

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to present a petition on behalf of citizens throughout our province. And the prayer reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to grandfather vehicles that were tax paid on budget day therefore providing these dealers the opportunity to pass on the savings to their customers.

And the signators on this petition, Mr. Speaker, are from Humboldt, from Rosthern and Regina.

I so present.

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to present a petition today — a petition to reduce fuel tax by 10 cents a litre. And the prayer says:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the federal and provincial governments to immediately reduce fuel taxes by 10 cents a litre, cost shared by both levels of government.

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

Mr. Speaker, these petitioners come from such communities as Biggar in my riding, as well as Swift Current, Moose Jaw, Regina, and a number of other communities. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a petition today as well for cellular coverage for Watson and area.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to ensure reliable cellular service to Watson and area by installing a cellular tower at the town of Watson.

And the people that have signed this petition are from Watson and Englefeld and Quill Lake.

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on behalf of citizens concerned about the high price of fuel. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the federal and provincial governments to immediately reduce fuel taxes by 10 cents a litre, cost shared by both levels of government.

Signatures on this petition, Mr. Speaker, come from the

community of Melfort, Carrot River, and Watson.

I so present.

**Mr. Peters:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition in regards to high price of fuel and the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the federal and provincial governments to immediately reduce fuel taxes by 10 cents a litre, cost shared by both levels of government.

And these . . . the signatures are from the town of Unity and area.

I so present.

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition to reduce the fuel tax by 10 cents a litre and the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the federal and provincial governments to immediately reduce fuel taxes by 10 cents a litre, cost shared by both levels of government.

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

And this petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by residents of Wymark, Kincaid, Stewart Valley and the city of Swift Current.

I so present.

**Mr. McMorris:** — Mr. Speaker, I too present a petition on behalf of citizens against municipal reserve account confiscation. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to abandon permanently and rule out any plans it has to confiscate municipal reserve accounts.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And this petition is signed from citizens in the Nipawin area. Thank you.

**Mr. Weekes:** — I also rise to read a petition to reduce fuel tax by 10 cents a litre. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the federal and provincial governments to immediately reduce fuel taxes by 10 cents a litre, cost shared by both levels of government.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed by the good people of Melfort, Tisdale, and St. Brieux. Thank you.

**Mr. Brkich:** — Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition to reduce fuel tax by 10 cents a litre.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the federal, provincial governments to immediately reduce fuel taxes by 10 cents a litre, cost shared by both levels of government.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Petitioners are from Davidson, Yorkton, Indian Head, and even one signature from the city of Boston.

I so present.

**Mr. Wiberg:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to stop municipal reserve account confiscation. Mr. Speaker, the prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to abandon permanently and rule out any plans it has to confiscate municipal reserve accounts.

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

Mr. Speaker, this petition is from the good citizens of Prince Albert.

I so present.

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

These are petitions of citizens of the province petitioning the Assembly on the following matters:

To ensure reliable cellular service to Watson and area;

To provide funding for the Swift Current Regional Hospital;

To reduce fuel taxes;

To provide regular, reliable cellular service in Prud'homme, Bruno, Vonda, and Cudworth.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Allan Stevens, who's seated behind the bar on the government side.

And Mr. Stevens is a retired farmer and he also is the former MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) from Rosetown constituency, as I think it was then called, from 1960 to 1964. And members will recall that that period of time was the time when the government of the day under Mr. Douglas and Mr. Lloyd introduced medicare to Saskatchewan, which ultimately

was introduced to the rest of Canada.

So obviously Mr. Stevens would have been in a very busy and a very active government. And we have a great debt to pay to people who have served in the legislature before.

And I know that all members will want to join with me in welcoming Mr. Stevens back to the Legislative Assembly today.

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

**Mr. Wartman:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to be able to introduce to you and through you to the rest of the Assembly today, 25 students from St. Jerome School which is in the constituency of Regina Qu'Appelle Valley. They're sitting in the west gallery. And they are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Domm, and chaperone, Mrs. Britton.

We'd like you to join in welcoming them to the legislature.

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

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

##### Moose Jaw Women of Distinction

**Ms. Higgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Saturday the member from Moose Jaw North and I were privileged to attend the fourth annual Moose Jaw Women of Distinction awards sponsored by the YM/YWCA (Young Men's/Young Women's Christian Association) and the Moose Jaw Transition House.

As the member from Regina stated last week of their awards dinner here, all the nominees are noteworthy women in our city and all deserve the recognition they receive.

In addition, proceeds from the luncheon go towards supporting the work of the Moose Jaw Transition House and the YWCA and programs that support underprivileged children. And that in itself made the evening worthwhile.

The eventual award winners were: Dorothy Boschuk for leadership in the workplace; Doreen Mowers as community mentor; Lena Hartman for science and technology, Yvette Moore for community enhancement; and Lisa Franks in the youth category.

My congratulations to each of the outstanding Moose Jaw Women of Distinction and to each of the nominees. It's a pleasure to represent a city which provides such outstanding community leadership.

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

##### National Nursing Week

**Ms. Bakken:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to rise in this Assembly today to ask all hon. members to join with me in saluting a very dedicated and hard-working group of individuals.

This week is National Nursing Awareness Week in Canada.

This year's theme is "Challenge Yourself: Get Active." Over the next few days, provinces and territories across Canada will be honouring those that have dedicated themselves to ensuring our society's better health, well-being, and quality of life.

Nowhere more than here in Saskatchewan could we be more grateful for this group of men and women who are committed to providing the utmost in professional health care. Citizens of Saskatchewan place a great deal of trust in those who work in the nursing profession. We value the services that they provide and advice that they give.

Nurses know that healthy living contributes to disease prevention and overall better health. As a society we owe it to ourselves to listen to them and to take an active role. Yet even as we talk about the unique and very special contributions that nurses make, we cannot help but remember that they are a group under siege.

Over the years we have watched their numbers decrease while their workloads have increased. Repeated attempts to call attention to this critical situation have gone unaddressed. Yet through it all they have maintained their compassion, competency, and professionalism.

We owe much to them, for they along with other health care professionals that work on the front lines every day have held this crippled health care system together. So now during national awareness week, let's take an extra moment to thank them for all that they have done for us.

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

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the celebration of National Nursing Week which runs from May 8 to May 14.

Nursing encompasses the professions of registered nurses, registered psychiatric nurses, and licensed practical nurses. Each of these professions plays an essential and valued role in our health system, and I know all members will join with me in saluting their achievements.

Nurses are the heart and soul of the health system. Nursing combines clinical skill with the more elusive qualities of caring and human kindness. Nurses are there for us in the newborn nursery. They have the skill and understanding to help us stay well and improve our health, and are managers who make our health system function. And nurses are there to support our needs with compassion at the end of life.

Nurses today are taking on new roles, gaining advanced skills, and increasing their value to the health system in many settings. They are in short supply across the globe, Mr. Speaker. And in Saskatchewan we are working with nursing organizations and health districts to attract and retain the nurses we need today and into the future.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Saskatchewan citizens, I want to thank each and every individual RN (registered nurse), RPN (registered practical nurse), and LPN (licensed practical nurse) for their effort, skill, and dedication. We value the contribution you make, and join you in celebrating this special week.

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

### Carrot River Health Care Facility

**Mr. Kwiatkowski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I rise in this Assembly to declare a victory for the small town of Carrot River, located in the heart of the Carrot River Valley constituency.

Now as we all know, this government has done nothing to elicit trust from the rural areas of this province — a fact that was well documented by the numbers in last fall's election. In fact, rural residents have been treated very shabbily by this government; a government that says one thing and then does another.

Take the case of the Carrot River Hospital. After repeatedly saying that it would not close the Carrot River Hospital just two short months ago, that's exactly what this government did. The hospital became a wellness centre — a term we're all sadly very familiar with — and only one acute care facility was left in the entire North-East Health District, one of the largest in the province.

As was to be expected, there was frustration, outrage, and a backlash. People in the area were not prepared to accept this. Only after the Saskatchewan Party repeatedly hammered the government on this issue and residents of the town and surrounding communities rallied together, did the coalition government finally wake up.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've very pleased to announce that after a long and hard-fought battle, the residents of Carrot River and surrounding areas will be seeing an integrated 24-hour health care facility, something the community itself suggested about 20 years ago.

This 2.3 million, three-phase project will restore many of . . .

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

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

### Spring Seeding

**Mr. Harper:** — As we know, spring has arrived in Saskatchewan, which means farmers are out in their fields seeding. This spring they are hard at work as they always do. The result — seeding is right on track.

This spring the Canada-Saskatchewan Adjustment Program is helping producers put the crop in the ground. The goal of this program is to get the money into producers' hands as quickly as possible. Well, Mr. Speaker, that goal has been met.

Of the applications mailed out on April 13, Saskatchewan Crop Insurance has received from farmers 37,700 applicants, of which they have processed 35,275. Saskatchewan Crop Insurance has paid out approximately 93 per cent of the applicants they have received. To date, just over \$147 million has been paid out to Saskatchewan farmers to help them put in this spring's seeding.

The 147 million is in addition to the \$40 million in tax cuts to

farm fuel and education land tax, 300 million available under the AIDA (Agricultural Income Disaster Assistance) programs, 400 million available under the spring credit advance program.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this encouraging news, I am pleased to announce that 18 per cent of the estimated 33 million acres have been planted. This compares to 15 per cent planted at this time last year and the five-year average of 14 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the programs such as the Canada-Saskatchewan Adjustment Program and other programs that I have mentioned are working very well for Saskatchewan farmers. Thank you.

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

### **Increases in Taxes**

**Mr. Wiberg:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, each week we hear from the members opposite talk about the so-called good news happening in Saskatchewan. Every day we hear those in the back benches across the way who never get any media attention and never will. Mr. Speaker, Sask Party staff actually get more headlines than many members opposite.

We hear chattering from those across the way who will never get a cabinet post. Maybe they should ask the Hon. Education minister or the Hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs why that is. Well they put on their rose-coloured glasses and tell about life in their own little fantasy world. Well, Mr. Speaker, on this side we deal with reality and facts.

And today the residents of my home constituency of Saskatchewan Rivers are dealing with reality, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, is that thanks to this NDP (New Democratic Party) government taxes are going up. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Rivers school division is facing enormous hikes at the local level which will unfortunately have to be passed on to their residents. Thanks to this NDP government, the Saskatchewan Rivers school division is faced with a 10 per cent hike in utilities — 10 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

There's also a hike in fuel which they use to run the school buses; that's up 30 per cent. All of this, thanks to the NDP tax machine, Mr. Speaker. If this is what the NDP call reality, maybe we should pay a visit to their fantasy world and get fitted for some of those rose-coloured glasses. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

### **Women of Distinction Awards in Prince Albert**

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, last night I was privileged to attend the annual YWCA Women of Distinction Awards Banquet in Prince Albert. Today I'd like to congratulate all five outstanding award recipients and I would like to briefly mention their names and the area in which they've been honoured.

Pauline Steele in the category of health, sports and fitness; Gabrielle Favreau for her contributions to the arts and culture; Randy Arnot was recognized in the category of business and professional; Ruth Griffiths was an honouree in the community

enhancement category; and Farrah Mateen the recipient of the 2000 SaskPower/Roberta Bondar Scholarship.

I would like to take a little time to recognize the young woman of distinction, Farrah Mateen. Farrah is studying to become a neurosurgeon and has just finished her first year as a biochemistry major at the University of Saskatchewan. One of her goals is to help maintain universal medicare in the province in which it originated. Another is to see parity in earnings between men and women.

Mr. Speaker, she is a young person to watch. She is interested in politics — don't be surprised if you hear her name in the future.

