement made based on sound business practices that would return a very positive investment for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Minister, aside from the fact that this is a very . . . is a tremendously risky deal, I guess the bigger question is why; why is it the business of SaskPower to be spending millions of Saskatchewan taxpayers' dollar buying power companies in foreign countries? If SaskPower has \$31 million to spare, why don't they spend it in Saskatchewan? Better yet, why don't they give it back to the consumers in the form of a rate decrease — a real rate decrease.

Mr. Minister, why is SaskPower doing this? Why are you blowing our money on a dilapidated, foreign power company?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to that member that we are not putting the Power Corporation in a

position where it will be doing undue risk. I want to say that the members of that political party did more to destroy the Crown corporations both in Regina and in Ottawa, along with their cousins the Liberals in Regina and in Ottawa, than any single thing any government in this country could do with respect to a Crown.

Mr. Speaker, these Crowns are facing a deregulated environment and they will do what is sound business, and that's position these corporations so that they can compete. We're not about to stand by and see the assets of this province diminish because we did nothing. And I want to say that these corporations will, as they have in the past, look at business opportunities both inside and outside of this province.

Those members forget to mention the fact that SaskTel netted for the people of this province, to reduce debt, \$114 million on a cable deal in Leicester. I say they've got selective amnesia. They're playing politics with . . .

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

Health Care Bill of Rights

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions this afternoon are for the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, Saskatchewan people have lost faith in your health system and the health care problems in this province. Your polling shows that 62 per cent of people expect health services to deteriorate even further over the next 10 years.

Mr. Minister, the biggest problem we hear from Saskatchewan people is the uncertainty about health care services. They don't know if they're going to lose their hospital or their nursing home. They don't know if emergency services are going to be available to them. They don't know what the bottom line is — what your health care services and what kind of health care services they can expect in the future.

Mr. Minister, the PC (Progressive Conservative) caucus is proposing that a health care bill of rights and responsibilities be established through consultation with health care providers, communities, and Saskatchewan people. Will you support this process and support the Saskatchewan health care bill of rights and responsibilities?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Mr. Speaker, this party, this government, and this province brought in a health care bill of rights in 1962 when we pioneered the medicare system for this country . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — . . . over the opposition of that party, the Conservatives, and that party, the Liberals.

That's our commitment. That's our bill of rights for health care, Mr. Speaker. And we're going to keep the public medicare system that we pioneered — no thanks to the Conservatives, no thanks to the Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you know what was most frightening about last night's leaders' debate? When Jean Chrétien defended his health care record by quoting the Premier of Saskatchewan. If Jean Chrétien is basing his health care policy on Saskatchewan's NDP's attacks on the health care system, we're all in a lot of trouble in this province.

Mr. Minister, last summer I toured a number of communities that lost health care services. They just wanted to know what the bottom line was — what was the basic level of health care services we can have the right to expect so we can start doing some long-term planning instead of crisis management. That's what they wanted to know. Our health care bill of rights and responsibilities would set up a process of establishing those standards and guaranteeing them in law.

And we wonder, Mr. Minister, what is wrong with that. Why don't you provide Saskatchewan people with a guarantee of health care services in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Mr. Speaker, coming from the Conservative Party, this is empty words and hollow rhetoric. What we have done in this province, Mr. Speaker, is to back-fill every penny of federal cuts to the health care system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Cuts which started under the Conservatives when they were in power under Brian Mulroney and continued under the Liberals. And I want to say to this House that Alexa McDonough and the New Democrats are talking about keeping the public medicare system.

The policy of the Conservatives is two-tier, pay-as-you-go medicine. That's the policy of the Liberals and that's the policy of the Reform Party. There is one party that stands for the public medicare system, Mr. Speaker. It is the New Democratic Party that founded the public medicare system in this province — no thanks to the Conservatives, no thanks to the Liberals, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, if you're doing such a great job in health care, then why do 62 per cent of the people expect health care services to continue to deteriorate over the next few years?

Mr. Minister, your government recently undertook a public review of the Crown corporations. While that is important, the future of health care services is far more important in this province. Yet you don't want to even give Saskatchewan people a right to a say in the future of the delivery of health care services.

Mr. Minister, most people in Saskatchewan expect health care services to deteriorate because there is no clear game plan.

They have no guarantee of what health care services they can expect and no outline of who is responsible for providing those services. Mr. Minister, shouldn't people expect their government to show some leadership and provide that blueprint? Mr. Minister, will you do so today by supporting our bill on health care rights and responsibilities for the people of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — As I've already told the member, Mr. Speaker, the bill of rights in health care in this province came about in 1962 when medicare was introduced.

But I want to say to the member, that if the member thinks back to the provincial budget, delivered on March 20 by the Minister of Finance, which the member supported — the member supported, Mr. Speaker — one of the things about that budget is that it puts into health care in Saskatchewan \$56.2 million new money, and \$53 million additional money to back-fill the Liberal cuts to health care. That's more than \$100 million new money to health care in Saskatchewan this year, Mr. Speaker. And that money is going to guarantee stability and security in the health care system. And it's going to help secure medicare for future generations.

We don't just have empty words and hollow rhetoric, Mr. Speaker. Unlike the Conservatives and the Liberals, this government puts its money where its mouth is, which is in public medicare, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Health Care Reform

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this government began axing hospital beds, it promised the people of this province better home care services. But evidently this is not happening, and Colleen Covey-Kennedy's battle to get an in-home nurse for her daughter Natalie is a prime example of an epidemic facing our health care system.

After a year and a half fight the health board finally approved a nurse for Natalie. However, Mr. Speaker, it came too late as Natalie died of brain cancer four days later. The Covey-Kennedys represent hundreds of people slipping through the cracks as neither hospitals nor the home care system are meeting their needs.

Mr. Speaker, Natalie spent her final days concerned about the financial toll her illness was taking on her family — the very last thing that she should have been worried about.

Mr. Speaker, today we hear the sanctimonious Health minister. They're so busy slapping themselves on the back and praising their health care. Mr. Speaker, where is their compassion, and what are you doing about all these people, Mr. Minister, that are falling through the cracks in your wellness model?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to report to the House that Saskatchewan is recognized as a leader in the provision of palliative care. Much more money has been directed toward palliative care in the last number of years.

And I want to say to the member that in the Saskatoon Health District the palliative care unit provides 24-hour palliative care support. People do not always want to be in institutions. Sometimes they need palliative care in their home. And palliative home care has increased, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatoon by 67 per cent in 1995-96 over the previous year.

It's always a sad situation and a tragic situation when somebody needs palliative care, especially a young person. But I want to say that we're doing a lot more in the area of palliative care than we have in the past, Mr. Speaker. There may be some improvements that can be made, and if there are improvements that are needed, this government wants to work on those improvements in cooperation with the people in Saskatoon and elsewhere.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the Assembly to make a motion which would change the hours of sitting for the day. I will read the motion so that the members can hear what the intent is. The motion would read:

That notwithstanding rule 3, this Assembly will recess at 6 p.m. and reconvene at 8:30 p.m. on May 13, 1997.

Leave granted.

MOTIONS

Hours of Sitting

Mr. Kowalsky: — I therefore move, seconded by the member from Melfort-Tisdale:

That notwithstanding rule 3, this Assembly will recess at 6 p.m. and reconvene at 8:30 p.m. on May 13, 1997.

Motion agreed to.

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

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, due to an oversight, by leave, we would like to move back to item no. 3, Bill No 227, introduction of Bills.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 227 — The Saskatchewan Health Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Act

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the legislature. Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of Bill No. 227,

The Health Care Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Act be now introduced and read a first time.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE BILLS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 303 — The TD Trust Company Act, 1997

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 303 — The TD Trust Company Act, 1997

Ms. Murrell: — Mr. Chair, I move that Bill No. 303, The TD Trust Company Act, 1997 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.

The Deputy Speaker: — I recognize the Government Whip.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, in discussions we've reached agreement with the opposition party and the third party for the agenda for the remainder of the day. And I would ask for leave of the House that we now go directly to private members' public Bills to deal with Bills 209 and 234. And furthermore, that when we vote off those Bills, that we would proceed to government business for the remainder of the day.

Leave granted.

(1430)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 209 — The Measures to Combat Child Prostitution Act

Ms. Julé: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak about Bill 209 at the second reading stage in this House. At the close of my remarks I will be making a motion in relation to my Bill. Mr. Speaker, I will preface my remarks by citing the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Rights of the Child states that:

Every child has the inherent right to life, and States shall

ensure to maximum, child survival and development.

States shall ensure that each child enjoys full rights without discrimination or distinctions of any kind.

States shall protect children from physical or mental harm and neglect, including sexual abuse and exploitation.

The child is entitled to the highest attainable standard of health.

Children shall have time to rest and play.

States shall protect children from the illegal use of drugs and involvement in drug production and trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today about a problem.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order, the hon. member from Humboldt has the floor and I would ask the private conversations to please move behind the bar or outside the Chamber. I'm having trouble hearing the hon. member in her debate and I would ask that the House refrain from private . . . too loud private conversations.

Ms. Julé: — I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am speaking today about a problem, or more accurately a crisis, the importance of which cannot be overstated and where action instead of empty rhetoric is long overdue. I am talking about child sexual abuse and exploitation. I am talking about child prostitution.

As a conscientious woman, mother, human being, and legislator — and yes, we legislators are human — I care about the healthy emotional, psychological, and physical development of our children. I believe in the worth and dignity of every human being and I treasure beyond measure the lives of our children. My social responsibility is to work toward the betterment of all lives in order to better society. But most of all it is to work for and protect the most vulnerable members of our society, those children who are defenceless against the predatory and criminal behaviour of ruthless and exploiting adults.

In a country like Canada, which according to the United Nations is the best country in the world for quality of life and Saskatchewan the best province, child prostitution is a blight and a blemish not to be tolerated. Not only must it not be tolerated, Mr. Speaker, it must be eradicated. It is fine and dandy to place first on the United Nations' development program's human development index. Unfortunately there is a marked disparity between the rhetoric about prosperity and the reality that many Saskatchewan families face.

Mr. Speaker, in December 1996 there were 39,000 Saskatchewan Assistance Plan cases involving 79,000 recipients, which is about 8 per cent of the population. Over 43,000 Saskatchewan children under 18 live in poverty, this in a province where the government boasts of its economic management and job creation prowess. The situation is further compounded by the difficulty families and communities

experience in attempting to voice their concerns about the well-being of children.

A case in point was the recent rash of car thefts and near-fatal encounters with police in Regina. And what was the Minister of Justice's response? His response, hard as it is to believe, was that car theft was not a serious problem. He quickly changed his tune however when everyone else — police, parents, youth, judges — disagreed with the minister and thought it a problem worthy of some attention.

Mr. Speaker, it took a rash of car thefts to really focus the public's and politicians' attention, albeit only for a short period, on a problem of endemic proportions. Similarly, child prostitution in Regina only receives significant public attention with the recent release of the City of Regina Crime Prevention Commission report on child prostitution and the attendant media reporting.

The report is illuminating and disturbing, and echoes the findings and conclusions in other jurisdictions. The commissioners identify child prostitution as a priority because of the children's vulnerability as well as the long-term consequences to our children and our community if child prostitution is not stopped.

How do you eliminate child prostitution? And make no mistake about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, anything less than total elimination is unacceptable.

My Bill, which I will have more to say about a little later, is a concrete step in excising this cancerous community sore. It does so by targeting the perpetrators of child prostitution — the pedophiles and the rapists. I fully recognize that my Bill or any criminal and any punitive legislation only deals with the symptoms of a much broader and deep-rooted community problem.

Such legislation however, as has been recognized and acted upon in Alberta and Manitoba, is an essential step with potential dramatic short-term results, while the policies and programs and support structure and services necessary for treating the underlying causes of child prostitution are developed and improved and implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier to the fact that there are 43,000 Saskatchewan children living in poverty and 79,000 people are dependent on the social assistance plan. Mr. Speaker, poverty and lack of employment opportunities are the root cause of many social ills and crimes including child prostitution.

Unemployment, poverty, and the inability to provide for one's family and loved ones inflicts a debilitating emotional and psychological humiliation that results in family breakdown. This is particularly true when there is little or no hope for employment and improved family prospects because of the lack of appropriate education and skills or family circumstances. Inevitably, the ones that suffer the most are the children — too young to understand and fend for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the Children Off The Streets research project by

the Regina Aboriginal Human Services Co-operative lucidly describes the conditions that give rise to child prostitution. And I quote:

Poor children suffer greater risks and have a markedly inferior quality of life, compared to economically advantaged children.

Poor children have more than twice the rate of emotional and behavioral disorders, poor school performance, regular tobacco use and the lack of social skills.

They have a greater risk of chronic health problems and are more likely to grow up in one parent families where there is overcrowding in the home, disturbed family relationships, and parental psychiatric disturbance.

Mr. Speaker, there is widespread consensus that while the freedom and the fast-paced life of the street do lure some youth to leave home, the vast majority of children are fleeing from intolerable home situations, plagued by physical and sexual abuse, and alcoholism and other addictions.

This verse from the Alberta report on child prostitution titled "Nobody Understands" says more than volumes of reports and statistics about how these children feel:

Cold, scared, haven't eaten in three days
It's like a game out there, but a board game, that is.
Try & make money — but don't end up dead.
See — if you look at it from my eyes,
You would see that we hookers aren't so bad
Most of us are children — 12, 13 years old
So that makes us children of the night.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted earlier, child prostitution has not in the past attracted much public attention or concern. The reason, Mr. Speaker, to put it bluntly, is because most of the victims are native children. It grieves me to say this, but I suspect that if the large majority of victims were white children, there would have been great public outcry a long time ago, and concrete government action would also have been taken long ago.

The victims of child prostitution are mostly aboriginal children because aboriginal people are largely outside the economic mainstream.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, today people of Indian ancestry make up the fourth largest group in Saskatchewan's population. The majority no longer live on reserves or isolated communities. Instead, they live in both rural and urban settings in all areas of the province, caught in a twilight zone between their traditional reservation culture and the urban mainstream culture, and often living in ghettos in substandard housing, owned sometimes by absentee landlords.

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of settlement more than a century ago, aboriginal and non-aboriginal cultures have been in conflict. Traditional cultures have been eroded by white people's value system and education system which forces Indian and Metis children to learn not of their history and their

successes, but of their failures.