I want to congratulate all of this year's Women of Distinction recipients and wish them all of the best and continued success in their endeavours. And I also congratulate all the sponsors and volunteers who helped make this event a successful one.

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

### **ORAL QUESTIONS**

#### **Construction Industry Union Legislation**

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today my question is again for the Minister of Labour.

Madam Minister, over the past few weeks we have received dozens of letters from construction workers, and these letters are opposed to your forced unionization policy. These letters all tell different stories, but they all have the same message — we deserve the right to choose.

Madam Minister, thousands of construction workers in this province have chosen not to join a union. They've made the choice to work in an open shop, but that's because that's what's best for them and their families.

Madam Minister, why would you take that right away from them? Why would you force them to join a union against their will?

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have mentioned several times that since 1944 it's been a fundamental right for people to choose to become members of a union and to choose who represents them.

Now in the instance of the construction industry, no one would become unionized who wasn't part of a certification, a legitimate certification order, and no one would lose their job as a result of this. When their contract expired, they would then have a choice whether to be part of a union hiring hall or whether to be part of an independent contractor. But I just say that this is misinformation that the opposition is presenting. And I encourage people to be assured this is not the case.

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

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Mr. Speaker, we hope that the minister

would care about workers in Saskatchewan. Madam Minister, some of these workers have chosen to work at an open shop for the past 10, even 20 years. These workers simply do not want to join a union. They've made a good living because of their skill in their chosen profession, not because of their seniority on a union hiring list.

Mr. Speaker, if you force them into a union against their will, they will go to the bottom rung of the hiring list — even though they may have 20 years of experience. One worker writes:

If you go ahead with this, you will drive myself and other tradesmen from this province.

Madam Minister, why are you taking these workers' rights away?

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question shows how little he understands about the construction industry, because in fact seniority does not operate within the construction industry in the same format as within a constant workplace.

When an employee is done a contract, they go back onto the list because they're available for employment . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order please. I would ask all hon. members not to debate across the floor while a member is on their feet. Please, I ask for your co-operation.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as the conventional view of seniority that the member opposite . . . And we might have some good discussions on competitiveness, job growth, economic development, jobs up by 10,000 — those are the kinds of things we should be discussing not a misinformation campaign.

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

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's all right for the minister to take shots at me in the Legislative Assembly, but she's taking shots at the workers — the workers she's supposed to be representing.

Madam Minister, one of these workers writes:

I do not deny there is a place for unions. However, living in a free country it is my right to choose.

Another worker writes:

Why am I not given the chance to vote if I want to be unionized? Do I live in a communist country?

Another worker writes:

I have planned for my family's future and the changes being forced upon us will affect my family for the worst.

Another worker writes:

I feel your government is pushing this piece of legislation only to please a few prominent trade unions with little or no concern for the majority of workers who make their living through construction.

Madam Minister, you are only listening to your union leader friends — not to the people who are working. You are living to the . . . listening to the people who are giving you money. Why aren't you listening to construction workers who oppose forced unionization?

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Speaker, the long-standing democratic arrangement that exists within the economic and social contract in this society exists in every province in Canada. And I find it particularly odd that the member opposite would choose to portray this as a unique and unusual circumstance. This is fundamental to the laws right across Canada. There's nothing unusual about it and people always get to indicate their support before a union is certified in the workplace.

**Mr. Hermanson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From the dozens of letters I have here, Madam Minister, this is one of the most touching responses. A 36-year-old worker writes:

I am a 36-year-old, semi-skilled construction worker. To my shame, I have spent the greater part of my life drinking and doing drugs and living on welfare. Two years ago I quit all that and began to get my life back in order. It was not easy trying to find work. I worked odd jobs here and there, but nothing with a future.

Finally, a big construction company hired me. This is what I've been looking for, an opportunity to get ahead, to become a valuable worker to have around. I need you to know that I am against our construction industry becoming unionized because I will lose my new-found job and opportunities that I am just now receiving from my company.

Madam Minister, your legislation may cost this worker his job. Why are you taking away his right to choose?

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

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — Mr. Speaker, if I could speak through this Assembly, I'd like to commend the worker mentioned for the work he's done in getting his life together. That's very commendable.

And I'd like to say that there is nothing in this legislation that will negatively impact that worker. That worker will be able to work to the end of any existing contract. They can become part of the hall, their name goes in rotation, and we have in some industries in the province, particularly the carpenters' union, the ability for employers to . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order, order, please. The question was allowed to be asked in silence, and I would ask that all hon. members would allow the answer to be given in silence as well. I ask you please to co-operate.

**Hon. Ms. Crofford:** — I'd like to correct two pieces of misinformation. One is there is no standing union contract in the province that requires the use of union subcontractors. Certainly union . . . non-union subcontractors are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it will not.

And the other thing is that there is no employee that will lose their job as a result of this if they wish to continue working in the construction sector because there is plenty of work for everyone. And the fact of the matter is they are not negatively impacted by this Bill.

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

### Economic Conditions

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government isn't listening to workers and they're not listening to employers either. A recent survey by the North Saskatoon Business Association shows that one in 10 of their members is thinking about leaving this province. One in 10, Mr. Speaker, are thinking about leaving this province, and almost one in four are thinking about moving part of their operation out of the province.

That's a scathing indictment, Mr. Speaker, of this government's economic policies. To the Minister of Economic Development: Madam Minister, in light of the high number of Saskatoon businesses looking to leave this province, will you admit that your economic policies are a failure?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as usual the opposition is being fairly selective when it comes to the presentation of information. Because I tell the House that although the survey indicates 10 per cent of the businesses have considered leaving the province — considered, Mr. Speaker — five times as many say they're considering expanding in the province, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — And things in the province are going well, Mr. Speaker. And that's why this year, in April, there are 10,000 more people working in Saskatchewan today than there were a year ago, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — And part of the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that we're going to cut income taxes in this province by \$430 million. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? They voted against the income tax cut.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have lots of different items to select from with this government in power, and every one that we choose, Mr. Speaker, is indeed accurate.

Mr. Speaker, the government opposite keeps bragging about its budget. And what does the executive director of the NSBA (North Saskatoon Business Association) say? She says that if

they had done their survey after the budget, it would have been even worse. She says businesses are upset about the NDP raising taxes. She says they are reacting negatively to the PST (provincial sales tax). She says they don't like being tax collectors for this NDP government.

Mr. Minister, how many more businesses have to leave this province before you understand the message?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, again the opposition is being very selective in presentation of information. Because what the executive director of the NSBA actually said, Mr. Speaker, was that . . . and I'm quoting from *The StarPhoenix*. She said:

There is no question it will benefit (that is the budget) all people in this province. It should broaden our economic base. . . Definitely, Mr. Cline has made some very positive steps and some very difficult choices and the government is to be highly commended.

That's what she said, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — And the result is, Mr. Speaker, that we have Doug Elliott from *Sask Trends Monitor* and the Royal Bank saying that we're going to have impressive growth in the province this year.

Mr. Speaker, we've had impressive growth in jobs the last year, and you know what we're going to do this year, Mr. Speaker? We're going to improve on that and do even better. And unlike the opposition, we and the people of the province are optimistic about the future of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, after this government being in power, any growth is great in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the NSB also asked why businesses were thinking of leaving. The number one answer for leaving was high taxes. The number two reason for leaving is the NDP labour laws. And so what does this government, the NDP, do? They raise taxes and then they are going to bring in even worse labour laws.

Madam Minister, Mr. Minister, when are you going to take the blinders off? When are you going to start listening to the people who create the jobs in this province? How many more businesses have to leave before you get the message that taxes are too high and the labour laws are too restrictive?

Mr. Minister, will you cancel your \$160 million PST tax grab and will you drop your plans to force unionization on the workers of this province?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cline:** — Mr. Speaker, unlike the opposition we do listen to people in the province. Now I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the number one message we got from the business community preparing this year's budget was that income taxes had to be cut. And you know what we did in the budget, Mr. Speaker? We presented a plan that represents the largest income tax cut in the province's history, Mr. Speaker, and they voted against it.

We said in the budget that income taxes should be cut by \$430 million over three years, Mr. Speaker. We're going to eliminate the flat tax; we're going to eliminate the debt-reduction surtax; we're going to eliminate the high-income surtax. And we're going to do it over the opposition of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, but that's what the people of the province want us to do, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### Living Sky Health District

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, SUN (Saskatchewan Union of Nurses) president, Rosalee Longmoore, recently stated in the Regina *Leader-Post* that the NDP has threatened to remove any health board that makes public its 2000 plans. According to the nurses' union you threatened to replace the offending boards with a public administrator.

Well, Madam Minister, it appears that you have a problem in the Living Sky Health District. According to one of the district's board members, your plan for Living Sky is to close the Lanigan Hospital, then you plan to close the Watrous Hospital, then you're going to wrap it up by closing the Wynyard Hospital.

Madam Minister, is this the NDP's plan for Living Sky Health District — to close down the hospitals in Watrous, Lanigan, and Wynyard?

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

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As part of the process for developing health plans in the province, a number of districts have been consulting with their publics. The health plans are to be to the Department of Health by mid-May. At that time the Department of Health will review all of the health plans within a broader provincial context. And once the health plans are reviewed, we'll determine whether or not those health plans will go forward and the health districts will have an opportunity to consult with their public on the health plans that are approved by the province.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question again for the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, Bernie Bishop is an elected member of the Living Sky Health District. This week, Mr. Bishop wrote a letter to the editor in the *Lanigan Advisor*.

Mr. Bishop says the 2000-2001 district health plan was submitted to your office last week and he says a secret committee drafted the plan without input from a number of

board members. Mr. Bishop says he cannot in good faith support your plan to close three hospitals in the Living Sky Health District.

Why is the district's plan concocted in secret? Why were some board members excluded from the process? And will you be approving the closure of hospitals in Lanigan, Watrous, and Wynyard as proposed by this secret deal?

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

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to review the letter that Bernie Bishop wrote to the *Lanigan Advisor* and I just want to quote:

In fairness to Lou Karpinski (and Lou is a member of the Department of Health), she advised me that the plan would have to be reviewed along with others from the surrounding health districts before any decision was made by the government and that I may be creating unnecessary panic if I went public.

I want to assure the members, I want to assure the House that we have not seen all of the health plans from across the province. And once we have an opportunity to review the health plans of the health districts, health districts will have an opportunity to go forward and talk to the public.

No decisions have been finalized, Mr. Speaker. In fact I have only seen one health plan that's been presented to my department, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'll continue to quote from the same letter. And he goes on to say:

When I was elected by the people of Lanigan to the board, I made it very clear that I would do everything in my power to maintain the level of services offered, and if anything, improve them.

Regrettably I have been unable to accomplish this (in the Living Sky) if the Living Sky (District) Health Plan . . . is adopted. Phase 1: . . . convert Nokomis Health Centre to the Puffer Special Care Home; close Lanigan Hospital; restructure Home Care . . . Phase 2: . . . convert Watrous Hospital to a Health Centre. Phase 3: . . . convert Wynyard Hospital to a Health Care Centre.

Madam Minister, clearly this is in, in the plans for this health district. Will you approve the closure of these three hospitals if they're submitted to your department?

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, obviously the member can't hear. Obviously he can't hear. I have made it very clear in this Assembly that we have not received all of the health plans from districts across the province, and that no decisions have been finalized.

But I will say to the member this: that in this last budget we increased health spending by some \$113 million, which represented a 5.1 per cent increase. This crowd over here would

have frozen health spending in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to two-tier health care, Bill 11 in Alberta. This crowd in their campaign material said that they supported private surgical clinics. I want to assure the people of the province that our government is supportive of publicly funded, publicly administered health care, and this crowd over here is not, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question again for the minister. Madam Minister, you're threatening the elected health boards to a muzzle order if they talk about these budgets before your department stamps the approval on them. You're not allowing them to discuss fully and completely with the people they represent, what they're going to recommend until you've put your imprimatur on it.

Madam Minister, will you lift the gag order on these health districts? Will you let them discuss their plans with the communities they serve? Or are you going to keep them under a cone of silence until you stamp an approval on the closures of hospitals?

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

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, it's very strange — the member's question and comments. Mr. Speaker, I have an ad from the Regina *Leader-Post* dated April 8, 2000 — Regina health district public input forum, public participation, public input. So, Mr. Speaker, this is not secret as the member says.

Mr. Speaker, everyday in this legislature these people get up, and they make false statements about everything, Mr. Speaker. They are simply misleading the public. They don't have their facts straight. And, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly the people of this province are getting sick and tired listening to the negativity of the members opposite when they simply don't seem to know what they're talking about, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Mr. Speaker, the only thing the people of this province are getting sick and tired of is your wellness plan and the closure of facilities, Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, you get out an article from *The Leader-Post* saying people are invited for their input. What I'm talking about are decisions that are being made . . . And district health boards are trying to listen to the people, but the decisions you're forcing them to make are under a muzzle order and they cannot say anything until you give your stamp of approval.

Will you allow them to tell people in their jurisdiction what you're forcing them to do before you give your stamp of approval on it?

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

**Hon. Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Speaker, health districts across the province are talking to their public about what their plans may be for the next three years, Mr. Speaker. This is not unusual —

this is not unusual.

Health district plans will be presented to the province by May 15, 2000. Once the Department of Health has had an opportunity to look at all of the health plans within a broader provincial context, those health plans that are approved initially will go back to the districts and they can consult with their public. And the public will have an opportunity to have huge input, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want again make the point, every day we heard it from the Leader of the Opposition in terms of labour law, we heard it on the member's statement in terms of Carrot River; we hear today, every day, these people get up in the House and make statements that are not true, they're not based on fact. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, people are getting sick of it.

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

### Government Funding of Film Festival

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. Yesterday the minister stood in the House and reported that 11 films scheduled to be shown during the Queer City Film Festival had been sent to the BC (British Columbia) Film Classification Board for review. That was a very good move and we thank you for it.

It is now being reported in the media that the government officials are saying that there are two of these movies which will not be shown. One of those was called *S&M in the Hood* which is reportedly being held up by Canada Customs. The second film called *Hose* which I referred to in the House last week . . . has supposedly been pulled from the festival.

Mr. Minister, can you confirm the status of these movies and why they have been removed? And have you been notified of the classification status of the other movies that you sent to the board?

**Hon. Mr. Axworthy:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, the member is right about the two movies in question. One was pulled, in fact, by the director as I understand it, and the other, as she says, is being held by, I think, the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) in Calgary. So those two movies will not be shown, Mr. Speaker.

My understanding is from the film classification board here in Saskatchewan that the other nine movies, Mr. Speaker, are being exempted from classification; therefore they will be shown at the festival this weekend. And, Mr. Speaker, that complies with the commitment I made yesterday that no movies would be shown at the festival unless they were within the bounds of the classification system and the Criminal Code.

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

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be putting forward a motion this afternoon calling for the removal of government funding for this festival because of the pornographic screenings of this festival.

I hope the Premier will allow the members on the government



side of the House to vote freely on this motion so they can represent their constituents. Because voting against our motion, Mr. Speaker, the members on the government side will be supporting the screening of the film, *Lez B. Friends*.

Mr. Speaker, this film is reviewed, and I quote:

As how a female biker gang torments straight people by kidnapping their children, selling them to lesbian couples, and making them into sex slaves.

This is one of the films that you have exempted. This is a 20-minute-long video scheduled to be shown this Thursday during the film festival.

Mr. Speaker, do you not call this pornography? I ask the government members if this is how they support spending taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Premier, will you allow your members to vote freely on my motion this afternoon?

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

**Hon. Mr. Axworthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I should make one point absolutely clear. I think the member understands this fully, and I'm not quite sure why she persists in saying that the classification of films is my responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the classification of films, Mr. Speaker, is conducted by an independent board at arm's length from the government, their criteria clearly set out in the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

And my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the board will dictate that these movies will be shown to people only over the age of 18. And, Mr. Speaker, there will be clear indications that checks on age will be required. And also, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a big sign outside informing those who might come what those movies are about.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's be quite clear — this is an independent board which makes these decisions, not the Department of Justice.

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

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I should clarify, I do not rise for a ministerial statement. I rise to request leave to introduce guests.

**The Speaker:** — I'll recognize the Hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs on orders of the day for guest introduction.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### **Bill No. 220 — The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Amendment Act, 2000 (Votes of Confidence)**

**Mr. McMorris:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move first reading of Bill 220, The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Amendment Act, 2000.

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

##### **Bill No. 35 — The Automobile Accident Insurance Amendment Act, 2000 (No. 2)**

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 35, The Automobile Accident Insurance Amendment Act, 2000 be now introduced and read the first time.

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

##### **Bill No. 36 — The Motor Carrier Amendment Act, 2000**

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 36, The Motor Carrier Amendment Act, 2000 be now introduced and read the first time.

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

##### **Bill No. 37 — The Public Libraries Amendment Act, 2000**

**Hon. Mr. Serby:** — Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 37, The Public Libraries Amendment Act, 2000 be now introduced and read the first time.

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

##### **Bill No. 38 — The Electronic Information and Documents Act, 2000**

**Hon. Mr. Axworthy:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill 38, The Electronic Information and Documents Act, 2000 be now introduced and read the first time.

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

**The Speaker:** — The hon. member for North Battleford has asked leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Hillson:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the members will be aware, the FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) is meeting this week at the Regina Inn in a governance conference. And we have with us this afternoon two members who are in the city for that conference. They are Chief Delbert Britton from Peter Chapman Band, and Oliver Constant from the James Smith Cree Nation. And I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly this afternoon.

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

**Mr. Harper:** — I would like to ask leave for the introduction of

guests.

Leave granted.

**Mr. Harper:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to all members of the House, I'd like to introduce a constituent of mine in your west gallery, Mr. Brett Quiring. Brett is a university student from Regina here and he is . . . I believe he is done university just in the last few days here and I think he's enjoying some time off.

Mr. Quiring is also my constituency association president and doing a wonderful job there. So I'd ask all the members to offer Brett a very warm welcome.

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

### STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

#### Ruling on a Point of Order

**The Speaker:** — Hon. members, last Friday the Minister of Education raised a point of order regarding the line of questioning that the Leader of Opposition had been pursuing. At the time I indicated I would reserve any decision until I had an opportunity to review the *Hansard* for oral question period, and I'm now prepared to rule on the matter.

The rules of parliamentary debate place certain restrictions on what questions may appropriately be asked of ministers. This is not a new concern. I remind members of a statement I made on April 17 on this exact matter, and I will quote from that statement:

. . . there have been repeated instances when questions have been addressed to the Leader of the Liberal Party in regards to that party's political platform. Beauchesne's, 6th Edition, in paragraph 409(6) states that "A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government"; and (then) further . . .

Order. Order.

and further in paragraph 410(17), that "Ministers may not be questioned with respect to (any) party responsibilities."

Comments regarding the political responsibilities of a Minister, or the Leader of the Opposition, or of (any other) member are properly matters of debate. As such, they may be raised during debate on relevant topics in bills, estimates and motions. During Question Period however, only questions touching upon the collective administrative responsibility of the Government or the current individual responsibilities of a Minister are properly (the) subject of oral questions.

Friday's question period illustrates the importance of how a question is phrased. For example, the first two questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition were out of order on the grounds that they questioned a minister on the administrative responsibilities of his political party organization. The third question, addressed to the Minister of Justice, questioning the application of The Election Act was in order. However, some of

the preamble was unparliamentary.

The difficulty that I, as Speaker, must resolve is determining whether a question, while it is being posed, is in order. In some instances, it is very clear where a member is heading and that the subject matter is inappropriate. In other instances, it is only after a member has completed asking his or her question that one is able to determine its procedural acceptability. In many instances, by the time the appropriateness of the question is determined, the minister has indicated his or her desire to respond.

The questions become difficult to assess in situations where there has been legislation before the Assembly that governs political parties. Where such business is being considered, the practice of this Assembly is to allow questions on these particular policy issues. And I refer members to question period in June of 1996 where questions frequently dealt with issues related to political donations and to The Elections Act that was then before the Assembly. I note that this is not the case today.

Our own precedents repeatedly illustrate that ministers are responsible only for their portfolios. The rationale outlined by the Speaker on December 5, 1991, when ruling on the admissibility of a written question applies to the case at hand. That statement provided as follows:

" . . . Beauchesne's, 6th Edition, paragraph 428(dd) states as follows: (and I quote)

"A question . . . must not:

(dd) deal with matters not officially connected with Government or Parliament, or which are of a private nature."

The political contributions and political activities of individual citizens is not a matter of administrative responsibility of any minister of the Assembly.

If such matters have a relation to public affairs, then that is subject for debate and not appropriate in the form of a written question. Members cannot ask ministers to report on matters for which they have no official responsibility.

Hon. members, further rulings on this point include those of December 10, 1991; July 17, 1992; June 6, 1996; April 20 and May 4, 1998; March 24 and 30, and April 26 of 1999.

The main principle underlying the Chair's application of parliamentary procedure is fairness. In this instant it would be patently unfair to require the members of only one side of the House to answer for the administration of their political parties. This is why question period is restricted to questions for which the government has administrative responsibility as the executive government.

I therefore ask all hon. members to carefully consider how they choose to word their questions and their preambles to ensure that they address an issue of public policy or the minister's administrative responsibility. An inappropriately worded preamble could prompt me as Speaker to intervene even though the question or answer to follow is procedurally acceptable.

And I just want to conclude with a comment on decorum. Earlier this year I made a lengthy statement on the practices that are traditionally followed in parliamentary institutions to ensure that the decorum in the debate and in the Chamber are befitting this Assembly. Unfortunately members on both sides continue to engage in disrespectful behaviour towards one another. In particular there have been several instances where aspersions have been cast upon the chair occupant or where the motives of hon. members have been impugned.

I appreciate that the level of decorum has much, much improved since Friday.

Members should realize that they are accountable for their actions and for their words, regardless of whether the member has been recognized to speak. It is the members who are expected to maintain a respectable level of decorum, and it is the responsibility of the Speaker to assist all members in maintaining this level.

I ask all hon. members to seriously consider the loss of public respect for this Assembly that can result from their actions.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**Mr. Yates:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And with leave of the Assembly, I'd like to table the answers for questions 132 through 135.

**The Speaker:** — Written questions 132 to 135 inclusive have been tabled.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

##### Motion No. 5 — Government Funding of Programs

**Ms. Draude:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the motion that I will propose when I am finished speaking today is:

That this Assembly urges the provincial government to cancel all the funding it provides that is being used to promote pornography and that this funding be redirected to programs to combat the child sex trade.

Mr. Speaker, this question actually boils down to a simple sentence. What are taxpayers' dollars . . . why are taxpayers' dollars going to promote pornography?

We all understand and appreciate freedom of speech and freedom of expression. The film industry in our province has done a fantastic job. It creates jobs and it promotes economic development, but there has to be some limit to what this government will support. Pornography is degrading and demeaning, and studies have shown that it promotes violence towards women and children.

How can SaskTel justify increasing their phone rates every year when they have money to fund pornography in this province? And then we have to ask even further — what is this government's priorities anyway? This government claims that

Saskatchewan is the best place in the world to live. Well how do they justify supporting an industry that promotes abuse against our children?

We have seen in a BC case when the BC Supreme Court ruled in favour of a man possessed . . . having possession of child pornography and what a dangerous precedent this can set.