Education is the key to resolving this clash of cultures and cultural conflicts and to providing the native students with the required skills in education to tear themselves away from the vicious and perpetual circle of minimal education — no skills, no jobs; welfare; poverty; violence; crime; child prostitution. Any vestiges of stereotyped and negative images of aboriginal peoples in instructional materials and in classrooms must be replaced by positive ones. Education programs must be adapted so that children who's learning styles are influenced by their cultural backgrounds are not at a disadvantage.

I urge and challenge the Minister of Education to ensure that the education system and curricula accommodate the needs and aspirations of aboriginal people. Not until aboriginal people feel like full and equal partners in the economy and society will we be a community of the whole. And not until then will the root causes of child prostitution be eradicated for good.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the long-term solution. In the meantime we must act immediately to target and charge those who prey on those children and who live off their avails. It is the government's responsibility to provide the means whereby all citizens enjoy life in a safe and a healthy environment.

Mr. Speaker, communities and community organizations are willing and they're chomping at the bit to do their part and government must do its part. Presently, you are not providing the legislative protection required for the children of the night, and so in effect you are contributing to the continued neglect and abuse of our children. Why are you failing to act? Why are you dragging your feet? There is no time to be lost.

Mr. Speaker, the life expectancy of a child prostitute is eight years. Within eight years she or he will either be dead or destroyed from drugs and abuse. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time for studies is long past. The government has it within its powers to do the right thing. Manitoba has passed legislation that treats the children as the victims they are, and targets and penalizes the pimps and the johns.

In Alberta, all parties of the government, each party, have agreed to the necessity for such legislation. The federal government on April 14, 1997 passed Bill C-27, amendments to the Criminal Code to enforce harsher penalties on those involved in the child prostitution trade.

My Bill 209, An Act to Implement Measures to Combat Child Prostitution in Saskatchewan parallels the Alberta, Manitoba, and federal legislation, and would be a major step for the enforcement of laws to protect Saskatchewan's children from the abomination of child prostitution.

(1445)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list some of things that I hope to accomplish with the passage of this Bill: (1) identifying prostitutes under the age of 18 as victims of sexual abuse and the men who prey on them as sexual abusers; (2) expanding the coverage of The Child and Family Services Act in order to

protect young people 18 and under if they are being sexually abused and exploited through prostitution; (3) permitting government authorities and Justice officials to offer the treatment and services that child prostitutes desperately need to overcome abusive situations in their home life or drug dependency problems; (4) and finally, the measures to combat child prostitution would allow Social Services officials to accept gifts for the purpose of establishing safe recovery houses for child prostitutes — such safe houses are considered by community and outreach organizations as an indispensable requirement for combating child prostitution.

So to the ministers of Social Services and Justice, I implore you to act now. Please do not resort to Ottawa bashing and buck passing. This is too important to be lobbed back and forth like a ping-pong ball between Regina and Ottawa while there are child prostitutes catching AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) and venereal diseases and dying.

The Liberal caucus will cooperate with you to the fullest extent to pass my Bill, or any Bill that accomplishes its intent.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with another verse titled, "Forgotten Souls."

Not because we choose to turn to the streets,
But because everyone else chose to forget us.
We do need help — but you have to understand
That we grew up with neglect, abuse, and hurt.
We don't know how or what to say when we need help.
Until then, we stay as children of the night
With lots of questions — questions in the wind.

Mr. Speaker, I choose not to forget and I will not rest until there are no more children of the night.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 209 be read a second time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And first of all let me say that it is my pleasure to make a few comments in this debate. And I want to commend the hon. member from Humboldt for putting forth this initiative and also for her very thoughtful comments on a issue that she feels obviously very passionate about.

Certainly it's the responsibility of opposition members not just to criticize but to put forth constructive ideas and I want to acknowledge that I appreciate the hon. member doing that.

And that the whole question of child prostitution — which I prefer to call sexual abuse — is simply not acceptable, not tolerated. And I think that's been made clear by the Minister of Social Services, Minister of Justice, that we on this side certainly take that position very strongly.

Indeed we've taken the historic position, as a government three or four years ago, that there's a zero tolerance level on family violence. I think perhaps the only legislature in Canada,

provincially, who's brought in legislation to deem that as such and put a program in place to deal with that.

I want to say to the hon. member that I'm no expert in the family service . . . Child and Family Services Act, but I've also been able to take through some of the amendments to that Act in this legislature in the past. And I've looked at her Bill very carefully, as I know the Minister of Social Services and the department have.

And I say this with the most respect possible — I really mean that — and that is that the Bill, while I appreciate the initiative, really does not add anything that isn't there already and that isn't being done already. I say this with the greatest of respect. It is a good initiative but it is already possible within the current Child and Family Services Act and it is already occurring. So the two provisions, that is safety and enhanced protection to young people 18 and under, is being provided already. And I support the spirit of that intent.

Secondly, this notion of gifts is already possible under the Act. And so while I applaud the initiative, I agree with the Minister of Social Services, that it really does not add anything that isn't there now and isn't happening now.

And, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean I don't value the initiative; I really do. I also think it's important — and I don't think this is federal bashing; I hope the member doesn't see it this way — but I also think it is important, because the Alberta report makes this clear too, that the Criminal Code changes that in a sense died on the order paper with the call of the federal election, or while it is not proclaimed yet, the federal Criminal Code changes which would make the gathering of evidence easier and make it easier for young people to testify and would allow their evidence to be heard in an easier fashion, through screens and so on and monitors and so on, that is very important legislation that would go a long way to . . . I think even would go further than the member's Bill to actually getting the convictions, which has been the major problem.

So this isn't federal bashing, but the federal government needs to also make sure that they're on board and that the Criminal Code amendments are in fact proclaimed. And I see the hon. member from North Battleford agrees. So I think that's a partnership more than fed bashing.

But I'm really sad that that died on the order paper because I think that that is the initiative that Alberta and all the provinces and territories want. I think that would have been very, very important.

And I have never heard the hon. member from Humboldt acknowledge that that is a problem, that the Criminal Code changes should not be speeded up and endorsed. Because I think that would make major changes that would be supportive to what she's trying to do here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. member, the points she made about poverty, I agree with those. I agree that the level of family poverty in Canada is unacceptable and that's a blight on all of us. But as she was speaking, I'm wondering — and I say

this again with the greatest respect — I'm wondering why the member's party was critical of the minimum wage increase which gives more money to working families. I was thinking, why the member's party did not say anything about the federal government pulling out of the social housing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I mean these are valid questions on my part. I'm wondering why the member's party voted against part-time benefits for part-time employees.

When they had the opportunity, they voted against those pieces of legislation that would have enhanced the income for low income families. I wondered again why the member's party voted against this budget on the initial vote which actually gave more money to increase the Family Income Plan for low income families.

Now why would you have voted against that? Why would you have voted against a budget that doubled the money in the action plan for children that put \$250,000 directly into the cause you're just trying to promote, and put another \$12 million in other support for low income families, many of them of aboriginal background? Why you would have voted against that baffles me. It really baffles me.

I'm really wondering about this concern about poverty because those things were designed to help. Those things were brought in to help and you voted against those. So when you're talking about that 12-year-old on the street with this important story, think about why you voted against those measures that would have helped her family to get more food for her.

So I think it's important to think about that. So the crusade has got to be a multi-dimensional crusade as well, and a consistent one.

Now I would say that to say that the province is doing nothing is really unfair. I have to say that with the greatest of respect, because whether you like it or not the action plan for children, that puts \$25 million into the kind of programs that you want, is a nationally renowned program.

That doesn't mean to say it's perfect and it's going far enough, but it is a nationally renowned program in this sense, that it prioritizes the support for children and their families — especially poor children and their families. Secondly, it is a model for government departments and agencies working together. And thirdly, it's a model for government working with the community in an integrated way in partnership.

So I think that that sort of an approach is a strong message that we're not doing . . . it's not that we're not doing anything. I think that we're recognized as trying to do a great deal to prioritize children in this work to children.

We also — and this is somewhat historic — have signed 10 agreements with first nations bands and tribal councils to support them to develop their own child welfare services, and services to children. Now surely all members in this Assembly would support that initiative, because that allows and supports aboriginal people to develop their own services.

So, Mr. Speaker, from our point of view, we believe that this initiative is positive, but it is already being done. We believe that the five-point strategy outlined last week by the Minister of Social Services and the Minister of Justice, which is designed to get children off the street, to create working protocols within the community, between the community and government — that is all the parties working together — to organize community resources to focus on the very concern that this Bill addresses, and then to work towards toward long-term strategies — those four objectives are consistent with what the member would like to see, I think, and with her Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that we agree that this sexual abuse of children is not acceptable. That this is abuse that we will, as outlined last week, bring down the full force of the law on johns and those who are abusers. We have put specific money, the 250,000 plus the additional money in the action plan for children, towards this particular problem, which would result in additional outreach services, perhaps safe houses. I can't prejudge what the communities are going to decide, where they're going to decide to prioritize. But we're also . . . there's a commitment to make sure that if there is any way we can enhance the legislation, that is ongoing and we will continue to look at that.

And of course we will continue to urge the federal government to partner here to pass those important changes to the Criminal Code, and along with an important informational campaign and the educational process that the hon. member from Humboldt is promoting.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for the initiative. I'm going to vote against this Bill, not because I don't support it, but because it does not add anything that is not already possible and is not being done already.

And I hope that it's seen in that spirit; I hope it's seen in that spirit. And that does not mean that I don't appreciate the initiative. But what she's advocating, plus more, is already being done and will continue to be done and I look forward to working with her as we deal with this together in a depoliticized way. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Is the member wishing to close debate?

Ms. Julé: — Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — The hon. member from Humboldt is wishing to close debate and it is my duty to warn the Assembly that the debate is about to be closed and that any member wishing to speak on this must do so now.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to offer my thank you to the comments of the member opposite regarding child prostitution. Why? Because it really outlines for me, in a sense, the lack of dedication to action on the part of this government. What this government does or does not do in regard to child prostitution,

or anything else, speaks very loudly to what is really important to them.

Now my Bill . . . if one would look into The Child and Family Services Act, we would recognize that there is nothing there that provides for protection of child prostitutes. Child prostitutes are not even named in that Bill from what I have seen. We want to extend protection to children that are victims of child prostitution; protection in the means of services and any other protection that children that are sexually abused in their home are entitled to. That is where the difference is.

(1500)

Once children are in fact stated as being child prostitutes and that they are being exploited, that constitutes child sexual abuse. And it follows, hon. member opposite, that those people abusing that person would be then having to face the repercussions through the amendments to the Criminal Code that have been put forth.

Now you have mentioned that the amendments to the Criminal Code have not been passed, if I understood you correctly, and I recognize that they have been passed. And we will urge the federal government to proclaim that Act. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I look at the number of things that could be done in order to combat child prostitution — and just a few of them that I have put forward in my Bill — one of them surrounding the ability of the minister or his officials to receive monies or buildings or labour or work or any contributions to contribute towards the needs that the many people out there in communities have in order to establish safe houses, I am amazed that that's something that is not acceptable to you. Those kind of measures are necessary to make clear to the public and to yourselves that those things can be done, and that it does open up the door for people in this province to recognize that there is an avenue that they can donate so that this problem of child prostitution can be combated.

I would also like to comment for a moment on the why and why and why questions that you put forward about why I didn't support the budget. I would like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that although there are some measures in the budget that everyone would agree with, there are many that we cannot agree with. If the bulk of the budget is something we cannot agree with, then we would have to speak against it. It's very simple. And that is why I did vote against the budget.

Rather than ask the why's and the why's and the why's and mentioning your \$250,000 announced for youth outreach initiatives, I would like to remind your government of how they could spend some money towards this initiative.

First and foremost, I would ask you to please take the half a million dollars from now on that you put forward for every Roughrider party that lasts for one day and throw it out to the children that need it, to those people trying to help children. That half a million dollars was double the amount that you put in for one whole year to combat child prostitution in the form of

youth outreach. I disagree with that kind of priority.

I also would like to mention the \$250 for the . . . plus 31 million for purchasing and upgrading a Guyanan power company — a major risk.

We have a bigger risk right here on our streets that we could put that money towards. That's a combination and a total of \$246 million. I would like to use some of that towards child prostitution.

There are other monies that I could mention here that we could certainly redirect, and depending on government priorities, I guess it's up to you. Ultimately you hold the purse-strings.

I would also like to mention just one more statement. We have been in contact with Egadz in Saskatoon. There are 200 . . . over 200 child prostitutes in Saskatoon right now. There is a population of 200,000 people. Now that ratio of 200:200,000 means that 1 in 1,000 people living in Saskatoon are child prostitutes. That's alarming.

We have also some mention from Bill Thibodeau of Egadz that as he read your measures that you put across, or the minister put across the other day to combat child prostitution, his comment was that these measures do not go even close to far enough. It simply is not going to do the trick.

I think what we need to do is we need to re-examine our priorities. There are other provinces around that have really looked into this, B.C. (British Columbia) being one of them. I invite you to look there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot say strongly enough how important this issue is. The problems of our children's lives being decimated on the streets is in fact growing and growing and growing. We have many, many concerned citizens out there, and the quality of life and the kind of province we want to be living in is up to us to determine.

I believe firmly that children need to have adults caring and protecting them. That is why the United Nations put forth the Rights of the Child. They have no one else to depend on.

This government will leave a legacy someday, Mr. Speaker, and everyone in this province will be looking to that legacy. I would suggest that they first and foremost look to the needs of our children and those minority groups that need it the most.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on division.

Bill No. 234 — The Crown Construction Tendering Agreement Revocation Act (No. 2)

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased once again to discuss this government's unfair Crown construction tendering policy or their so-called fair wage policy

brought in by the NDP members opposite.

I'm also pleased to have the opportunity to bring this Act to a vote today because it will clearly show the people of Saskatchewan who is in favour of this costly, unnecessary pay-off to the unions of this province and who stands for fair and open government tendering in this province as well.

It's no surprise, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP forced through this unnecessary labour legislation over the past few years since they still have to gain back some political support of unions. It doesn't matter that the legislation wasn't needed or that it would kill jobs or that it doesn't make any sense. The NDP didn't care at all about that. All they cared about was scoring a few political points and paying off a few political debts.

The same is true for the leaked memo prepared by the Department of Economic Development — the department that we pay experts for advice on very important economic policies and ideas.