Our office received a call from a young man not long ago who did most of the film footage from the RCMP musical ride. This is a historical event that celebrates the rich history of Saskatchewan. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? He could not receive any funding to complete his work.

And yet at the same time, we've got funding for pornography. We are supporting pornography in this province. This doesn't make any sense, Mr. Speaker.

Everyone in this Assembly is very well aware of the growing child sex trade right here in our own province. A legislative committee has been struck to attempt to deal with this problem. But how hypocritical is this when this very government that is supporting this committee is also supporting the very industry that acts as a catalyst towards the abuse of children? Violence and abuse of any kind should not and cannot be tolerated in our society, and it is abhorrent that the members opposite are using taxpayers' dollars to support this industry.

The money that is being spent by this government on this industry would be better served to perhaps set up a safe house or help get those that are in the industry off the streets and into another life.

(1430)

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

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, I quote the Minister of Culture and Housing last week when he said: this is not about pornography.

He's defending his government's participation in pornography. He's trying to say that it is not pornography, when the people, when the people that are actually putting on the festival call it hard-core pornography. They're saying this is very hard-core, people do everything in it. And, Mr. Speaker, one of the actresses actually said, please don't use my real name — my mother would kill me.

Mr. Speaker, what do we say about a government who's saying it's okay to spend money on this but let's not use the actresses name because it was something that even a family member could not be supportive of. For almost two weeks the Saskatchewan Party has been questioning this government on their priorities.

The names of the movies that are being . . . in this film festival are so graphic that they cannot be read into this Assembly's minutes. Since the members opposite are so proud of their involvement perhaps they could read the names of these movies to their children.

We've been receiving calls from constituents who are

represented by the members opposite and they're asking us why their MLAs are promoting pornography. These taxpayers assure us that come the next election the members opposite will not be around to promote anything.

It is also noteworthy to mention that during this very important debate the NDP government made a desperate attempt to label the Saskatchewan Party as homophobic and promoting censorship. This has never been raised on this side of the House and the problem that we have is with the pornographic section of this festival.

More recent events have shown that these movies may actually be illegal as shown . . . as of section 7 of The Film and Video Classification regulations. Actually, Mr. Minister, we have to wonder if this government is now hiding behind the BC regulations film board as well. We have movies that are held up at the border because they can't come into the province. We've got them actually pulled from the festival, and yet we still have this government saying, it's okay; we're sure it's fine — they've been exempted.

Times have really changed, Mr. Speaker. It was not long ago that a person had to go out of their way to find hard-core pornography. But for the people of Saskatchewan all they have to do is go down the street to their local library and they can find it.

There are parents all over Saskatchewan that are concerned that their children can access pornography way too readily especially since the advent of the Internet. It's not very comforting for parents to know that, when they are trying to deter their children from watching this kind of demeaning material, that the government is actually spending money promoting it.

Mr. Speaker, today the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly is debating the question whether government funding should be used to promote pornography. Mr. Speaker, there is no grey area here. There is no mixed messages at all. Mr. Speaker, there is not two sides to this story. There is no way to water down this issue. The question is simple: do you as government members believe taxpayers' dollars should be used to promote and in some cases celebrate pornography.

I'd like the members opposite to tell me that their constituents are proud of their decision to spend hard-earned taxpayers' dollars on pornography. And tell me that truthfully. Have the majority of your constituents phoned you and said, way to go, member from Regina Qu'Appelle or member from Greystone, just continue to use my taxpayers' dollars that way. I'm really proud of you.

Mr. Speaker, last week the previous . . . last year, the previous Speaker came out to my constituency and made a statement that I'll always remember. He said that democracy means the minority shall have their say, and the majority will have their way. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know what the majority of my constituents are saying. And I believe I know what the majority of the constituents from the members opposite are saying as well.

Mr. Speaker, constituents often tell us they vote not just for the

party, but for the candidate. They want to know that their MLAs have the values and the ideals and priorities in life that the constituents can relate to. So yesterday and today in the House I asked the Premier and each of his caucus members if they were going to be allowed to vote their conscience on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe an issue like this has to be an issue of conscience because that is the backbone of government. What government really is, is individual members with their voices combined to decide what is right or wrong.

To each of you as government MLAs, can you say in your heart that supporting the promotion of pornography is right? Can you explain to your spouse and to your children and your own conscience that this is the right direction for any government to take, that this is going to enhance democracy, and that it'll enhance the life of the ordinary taxpayer in Saskatchewan — ordinary people like you and I, members? Can you stand proudly in this House and say: yes I made a difference today; future generations will benefit from what I did today in the House?

Saskatchewan is fighting for its rightful place in Canada and in the world. We as legislators are sending a message every time we vote on an issue in this House. We're sending a message about the kind of people we are. Is this really the message we want to send out across Saskatchewan, across Canada, and across the world? That we will use our taxpayers' dollars to promote pornography in Saskatchewan? Is this part of the foundation of the province that we are building here? That we can spend hard-earned taxpayers' dollars on the most demeaning and degrading act known to man — sexual exploitation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about sexual preference. I'm talking about pornography — gay or straight. Pornography is not a victimless crime. The society you and I as members of the legislature are shaping takes into account all of our actions.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite cannot in good conscience say, I'm not going to . . . that you're going to not promote pornography and justify by saying just one small part of what this government is doing. Everything that you're doing is building this government. Everything that you say is an indication of what your government stands for or doesn't stand for. You cannot hide behind this.

Mr. Speaker, it tells our children . . . we are telling our children here in the House by our votes and by our actions what is right and wrong. And government has a responsibility to put those form to words. The fundamental beliefs in right and wrong is what shapes our justice system, and our justice system is what defines us as people.

This is a huge issue, my friends. You cannot hide behind a Crown corporation or a board. You will be the one standing in the House today saying yea or nay. And you will have to live with yourself and the decision that you have made.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move this motion:

That this Assembly urge the provincial government to cancel all of the funding it provides that is being used to

promote pornography, and this funding be redirected to programs to combat the child sex trade in this province.

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

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to second the motion put forward by the member from Kelvington-Wadena.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To you and through you to my colleagues in this Assembly it's a great pleasure to introduce a gentleman in the east gallery. Mr. Speaker, he is Mr. Ernest Heapy, and he is the general manager for the South West Centre for Entrepreneurial Development located in Swift Current.

The centre, Mr. Speaker, is doing some pioneering work in terms of extending entrepreneurial training to everyone, but especially to youth and to high school students. And Mr. Heapy himself has done great work and spoke at many functions about the efforts of the Swift Current centre. I had the pleasure of serving on that board of the centre, Mr. Speaker, and it's a very worthwhile project that we wish much success to.

So I'd just ask all hon. members to join with me in welcoming Mr. Heapy to the Legislative Assembly.

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

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

#### Motion No. 5 — Government Funding of Programs (continued)

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker it is my pleasure to second the motion put forward by the member from Kelvington-Wadena.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's a person in this entire province or this entire country that would promote this sort of pornographic material at a time historically when we are trying so very desperately to save our children in this country.

Everyone in this country understands and knows that there's a heightened awareness now that many, many women and children have suffered from sexual exploitation in many forms and that it is very damaging to all in our country. It is damaging and it is a horrendous sort of activity going on here. Damaging in a way that our province and our country cannot go further ahead because we have damaged people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just put forward some facts about pornography and how very damaging it is and the violence related to pornography. Child molesters often use pornography to seduce their prey, to lower the inhibitions of the victim, and

to serve as an instruction manual.

Of 36 serial sex murderers interviewed by the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) in 1985, 81 per cent admitted using pornography. Eighty-seven per cent of girl-child molesters and 77 per cent of boy-child molesters studied, admitted to regular use of hard core pornography.

And, Mr. Speaker, there certainly was a statement from one of the promoters of the Queer Festival that this was hard core pornography going on there.

Mr. Speaker, when we see those kind of statistics, how much does it take us yet to get it through our heads on how damaging this is, how destructive these kind of initiatives are in a world, in a world where we are trying to become citizens that are more interested in human dignity than we are in profiting.

We are obviously in a sick society. And we obviously have a long way to go before we can heighten our awareness of civility and heighten our honour and our respect for women and children.

Mr. Speaker, I have with me some excerpts written by children. Children who are witnessing to the damage that pornography has caused in their life, witnessing to sexual exploitation as a result of pornographic incidents that have added to their demise and their illness.

And it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in this world nowadays we have children that are trying to teach us just how very, very sick some of the adults are. Children who have gone through horrendous, horrendous sort of instances of abuse, sexual abuse, physical abuse, all kinds of abuse, and that have come through it somehow alive, that are now teaching us. And for goodness' sake if we won't listen to those of us who care about a civil and a decent society, maybe we should at least listen to our children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the things I'm going to read here are not very pleasant. And I don't do this for any other reason but to give voice to the children who are so against pornography.

One eight-year-old witness, or rather not eight years old now, but when he was eight years old he wrote:

When I was eight my father made me look at pictures that showed girls doing sexual things to men in books. I went along with him not knowing any better. He continued to rape me and use me for four years while using these books.

Now at 16, I have found that I have a serious STD that has no cure. I have been with no one but my father. What will I tell my husband some day? I may die from this disease. Pornography has ruined my life.

(1445)

And another witness, Mr. Speaker, states:

I am 13 years old. You could say that I am average teenager except for one fact. I am a victim of pornography. When I was very small my real dad sexually abused me

while he was watching a pornographic video. I lost my innocence to my real dad when he chose to use me for his own self-fulfilling needs.

The things he did to me happened while he was watching pornography. What did I do to deserve this? I go through times of depression, confusion, anorexia, and guilt. My mom says that it was not my fault, but still I wonder. Wasn't I good enough or perfect enough?

I am finding that there are many others like me. While people say there is no harm to pornography, I say they are wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, just recently some of the members of this Assembly as well as others in Saskatchewan travelled to Edmonton to talk about and to discuss, through a conference, healing and healing methods for victims of sexual exploitation and prostitution.

At that conference, Mr. Speaker, it was clear through one of the presentations, a pornography through the Internet and pornography through videos — pornography in any way it's presented — how there is an absolute co-relation to the sexual exploitation of children. Mr. Speaker, there isn't a person at that conference that didn't agree with that. It is a known fact. Intelligent people can assume that; they know that.

So what we have to ask this government is why does it take so much time to make a decision on pulling funding from an exhibition that is promoting something, especially at the same time that we in Saskatchewan who care about this issue so very dearly are trying so hard to try to find ways to heal the victims of sexual exploitation.

It makes no sense to me that government would not immediately pull funding. And it makes no sense to me either why the Minister of Justice mentioned today that there are . . . some of the films have been exempt, exempt from classification. That is a very irresponsible way of dealing with this issue to make no decision, but rather to exempt this from classification.

I guess the question in the end is, is this going to help our children? Is this going to help women who have endured virtually hundreds of years of sexual exploitation? I think not. I think a good decision — a good decision — and some moral fortitude to assist, to help, to honour and uphold women and children would be more in order.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more story that I'm going to be reading from a victim of sexual exploitation — a victim who has lifelong harm, lifelong damage, who cannot function properly, who talks about healing. Healing is the discovery of what's happened to you. Healing means that you come to understand what's happened to you. But, Mr. Speaker, these women are debilitated all of their lives simply because they still have memories of what has happened to them.

When I was six years old my great uncle started showing me pictures of men and women in all kinds of pornographic situations. As a child of divorced and busy parents, I was so eager for any kind of attention I could get

— even this kind. My uncle started out teaching me to masturbate so I wouldn't be physically damaged when he started to molest me. I only saw him every other week or so. But by the time I was seven when we, which means my mom, my grandmother, and I, moved in with him I knew everything that was in those magazines and how to do them.