As I recall, it wasn't very long ago that there was a leaked memo from the department of economics that talked about how this policy would be seen as a pay-off to the unions, and that it would be costly to the taxpayers. Any responsible government would have listened to the advice of the officials on this issue and scrapped the whole idea in the first place. But not the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

What did the NDP government do with its memo prepared by the professionals? Well they took one look at it and they decided against what was right for the Saskatchewan people, against what would create jobs for Saskatchewan people, against the advice of their own department, and did what they thought was good for them politically, and only politically.

It's pretty sad, Mr. Speaker, that a leaked memo has to surface several months later providing . . . proving that the PC caucus was right all along, that the concerns brought by our caucus — and the business community brought the same concerns — the Economic Development officials brought to the people as well.

From the very beginning, our caucus along with the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Saskatchewan Construction Association, and other organizations were against the NDP's union-preference Crown tendering policy.

We took this position for a number of reasons, Mr. Speaker. This policy is unfair to non-union contractors and non-union construction employees. It significantly increases the cost to taxpayers by as much as 30 per cent. And it forces non-union contractors to subsidize union contractors through additional fees and the like.

But, Mr. Speaker, what did the NDP say when those concerns were brought up? They said their union-preference tendering policy, otherwise known as the Crown Construction Tendering Agreement, CCTA, was not a pro-union policy; that it would mean fair tendering and that there would be no increased cost to the taxpayers.

Well last May, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we found out that that simply wasn't the case. Last year we found out that the NDP were misleading the public on this issue right from the very start and that we were right all along. A leaked memo from the Department of Economic Development to the minister, dated November 19, 1994, revealed the department recommended against implementing this policy.

In fact the memo describes the CCTA as a union-preference policy instead of a fair wage policy that the government tried to promote, and that union contractors would receive 15 to 20 per cent more for their work than they would ordinarily. It further states that the CCTA could increase Crown construction tenders by as much as 30 per cent.

So I guess the PC caucus and the business community, all we say can is, I told you so.

In addition to what Mr. Romanow has told others to sell their . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. I think the member knows that he is not to use proper names in addresses to the Legislative Assembly of someone that is presently sitting in the House, and I would ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Boyd: — In addition to what the Premier has told the people of this province, he's also told his members to go out and sell, and sell this unfair policy. The memo also states that the bureaucrats were instructed to prepare an article for the NDP's party magazine, *The Commonwealth*.

You have to really wonder about that. The Department of Economic Development officials are supposed to be non-partisan; they're supposed to be non-partisan. Yet they engaged in this activity on instructions from this government that they would prepare information and prepare a policy to sell to the people of Saskatchewan in the NDP party magazine, *The Commonwealth*.

The memo also stated . . . also called for a letter-to-the-editor campaign and approached a few employers to contact specific business and political reporters for pre-announcement, positive stories on similar union-preference agreements. One editorial has put it:

Getting business to manipulate reporters; writing phoney letters to the editor; civil servants writing for *The Commonwealth* — our hard-earned taxpayers' dollars at work. It makes the last 14 per cent SaskPower hike seem all that much more worthwhile.

The issue however isn't over. This so-called internal review of this policy certainly wasn't a valid one. The public heard about the many facts about the CCTA from the review, as they did about the memo sent to the minister three years ago.

We've called on the NDP to scrap this policy altogether. We've called on the NDP to conduct an independent review of this policy. And we think it is the very least that this government should do. Unfortunately, I doubt Saskatchewan taxpayers will

get even that.

Mr. Speaker, that's why we've brought forward this legislation today. By supporting Bill No. 234, all members of this Assembly could show that they believe in fair government tendering — they believe each and every tender awarded to the government should be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder. They could show that contracts shouldn't be awarded based on who has more union workers.

Mr. Speaker, the CCTA is blatantly unfair. Although the NDP can't hide this fact, they certainly try to deny this fact. The minister responsible for Labour gets up and puts on his best poker face and says things like, there's no proof that this policy is costing taxpayers any money. But there is proof, Mr. Speaker, and there's plenty of proof.

The leaked memo outlined how much money this would cost taxpayers. The Economic Development minister stood in this House last year and said, this policy costs taxpayers money. Everyone knows this policy costs taxpayers money.

Mr. Speaker, I know this policy has caused many a rift between government members. It has to have if MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) are standing up for their constituents. It's certain the minister responsible for Economic Development isn't in favour of this policy. I'm certain of that, because it hurts job creation and it doesn't make any economic sense in this province.

I'm sure there are other members of cabinet that recognize how ridiculous this policy is as well. Those MLAs representing rural areas of this province should be ashamed that this policy was even considered — rural contractors being forced to hire union workers from large centres instead of giving work to their long-time, non-union employees. This policy has forced small contractors in rural areas to lay off their own sons — their own sons, in some cases — to hire union workers from cities to complete work. And very few construction workers and union employees even believe that this policy makes sense themselves.

And this all comes from a party that likes to call themselves democrats. They like to call themselves democrats — people who believe in fairness; people who believe that everyone should be treated the same; people who stand in the legislature on a daily basis and say they are the ones that stand up for people who can't stand up for themselves.

That's what they say in this legislature, Mr. Speaker. They are the ones opposite over there that stand before everyone in Saskatchewan and say that they stand up for what they believe in. They stand up for a principled way of governing this province.

They stand up for, in this case — they stand up for, in this case — what they think is good for them politically and they could care less what it costs the taxpayers of this province. And they could care less what it does for anyone but what they think is best for them politically. Isn't that incredible?

You have a government opposite who says, so what if it costs taxpayers money; so what if it's unfair; we're going to do it anyway because our political hides demand it. That's what it means.

It means pork-barrel politics at its worst. It means bringing in legislation to promote an agenda that is unfair; that even the most wild-eyed socialist over there in their heart of hearts realizes it isn't fair. They realize that it isn't fair but they could care less about that, Mr. Speaker.

But there are a few exceptions. I think the Minister of Economic Development knows the policy isn't fair because it hurts job creation and it doesn't make any sense. But he also realizes that he has to have the support of unionized workers in this province if he hopes to become the premier of Saskatchewan someday. And he's been waiting a long time for that. And I think he's prepared to pay the price, whatever it takes — whatever it takes — just like the government members opposite.

And everyone in Saskatchewan understands that about this policy, and they understand that about this government as well: that when the chips are down, when it really gets tough slugging in Saskatchewan, you can always count on the NDP for one thing and one thing only — to do whatever they think is best for them politically. It doesn't matter. The end justifies the means. The end justifies the means. It doesn't matter anything about anything else.

(1515)

It only matters about politics. It only matters about gaining the support, it only matters about gaining the support of people that they believe will help them in election campaigns, help fund them in election campaigns.

And the minister from Regina here chirping, chirping from her seat saying that that's right. Well it is right — isn't it, Madam Minister? You know darn well what I'm saying is correct. You know darn well this policy is unfair. You know darn well it's discriminatory.

And again this comes from a party, this comes from a party who on a regular basis stands in this House and says that they believe that all kinds of discrimination should be wiped out from this legislature. They proudly display all kinds of ribbons and everything else to pay lip-service, to pay lip-service to the latest cause of the day — to pay lip-service to the latest cause of the day.

They do that on a regular basis in here. They stand up with the highest level of sanctimony you can possibly imagine and suggest that this is fair. They bring in a policy that says, if you're going to bid on a government contract in Saskatchewan, you have to be unionized whether you like it or not.

What possible way, what possible way can you defend that as the great democrats that you all like to call yourselves? What possible defence do you have for that? Is there any defence that you have at all for bringing in that type of discriminatory

policy? Is there any at all to it? Any at all, Madam Minister? Is there any, any possible defence for it, member from Albert South? Or member from Lloydminster? Or Tisdale country up there?

Is there any possible defence for it? Is there any possible defence, Saskatoon Eastview?

An Hon. Member: — Southeast.

Mr. Boyd: — Southeast. Any possible defence for it at all? Or does it have nothing to do with it at all? The only concern is, is to make sure you get elected again, is to make sure that the unionized people in this province continue to fund your election campaigns.

Does it have anything . . . You know I really believe in Saskatchewan, people would have a lot more respect for you as a party if you'd at least stand up and say yes, that's right. That's exactly right. We believe in it because we want to promote an agenda in this province that says you have to be a unionized contractor. That we believe that that's the proper way to have labour peace in this province.

If you'd at least stand up and say that, then people I think would have some degree of respect for what you're doing here. But no, you hide behind this false attitude that it's a fair wage policy. You hide behind that because that's all that there is — is trying to suggest to the people of Saskatchewan that somehow or another this is fair — when all evidence, when all around you is saying no, it's not fair. Even when everyone is against you, political ideology is what you cling to most.

And that's shameful, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's a shameful admission, I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker. When it comes down to the decisions between doing what is right and doing what is right politically for you, the NDP, you can always count on them to do what is right politically for them. And the rest of the province — tough luck. Tough luck.

The vast majority of people in this province . . . Mr. Speaker, over 80 per cent of all construction workers in this province don't belong to a union, and they shouldn't have to unless they want to. No government should force people to join unions under any circumstance because that's exactly what people don't believe in in Saskatchewan. People in Saskatchewan have an inherent belief in fairness. They don't believe this policy is fair.

Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the world is moving ahead, while states with right-to-work legislation are growing by 15 to 20 per cent annually, Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan NDP have taken a huge step backwards. And as long as they keep taking steps backwards, we'll continue to lag behind Manitoba and Alberta in job creations, and we'll continue to be a have-not province, and we'll continue to stagnate growth, and we'll continue to watch our brothers and our sisters and our sons and our daughters and our cousins leave this province because there isn't opportunity for them here.

We'll continue to watch that happen. Each and every member

of this legislature, I'll bet if you searched and talked to every one of them, they have many, many members of their family that would dearly love to stay in Saskatchewan but they have no choice. There's no hope or there's no dreams or there's no opportunity here in Saskatchewan. They pick up and they leave. And the only time we hear from them is when they phone home to tell us how good it is in Alberta. And that's a sad admission.

It reminds me of a little story, reminds me of a little story that I've told a lot on the campaign trail. It reminds me of a little story that I'm going to share with you that I've told on the campaign trail. And obviously members opposite wouldn't have been in the crowd — thankfully — at all of those functions. Reminds me of a little story.

It happened about, happened about four or five years ago. I was invited, I was invited to a little town in my constituency called Eatonia to the opening of an airport. And many of my members have heard this story but I'm going to share it with everyone here today. I was asked to go over to this opening of this new little airport. Eatonia is a small town, 6 or 700 — 6 or 700 people — is all there is in Eatonia but they were going to open up this new little airstrip this day; they're going to open up this new little airstrip. And what we're talking about is a little grass airstrip and a telephone booth. That's all there is — all there is there.

But of course you know what it's like in rural Saskatchewan, anytime that there's something going to happen like that the community supports it wholeheartedly. They closed the school down; they had all of the kids of the school at that airport opening that day; the band was there — the local band — they had everybody in the whole community turned out, in spite of the fact that it was about September 7, right smack dab in the middle of harvest.

But the whole community turned out because they were so proud, they were so proud of the fact that they were opening up this little airport — this little airstrip. And so they asked me as the MLA to come over and say a few words, so I did. I never will forget this occasion — went over to it and offered my support to the fact that they were opening this and how proud as a small community to have this advance in their community.

And then what happened next was they asked another gentleman to speak. I'd never met the man before, never met him at all before, but he came in to speak to the people that day. He got up to the podium and he said, you know this is the proudest day of my life. I've had many, many occasions to have honours bestowed on me but today is the proudest day of my life — because they were going to name this little airstrip after this gentleman.

And he said, you know I was born and raised in Eatonia, Saskatchewan; I grew up there and from there I went to the University of Saskatchewan — he got a degree. From there he went to the Harvard Business School and got his M.B.A. in business administration; and from there he went into business; and from there he became the chairman of the board of Pratt & Whitney. The second largest aircraft engine manufacturer in the entire world is from Eatonia, Saskatchewan.

And then you know what he said then — and you know what he said then? Ladies and gentlemen, but I have one thing that I'm ashamed of. I'm ashamed of the fact that I couldn't do it in Saskatchewan — I couldn't do it in Saskatchewan because there isn't any dreams or there isn't any hope or there isn't opportunity here. I had to leave Saskatchewan in order to become successful and be able to create what I've been able to create.

That's what that gentleman said. And you looked around the crowd there and I think there wasn't a dry eye in the place because everybody realized what that man said was true; everybody realized that that was the saddest testimony to this province that they had ever heard.

He wished, he wished, he wished he had been able to do it here in Saskatchewan he said, but there was no support here in this province. There was an attitude that if you didn't want to work for government or that you didn't belong to the NDP in this province, that you didn't belong in Saskatchewan.

So he picked up — he picked up and he left this province and he created what, by most people would believe, is one of the biggest and proudest companies in all of the aircraft manufacturing in the world. Sad testimony, sad testimony to this province, but I think it's one that illustrates how clearly this province has been mismanaged largely by a socialist attitude that says somehow or another we aren't equal to the rest of the world. Somehow or another we have to put up walls around this province to keep big bad business out of Saskatchewan. Somehow or another we have to protect us and protect the people of Saskatchewan from the rest of the world.

That's what he said that day. That's what he said to the people of Saskatchewan. That's what this kind of policy does to Saskatchewan. That's what you people opposite believe in. That's what this kind of thing does in terms of providing our young people with hopes and dreams and opportunity here in Saskatchewan.

You people stifle development in Saskatchewan. You people have done everything within your power to drive our young people out of Saskatchewan, and I say to you, you should be ashamed of yourself. You should be ashamed of a policy that says you have to be treated different if you are non-unionized and if you are unionized in Saskatchewan. Discrimination of the worst kind. Discrimination of the worst kind.

I suggest to you that if this was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, it would be struck down. You would be laughed out of court. Unfortunately, unfortunately, no one has the resources to take the Government of Saskatchewan to court except in a few cases — the farmers are doing it in Saskatchewan. And they're going to thoroughly thump you on that one, I suspect.

But the fact of the matter is that at the end of the day, at the end of the day, at the end of the day what we can fully expect from this government is policies like this. It's policies like this that hurt Saskatchewan and that have always hurt Saskatchewan.

(1530)

It's an attitude of failure. It's an attitude I don't accept. It's an attitude that this party doesn't accept. And we will never accept that, Mr. Speaker, because it is wrong. The people of Saskatchewan know it's wrong. I think the NDP knows it's wrong but they don't care — because it's right for them politically — and they should be ashamed to bring in this type of policy.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I challenge each and every member of this Assembly to do the right thing now and vote in support of eliminating, eliminating the Crown Construction Tendering Agreement and supporting The Crown construction agreement revocation Act that we have before us today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Would the member move the motion, please?

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 234, The Crown Construction Tendering Agreement Revocation Act, be now read a second time.

Mr. Renaud: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words about The Crown Construction Tendering Agreement.

The member from Kindersley or somewhere around there — I think it's maybe Kindersley — are very opposed and his party is very opposed to working people in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The government on this side of the House will not participate in fighting against working people of the province of Saskatchewan. We will not participate in telling workers that they're making too much money or they have too many benefits. We will not participate in that, Mr. Speaker.

The reason why we have a Crown tendering . . . a Crown Construction Tendering Agreement in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is to have some fairness in the system. Fairness between workers; fairness between companies. This is what this government is all about — fairness — and that's exactly what we're trying to do in workers versus companies and business.

Under the previous administration, before the NDP formed government in '91, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was a lot of spin-off companies created because of legislative changes to The Trade Union Act by the Conservative government.

Why did companies spin off to non-union construction companies and spin off . . . Some companies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have hundreds of companies that are all really the same company, but to avoid fair wages, decent benefits to the workers, what did they do? — create another company so that they could bid on a particular contract and avoid the fairness.

Do you know that Ontario wouldn't do that? Manitoba — Conservative Manitoba — wouldn't do that. But what did we do in Saskatchewan? We did it.

I have no idea, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it's because of political donations to the parties opposite. I don't know that. But I'd say one might say that it could be because of political donations by the large corporations to the members opposite, that maybe that's why they allowed spin-off companies in the '80s. I don't know that, but that's what some people say, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

If we would have either of those parties governing the province today it would be like Alabama North, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There would be no minimum wage. There would be no fairness for workers in the workplace.

There are reasons for the CTA, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that's to promote and maintain a stable, qualified workforce on projects, and ensure that all employees working on projects are treated fairly.

The agreement was the result of the previous administration's legislation that allowed construction companies, as I mentioned earlier, to double-breast. That's where a company which has a collective agreement in place can establish a spin-off — a non-unionized entity — to bid on contracts.

It was felt that there was a need to ensure that unionized workers had access to a least some of the construction jobs tendered by government. This was considered desirable because it would keep skilled tradesmen in the province of Saskatchewan, encourage apprenticeship training, and provide wages fair to workers in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker — not one-sided, not just for big business or big construction companies, but a balance between workers and construction companies; fairness for everybody to make a decent living in the province of Saskatchewan.

There's little stories, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the opposition parties like to say about the Crown Tendering Agreement. And I just want to correct some of those stories — that false information about the CCTA, just for the record, as the member from Saskatoon mentions.

In 1997 the Crown corporations under the agreement planned to source \$220.269 million in capital projects. They estimate that the projects which would qualify under the CCTA would amount to \$38.561 million. About 17 per cent of the Crown projects will fit under the CCTA and they're still saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's not fair.

Well it isn't fair to the unionized workers of this province, and I agree with that. They would have no minimum wage, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They would have no benefits for workers. It would be Alabama North in the province of Saskatchewan. I wonder about child labour — what their feelings are on child labour is, Mr. Speaker?

It is important to note that there is nothing in the CCTA stating that you have to be a union firm to bid on the CCTA contract. But do the members opposite say that? No they don't. They like to spread little innuendoes and little falsehoods about the CCTA, but it's not fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Just like you have to pay union-based wages and benefits, and hire a certain number of employees from the union halls, which strengthens our apprenticeship programs and keeps workers in Saskatchewan living in Saskatchewan and working in Saskatchewan. We are not bringing in employees, or as many, from outside of the province.

Our economy is growing; it's bustling. We have a very vibrant economy — something that the opposition members will not admit to. But we know it here that the province of Saskatchewan is doing very good.

In construction . . . house construction is way up, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We need a lot of workers in the province of Saskatchewan and we need a strong workforce, both union and non-union. And that's what this government wants — is fairness.

Where a contractor not subject to a collective bargaining agreement secures work in a project, it is agreed by the parties that the regular employees of that contractor will be exempt from the collective bargaining agreement mandatory requirement to join the union, Mr. Speaker.

It is agreed under the terms of the CCTA that there will be no lockouts or work stoppages during the course of the contract. Do we hear anything about that from the members opposite? Do we hear from them that the CCTA prevents lockouts and strikes during a job?

No, we don't. They're just worried about the worker getting too much salary. Well what is too much salary, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I don't know what too much salary is. I don't know what too much benefit is. I don't understand that. The workers I know struggle to make a living just like the rest of us.

But no, the members opposite are very much against workers getting a decent salary and decent benefits in the province of Saskatchewan.

And so I'm going to take my place now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'm going to vote against the Bill from the member from Kindersley.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 3:40 p.m. until 3:43 p.m.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 12

McLane	Gantefoer	Draude
Osika	Bjornerud	Belanger
Hillson	Julé	Boyd
D'Autremont	Toth	Heppner

Nays — 25

Van Mulligen	Tchorzewski	Johnson
Lautermilch	Upshall	Kowalsky

Crofford	Calvert	Teichrob
Pringle	Koenker	Trew
Bradley	Renaud	Cline
Stanger	Hamilton	Murray
Wall	Kasperski	Ward
Sonntag	Jess	Langford
Murrell		

STATEMENT BY THE DEPUTY SPEAKER

Bill No. 210 Removed from Order Paper

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Before proceeding to the next order of business, I have a ruling to make with respect to Bill No. 210, being item No. 7 under the private members public Bills and orders, second readings.

I draw to the attention of the members that, until the disposal of Bill No. 234, The Crown Construction Tendering Agreement Revocation Act (No. 2) moments ago, this Assembly had two Bills on the order paper with the same purpose. Bill No. 210, The Crown Construction Tendering Agreement Revocation Act proposed by the member from Cypress Hills, is in fact identical to Bill No. 234.

It is the practice of this Assembly that in such instances, once the Assembly has given or refused second reading of one Bill, the Speaker must prevent any further consideration of the other Bill.

Order. I refer members to recent rulings of the Chair, dated June 1, 1994 and May 9, 1994. Because the Assembly has refused second reading of Bill No. 234, it is necessary that I order Bill No. 210 to be removed from the order paper.

(1545)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 70 — The Archives Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 70 amends The Archives Act. The Archives Act is the legislation which sets out the powers and duties of the Saskatchewan Archives Board in managing the documentary history of Saskatchewan. Our government is committed to ensuring that the documentary heritage of this province is properly acquired, preserved, arranged, described, and made available to the public.

There is only one amendment in this Bill. This amendment speaks to obligations undertaken by the Archives Board when it enters into agreements with donors of documents. Clearly the Archives Board wishes to obtain and preserve documents that reflect important milestones in our history. In doing so, the rights and wishes of donors should be respected. By ensuring that donor agreements are respected, we are in a better position to attract donations that will help build a fuller and more complete story of our proud Saskatchewan heritage.

Mr. Speaker, we all understand the need to achieve a balance between providing information and protecting the rights of donors. If we did not protect the rights of donors, we would be left with no information to share because donors would be reluctant to deposit their documents. The Saskatchewan Archives is one of the few public Archives to attract many private donations which have helped to create the most complete and well-rounded Archives in North America.

This legislation is about balancing the interests of public access to archival information with an individual donor's right to retain some authority over his or her donation. This is particularly important where agreements were entered into between the Archives Board and donors prior to the introduction of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

We don't believe that new legislation should rewrite the rules which were agreed to on an individual and private basis by the Archives Board and the donor. The provisions of such agreements must be respected and be the paramount consideration in the relationship between the donor and the Archives Board if we are to preserve the integrity of our Archives and encourage its continued support.

We believe this amendment is in the best interests of Saskatchewan people and enhances the ability of the Archives Board to fulfil its mandate. I hope that members on all sides of the House recognize the merit of this amendment and show their support for this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading of Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Archives Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is my pleasure today to speak to the Assembly on The Archives Act which was read for the first time in the Legislative Assembly yesterday.

We understand that there are two parts to the freedom of information legislation that this government passed in 1992. The first part is to ensure that certain information about private individuals cannot be disclosed without their consent. The second part of the legislation deals with access to public information.

Mr. Speaker, when the NDP government passed this legislation, which was introduced by the former Tory government, they stated that despite their initial opposition to the Tory freedom of information Act, they believed it could service Saskatchewan well if administered in the proper spirit.

In today's information age, it is important to have freedom of information legislation. However, the NDP government stated in 1992, when they passed the Bill, that they would be monitoring the situation and would make the necessary amendments to the legislation, which they initially deemed to be a watered-down version of legislation in other jurisdictions.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that this government has done nothing to monitor the effects of this legislation. Too often the government utilizes this legislation as the freedom from disclosing public information rather than access to public information. Private citizens are often amazed at the information that this government does not want it to know.

Because of this constant secrecy, when the government introduced this legislation yesterday, it sparked the interest of the people of Saskatchewan. Although it is possible that this is non-controversial legislation and that it is necessary for the proper function of the Archives Board, Mr. Speaker, the people question the motives of this government. Mr. Speaker, people are asking themselves, what does this government have to hide? And maybe you don't. Maybe your government and the previous governments have nothing to hide, but, Mr. Speaker, let me say that by refusing on a regular basis to provide basic information on government investments and invoking such secrecy legislation, you beg the question, what is the government hiding?

It is my understanding that in other jurisdictions, that cabinet records are made public after a period of 10 years rather than the period of 25 years embodied in this legislation. What is so magical about 25 years? Could this period not be shortened to 10 or 15 years, in the spirit of democracy and open and accountable government? This is one of the questions which we will be raising in the Committee of the Whole before we make a decision on this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Trew): — Order. Now the hon. member for Moosomin has just risen to make his remarks to this Bill and already the Chair could not hear him. I simply remind all hon. members that each of you have an opportunity to debate this Bill here in second reading, and assuming it goes on to committee, again there. And I ask for the cooperation of all hon. members and I thank you for that anticipated cooperation.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Deputy Chair, and just for sake of me stumbling over my tongue, I will refer to you as Mr. Speaker from now on for clarification.

I have a few brief points that I would like to make regarding the legislation before us today.

Mr. Speaker, documents that are sent to the Saskatchewan Archives are kept confidential for quite some time. In fact I understand they are not viewed until 20 years after being donated. In my mind that's a long time, Mr. Speaker, and it's my view that after 20 years, especially in situations where documents are considered the property of a politician who is no longer is a politician, I think it's unreasonable to deny public access.

It would appear to us that this piece of legislation before us is to indeed maybe take away the ability of individuals to look at

documents through the Blakeney years. And one begins to wonder if there's maybe something about the documentation that might be available or that we would have access to now that would suggest that the expropriation or the buying-up of the potash mines in Saskatchewan was not a very good business decision. And I'm sure that this amendment has a lot to do with the fact that former premier Allan Blakeney doesn't want to release information about the Saskatchewan government's buying up the potash industry in our province.

And one must ask why this information shouldn't be released at this time. Is it because information from the department suggested at the time that it wasn't a good idea? That it would indeed ruin Saskatchewan's potash industry — which we have seen through the years it did, but we see a substantial turnaround in the last three years. And I certainly commend the government for the initiative they took in 1995 recognizing that private industry could do much better than Crown corporations.

Do these documents suggest that the present Premier was in favour of nationalizing the potash industry? The fact that he made a move, to indeed put the potash industry back in private hands.

I'm not sure what these documents entail however. Twenty years after these decisions have been made they are history. And if a person endeavours and wants to present that type of information to the Archives, and as we've already heard, in the Archives you can only make information available if the person contributing it wants to make that available, it would seem to me that when a person contributes documents to the Archives Board, that they do it with the understanding that this will become public sooner or later.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that individuals who would feel that there is information they don't really want to become public, would not indeed pass that information on, would not put it in the property of the Archives. Because down the road whether it's 20 years, or 30 or 40 or 50 years, that information is bound to become public. So I don't know exactly where the government is going with this present Bill.

Bill 70, I think is unfair. I think it's a sign of a closed government, a sign of individuals hiding something. And that's the last thing we need in this province. Talking about a sign of government being closed, I understand in Public Accounts today, the government made another move, just to hide information from the public through a motion they made in Public Accounts with regards to CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan).

And it seems to me that in a lot of cases the government uses arguments that when . . . government members while they were in opposition certainly wanted to have more information and more openness, and I find it inconceivable that the government would choose to hide information rather than becoming more open and accountable, such as we find the Acting Government House Leader on many occasions refers to. If he wants to release information, it's open and accountable. If he doesn't respond to a question, well it's just he doesn't really acknowledge the fact that no, this isn't open and accountable.

So this motion before us, this Bill before us, Mr. Speaker, just is something that raises some questions about the openness; and it's not directly dealing with the government of today, but it's dealing with the information that may be available in the future. And that information is at the prerogative of any individual or government as to whether they put it in the Archives.

And I would think that if a person submits documentation on any issue to the Archives Board, that they would certainly be doing it with the knowledge that it will eventually become public. If they don't want information to be public even 50 years from now, they won't bother doing it. So I'm not exactly sure what the real purpose is and why we would now need to set some limitations.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, there are some concerns we have. We look forward to certainly raising those concerns in committee, and however I can't support the Bill in its present structure.

Mr. Hillson: — Yes, I wish to speak very briefly on this and I'm pleased that Madam Minister is still present with us. I have a point I wish to bring before the legislature . . .

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Trew): — Order. I just want to remind the hon. member that commenting on the absence or presence of other members is simply not acceptable in the legislature and I know it was an oversight on the part of the hon. member. With that admonition I recognize the hon. member for North Battleford.

Mr. Hillson: — I have listened to the comments of the minister and of the members for Athabasca and Moosomin with some interest, and I would like to put forward a point that I hope the minister will respond to.

I understand that at times the Archives do receive donations which if they became public immediately, would be the subject of personal embarrassment, and that's the reason for sealing for a period of time, when issues such as the hon. member from Moosomin has pointed out, potash nationalization is simply no longer an alive political issue in this province today. It is now an historical issue and it's important that students of the history of this province have access to that.