He started molesting me soon after we moved in, and of course he wanted to do everything that those people did. I just tried to pretend that I wasn't there. This knowledge damaged me for most of life.

We lived there for a year and I finally told a friend what was happening, and she convinced me it wasn't my fault and that I should tell my father. Well my dad got the abuse stopped by threatening to go to court with it but then the . . . but then finally had to take over my custody because my mom didn't believe me and let my uncle come over to the house again.

Through my teenage years I abused alcohol and was very promiscuous. My view of myself was very warped. I married my husband at 17, and because of this degrading view of myself, I continued to abuse alcohol and started a long string of affairs. I felt I was nothing more than a hooker so I acted like one.

Well to make a long story short, seven years ago I found I was pregnant and I didn't know if it was my husband's or the other man I was seeing at the time. I called my husband to ask him what to do. At that time we were only a signature away from divorce. This man who has seen me cheat and lie to him still didn't want a divorce. He wanted to reconcile and raise the child together as a family.

Well being responsible for someone other than myself, which would be my child, woke me up and I was determined to be a better parent to my child than mine were.

And then she goes on talking about how her husband stood by her through her healing.

Mr. Speaker, it is this whole area of sexual exploitation and how it really interferes with the wholesome life development of children is something that is of great magnitude and does encompass a great number of different events in people's lives that have contributed to it. But surely, everyone knows and everyone should be supporting the removal of pornography in any form in our province, and certainly in our country.

And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I implore the members opposite, the Premier of the province, and the Minister of Justice to withdraw any funding that may be put forward to support pornography. And instead I implore the Premier to take that very funding and add it to any other funding that might come forward; to start with transition houses, with healing initiatives that will help the children of our province and the women of our province heal from many, many years of sexual exploitation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Lorje:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to first of all start out by commending both the member for Humboldt and the member for Saskatoon Greystone for the work that they are doing to prevent the abuse and exploitation of children.

In my former life, Mr. Speaker, when I was, as I often joke, gainfully employed, I was a clinical psychologist in Saskatoon and I saw many, many victims of childhood sexual abuse; many adult men and women who had been abused.

I will say I appreciate the quotes that the member from Humboldt has read into the record, but in my clinical experience what was often the more triggering factor was the abuse of power. And yes, it is true that occasionally these adult abusers would use pornography to degrade and to entice their child victims into abhorrent activities. But that, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, is a separate issue from the issue that we are debating in this House today.

The issue we are debating today is whether or not there should be arm's-length organizations that grant funding to community groups to promote discussions about extremely important and weighty matters in this society.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, 6,000 years ago, we had an arts community in this part of the world. Evidence can be seen in the petroglyphs south of Estevan, in the various shards of pottery and arrowheads, and in other artefacts preserved in our provincial museums.

Those artists 6,000 years ago, and presumably their storytellers and singers, were supported by their community because they gave their community both means of expression and memory. They reflected the past, they imagined the future, they nudged the present — exactly the same as artists today do.

Mr. Speaker, today our human occupation on this bit of land we call Saskatchewan has expanded and become more diversified and perhaps more inclusive. We still have artists and artisans who reflect on our identity. They challenge our assumptions, they affirm our humanity, and they help us revel in our complexity as physical, spiritual, cultural, and sexual beings.

And the community still supports the arts for exactly the same reasons. likely, as 6,000 years ago. And as has been the case since the beginning of time, we still have with us that segment of society, a small group, that believes our resources could be better spent elsewhere.

There are those who believed, even on the first day, that we have seen all that we need to see, learned all that we need to learn, experienced all that anyone could possibly desire. And they're still with us.

Most people work on expanding our horizons, pushing the envelope; others put up stop signs. In other words, Mr. Speaker, here we go again: same song, different verse; same argument, different circumstances.

And, Mr. Speaker, it gives me no pleasure to speak to this resolution because one would have thought that with all the very real problems facing this province, this nation, and this

world that we would have, once and for all, put aside attempts to stifle the expressions of others, to find more reasons to divide us than to bring us together.

But here we are debating a very complex issue in words of one syllable. It gives me no pleasure to point out, for openers, the obvious fact that the crusade by the member from Kelvington-Wadena against a small festival with a minuscule budget has given that festival more publicity than it could have ever hoped to receive with a mere \$500 from SaskTel.

It gives me no pleasure to note that the several million dollars spent each year by the Departments of Social Services and Justice to combat the child sex trade dwarfs the \$5,000 the Arts Board granted to the Queer City Film Festival.

The member from Kelvington-Wadena knows that; her friend from Humboldt knows that we will stop child prostitution when we stop child poverty; and more importantly, when we learn to confront honestly and to treat whatever depravity there is in human nature which causes adults to prey on children.

I take no pleasure in stating another obvious fact, that the Sask Party by printing the names of the supposed offending movies on its web site with a warning that children under 18 shouldn't peek is dancing pretty close to encouraging some people to break the obscenity laws dealing with children. Having that warning up on the screen, Mr. Speaker, is like telling little Johnny not to stick the bean up his nose.

And finally, and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I take no pleasure in once again having to defend honourable men and women professionals — honourable men and women — who give of their time and expertise to serve on boards and commissions only to be attacked by narrow-minded partisans hiding behind their parliamentary immunity.

So let me say as plainly as I can, Mr. Speaker, this caucus and this government and the New Democratic Party fully and firmly support arm's-length funding for the arts and for other institutions. We boldly reaffirm our faith in the integrity of the board and the staff of the Saskatchewan Arts Board, and we support their right to make decisions based on their judgment without any interference from either the government or the opposition.

(1500)

In passing, Mr. Speaker, we often hear from that side the question — what would Tommy Douglas say if? That question doesn't interest me. I don't see any virtue in playing ventriloquist for the deceased. We know what Tommy Douglas said and we know what he did. What Tommy Douglas and his government did was establish the Arts Board and the principal of arm's-length funding.

He saw the member from Kelvington-Wadena coming down the pike 50 years ago. He put a stop to her deciding what we should be allowed to discuss. Smart man, Mr. Douglas. He created an independent body — the Saskatchewan Arts Board.

I take no pleasure in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but I am more than willing to take part in this debate because, quite simply, the

kind of moral imperialism being attempted by the member from Kelvington-Wadena and her party has to be stopped. She says her concern is a concern over pornography and she claims that the government is, quote, “promoting pornography.” She is wrong.

Her resolution is, firstly, nonsense because neither the government nor the Arts Board is supporting anything. The Arts Board has given a small grant to facilitate, among other things, a discussion on an issue that quite frankly needs to be discussed.

Secondly, this is not about pornography. It is about censorship, scaremongering, and propaganda, pitting one group in society against a minority group in that same society. Censorship, plain and simple. Intolerance and hate propaganda at its most basic. We’ve been there before, Mr. Speaker, and we should not ever come close to that road again.

A Canadian scholar, Stephen Lewis — not the NDP Stephen Lewis I hasten to add — said:

A civilized society can never defend to excess the rights of its minorities. New generations must be made aware of the nightmares of the past and how they connect organically with the destructive (influences) impulses (rather) of the present.

This attempt by the Saskatchewan Party in Regina, in the year 2000, is directly connected to the destructive impulses of the past century. They weren’t stopped then; they were encouraged, and our parents still live with the consequences.

This time though, Mr. Speaker, we’re going to stop this manifestation of this same impulse in its tracks. Censorship has no place in a civilized society. Propaganda has no place anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that we are today engaged . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. Members, this is early in this debate and I wish to remind all members that you will have an opportunity to participate in this debate, but for the moment the hon. member from Saskatoon has the floor.

**Ms. Lorje:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Today as I said we’re engaged in an eternal debate — as least as old as Cain who didn’t like his brother’s creation. So, who’s on the side of the Saskatchewan Party? Who’s with them in trying to stifle artistic expression? In the words of the old Pete Seeger song, “Which side are they on?”

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. Order. Thank you.

**Ms. Lorje:** — Thank you again. Well I asked rhetorically, which side are they on? Well, how about for openers, Mr. Speaker, the London of 1601 when the Puritans wanted to shut down the queer city cinema of the day because that Shakespeare guy was a freak who hung out with thieves and actors, and their place of business was a gathering place for prostitutes and pickpockets.

They didn’t want a play about some Danish kid who questioned the meaning of life and who used some pretty graphic images to define his uncertainty. No. They already knew all that needed to be known in their flat-earth world, and they didn’t want to be troubled by anything beyond their narrow horizons.

Now let’s skip ahead to 19th century Regina. You may have seen a piece in the *Sunday Sun* a while back commenting on an article in the 1889 *Regina Leader* — an article which said nudity was okay in Greek and European art of the past, but certainly not in 19th century Regina. The intention of the Greek and European artists of antiquity was to represent quote, “sheer beauty.” But the current Regina artists, the editorial said, were merely quote, “exciting desire with impure work.” Old is good, new is bad. As the Queen of Hearts in *Alice in Wonderland* said, “Jam today and jam tomorrow, but not jam today.”

And we all know what the Victorians thought about desire, didn’t we? That’s why wealthy Victorians were known to have huge collections of pornography. A bit of hypocrisy amongst our ancestors? Perhaps.

And in our own century and in our own country? Well Margaret Lawrence has been censored because she wrote a book which has some mildly graphic scenes between her heroine and her Metis lover. Novels without this little plot twist have been overlooked by the morale watchdogs of society.

And how many of us in our own school days wanted to have a peek at *Lady Chatterly’s Lover* or the *Tropic of Cancer* just because they were banned on this continent but were allowed in France where everything is so sophisticated. I finally did get to read both those books and frankly, I was bored to death by both of them. Their reputation was enhanced far beyond their worth as art because some self-appointed arbiter said we needed to be protected. Some self-appointed censor decided, in advance, that those . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order.

**Ms. Lorje:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I said, some self-appointed arbiter said we needed to be protected from that self-appointed arbiter’s definition of pornography. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there are always thought police around. There are always Mr. and Mrs. Grundys who know better, whose knowledge should be everybody’s knowledge, whose morality they think is universal, whose tolerance is zero.

The Canadian humourist, Stephen Leacock, said on receiving his Ph.D. (Doctor of Philosophy), quote, “Now my head is full and I don’t have to add another drop of knowledge for the rest of my life.” Well, that to me is the definition of self-righteous censorship.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion by the member from Kelvington-Wadena is in good, historical company. And notice, by the way, that I didn’t even bother mentioning the countless times in history when the *Bible* — which those very few protestors down at the Regina Library yesterday claimed to speak for — has been banned.

The motion from the member opposite uses the word pornography, without bothering to define the word I might add.



And I don't blame the member, because quite frankly there is no generally acceptable definition of the term. Even the Criminal Code of Canada uses the word obscene in dealing with adults.

Obscenity is defined as:

the undue exploitation of sex, or of sex and any one or more of the following subjects, namely, crime, horror, cruelty and violence . . .

That's section 163 of the Criminal Code, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Members know that a great deal of legal ink has been dedicated to finding an acceptable definition of the word pornography. One very unsatisfactory attempt has been to use the term, community standards, and that takes us right back to square one. Who is to be given the responsibility for defining and upholding this concept, community standards, with respect to pornography?

Mr. Speaker, the question of what is pornography and what is its place, if at all, in society is at the heart of this debate and at the heart of the festival panel in discussion — a debate the opposition wants to stifle before it even begins. The member from Kelvington-Wadena is attempting to lead the public astray in her moral outrage.