However my concern is somewhat opposite to the member from Moosomin. My concern is not so much that things may not go to the Archives because they will eventually become public.

I wish to ask if there is a danger in this legislation that someone who has public documents that he or she does not wish to make public, could they then become the subject of a donation to the Archives so that they would automatically be sealed?

(1600)

And I want to know what protection is in this legislation so that, as I say, if I have public documents that I don't wish to get out, and I don't wish to be the subject of a freedom of information application, I simply donate them to the Archives,

they're automatically sealed for 20 years, and they won't be seen again for a long, long time.

Now as I say, I throw that out more as a question than as a criticism, but I would invite Madam Minister to respond to that. Has the department, have the draftspersons, anticipated this possibility and this problem, and has it been addressed in the preparation of this legislation?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Trew): — Does the minister wish to close debate?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Trew): — It is my duty to inform the Assembly that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is exercising her right to close debate on Bill No. 70 — The Archives Amendment Act, 1997. It is also my duty to inform members that if they wish to enter second reading debate, they must do so now.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would not have risen and would have waited until we considered the Bill in Committee of the Whole, except that the members opposite on both sides have made some quite erroneous statements or misrepresentations of the facts as they are, and I don't want to let that lie for another day.

For one thing, the agreements that the Archives enter into with various donors are all subject to different terms. It's a standard form of agreement but you could say as a donor, that you didn't want your papers in the public realm for 25 years, or 50 years, or 20 years after your demise, or whatever the terms are.

The problem arose when the freedom of information Act did not, when it was passed in 1992 — didn't provide exceptions to allow for the integrity of those agreements. So that would mean that if someone had made an agreement for their papers to be not open to the public for 25 years and they've been only there for 2 years, and if someone made a freedom of information request, the statute would always override the agreement. So we need a statute of similar force in order to respect the integrity of agreements, particularly those agreements.

I mean a donor now would be aware that there's freedom of information legislation and so on. But someone who donated material in the '60s, '70s, '80s, any time prior to 1992, would think that the agreement that they were honouring . . . that they were entering into with the Archives would be binding. And the freedom of information legislation would supersede that and allow the integrity of the agreement to be broken. And that's a question of fairness, because that would be an abrogation of the terms that the donor agreed to. And if the donors couldn't be assured that the agreement was secure, obviously there would be a number of valuable donations that the Archives would not be able to attract.

A member of the third party made reference to a 20-year automatic period. There is no automatic period, and in fact it's

only by nature of the agreement. Usually the donor will . . . and in most cases donors will allow historians, writers, researchers who have a valid reason for wanting the information, they will give them their express permission to go into the Archives and to seek that. Newspaper reporters or journalists might have slightly different motives, but it would depend, again, on . . . With the consent of the donor, anyone could have access, if the donor consents.

The case that the member from North Battleford raises about having items automatically sealed, nothing is automatically sealed and nothing is immune from the freedom of information legislation unless we pass this amendment, which would give the agreements similar force.

And I do have to say on this point that, for example, the Thatcher administration did not submit any records to the Archives. So that whole period, the period of history — sad piece of history it was — but from 1964 to 1971, there is not any record in the Archives. They shredded it all. And so this is a very important amendment, very important to the continuing quality of our archival collection for the future of Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

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

Bill No. 69 — The Police Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to move second reading of The Police Amendment Act, 1997.

The Police Act, 1990 serves as the framework pursuant to which RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) services are provided to rural municipalities and to the majority of urban municipalities.

The Act currently establishes a process through which urban municipalities are able to contract, either through the provincial government or directly with the federal government, for RCMP services, depending on the size of the urban municipality.

One of the long-standing issues in this community has been the disparity which exists between urban municipalities and rural municipalities regarding the funding for such RCMP services. Rural municipalities and urban municipalities under 500 people currently do not provide any direct funding for the RCMP services which they receive.

As a result, larger urban municipalities have long expressed their view that a fairer system would be to redistribute the municipal portion of policing costs over all municipalities that benefit from the policing services.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is a difficult one but one which this government was compelled by fairness to address. Accordingly, extensive consultations and negotiations were initiated with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), and the RCMP in an effort to reach a consensus solution that

21 would be fair to all parties.

These negotiations are being conducted in the context of a number of new initiatives in RCMP rural policing. Subdivision reorganization by the RCMP will provide for staff redeployment to a number of rural detachments. The RCMP are also considering moving their record entry functions to their new central dispatch centre, thereby dramatically cutting down on the paperwork for RCMP officers in the field and increasing their time on the road.

The RCMP are also working on establishing a new radio system which will support greater use of laptop and mobile computer terminals. This will allow RCMP members to receive updated electronic files without returning to their offices. A similar project in New Brunswick has increased on-the-road time for officers by 20 per cent.

In further support of enhanced RCMP rural policing services, the government will be providing an additional \$1 million to the RCMP provincial policing budget base. This initiative alone will provide for additional RCMP staff for 12 rural detachments.

Perhaps most significantly, this government is also considering the RCMP models of policing proposal which would reduce the administrative work of 45 smaller RCMP detachments, thereby freeing up officers at these units to spend more time policing the community and surrounding municipalities.

It should be stressed that in this model, none of these detachments will lose staff as a direct result of the model change.

There are also important initiatives in aboriginal RCMP policing which will further enhance our provincial policing framework. Over the past four years, Saskatchewan Justice, the Solicitor General of Canada, RCMP, and Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations officials have attended over 250 meetings with first nations communities throughout Saskatchewan. As a result of these consultations, 23 police-community tripartite agreements covering 35 bands and encompassing over one-half of the on-reserve population of Saskatchewan have been signed.

These established local police management boards to set policing priorities and work with the RCMP, arrangements for elders to work directly with the RCMP to ensure that the policing is consistent with first nations' culture, and on-reserve RCMP officers on the larger reserves as well as additional clerical support and police liaison officers who will be working with victims. In a number of these locations, police officers will be living on the reserves in the communities which they are policing.

Mr. Speaker, these initiatives will facilitate restorative justice initiatives whereby our aboriginal communities will be encouraged to find solutions to problems at the local level as opposed to being forced to rely on the formal legal system. We are confident that these initiatives will reduce crime both on the reserves and in the neighbouring communities.

I would also note, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has been able to significantly improve the services at no extra cost to the province. This has been done by moving RCMP positions from the provincial police service contract, wherein the province pays 70 per cent of the costs, into tripartite contracts under the federal first nations policing policy where the province is required to pay only 48 per cent of the cost. Again these savings allow us to focus on and enhance our rural policing network.

Mr. Speaker, the consultations with SARM, SUMA, and the RCMP with respect to cost redistribution are not yet finalized. Accordingly, this Bill is intended to facilitate the implementation of a new model for redistributing part of the cost of RCMP services, the details of which will be contained in the regulations.

This Bill provides for the following major changes. The introduction of a global agreement between the provincial and federal governments to provide RCMP services in those urban municipalities that previously contracted through the provincial government but now consent to participate in the global agreement.

Secondly, amendments to existing agreements between urban municipalities and the federal government for RCMP services. The province of Saskatchewan will undertake the financial obligations of those urban municipalities who consent to amending their agreement.

And finally the establishment of a cost-distribution formula to redistribute the costs to provide policing services from those urban municipalities that choose to participate in the redistribution processes outlined above, to Saskatchewan's rural municipalities and urban municipalities under 500 in population.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that participation in the global agreement by urban municipalities is subject to their electing to participate. Similarly, only those urban municipalities that consent to amend their direct agreements with the federal government will be participating in the cost redistribution.

The negotiations which are ongoing with respect to the distribution formula itself will reflect SARM's strong advocacy on behalf of rural municipalities and SUMA's diligence in protecting the interests of urban municipalities both large and small.

We sincerely thank SUMA, SARM, and the RCMP for the professional and constructive approach they have brought to this ongoing discussion. With this amending Bill in place, we are confident that a fair and functional agreement can be reached that respects the legitimate concerns of all parties as well as their best interests.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Police Act, 1990.

(1615)

Mr. Hillson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First as a general comment, the hon. members will recall when this session was called into session, the legislation coming before us was described as housekeeping. And I think that was indeed a fair and apt description of the legislation which was initially presented before us.

Now as we get later in the session we see one Bill after another which has important ramifications for the people of Saskatchewan, far more weighty and important pieces of legislation than those which came before us up until this week. And that is of concern as we seek to do our job in making sure that all pieces of legislation are subjected to the closest of scrutiny and that we have input from all persons who are affected.

Having made this comment, I would just say that the principle behind this legislation — namely that all residents of the province will have to contribute something towards their police services — is one that we accept and one which is reasonable. However, having said that, there are a number of problems I and my colleagues have with this legislation.

First of all, it appears that no exception is made for those rural municipalities in smaller communities which have made private arrangements for police services. Now the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I understand is quite familiar with the RM of Corman Park, and there is a municipality which has its own police force. Will the RM of Corman Park have to contribute to provincial police servicing agreements or will an exception be made for them?

Of greater significance too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see no set amount of funds. We do not know how much is going to have to be paid by rural municipalities for police services. Why does that have to be hidden in regulations? Why can they be not told up front what the cost is going to be? Not only is the cost not in the Act, what's more, the minister has not seen fit to make any announcement this afternoon as to what the level of support is going to be.

Surely it is incumbent on the government to announce what municipalities are going to have to pay for police services. This is a new departure, making rural municipalities pay for police services, and they have a right to know while this legislation is still being debated in the House, as to how hard they are going to be hit.

Now the minister in introducing this legislation said that there has been some disagreement between urban and rural municipalities in the sense that urban people have had to pay something towards their police services and they feel, with some justification, that their rural neighbours ought to be making a contribution as well.

And coming as I say from an urban municipality, that is a point of view that I certainly don't totally reject. But our rural friends are asking us how much are we going to be hit, what actually is behind this, and most important of all, why right now? Why does it have to come down in 1997?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems incomprehensible that a problem which has been let go for years and years now surfaces in 1997 of all years — the year of reassessment, the year of vanishing revenue-sharing grants . . . (inaudible) . . . they say in one of the RMs in my constituency, the RM of Meota, grants slashed from 53,000 down to 18,000. Are they now going to have to pay a large amount towards police services? I guess the answer is yes. What about the RM of North Battleford? How much have they lost in revenue sharing? How much will they now have to pay towards police services?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 1997 is the year of reassessment. That has placed tremendous pressure on our rural municipalities in taxation matters. 1997 is the year of the slashes to grants to municipalities. In the case of our rural municipalities, the average cut is at least 50 per cent, if not higher.

So we have rural municipalities that are trying to deal with reassessment. They're trying to deal with their provincial grants being cut in half, or worse. They're trying to deal with an Assessment Management Agency that can't seem to get out the correct figures to them in order to tell them where they stand. They are trying to deal with legislation that says that they must be contributing to a library region. They have no right to opt out, so every municipality has to contribute to a library region.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say that not by way of opposition, but just simply to point out so many things have come together for our rural municipalities all in one year. And surely, you know, enough is enough for any one year.

And the principle that all municipalities should be contributing towards a library region — maybe that's not a bad principle — but again, it's something else. It's another small thing that has hit our rural municipalities all at the same time. And many of our rural municipalities are facing problems with their tax base which may come about if rail line abandonment occurs.

So my question I put before the government is, why now? We understand the principle in the amendment to The Police Act. We understand the principle that all Saskatchewan residents are going to have to make some contribution for this service. But surely, with a bit of foresight, a bit of planning, this didn't have to come in the same year as reassessment, in the same year as you took the machete to the municipal grants and the municipal grants did the disappearing act — or you wrote the municipal grants in disappearing ink.

It didn't have to come in the same year as you decided that they had to pay more for library service. It didn't have to come in the same year as they're facing the chaos of not being able to get proper assessment figures from the assessment agency.

So before we can approve, before we can approve this legislation, we think we're entitled to know, and more important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of rural Saskatchewan are entitled to know: what is the plan? How much are they going to be hit? How much are they going to be expected to contribute to policing services?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is not a case that the government is

having to decide or having to figure out what is to be paid. I think they know. They know what rural municipalities are going to have to pay but they haven't chosen to tell us, either in the form of putting it into legislation or in the form of a ministerial statement.

We would be remiss if we let this Bill just simply go through with not the slightest idea as to what we had committed our rural municipalities for. At the very, very least we cannot support this Bill unless and until the government indicates what our rural municipalities are going to be forced to cough up — what they're going to have to cough up and say, on top of . . . on top of all the chaos caused by reassessment; on top of the education grants disappearing; on top of the municipal grants slashed; on top of assessment in confusion; on top of library costs going up.

This is just one more hit that comes on top of everything else. It's not that the principle of contribution to police costs is wrong, but your sense of timing is just terrible. And together with your terrible sense of timing, is your refusal to come clean and tell the people of rural Saskatchewan exactly what you have in mind; what is going to be their bill for police services. And I cannot see the Liberal opposition allowing this legislation to just sweep through until the government indicates that publicly.

And for that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say there are many people that my colleagues and I will want to consult with. But we really even can't do a lot of consultation until we know the bottom line; until we know what this government has in mind. I invite the government to make a public announcement as to what really is planned here in terms of what rural municipalities will have to contribute to their policing costs, and pending that information being supplied, I now move that this debate be adjourned.

Debate adjourned.

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

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 68 contains housekeeping amendments to The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Act to ensure that there is legislative authority for the first nations fund and the associated entities fund, to receive a share of the profits from first nations-run casinos.

The amendments also expand the purposes for which payments may be made from the first nations fund, bringing the legislation in line with the framework agreement on casinos.

Mr. Speaker, the first nations fund supports economic, social, educational, and cultural development for first nations people. The associated entities fund allows a portion of casino profits to be directed to Metis people and to organizations providing programs and services for vulnerable children, youth, and families through Saskatchewan's action plan for children. The first nations fund and associated entities fund are examples of Saskatchewan's commitment to work cooperatively with aboriginal people to generate jobs and revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 68, The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act, 1997.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Osika: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I welcome this opportunity to say a few words on Bill C-68 and I thank the minister for a few brief remarks. I note that in the Bill there is some mention of retroactivity, and that always raises a red flag in my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because this Bill deals with a very important aspect of this government's gambling expansion policy, an aspect that has not been dealt with to a large extent by the members opposite.