I would like to quote from the media release, May 8, 2000, of the Queer City Cinema. They state:

*Queer City Cinema* is not a festival of pornography. Of over thirty hours of screenings spanning a six-day period, no more than three hours are devoted to erotica and to a debate on pornography. These three hours of programming do not involve a gratuitous showing of sexually explicit material, nor are they intended to promote pornography. Instead, they offer a rare forum for critical discussion and an opportunity for the gay and lesbian community and communities at large to view the work of national and international artists who have chosen to explore the notion of sexuality through their works. All (of) these screenings (they say in their media release) are restricted to audience members 18 years of age and over and none of the works contravene Canada's Criminal Code. Ultimately, no one will view this material unless they choose to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Queer City Film Festival is about to have a debate, a discussion about community and pornography. This is an important debate. It is a debate that sensible people and sensible governments have been grappling with for some time because we all know — and in this instance I will agree with the Saskatchewan Party — we all know that pornography exists, that some of it poses a problem with our sense of community, and that admittedly some of it, in extreme cases, threatens us. Admittedly. Actually it's been said that even just the very sound of the word pornography makes it attractive to some.

Sensible people and sensible governments have been grappling with the issue of pornography for some time. They have tried to promote community discussion of it. They have not been trying to stifle it.

I would refer members to the former Mulroney government. Now I may be committing heresy by calling it a sensible government, but I think that they acted very sensibly in receiving in 1985 the Royal Commission on pornography and prostitution.

I have more than a passing interest in that Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker, because I myself presented a brief to that commission, representing the Saskatoon Committee Against Pornography. I only point out that bit of bibliographical information to remind all members that no one here promotes pornography.

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

**Ms. Lorje:** — But an awful lot of us want to understand it.

That Royal Commission tried to come up with a workable definition for pornography. And they made several suggestions for changes to the Criminal Code — changes which I think the member from Humboldt would find acceptable.

One suggestion did find its way into the code. A change dealing with child pornography. And it says simply — it's section 163.1 of the Criminal Code — it says that any depiction of sexuality using children under the age of 18 is punishable, by law, up to five years in prison.

I agree with that, Mr. Speaker, and members on this side of the House agree with that.

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

(1515)

**Ms. Lorje:** — Now other attempts to define pornography are a bit more problematical and point to the incredible complexity of the subject we plunged into.

The commission, in its final study, came up with a three-tiered definition of pornography, the levels having to do with the concept of victimization. Tier one, the commission said, involved children under 18 and should be forbidden, as is the case. And I totally agree with that.

Tier two of their definition referred to sexual scenes involving violence or incest, and should be generally subject to prosecution unless an argument could be made for artistic merit. Back again to the old community standards argument.

The third tier involves what the commission calls victimless pornography, scenes of a blatant sexual nature only. But even this very thorough study received some submissions that are questionable and need to be debated. That study in 1985 involved heterosexual pornography. But there was a presentation by the Emergency Committee of Gay Cultural Workers Against Obscenity of Montreal. I want to just quote very briefly about their comments on gay pornography.

They said, quote: "Heterosexual pornography is often said to victimize women as a gender group, women depicted as submissive and passive receptacles of violence by male producers for male consumers."

They then went on to suggest that, quote . . . This is very important, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hope that members opposite will listen because it is the crux of the community debate that will occur this Saturday.

They went on to say, quote: "The argument that women as a group are victimized by heterosexual pornography has no equivalent argument with relation to gay pornography: in this sense, gay pornography is (as they said) primarily a 'victimless, cultural phenomena.'" "

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have trouble with that position by the Gay Cultural Workers of Montreal.

**The Speaker:** — Order.

**Ms. Lorje:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I said, I have trouble with that position. Now I don't know whether that's because I, as a heterosexual woman, have a imprecise and incomplete understanding of the experiences of homosexual women or of homosexual men, or whether it is because I, as a feminist, believe that regardless of the sex of the people that's involved in certain activities, if there is degradation, if there is violence, if there is power imbalance, whether or not they are the same age or the same sex, that that still is pornographic.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a debate that is going to occur this Saturday in Regina, Saskatchewan. A debate, Mr. Speaker, that I would suggest is long overdue.

In the heterosexual community we have for about 10 or 15 years been comfortable with debating the notions of pornography, of grappling with the definition of it, of trying to understand the potentially horrific implications of it. It is time that we showed the courtesy and the respect to the homosexual community of Saskatchewan, and allowed them the same degree of comfort and tolerance to debate that within their own community, Mr. Speaker.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I should point out parenthetically that the commission, the Royal Commission, in 1995 suggested that there should be a new category of pornography added to the Criminal Code.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. I wish to remind members that there will be an opportunity for hon. members to engage in this debate. We're currently enjoying the third person, third member in the debate. Order.

**Ms. Lorje:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I just wanted to go on and talk about the fact that while the Royal Commission on pornography and prostitution suggested a three-tier definition, something which has not been, unfortunately, completely enshrined in law, they also did suggest that there should be a new category added to the Criminal Code called violence without sex. We haven't heard too much about that one lately, Mr. Speaker. Apparently killing is okay but erotica is not.

Now I mentioned the commission and its 800-page report by very respected Canadian citizens as evidence of the complexity of this one subject in our very complex society.

Now I have a question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why are we picking on the arts here? What does the opposition have against an industry that contributes more than \$400 million a year to the Saskatchewan economy and that employs more than 18,000 highly educated and motivated people. They'll say they're not against the arts, just this art or that art. If someone wants to paint an arrangement of flowers, that's great. But if someone wants to look behind the surface to explore the dark side of human nature, well that's an entirely different matter and that should be censored, they say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we don't need to get into a long discussion of the role and nature of art in our society. But the Speaker knows as a policeman, I know in my former role as a psychologist, the member from Regina Qu'Appelle Valley knows in his role as a minister of the cloth, we all know that human nature has many, many dark corners.

We know that we can be simultaneously attracted and repelled, that extreme and contradictory impulses are never far from the surface, that every human being — every human being — is a ragtag collection of good and evil with a hand reaching to heaven and a foot mired in the dreck.

That complexity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is often the subject of the artist to explore and report back on this terribly limited and wonderfully capable animal that is ourselves. We don't always like where the artist goes but we should be grateful that someone has the courage to look inside human beings and inside our society.

Paraphrasing the German playwright Bertolt Brecht, I want to emphasize that art is not a mirror to reflect society, rather it is a hammer to help shape society. Art and the issues it raises is not black and white. Art is not a series of do's and don'ts. Just like religious faith is much more than a list of proscriptions, regulations, and condemnations, the same can be said of art. And, Mr. Speaker, why do we always pick on the arts when the subject of grants comes up?

We receive reports from the Child Advocate. We don't hear calls from the members opposite to immediately do away with the Office of the Child Advocate. We receive reports from the Workers' Compensation Board. We don't immediately hear them crying, do away with the independent, arms-length, quasi-judicial body called the Workers' Compensation Board. Why is it that we're always picking on the arts here?

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am personally a distance runner. That's a solitary sport. I'm not a fan of team sports. I don't even know or care, quite frankly, what the difference is between the Reds and the Red Sox. But I do acknowledge that others in this democracy think differently than I and that their interests should be supported.

I personally don't particularly see why money should go, for instance, to hockey organizations. But I fully support their right to apply for and receive arm's-length funding based on the knowledge of those involved in sport and recreation. People do not want the government telling them what they can listen to, what they can watch, what they can read, or what they can view in either art or sport. That's why our political process has always supported the integrity of independent action by the

Child Advocate, by the Ombudsman, by the Workers' Compensation Board, by the Provincial Auditor, by the Arts Board.

The opposition's tactic on the funding of the Queer City Cinema 2000 calls into question the independence of all these boards.

The opposition is constantly calling for independent inquiries on their cause of the day. But when they get one, they're not happy. Just let me provide them with a little quote from Ralph Emerson, the American essayist. He said "... consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds ...". I would suggest there's an incredible number of hobgoblins over on the side opposite.

I would like to remind members of what the previous minister of Culture, Carol Teichrob said the last time this issue came up in the House. She said, quote, "Freedom of expression is the cornerstone of democracy." She was right then in opposing the question from the member of Rosthern; we are right today in opposing the motion from the member for Kelvington-Wadena.

Finally, Mr. Speaker ... and, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to acknowledge right now before I even launch into the last part of my remarks that there will probably be incredible screams of outrage, howls and squeals coming from the side opposite, but I'm going to say what needs to be said.

I want to be very plain spoken here. Why is the opposition once again picking on the gay community. The member from Kelvington-Wadena has said repeatedly that she is not homophobic, so we can accept her at her word. The member from Swift Current got up the other day and accused us of calling her a homophobe, which we didn't.

Is it just a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that for the third time in this legislature the Sask Party, previously the Tory Party, has taken a stand against gays and lesbians. It is only a coincidence I guess, that those few people marching around the library are carrying signs that on the one hand parrot the Sask Party line about wasting their tax money, and on the other hand condemning the gay lifestyle as immoral and unbiblical.

Just a coincidence that they have studiously and blatantly ignored the Arts Board statement that it is funding a festival devoted to identity and self-awareness in the gay community, and that a discussion of gay erotica takes up only a fraction of that festival's program. The funding is for the entire event, not for any specific session or portion of the festival.

The member from Kelvington-Wadena says she is not homophobic. She just refuses to allow the gay community a sense of community. They're quite okay, she says, as long as they make movies about a boy and his dog and paint pictures about floral arrangements. You can be gay but you cannot explore the implications of being gay, according to that member's world view.

But she's not homophobic, nor are her colleagues. It was just a coincidence that a few years ago the members from Moosomin and Kindersley, the opposition members, led an attack on the Human Rights Code because we dared to expand it to allow housing and work protection for those with alternate sexual

preferences.

They weren't homophobic either. And it wasn't their fault that their supporters outside the legislature were amongst the most flagrantly intolerant homophobes in our society. They were all for human rights then; they just didn't want them to be enshrined in law.

(1530)

And of course the member from Rosthern is not a homophobe. He just didn't want this same festival to receive any support four years ago.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what they say, the Saskatchewan Party is scaremongering. They are pandering to the lowest element in society, and they know it. Their issue is not pornography; it is about catering to the fear of the different.

As I said earlier, the world has been down this road many, many times before. We don't need people in positions of public prominence to take us back down that same tedious blind alley.

And the funny thing, Mr. Speaker, is that they already know that they've grabbed the wrong side of this issue, that their public support, such as it is, is that pitifully small group of demonstrators down at the library yesterday.

Both Conrad Black dailies in this province have commented on the absurdity of their position. Letters to the editor, like the one today from Felipe Diaz, have pointed out that a mature discussion on sexuality is quite reasonable in our culture, a fact that the Saskatchewan Party is ignoring.

I keep hearing how politically smart they are, Mr. Speaker. Boy, are they ever on the wrong side on this one. Who are they speaking to? Who is their constituency here? What, in sum, is their judgment of the intelligence level of Saskatchewan people? Do they really believe that the Saskatchewan voter needs the member from Kelvington-Wadena to protect them?

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Ms. Lorje:** — Thank you. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am astonished at the naiveté, the political naiveté and the presumption from the Saskatchewan Party. At least, thank God, they're not homophobic though.

Mr. Speaker, we all refer often to the Canadian mosaic. We revel in the fact that our Canadian society is made up of people from many cultures, many places. Our diversity makes us strong.

As Carl Jung, a noted psychologist, once said, quote, everything that irritates us about ourselves ... about others rather ... "Everything that irritates us about others can lead to an understanding of ourselves."

Our mosaic, I believe is broad. It consists of Jews, Christians, Muslims, other beliefs, and non-believers. It consists of married couples, singles, and even colonies. It has young and old. It has gays and straights. Stifle one part of the mosaic — racial or otherwise — and you disrupt the mosaic.

We have come a long way in this society towards eliminating racial discrimination — not far enough I will say, but we are at least making progress — but we have an awful long way to go in the other area: eliminating intolerance based on sexual orientation.

And by the way, I would just like to add, parenthetically here, the opposition says that this is an issue of misusing taxpayers' dollars. I've got news for them. I've got news for them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, gay people are taxpayers as well.

Mr. Speaker, over 30 businesses in Regina support this festival. If you read their program, you will see all the ads in that program. Over 30 businesses support this festival — restaurants, caterers, art galleries, glaziers, carpenters, and other artisans. And yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, SaskTel supports this festival. The Arts Board supports this festival. The city of Regina supports this festival. The University of Regina supports this festival.

They all gave financial support without trying to tell the festival how to run its business because they understood, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that we had an intelligent, informed, rational, and sophisticated discussion about community and pornography within the homosexual community.

Only the Saskatchewan Party is opposed. They're marching smartly backwards towards intolerance, oppression, and . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order.

**Ms. Lorje:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're marching towards intolerance, oppression, and ignorance. I've got news for them. The rest of society, with the prodding and with the challenge and encouragement of all artists, is inching ahead towards that perfect place we all desire but that we know we will never reach — a community of harmony, love, diversity, and creativity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I therefore move an amendment to the motion, seconded by the member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley:

That we remove all words after "Assembly" and replace them with the following:

reaffirm its support for the principle of arm's-length funding.

The motion then, Mr. Speaker, as amended, will read:

That this Assembly reaffirms its support for the principle of arm's-length funding.

I am proud to move that motion. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — As I recognize the hon. member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley, I wish to remind all members that the debate on the main motion and the amendment will proceed concurrently.

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to second the amendment by the member from Saskatoon Southeast. I believe that her speech, her comments about this

issue were right on point, were very, very important as we begin to try and get a sense of what is or is not appropriate for this government to fund.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no one on this side of the House, there is no one in this government who is in favour of exploitation of children. There is no one in this House, no one in this government who is in favour of pornography. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no one in this House — on this side of the House at least, and I suspect on the other side of the House — who is in favour, who is in favour, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of any kind of pornography which would cause pain, suffering, or exploitation within the community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have laws in this province. Our Attorney General, our Minister of Justice, has made very clear that those laws will be upheld. Those laws . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. Order, order. Order.

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The mover of this amendment, the member from Saskatoon Southeast, spoke very clearly about the history of the arts and how the arts have pushed our edges always. Always they have pushed the community to think, to move, to understand more completely others. They have done that in areas of racism; they have done that in areas of sexism; they will continue to do that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support having third party funding boards like our Saskatchewan Arts Board. I believe that they are doing a good job, and I disagree with the member from Kelvington and that motion that would censor our Arts Board and that calls for taking away the funding for this particular festival.

So what are the issues here in this debate? Is it really about funding for this particular Queer City Cinema and the festival that is going on? Is that what it's about? Or is it really, as the member speaking before me noted, about issues of sexual orientation?

**An Hon. Member:** — Don't go there, Mark.

**Mr. Wartman:** — I can go there, I can speak about that because I have spent the last 20 years in ministry dealing with this issue. I have dealt, Mr. Speaker, with all kinds of homophobia. I have dealt with parents with children who are homosexual, who have been trying to the best of their ability to help their children find a deep and meaningful life.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, gays and lesbians in this country as in many other countries have faced persecution for centuries, persecution that has driven them deeply underground. Mr. Deputy Speaker, driven underground, that society, that community has formed in ways that are very often different from the community that is non-homosexual.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that community is telling us in this festival and telling us in other ways that they are a part of our lives, that they are our children, that they are our parents, that they are community around us and that they need to be understood, and that they are a part of this community and this society.

Now one of the things that has to happen as they move from that underground society, where they were repressed, where they faced all kind of abuse, exploitation, beatings, killings by homophobes, these folks are trying to discover and discern what it means to be a part of mainstream society.

It is absolutely vital in that process that they discuss what is pornography, what is acceptable to the community and what is not acceptable to the community? As the member from Saskatoon Southeast said . . .

(1545)

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I'm sorry. Why is the hon. member for Rosthern on his feet?

**Mr. Heppner:** — Point of order. The speech, as it's moving on at present, has absolutely nothing to do with either the motion or the amended motion as it was put forward.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — The hon. member . . . I thank the hon. member for Rosthern for raising the point of order which . . . I was listening carefully to the short point of order and I want to feed it back to make sure that I understood what you said.

The hon. member is stating the point of order that the speech we're hearing is not on the motion or the amendment. I see the hon. member nodding and I thank you for that.

Having listened very carefully to the debate thus far, I do not find the point of order well taken. I simply point out that we are engaged in a wide-ranging speech on the subject of arts, arts funding, pornography, and the very matters that the member was talking are in, in his method of entering the debate.

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I believe that it is vital that the gay and lesbian community have opportunity to explore these issues. To explore them in a forum where they can debate, where they see this picture, they look at it and they say, is that what it is, is that pornography, or is that fit within a community standard?

I can say very clearly from my experience within the church, and particularly in a church which is an affirming congregation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are those people who are well morally grounded, who have an opinion on this, who will probably speak out about this issue and who are opposed to pornography — people who are gay and lesbian. And those people need the opportunity within their community to help set standards. This festival provides that type of forum.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those people are not people who would exploit children. Those people are fine, upstanding, Christian people who do what they can to seek justice and resist evil. Those people will be engaged in the debate and those people will make the case for what is right within community standards and what is wrong within community standards.

I believe that the Arts Board is right and it is courageous in funding this kind of a festival and funding this kind of a debate as the community seeks to set its standards. As the hon. member from Saskatoon Southeast said very clearly, within the heterosexual community within this country, we have had the

opportunity to have that debate. We have had that debate fully, we continue that debate, and we have standards that our federal government has set and we continue to try and set and amend those standards.

And therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can't say anything that would go against the Arts Board funding a festival like this that may help set those standards. I can only say that I am concerned, I am concerned that what we're getting from across the floor is some vain attempt — a vain attempt — to set a righteous high road.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these folks across the way have no — no — vital ownership of what is righteous. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say if we look at that whole issue of morality within the *Bible* — and I will refer to the *Bible* because it's where I am grounded — Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is very, very little in the *Bible* about sexual morality. There is a lot in the *Bible* about social and economic morality where these folks never want to go — never want to talk about. What is social justice?

And when we're talking about a sex trade we're talking about children who are in that sex trade because of the poverty that they are raised in. And you folks need to pay attention to that and begin to do something — try and do something — to shore up those people on the bottom end.

We want to talk about a morale high road and their history? We can do that. We can talk about the convictions, the criminal convictions, of people on the political right. And we can stack that up against the record on this side.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe . . .

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

**Mr. Heppner:** — Mr. Speaker, these are unacceptable, personal attacks on which there is no backing for the members on this side of the House whatsoever. And so, therefore, I suggest that that member just be cut short. Thank you very much.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — A point of clarification on my behalf. You're raising that as a point of order I assume?

**Mr. Heppner:** — Yes.

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Fair enough. First off, I want to thank again the hon. member for Rosthern for raising a point of order. What we have is a debate, and what I've just seen, frankly, is a dispute between members. And . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Well it's an accusation . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. Order. What we have is a dispute between members and members generally take care of disputes by giving speeches back and forth.

Again, I thank the hon. member for raising the point of order, and I recognize the hon. member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley.

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

Speaker, I talked about the issues of . . . just was talking about the issues of a moral high road and whether one of us has more of a right to that position. And I've got to say very clearly I raised the issue of criminal convictions and the history and, you know, what we faced in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was just talking about the proportion, the general proportions. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that there are people on that side of the House . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I have not to date named any member as I call for order, but the member understands that I've been reasonably generous thus far and I ask for the co-operation of all members in allowing the member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley to conclude . . . to continue his speech.

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Where I was moving with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was looking at the proportion. What I was saying was that the people on the opposite side of the House do not own the moral high road.

In fact, historically, again I will repeat, that they have shown very clearly that they're proportionately many, many convictions, many, many problems dealing with moral issues, in fact not just with empty rhetoric.

Now on the other side of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to note . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Why is the hon. member for Cypress Hills on his feet?

**Mr. Elhard:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I find that the member's statements are extremely offensive to me personally and to every member on this side. If he has an accusation to make against any of us, let him state his case. But this type of slanderous comment is unacceptable.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** — I thank the . . . Order, order. I thank the hon. member for Cypress Hills for raising the point of order.

What we have, I wish to remind members, is a debate that is . . . let me . . . Perhaps it will be useful to all hon. members if I were to read the main motion and the proposed amendment, which I will do. And in so I'm asking all members to reflect that this motion and amendment deals with a fairly wide range of issues. Order, order. The motion as proposed by the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena, and seconded by the hon. member for Humboldt, reads:

That this Assembly urges the provincial government to cancel all the funding it provides that is being used to promote pornography and that this funding be redirected to programs to combat the child sex trade.

That's the main motion. The amendment as moved by the hon.

member for Saskatoon Southeast and seconded by the hon. member for Regina Qu'Appelle Valley reads:

That we remove all the words after "Assembly" and replace them with the following:

"reaffirm its support for the principle of arm's-length funding."

And I remind all members that members will mount their arguments around the motion and the amendment as best they can, and I urge that — order, order — and I urge that the debate continue on the main motion and the amendment.

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll go directly to what my next sentence was to be, and that is that I recognize, as I have come to know, that there are fine people on that side of the Chamber as well who have high moral standards.

I recognize that in the way that they see things, which it may well be quite different from the way that I see things, that they see that there is some moral wrong happening in this. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is their right to see it. It is their right to protest it. But what I am saying is that their motion which would refer to us as if we were promoting porn is just . . . first of all, it's ultra vires. It shouldn't be allowed on that basis.

And secondly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, secondly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we take personal umbrage to that kind of insinuation. However, we will still deal with the issue of third-party funding. We will still deal with the issue of what is behind all of this. And what I . . . what my contention is and why I support the amendment is that as this community moves to try and get their place, their standard within the community, they must look at the issues that have been a part of it.

In an underground community, in an underground community, pornography is much more the norm. A lot of these folks have only been in the underground and what they are trying to do is trying to find, as a part of the whole community, what is acceptable.

You heard the . . . if you were listening, the members opposite heard the references from the federal document. They will know that there are differences between heterosexual and homosexual explicit movies. And what these people are trying to do is trying to determine which is which. That's the struggle.

Now what I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that if they are concerned, if they really want to be a part of the debate about what is and isn't pornography, that they should go to the festival, that they should watch the movies, they should take part in the debate, and they should say what they think would be an acceptable standard. And I think that that is what this is about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a history of funding the Arts Board that is sound. We have a history of providing that funding so that that part of our community can explore what is art, that they can develop what is art. And the arts have enriched us from the very beginning of time.

The standards change. We referred . . . a member from Saskatoon Southeast referred to the change from what is old art — the statues of naked men and women, the paintings of people making love that are old art. To do that now some might say is pornographic.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the masters did it, did that make it art? Because new artists are doing it, does that make it pornography? Those issues have to be debated, understood, and standards set.

That's what the arts community does. They debate that. They make the decisions as they see them. And we can participate in those. If we're old enough, we can go to the festival. We can participate in the debate there, if we're old enough. There is a limit — 18 or over.

We are following the law, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am convinced that we will continue to follow the law around this issue because this government does not, does not promote pornography and will not promote pornography.

Given the number of very, very key issues that we have to face, this reminds me, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order.

(1600)

**Mr. Wartman:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. These folks really engaging in this debate from the perspective of you've got to shut it down, you've got to not have the debate, you've got to not have public funding in there, these folks remind me of some characters in the *Bible*.