It deals with the various funds that are to be put aside by the casinos in Saskatchewan to share monies that are to go to charities and other enterprises that are in place to help first nations people and first nations communities to improve their standard of living. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we are to have gambling in Saskatchewan, we have to ensure that this money is getting to where it is supposed to go, and then the amount that was agreed when the framework agreement was signed over two years ago when the original gaming corporation Act was adopted by this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're told this Bill simply brings into the legislation what is already reality. While that may or may not be true and may or may not be the government's motivation with this legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have to ask the question, why now? Why wasn't this dealt with soon after the framework agreement was signed with the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations)? Why wasn't this dealt with during the last session or prior? Can we trust the government when it tells us that this legislation only puts into words what is already reality?

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope we can trust that explanation more than we can trust the government's projections on the profits to be expected by Casino Regina. Of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by now we all know the numbers by heart. At first, we and the first nations communities were told to expect a \$20 million profit. Then on the night that the casino opened we were told the projection was now \$10 million. Later on that sunk again, and now we expect no more than \$4 million in profit. Well as the members opposite like to argue, that's better than losing money. Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is better than losing money, like we did in the NST fiasco, also known as gigatel.

(1630)

But at the same time, while the government, and in particular the Minister of Economic Development, was over-inflating expectations to justify gambling \$37 million on the casino, real people have been affected by the more realistic profit of 3 to \$4 million. Because of the success of the native-run casinos in North Battleford, Prince Albert, Yorkton, and White Bear, and because of the way current agreements are set out, the FSIN-run casinos were on the hook for a bigger chunk of their profits flowing to various trust funds, all because the government's projections were way out.

One wonders if this was caused by the government's incompetence at running the casino, or because it negotiated this agreement in bad faith, knowing the Regina casino wasn't likely to make the profits that it had predicted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill raises a lot of questions about the trust funds that have been set up, both the first nations fund and the associated entities fund. My colleague, the member from North Battleford, and I will be asking the minister responsible for this Bill to give us some updates on these funds with regards to how much has flowed into these accounts since the casino began operation in Saskatchewan. And more importantly, we'll want an update on how much has flowed back out to the first nations people they were set up to help.

This was the intention of the framework agreement signed in February 1995, an agreement that gave our native community a stake in Casino Regina, as well as the ability to set up and run their own casinos around the province. And in terms of their own casinos, we must say that they have been successful. Whereas the government-run casino has fallen far below its expectations financially, the native-run operations have greatly exceeded theirs.

Could this be another example where it's simply best for government to simply run the province and stay out of business? It could very well be, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, section 4 of the Bill — that is, before changing the existing legislation — under the current law, the uses for the first nations fund are clearly delineated: under the current law, the money can be used for economic development, social development, justice initiatives, educational development, recreational facility operation and development, senior and youth programs, cultural development, community infrastructure development, and health care initiatives.

Those are all very worthy uses for money raised through gambling. I think it's very important that when a government or another body raises money through gambling, profits should be used for very specific purposes so people can see that there may be some good coming from allowing gambling in the province.

And that in theory is what the first nations trust fund is for — to ensure that this money gets back to the community. And this legislation expands the uses for this money to include charitable purposes in accordance with agreements between the governments and the FSIN. This seems to be a good idea, Mr. Deputy Speaker, although we'll want some clarification as to what these types of charitable purposes might be.

I can't help but think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at one time the provincial government promised to do much the same thing with the profits it reaps annually from VLTs (video lottery terminal). This is the money the government isn't willing to share with anyone, dumping it instead into general revenue for heaven's knows what.

At one time, at one time the government promised a small portion of the \$127 million it collects from VLTs. It promised it would be used for a specific purpose — to go back to

communities to help with municipal projects. But of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that did not happen. And the government makes no apologies for that.

But I digress, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'll continue to digress until this government begins to live up to its commitments and return some of the VLT revenue to the communities that need it to fund their own economic development, recreation, or community infrastructure initiatives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill, I understand, puts in place the necessary legislation to ensure that the native-run casinos contribute a fair share to first nations fund, which I understand is, as well, already or should be well under way.

It's important that all the casinos in this province contribute their allotted portion to the trust funds that are established to ensure that the money gets to where it's supposed to be going. The same goes for the associated entities fund.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as the legislation now stands, monies are theoretically distributed to agencies based on 25 per cent of the Gaming Corporation's profits — projected profits, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would hope because this is the case, the government's projections for profits at the casino will be a little more accurate from now on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill also allows the government to contribute unspecified amounts of money to both of the funds that have been established. We'll have a number of questions about this in terms of the amounts that may be appropriated directly from the General Revenue Fund.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we'll be asking for a number of specifics regarding these changes in committee. We need assurances that everything is now in place, well after the casinos have opened, to ensure money is getting to where it's supposed to be going.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we all know, the government is currently looking for a buyer for Casino Regina. We'll want some answers from the minister how any eventual sale of that casino will affect these agreements, if in fact it will have any effects.

We need to know these things, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan need to know these things. This Bill, in my mind, raises more questions than it answers, and we'll have to have some clear and concise answers on these questions before we can offer any support for this type of legislation.

I therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, move to adjourn debate on this Bill.

Debate adjourned.

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

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of The Health Care Directives and Substitute Health Care Decision Makers Act.

Many citizens in our province have been calling on government to introduce legislation in this area. Almost every other jurisdiction in Canada already provides for health care directives, sometimes commonly referred to as living wills.

The groups and individuals that we consulted told us that Saskatchewan citizens want to be able to give directions regarding their future health care, in the event that they lose the capacity to make such decisions themselves. Under this Bill, any person over the age of 16 who has the capacity, will be able to provide a written document that gives directions regarding his or her future medical treatment.

A person's health care directive would become effective when that person loses the capacity to make health care decisions. In a directive, a person may provide or refuse consent to medical treatment and may also appoint a proxy to make health care decisions on his or her behalf.

Saskatchewan residents want to be able to make the same decisions in a health care directive that they would be able to make if they had the capacity to do so themselves.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that during the consultation process the groups and individuals that we met were very supportive of the provision respecting proxies. They expressed clearly that people should be allowed to designate who would make health care decisions on their behalf.

This legislation also contains provisions respecting substitute decision making. The Act will provide a list of persons who are authorized to make health care decisions on behalf of an incapacitated person. This list will be utilized in circumstances where an incapacitated person does not have a health care directive nor a personal guardian to act as a substitute decision-maker or, Mr. Speaker, has a directive that does not appoint a proxy nor provide direction about a specific situation which has occurred.

Mr. Speaker, instructions given in health care directives or given by proxies or substitute decision-makers are subject to the same limitations as instructions given by individuals while they are competent. This legislation contains provisions designed to protect makers of directives from fraud and undue influence. A health care directive cannot authorize an illegal act.

The legislation also ensures that people who follow the instructions in a directive do not incur liability if they have acted in good faith.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that this Bill has achieved a broad degree of consensus among the diverse groups that will be affected by it. Various groups have called for legislation in this area. This legislation was the result of extensive consultations with health care providers, representatives of religious organizations, seniors, persons with disabilities, and others who express an interest in health care directives.

For example, in November, 1992 the Saskatchewan Seniors Speak report was released. This report, prepared for the

minister responsible for seniors, urged the government to introduce health care directives legislation. The Saskatchewan Seniors Speak report was the result of an extensive consultation process involving seniors from across the province. Health care directives legislation was among the first priority recommendations of this report.

Many Saskatchewan residents already have health care directives. However, there has been no court decision in Saskatchewan respecting their effectiveness. This legislation will ensure the legitimacy of health care directives and provide a framework for their use.

Mr. Speaker, health care directives legislation reinforces the personal autonomy of Saskatchewan residents. It recognizes the importance of self-determination, and it also recognizes that individuals want to exercise choice in their medical treatment.

In closing we would like to thank those with whom we have consulted for the considerable time and effort they spent in helping us to develop this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act respecting Health Care Directives and Substitute Health Care Decision Makers. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hillson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again I feel called upon to make the point that when the present session of this House began, the government informed this Assembly and the public that most of the legislation that the government would be placing before us for our consideration would be non-controversial and of a housekeeping nature.

To this point, much of the legislation that we have seen indeed does in fact meet that description, particularly the Justice Bills we saw earlier on in the session. Many of them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, came from the uniform law commission of Canada, and consequently, parallel and identical Bills will be introduced in the Parliament of Canada and every legislature in this country; so certainly ones that have gone through considerable consultation, ones that are certainly non-controversial in nature, and ones which are certainly not of any controversial nature to people of Saskatchewan.

(1645)

Well I'm disturbed now, I'm disturbed now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as we come to the latter part of the session we have legislation before us which indeed is the subject of enormous public interest and concern and which ought to be the subject of great public debate, and not only by members of this House but of the people of Saskatchewan generally.

There are many people who would like to be involved in this debate, who deserve to be consulted and deserve to be heard. And I can't believe this legislation was simply drafted late at the end of last week to be presented just before the weekend started. Surely the government knew about this at an earlier time, and surely it could have been presented more timely to

allow the proper public input and the public debate that is so necessary in this very important area that touches each and every one of us in a very personal way.

As I say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not mean to imply that I personally or the Liberal opposition are necessarily opposed to this legislation. I've had discussions with my loved ones and I assume all other members of the House have as well.

And incidentally, I say for the benefit of members opposite that I do in fact have loved ones — it may come as somewhat of a surprise to them — but I've had discussions with them as to the circumstances under which I would want to be resuscitated, the circumstances under which I would want heroic measures undertaken to save my life, and the circumstances under which I would prefer that no heroic measures be undertaken on my behalf.

To place this into legislation . . . and incidentally, again I say to members opposite that I will not be delegating them as my proxy to determine when I want to be resuscitated. The Minister of Health will not be named as my proxy to determine what measures ought to be undertaken to save my life. However all kidding aside, this is, as I say, a very serious matter which touches each and every one of us in a very deep and personal way.

Now similar legislation was introduced three years ago in the province of British Columbia. And when it was, there were public hearings around that province. Now the Minister of Health told us in this House a few moments ago that he has consulted widely and broadly, and I'm certainly not disputing his word, but any consultations that took place were certainly of a private nature. There was no opportunity for public hearings and public consultation, and I think there should have been.

While there are obvious groups such as community living and persons living with disabilities, there are obvious groups such as that who might have a particular interest. The fact is this is legislation which touches each and every one of us, ourselves, aged parents, and potentially anyone close and near and loved by us. And I think that we would be derelict in our duty as a Liberal opposition if we didn't guarantee the broadest possible public response to this legislation before it passed through this House.

I throw out a couple of particular issues that I think require public discussion. For instance, I note in the legislation that when there is a disagreement between siblings, that the word of the elder sibling will hold sway.

So I have to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that obviously when siblings cannot agree as to what is best for an aged parent, this creates a problem. But why have we arbitrarily decided that the word of the elder sibling will be given more weight than the word of the younger ones? I think that's something that has to be looked at here.

Well the Minister of Justice in speaking to the media last week about this Bill was quick to make the point that euthanasia is not part of this legislation and is not contemplated in this Bill.

And there's not going to be a special section inserted to cover the member for North Battleford, I take it.

None the less, it has to be pointed out that in some cases the line is very thin. And by that I mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is my understanding that the more advanced painkillers can in fact hasten the moment of death. But if they are administered for the purpose of relieving pain as opposed to hastening death that that is the distinction we have drawn.

However, it is admittedly a very fine distinction and one that must be looked at, because the fact is some treatments which are beneficial to the patient and, say, may relieve pain will none the less certainly have the effect of hastening the time of death.

The other thing I notice about this legislation — and I would invite the minister to comment on when he comes to speak to this matter later — is that of course normally one's proxy, to put it very bluntly and crudely, normally one's proxy will have a vested interest in our demise in the sense that our proxies, being close family members, are also the persons likely to be named in our wills.

That is a reality, and I know that that is something contemplated by the minister in preparing this legislation. And consequently, I see in section 24, that there are of course some penalties, small fines, the fine of \$1000 for any misuse of a health directive. And there's also provision there that if someone misuses a health directive, if someone misuses a health directive, that he or she will be barred as a beneficiary of the estate.

However, what I do not see in this legislation is that that person's spouse would also be barred as a beneficiary. And under The Wills Act, if you have acted improperly in the witnessing of a will, not only are you barred but also your spouse.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think this is mere academia because if we take the example of, say, a son-in-law putting undue pressure on an 83-year-old, that undue pressure would bar the son-in-law from inheriting. But in all likelihood the son-in-law is not going to inherit anyway. It would be the daughter.

And the daughter, the son-in-law's wife, would still continue to inherit so consequently there is no penalty there for the son-in-law exerting undue influence on an aged parent-in-law. The only penalty that would exist would be a thousand dollar fine which, of course, in today's world compared to what most estates would be worth the thousand dollar fine is not a big deterrent.

So I would encourage the government to look at this. But more than that, I simply point this out as one small example that . . . wouldn't we benefit from public consultation? Wouldn't we benefit from public hearing? This is, as I say, a matter which touches each and every person living in Saskatchewan at least potentially. This is something that touches us all in a very private and personal matter.

And so I don't think it has to be brought in on the dying days of the session, pardon the pun, to be rammed through and passed very, very quickly. I think that it would benefit from this public consultation and public hearings that it has not had and will not receive if the government has its way.

So with those comments I say that we really do need more input here. I think the legislation could benefit from greater input. I agree that the people of Saskatchewan — I am confident — will want to have this additional say, this additional legal tool to be able to have some input into what medical treatment they are given in the case of a serious emergency. I think that is, that is a right we all wish and to say, I assume we have all discussed already with our loved ones.

But this really is not something that should have come in the closing days of the session without public consultation, without public hearings. Please let us have this public input on an issue which touches each and every person in this province in a very deep and very personal way.

And with that, I will simply say that well, while I will not be asking for the services of members opposite to be my health proxy, in the event that they wish me to be named in their health directives that I will certainly be open to discussing the matter with them.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I now move this debate be adjourned.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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

Hon. Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Act has been brought forward because of an inadvertent change — one of the reasons — an inadvertent change in 1990 whereby it took away the powers of the government to enable it to make unilateral changes to marketing boards the same as other provinces have.

But the proposed Act will do a number of other things. It will clarify the role and power of government regarding provincial marketing plans, but enabling only. Any changes contemplated to individual plans will be reviewed on their own merits in consultation with stakeholders. It will harmonize with other jurisdictions the authority of governments to amend marketing and development plans, as I said.

It will enable establishment of regulations that would allow commodity groups to participate in national research and development check-offs. And it will enable introduction of regulations to increase flexibility in the Saskatchewan Agri-Food Council's supervisory powers.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments do not change the current functions and structures of the marketing boards. Rather the legislation enables the government to make changes if required.

I just want to say a few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the questions that were asked today in question period in terms of what this Act does. There is some indication that this legislation will take away the rights of producers to have a vote. That is not true. Producers will have a right to a vote.

This Act will allow the government though . . . for example, if producers decide on their own that they want to change a marketing system, and didn't need a vote of producers, then they could come to the government and request that, and government, through Executive Council, could enable that to happen.

The other thing that this could do, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is one of the most important parts of legislating, the member from Thunder . . . or not Thunder Creek, Arm River, says it gives the government a lot of power, and that's exactly what I was going to say. It does give the government significant power to make unilateral changes to marketing boards.

And I know that some will say, well you're destroying single desk selling and all the like. Well that's not true; we still believe in the consultation process.

But if for example there was a major packing plant looking to locate in western Canada . . . give you the example in Manitoba where Schneiders basically came in and said, we'll put a plant here for 40 or \$50 million while you kill the marketing board. The Manitoba government chose to do that. Were the producers happy? At the beginning, no they weren't. Are they happy now? I think the answer is yes.

(1700)

There is some talk from some people about the fact that the price of pork went down. Well in Manitoba there is a floor price that is lower than what producers got previously, but they now have the opportunity and are paid premiums that are not disclosed. The marketing board has paid the premiums if they deliver so many hogs on certain dates, of certain index, certain quality.

But if a plant were to come to western Canada and say we want to locate, but we would request that you remove the single desk power marketing board, in Saskatchewan we couldn't do that. So the government would not be able to make a decision that may be of economic benefit to the entire province, whereas Alberta and Manitoba can.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to have the same power. Is this a power grab? No. This is an effort to make sure that the Saskatchewan citizens are treated equally to other citizens across Canada.

If this is wrong in terms of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, if they do not believe this is right, then the question I would ask is, is every other province wrong as well? Is every other province wrong when they have the same power? I'd like members of the opposition to answer that question when they're replying to the second reading speech.

So the reality too, Mr. Speaker, is that there was a question brought forward by the Liberal opposition which made a statement from, I believe quoting Mr. Jim Morris, the CEO (chief executive officer) of Sask Pork International, saying that the layoffs at Moose Jaw were a direct result of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me sometimes to be calm in matters like this. This is absolutely fabrication — absolutely fabrication and irresponsible not only on the part of the opposition, Liberal opposition, but also in Mr. Morris's comment on this matter. Because we know . . . everybody — not everybody, many people know the problems they're having in Moose Jaw. It's very, very complicated. But I can assure you that the reality, it's got nothing to do with this legislation.

In fact decisions on Moose Jaw, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were being made prior to this legislation being introduced. I'm disheartened by the fact that some people are responding this way. I'm disappointed, but people will be people and they don't always make correct judgements. And I'm not going to overreact, Mr. Speaker, for one reason. I believe in Saskatchewan we need every producer producing hogs to fill a market that is demanding of our pork products. Small producers, medium sized producers, and large producers. I've said that . . . if I said that once, I've said it a hundred times. We need everybody producing.

SPI in the past, through single desk marketing, has served producers very well. Will it in the future? The producers themselves are asking themselves . . . are asking this question. But I'll tell you, in any other jurisdiction where there is a marketing of hogs, you have a marketing organization.

Manitoba, you have a marketing structure, a strong structure. In the United States you have large marketing co-ops. Because producers know, especially if you're a small producer, you need the security of a group marketing the product. And I think . . . I commend those people in Saskatchewan who are looking at themselves internally, like the dairy producers who said, can we maintain our current systems of individual province pooling. At the end of the day said no, we can't do it. They went to a western pooling. What has that done? It's given dairy producers in Saskatchewan the opportunity to produce more milk. It's been good for this province; it's forward thinking.

SPI's internal discussions, I think that's very futuristic as well. Analysing the structures that you have and seeing if that structure can serve or will serve you to the best . . . as it has served you in the past so very well. We have to continue. We did it with the Canadian Wheat Board. It was analysed and I think proven by the barley vote that the majority of people know that that institution still provides a very strong marketing system for farmers.

Is it the same as it was when it was first built? I don't think so. In fact had the Liberal government had a commitment to the Wheat Board — the federal Liberal government — the legislation would have been passed. The legislation would have been passed before the election was called. This is what puts it out in my mind, where the federal Liberals surely stand on the board because they could have passed that legislation and gave

the board more flexibility, and modernized it, and more powers to serve farmers well.

That's what we have to do with all our institutions. You have three options. You can leave status quo, you can get rid of them, or you can change them so that they suit you for the 21st century marketing needs. And I think unless we continue to do this, and review it and review it, that we will stagnate and we will be behind the other provinces.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a step I think in the right direction. It's only enabling. It has go through Executive Council and all of cabinet for anything to happen. It was never in my . . . as far as I know, it was never used prior to 1990 in Saskatchewan. I would hope that it would never have to be used in the future for anything but positive purposes.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask members to support this Act, and I move second reading of Bill No. 67, The Agri-Food Amendment Act, 1997.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm very pleased to rise today because I think this is an important change in agriculture in Saskatchewan. It's certainly an important change for the government members, because apparently somebody across there, Mr. Speaker, has had a conversion on the road to Damascus when it comes to marketing boards.

Up until now we have always heard that the only way to sell our agricultural commodities has been through some kind of socialist mechanism, such as single desk selling — be that the Canadian Wheat Board; be that the Chicken Marketing Board; be that SPI; or even the dairy quota system.

But, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, this Bill moves away from that concept. And as I read this Bill though, it gives the minister sweeping unilateral powers to change or eliminate marketing boards, check-offs, and the like, as he sees fit. And this is truly a conversion — truly a conversion — the elimination of marketing boards. Now where have we heard that before?

Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly not from the government opposite. This is the first time, I believe, that they have talked about the elimination of marketing boards, and we support that, Mr. Speaker. We believe that this is a positive move for agriculture in Saskatchewan.

We've always believed that producers of all kinds, and consumers, are best served by free and open competition in the market-place. We see in many areas of production how small cliques of producers have come to have a stranglehold over particular commodities, and this is unfair. And the minister is right to try and fix this problem.

The minister talked about Alberta and Manitoba competition for, say the \$50 million plant that he talked about from Schneiders, that went into Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of competition with Manitoba and Alberta. I just wish that this government would recognize that fact in other areas of the Saskatchewan economy, not just in the marketing board

area. In areas such as taxation and the effect that has on business, the effect that has on the economy of Saskatchewan.

Now that the minister has moved from his position of only marketing boards — and I'm glad to see that he has moved — this caucus, the members of our caucus look forward to the day when he can come all the way over and support the abolition of larger national marketing boards such as the Canadian Wheat Board, such as the dairy boards. Because, Mr. Speaker, those eliminate the ability of Saskatchewan producers to expand. They eliminate the opportunities of Saskatchewan producers to market as they see fit.

In Saskatchewan, the dairy board, while the minister says has pooled now in western Canada, nevertheless 40 per cent of all of the dairy industry is centred in one province, Mr. Deputy Speaker — 40 per cent. It's not Saskatchewan, it's not western Canada, but it's in the province of Quebec. With 25 per cent of the population, they control 40 per cent of the dairy industry in Canada, Mr. Speaker. And they get to do this though, Mr. Speaker, because of the powers of the marketing boards. And the same thing is present in Saskatchewan.

The reason that the hog producers wish to see the end of SPI is because it limits their ability to expand. It limits their abilities to find markets for their own products. And there are many, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speciality markets in the hog industry. I know of one hog producer who ships overweight, over-fat hogs to the Toronto market, outside of SPI, because there's a premium on that particular market, Mr. Speaker. And he has the ability to fill that contract because SPI is not interested, or else for some reason they're ignoring the market. I don't know why they're doing that but they are.

And that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not sure what kind of pigs they are but they're all pigs to me. If they're not bacon, they're ham. So that's my knowledge of the hog industry. I've never raised a pig. I'm a grain farmer. And you can't eat the squeal and you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear either, which sometimes this particular government tries to do.

But in this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, they're not trying to make a silk purse, because this is a valuable product. And I think the only thing you can make out of a sow's ear is those burnt things that they sell in little bags in the stores — piggy porks or something like that they're called.

An Hon. Member: — Piggy puffs.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Yes. And one of the presidents of the United States used to eat them.

An Hon. Member: — The Ag and Food minister knows all about those.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Yes, the Ag and Food minister is the expert on those particular things. I'm not sure if he raised any hogs but he certainly seems to have a good working knowledge of that particular type of hog operation.

But, Mr. Speaker, if it's good in the hog industry to eliminate

the marketing boards, if it has some value in the dairy industry to expand, then surely in other industries, Mr. Speaker, there are other benefits to be had. And we would certainly encourage the minister to move in that direction.

One of the areas of marketing boards that is the most restrictive in this particular province, Mr. Speaker, is the feather industry — the poultry marketing boards. I believe that there are approximately 97 members of this particular industry in the entire province of Saskatchewan. They have the quotas locked up and nobody else can get into the industry.

Expansion either takes place within their own little clique as they absorb some of the other members, or there is no expansion because no one new can come in unless he buys up existing quota from a current producer at an exorbitant price, Mr. Speaker. So we can't expand in this province.

And if someone in industry wanted to move into this province and take a large amount of the chicken, of the eggs, of the feather industry, and process it in some manner, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't do so. Because the animals, the chickens, simply are not available in this province unless there is major expansion, which can't happen under the current system.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the measures I hope that takes place when this Bill passes this House is the relaxation of the feather industry regulations and the quota systems and the marketing boards to allow a significant expansion in that area.

It is somewhat disturbing though, Mr. Speaker, that this entire measure, this entire move, is taking place at the current time under the current circumstances. If it's good today that the marketing boards be eliminated, then surely it would have been good last year or the year before that.

So I have to ask myself what has changed in the Saskatchewan economy? What has changed in the market-place for hogs that has made this a viable option for the government today to go against their normal ideology to move away from marketing boards?

The only thing that I can see that has changed today has been the move by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to enter into hog production in a major way. I believe they are proposing to build 16 large-scale hog operations around the province. That's the only thing that I can see that has driving this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker.

While I'm sorry that the government hasn't proceeded sooner on this, that it takes a move by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to drive a change in this particular government, I have to say that I'm glad at least that they have recognized the need for this particular change. And if it takes the Wheat Pool to make that change, well so be it. We're prepared to accept that, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to note a couple of areas of caution though. And clearly, as legislators we must always pause before we give sweeping powers to the government, in particular an NDP government, to override the democratic rights for the sake of

that ill-defined group, public interest.

And as much as I may agree with the minister that many marketing groups represent vested self-interests, I think we should proceed with some caution with this Bill, with the understanding that the use of these sweeping powers should only be as a last resort where extensive efforts at consultation and mediation with producer groups have failed. Because obviously these are the producer groups that you hope will expand their industry, that will grow, while new people come into the market. But the expertise at present remains with those that are already in the industry.

(1715)

But, Mr. Speaker, we will want to examine the Bill closely in Committee of the Whole to ensure that the Bill does not give the government the opposite power to which the minister is expressing. In other words, the power to establish marketing boards without the consent of producers. Because what we already have too much of, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are oligarchies; and I described one with the feather industry, where a small group control the market and restrict the access of everyone else into that market. To make those changes would mean that we can expand and that new entrants would be allowed into the market-place.

So, Mr. Speaker, we want to express our general support for this Bill and we look forward to dealing with it at length in Committee of the Whole. Thank you.

Ms. Julé: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will have something to say to this Bill, but I would prefer to say it in the next sitting, and I now move to adjourn debate. Thank you.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 15 — The Department of Health Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. With me, beside me is Lawrence Krahn, who is the executive director of the medical services and health registration branch of the Department of Health; and to his left is Drew Johnston, who is senior health professions analyst with the health planning and policy development branch of the Department of Health.

Clause 1

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, your officials, welcome to you.

Mr. Minister, just a couple of short questions regarding this amendment. As I understand, that one of the reasons for this amendment is to tighten up with the Saskatchewan health numbers and particularly to fraudulent uses of those cards. Just a confirmation if that's correct, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — That is correct. The fine for misuse of the card is increased from 500 to \$5,000.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. At this time of the year right across Saskatchewan, a lot of hunters are filling out their licence application forms. Many unhappy hunters, I might add, because of this government's ill-thought-out \$11 surcharge on hunting licences. But on those hunting licences is . . . one of the stipulations to apply for a hunting licence is you have to use your health number.

Does the minister view this as possibly a problem — by doing that, that could cause some fraudulent uses and actually some misuses of a person's or individual's health number?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Mr. Chair, the member knows that I don't like to be political in my answers. But I'd like to say to the member, at the risk of sounding political, that if he thinks the hunters are upset about the \$11 surcharge, he should talk to them about Liberal gun control some time.

But we're digressing from the subject matter before us. I don't think it's a concern that people are using their health registration numbers. Health registration numbers are used quite commonly, even in the private sector, in the sense that some individuals who are credit granters or maybe cashing cheques may be asking people for their health registration cards or their numbers.

And we looked at the matter of whether that should be closely regulated, and we concluded that it wasn't really practical or feasible to regulate it any more than regulating the use of drivers' licences, for example, because it seems to be part of doing business in the private sector and the commercial world now, that health numbers are commonly referred to.

So in this area we're dealing with a government agency, namely the agency that would issue the hunters' licences, and we think that misuse of the numbers in that context is less likely than other contexts. So it isn't something that gives us a great deal of concern.

And we feel that society has moved beyond the point where any government could adequately actually control the use of these numbers. They're just very commonly used now.

Mr. McLane: — As you are moving into your new health information network, there will be a lot more information, a lot of confidential information, that will go along with a person's identification number through his health number.

Have you discussed those issues as it relates to using it for hunting licences and some of the other uses you talked about? I know, actually I'm not sure about all libraries, but a lot of libraries ask for that number as well. Do you have a concern that as your health number and your health card will relate to a lot of information in your new system, if indeed it does come into fruition, that can be a major concern for a lot of people.

And it might be appropriate to address the issue of whether people have to use their health identification number to get a

hunting licence or a library card.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well I think the concern is very legitimate in terms of making sure that personal health information is very secure. And I think if the province moves forward with the health information network, for example, then I think the member's point is correct, that in conjunction with that, the province would have to bring about certain additional privacy and security of information measures to deal with that situation, and the one would certainly go with the other.

I think that in terms of actual use of the number, obviously the provincial people that give out the hunting licences would use the number to confirm the residency in the province of somebody applying for a licence. And in any situation where a government agency has to determine whether somebody is a resident of the province, certainly whether or not they have a health registration number is a good indication of that.

And it doesn't concern me that a government agency would want that number to be indicated. What would concern me is whether that number could be used outside of government to access information.

Any information system will have to be so designed that that wouldn't be feasible; that you would need probably a separate number, like a PIN (personal identification number) that we use when we go to the bank or the credit union, to access our health information.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman . . . or Deputy Chairman, thank you. I really don't have a question but I just want to mention to the minister that, as I understand it, this is more of a minor housekeeping Bill and it's certainly trying to make sure that the health care cards are protected from fraud and misuse.

I think, Mr. Minister, you will find that the utilization of health cards and the implementation of the health card system is something that the public has certainly been acceptable of — and more acceptable. I think as I've indicated before — and believe, Mr. Minister — that there may be other ways in which we can utilize the card to make it more effective certainly, in our health care system. And I would just like to bring that to your attention again.

And just suggest that I think it's important that we certainly protect how the cards are used and acknowledge the fact that they have been just another symbol of health care, wellness, and how it's working in the province of Saskatchewan — how people have accepted this method of communication and this identity with their health system.

So I'm pleased to see that it's something that's moving ahead. And I trust your department is looking at other ways in which we can make it even a more effective tool in the implementation and care-giving in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well I'd like to thank the member for those comments, Mr. Chair, with which I certainly am in agreement.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to thank the opposition for their cooperation. And I won't thank the officials just yet because I believe they're staying for the next Bill.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

(1730)

Bill No. 16 — The Occupational Therapists Act, 1997

Clause 1

Mr. McLane: — Mr. Chairman, just a couple of questions as well on this Bill. Mr. Minister, in your press release, news release that you issued with this Bill, you talked about addressing the issue of access to these therapists. Can you tell me in your Bill where this occurs?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Actually you would not find this in the Bill. It occurs as a result of something that isn't in the Bill. In the previous Occupational Therapists Act there was a provision that said that to see an occupational therapist you would have to be referred there by a physician. And that provision is not in this Bill; so that you can go to an occupational therapist yourself if you feel that you're in need of occupational therapy services.

Mr. McLane: — Thank you. Since that is the case then, can you tell me . . . and the idea is excellent of the people being able to access the service providers that they need to on a timely basis. And it cuts down on red tape, it cuts down on expenses and all those types of things.

However as well in your news release, you talked about that some health districts will have the ability to request that their people do, their residents do have to go to a doctor for a referral to an occupational therapist. Why would you want to do that?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — It will depend upon the individual case, whether a district has an operating policy, as opposed to a law or regulation, feels that a physician referral is required.

There are some situations where, if a person is suffering from a particular disease or condition, there may be reasons why it would not be a good idea to be treated by a physical therapist or an occupational therapist. Professionally I believe this is referred to as contraindications to treatment.

And I think the districts will be free to adopt policies or protocols; say in some situations you should get a physician referral before seeing an occupational therapist to make sure that it's a safe thing to do. But there will not be any law or regulation saying you must. And in most circumstances indeed, I think there won't be such a requirement. But we wouldn't close the door to . . . we wouldn't make it illegal for somebody to say in this situation, if you have this condition, before you see an occupational therapist, you should see the doctor.

I suppose in the same way that sometimes — not by law or regulation but just by practice — it might be said that before one professional sees an individual, another professional should be consulted. But that would become a matter of professional practice as opposed to a matter of provincial policy.

Mr. McLane: — Well I have a problem with this one. Because I agree that if a person's physician says that you shouldn't see the occupational therapist, I would think that's incumbent upon the therapist and the individual to decide what kind of treatment they got. I wouldn't think that it should be policy that's set by a health district to say that: well I don't think that this person X should be able to go directly and see an occupational therapist. Why wouldn't you . . . If you're going to have this open, accessible service to the people of this province, why would you allow health districts to intervene? It's up to the medical doctors to do that.

Maybe an example would be chiropractor. Are you going to come and . . . are you going to say to people that before you can go and see a chiropractor, your health district is going to have to say yes you can or no you can't? I think you . . . I think there's been an error here and I'm wondering if you're going to try and rectify this.

We talk about the Canada Health Act and principles across Canada. How will we ever be able to maintain that if we don't even have the same types of service and accessibility within our own province from health district to health district?

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well there's nothing in the legislation itself that really addresses this issue in the sense that the legislation is designed to regulate the profession of occupational therapy. In terms of the day-to-day practice, I think there may have been an illustration that in some cases professionals may arrive at some protocol that you need to see a physician before seeing an occupational therapist.

But there is nothing in the legislation that would need to be changed to say that's a good thing or not a good thing. That's a matter of practice under the existing law's regulation in the jurisdiction of the health districts and the health professionals.

So I appreciate the member's point. I understand what the member's saying and I'm not sure I entirely disagree with the point either. But my point would be, in terms of this legislation, it simply says you don't have to have a doctor's referral to see an occupational therapist. It really doesn't go into the details of situations where you might want to.

I think the point that was being made before is, in some cases medical professionals may decide that there is some reason why you need to. This legislation does not really speak to it directly.

Mr. McLane: — Yes, I understand that. I guess I have one or two last questions. One is, if what you say of course is true — and we have to rely on that — why would you issue a press release to accompany this particular piece of legislation that does say that?

And the reason I ask you where I would find this in this

legislation is so that I could vote against it. It's not there so we can't vote against it; so maybe you can tell me where I should go and what to watch for so that the next time that this tries to come through, I'll know what to watch for; so we can make sure that you don't make the same error when it is in the legislation somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well I'll take the member's comments to heart, Mr. Chair. Perhaps we can do a better and more accurate job of press releases in the future.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 54 inclusive agreed to.

The Deputy Chair: — I invite the minister to move the committee report the Bill without amendment.

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before I do that, I'd like to thank Mr. Krahn and Mr. Johnston for their assistance and I'd also like to thank the opposition for their cooperation with respect to the Bill. And with that, I move that we report the Bill without amendment.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair. I'd like to thank the minister and his officials for coming in today and for answering our questions.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 1 — The Northern Municipalities Amendment Act, 1997

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

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my right is John Edwards, director of municipal policy and legislative services. To his right is Jim Anderson, senior policy analyst. On my left is Paul Raths, director of the municipal development branch. And Perry Erhardt is legislative officer.

Clause 1

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of questions, Madam Minister, in reference to the . . . I believe the Act is speaking on the assessment in general. While the Act itself I believe is more of a housekeeping . . . just a couple points I wish to raise.

In northern Saskatchewan in terms of the assessment, there are a number of communities that may be having a bit of trouble with the assessment and the period in which the assessment has taken place. Have you had any communities that are come forth and had a large number of problems with assessment and the Bill in general in northern Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I'm told that there are two towns and one or two of the northern villages that already have their assessment notices out. Our understanding is that reassessment is going slowly in some of the other northern

villages but progressing. And we haven't had many calls from them for assistance or for an order extending the deadlines that they need to meet. So hopefully that's a sign that everything is going reasonable well.

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Madam Minister. Just a couple of other questions in terms of the . . . at one point in time, there was a number of administrators that spoke about the need to have a workshop on the west side of northern Saskatchewan — north-west side — and that was met with not much optimism and excitement by your officials in La Ronge. And I'm just wondering what the reason might be for not having two or three or four sessions to indicate the ramifications of the newest estimate and why your department would not make that offer to other administrators.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, there have been two meetings held in La Ronge in November of 1995 and a workshop in November of 1996. The workshop was reasonably well attended by representatives of the two towns and most of the northern villages. But what we have been doing is using a one-on-one basis, having our advisory personnel who is stationed in La Ronge go and actually visit the municipalities and the councils and the administrators that asked for help.

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you. And just to draw a quick point that in reference to some of the changes, and especially when it comes to municipal governments, I strongly encourage the minister and various members of her staff to make as much effort to attend community meetings with mayors and councillors and administrators, and have a lot more one-on-one discussion and dialogue on some of the changes that occur here, that ultimately affect them at the local level in northern Saskatchewan. As we know, in northern Saskatchewan there's a tremendous amount of land mass, and having one or two or three seminars in La Ronge, which people believe is central, certainly won't get the information out to these communities.

So while I can appreciate the hospitality of, you know, Lac La Ronge, I believe it's important that we reach out to other communities and have seminars in the far North, in the west side and the east side, and of course the central area. So I would encourage the minister to look at those options.

The second part of my brief question period today on this whole Bill is in terms of assessment. Many of the mining sectors, mining companies that operate in northern Saskatchewan contribute on an annual basis, lease fees for operating some of their mines in terms of the land lease fees.

How is reassessment going to affect the income to the Northern Revenue Sharing Trust Account if indeed the lease fees from the Crown lands that are being leased by the mining companies does indeed go into the NRSTA (Northern Revenue Sharing Trust Account)?

(1745)

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, the lease payments for mining operations are not tied to assessment. So they wouldn't be affected then by reassessment and there will be mill rate

factors that have been adopted to protect the mine tax revenues for the Northern Revenue Sharing Trust Account.

Mr. Belanger: — Thank you, Madam Minister.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 26 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 49 — The Local Government Election Amendment Act, 1997

Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

Bill No. 26 — The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 1997

Clauses 1 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 15 — The Department of Health Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Cline: — 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. 16 — The Occupational Therapists Act, 1997

Hon. Mr. Cline: — Well, Mr. Speaker, having so successfully made a motion just now, I'll once again 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. 1 — The Northern Municipalities Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — 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. 49 — The Local Government Election Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — 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. 26 — The Planning and Development
Amendment Act, 1997**

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the 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.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

The Deputy Chair: — Order. It now being near 6 o'clock, this committee will stand recessed until 8:30 p.m. this evening.

The Assembly recessed until 8:30 p.m.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Krawetz.....	1591
Osika.....	1591
Draude.....	1591
McLane.....	1591
Bjornerud.....	1591
Belanger.....	1591
Hillson.....	1591
Julé.....	1591

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Deputy Clerk.....	1592
-------------------	------

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Van Mulligen.....	1592
Belanger.....	1592
Murray.....	1592
Nilson.....	1592

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Federal Leaders' Debate

Thomson.....	1592
--------------	------

Buena Vista School Drama Production

Atkinson.....	1593
---------------	------

Science Fair Winners from St. Dominic School

Julé.....	1593
-----------	------

Child Care Week

Pringle.....	1593
--------------	------

Working Women's Share in the Economy

Draude.....	1594
-------------	------

Dr. Ali Rajput Selected for World Health Organization's International Committee on Parkinson's Disease

Koenker.....	1594
--------------	------

Teachers Enrich Students' Education

Belanger.....	1594
---------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

Producer Marketing Boards

Aldridge.....	1595
---------------	------

Upshall.....	1595
--------------	------

Chief Electoral Officer Report

Osika.....	1596
------------	------

Mitchell.....	1596
---------------	------

Main Farm Access Road Program

Bjornerud.....	1597
----------------	------

Teichrob.....	1597
---------------	------

SaskPower Proposed Project in Guyana

D'Autremont.....	1597
------------------	------

Lautermilch.....	1597
------------------	------

Health Care Bill of Rights

Boyd.....	1598
-----------	------

Cline.....	1598
------------	------

Health Care Reform

McLane.....	1599
-------------	------

Cline.....	1599
------------	------

MOTIONS

Hours of Sitting

Kowalsky.....	1599
---------------	------

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 227 — The Saskatchewan Health Bill of Rights and Responsibilities Act

Boyd.....	1599
-----------	------

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE BILLS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 303 — The TD Trust Company Act, 1997.....	1600
--	------

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 303 — The TD Trust Company Act, 1997.....	
--	--

Murrell.....	1600
PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS	
SECOND READINGS	
Bill No. 209 — The Measures to Combat Child Prostitution Act	
Julé.....	1600, 1604
Pringle.....	1602
Bill No. 234 — The Crown Construction Tendering Agreement Revocation Act (No. 2)	
Boyd.....	1605
Renaud.....	1609
Recorded Division.....	1610
STATEMENT BY THE DEPUTY SPEAKER	
Bill No. 210 Removed from Order Paper	
Deputy Speaker.....	1610
GOVERNMENT ORDERS	
SECOND READINGS	
Bill No. 70 — The Archives Amendment Act, 1997	
Teichrob.....	1610, 1613
Belanger.....	1611
Toth.....	1611
Hillson.....	1612
Bill No. 69 — The Police Amendment Act, 1997	
Cline.....	1613
Hillson.....	1615
Bill No. 68 — The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Amendment Act, 1997	
Teichrob.....	1616
Osika.....	1616
Bill No. 66 — The Health Care Directives and Substitute Health Care Decision Makers Act	
Cline.....	1617
Hillson.....	1618
Bill No. 67 — The Agri-Food Amendment Act, 1997	
Upshall.....	1620
D'Autremont.....	1621
Julé.....	1623
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE	
Bill No. 15 — The Department of Health Amendment Act, 1997	
Cline.....	1623
McLane.....	1623
Toth.....	1624
Bill No. 16 — The Occupational Therapists Act, 1997	
McLane.....	1624
Cline.....	1624
Bill No. 1 — The Northern Municipalities Amendment Act, 1997	
Teichrob.....	1625
Belanger.....	1625
Bill No. 49 — The Local Government Election Amendment Act, 1997	1626
Bill No. 26 — The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 1997	1626
THIRD READINGS	
Bill No. 15 — The Department of Health Amendment Act, 1997	
Cline.....	1626
Bill No. 16 — The Occupational Therapists Act, 1997	
Cline.....	1626
Bill No. 1 — The Northern Municipalities Amendment Act, 1997	
Teichrob.....	1626
Bill No. 49 — The Local Government Election Amendment Act, 1997	
Teichrob.....	1626
Bill No. 26 — The Planning and Development Amendment Act, 1997	
Teichrob.....	1627