They were called — and this very definitely is from a Christian perspective of these characters I have to say — they were called Pharisees. And the one that I follow talked about those Pharisees as being people who would strain at gnats while swallowing camels.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am convinced that that is what is happening right now. That we've got folks who are straining at gnats and swallowing camels on the opposite side of this Chamber.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, here is a festival that will help define what is pornographic and what is not. This is not a big raging issue like the members opposite are attempting to make it. This is a very simple part of the community trying to work out its identity in our times.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the same time it was raised earlier about child sex trade and child exploitation. Now there's a camel. And there's something that we do have to deal with and we will deal with and we will do our utmost to put an end to that.

And we know that one of the root causes of that is poverty. And I am sure that when we get to trying to put good supports in so that the people will not be poor, not exploited, that the members opposite will stand up with us and try and put that legislation through. Because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's a camel. And

they are willing to swallow that whole thing to let all of the social justice, the concern for the poor, the standards that we need to set for union, they're willing to let all of that go while they strain away at this gnat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can hardly believe it, the amount of time and energy that they've put into that while we have burning issues that need to be dealt with.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that the amendment says exactly what we need to say. I believe that that's where we should be. And so I will now move adjournment on this issue.

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

The division bells rang from 4:03 p.m. until 4:13 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 25

Hagel	Van Mulligen	Melenchuk
-------	--------------	-----------

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. We'll allow the . . . I ask all members to allow the vote to be taken. Vote continues.

Cline	Atkinson	Goulet
Lautermilch	Thomson	Lorje
Serby	Nilson	Crofford
Kowalsky	Sonntag	Hamilton
Prebble	Jones	Higgins
Yates	Harper	Axworthy
Junor	Kasperski	Wartman
Addley		

#### Nays — 19

Hermanson	Elhard	Heppner
Julé	Draude	Boyd
Gantefoer	Peters	Wall
Bakken	Bjornerud	D'Autremont
Weekes	Brkich	Harpauer
Wakefield	Wiberg	Allchurch
Kwiatkowski		

Debate adjourned.

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

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — To introduce guests, Mr. Deputy Chair.

Leave granted.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to my colleagues in the Assembly, a Mr. Thomas Dresing. He's the export manager for the world for Lenz Moser. He's visiting Canada today from Austria.

Lenz Moser is the largest producer of Austrian wines with

about 15 million bottles each year. Saskatchewan has been fortunate to have a long relationship, a long-standing relationship with the Moser family and we're pleased to have Thomas join us in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon.

He's joined today by Wally Fries, a Regina . . . the Saskatchewan agent for this winery. Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to be able to, hopefully, have a few moments to visit with them this afternoon before they must leave again. And I'd ask all members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming Thomas and Wally Fries with us this afternoon.

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

**Motion No. 6 — Community Management  
Boards in the North**

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to speak to this private members' motion which reads:

That this Assembly urge the government to continue the initiative of working with northern communities to create community management boards which respond to the particular law enforcement needs of aboriginal and northern communities.

I'm very pleased to speak to this motion, Mr. Speaker, because I believe this motion really addresses and really becomes . . . I want to speak to it in a sense of a celebration of inclusion.

It's a celebration showing that . . . our children and future generations in this province exactly what kind of a country we want to leave for them. And what kind of a province we want to leave for our children and our grandchildren.

This memorandum of understanding gives us hope, Mr. Speaker, because it is set up in a way in co-operation with First Nations, the New North neighbours, the RCMP, and Sask Justice. And it sets up a memorandum where people in the North . . . there's an agreement between the people in the North and the RCMP and Justice to work co-operatively on items of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I say that it's a celebration of inclusion because by not doing this, by not proceeding with actions of this type, we could be leading ourselves down a national pathway that we do not want.

Mr. Speaker, let me just give you an example of what I mean. Last night on television watching the late news, I was delighted to see a clip where they had . . . they were showing 18 new RCMP cadets being inducted into the RCMP — new members and they were all from Saskatchewan. Many of them were of Aboriginal background, and they were all being placed in Saskatchewan. And they were there proudly with their families accepting their graduation, being praised by their instructors, being accepted into the RCMP.

They have made it, Mr. Speaker. They will be respected and are respected by their own families, by their communities for having gone through the training. And they will be, through their work, promoting a respect for law and order and

promoting the rule of law in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And it was done in the spirit which I would like to see our children and our grandchildren carry on in this province.

And I want to contrast that clip, Mr. Speaker, that television clip with one that happened two weeks before that, or about a week before that. And on this case . . . on this particular clip, the newscaster showed two people at odds with each other. They were showing their hurt, Mr. Speaker. They were showing that the issue that divided them was very strong. And it was two women arguing with each other and laying blame on each other, and it had a lot of racial overtones, screaming and blaming, Mr. Speaker.

And you could see that they were both hurting and neither of them were able to overcome their hurt. And when I saw this clip, Mr. Speaker, it was . . . it gave a person a chance to think and reflect about what kind of a society we want, what kind of a place we want to live in. And more than that maybe even, it spoke to the work that needed to be done towards keeping racial harmony in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it reminded me of perhaps the greatest challenge that faces me as a politician and perhaps I would say all of us as politicians over the long haul in this province and in this country. And that is that whatever we do, and if we . . . that we follow our democratic principles and make provision for those people who are weaker or who are fewer or who may have alternate lifestyles or have alternative points of view, and most importantly who are poorer, to also participate and have some control over their life.

So I salute those 18 people that were inducted into the RCMP just yesterday here in Regina. And I wish them all the best, and I challenge . . . I know they will be challenged, Mr. Speaker, with the work that they have to do in keeping racial harmony, in keeping a respect for law and order in the communities in which they will be living.

I thought furthermore, Mr. Speaker, how fortunate we are in this country to have several other examples where those preceding us, and those of only five or ten years ago, have made great strides in racial harmony, in promoting racial harmony, and promoting inclusion in this province.

I speak of things like the land settlements which have been agreed upon, and which are now being administered, which are now being implemented. And this required a tremendous amount of discussion and a tremendous amount of hard work and a tremendous amount of compromise between people who worked with the federal government, with the provincial government, and with the FSIN. And we came to an agreement — and it took well over 20 years after the negotiations started — but the agreements are now being implemented, and they are being implemented in a way that I am proud.

And I must pay tribute to a former colleague who sat in this House, Bob Mitchell, who served as minister and put those . . . implemented those agreements, Mr. Speaker, with the advice of course of other MLAs and people he knew and the advice of cabinet.

But, Mr. Speaker, how different that is from what is happening



now in Zimbabwe, in Africa, where we've got hundreds of people, landless people, moving from shack villages and setting on land because they rightfully believe that they've been chased off of it. But there is nothing in place to include them and to work out a system where they can reclaim some of their land, or buy it back, or even work on it, Mr. Speaker.

So I feel that this example that has been set here in Saskatchewan and other parts of Canada with our First Nations on things like land settlements and this MOU (memorandum of understanding) to which I am talking, are really . . . have showed great, great progress.

Mr. Speaker, we have other examples which are . . . of which I am very proud here in Saskatchewan, much like this MOU. The casino agreement is an agreement which speaks to and addresses employment for First Nations people. It is an agreement which is allowing a lot of people to participate fully in the employment scene they wouldn't otherwise . . . an opportunity they wouldn't otherwise have.

When I look at the forestry partnerships that are being signed right now in this last year and some are being worked on right now in Saskatchewan, I see the same thing — co-operation, compromise, but in the end, people of different backgrounds working together so that everybody can benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, this has happened also in the education field. SIASST Woodland Campus working together with Gabriel Dumont — not having completely separate institutions but integrating. Who's to the benefit? Everybody's to the benefit, Mr. Speaker.

Our community schools have done a lot in that respect as well. By bringing parents into the community schools, Mr. Speaker, we avoid the segregation that we see in other parts of the world which have caused great strife in other parts of the world.

We all are relieved, Mr. Speaker, that we are no longer seeing planes and bombings going on in Kosovo. And we're no longer hearing about Muslims beating up and killing orthodox Serbs, and vice versa. And we're no longer seeing Albanians fighting against the Serbs in their own country, and vice versa.

It is very instructive, however, Mr. Speaker, when we see those things, how important it is to set up structures within our province and within our country to combat that kind of tribalism that exists in certain parts of Europe and certainly exists in Africa. And it's for that reason that I was more than willing and actually eager to move this particular motion, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to spend a couple of minutes describing now what it is that these . . . that this agreement does, this memorandum of understanding, what the terms of the framework are. What I really like about it is that the language in it doesn't say what you should do and what I should do or what they should do, but it all . . . it speaks about what we should do and what we should do together.

It speaks to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, to the New North member municipalities, and Saskatchewan Justice to work together and to mutually agree on the following principles

and activities, and I will read just but a few of them, Mr. Speaker.

Number one, the parties agree to work together to provide mutual support and assistance. That tells you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not Ottawa or Regina or somebody sending the RCMP into communities in the North and telling them how to run the show up in the North or any of these communities. It speaks about them working together.

The New North member municipalities have agreed to establish community police boards, and by establishing these community police boards, these local boards are used then to advise on how justice should be administered in these areas. All parties have agreed to support the community police boards. And it is the job of the community police boards and the RCMP to establish mutually agreed goals for policing, and to do so each year.

(1630)

And this . . . the RCMP will account and report to the board and to the community in a mutually agreed upon format and timetable. So the RCMP who are working there then are not just responsible to their superiors in Regina or in Ottawa, but they are also responsible to the local communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is partly modelled after the way policing is done in many other towns and cities in Saskatchewan. In general terms, in many countries, many democratic countries, municipalities are given the authority — if they can afford to do it and have got the capabilities of doing it — they are given the authority to do the policing within their towns. And of course you know that all of the larger cities and many smaller centres in Saskatchewan have their own police forces. This models it to some extent, this memorandum of understanding.

One of the items and one of the principles about this, Mr. Speaker, is that community police boards will be consulted regarding preferred RCMP staffing attributes. So when they are selecting their staff, again they're to contact and consult with the community police board.

By including the people from the community in the selection of the RCMP that are going to be policing them, they have much better chance of people complying with the wishes and with the directives and with the authority represented by the RCMP.

It's pretty hard to send somebody into a northern area and just have them take over without doing some training, Mr. Speaker. And in this, one of the principles in this MOU, one of the principles is that the community police boards and the RCMP will take part in joint training of the community police board members and the RCMP members.

So there is a process in place for them to take into account local customs and local needs and put it into a training program so they can get . . . And usually it's during a training program like this that you break the ice and get to know each other a bit because there is usually some type of socialization that takes place.

It's by doing that, Mr. Speaker, you not only enforce the law but you encourage a respect for law. Something very important

in a democratic society. That any law that you implement, any law that you implement, does represent and is accepted by the majority of people. And usually that is the case, Mr. Speaker.

But if you have a law implemented from outside, if you have a law implemented from the outside and then simply enforced without people understanding its purpose and believing in the law, that is when a society no longer stays civil. And you end up with either tribal wars or, Mr. Speaker, it could lead to revolutions as it does in many parts of the world, particularly and certainly in some parts of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principles here is that the RCMP will provide cross-cultural and socio-economic training for all northern RCMP staff and that community police boards will take an active role in fostering understanding of policing in the new northern member communities.

Just one more thing, Mr. Speaker, that I want to mention, and that is that the funding for this agreement is jointly done by the federal government and the provincial government. I believe it to be a 52/48 per cent agreement. It's a total cost in northern Saskatchewan for over \$9 million for policing, but it's an agreement which I think is very important.

The RCMP probably have more contact as a social agency . . . As a social agency compared with other social agencies, the RCMP probably has more contact with Northerners than any other social agency. So to have an agreement as to the processes to be used is very, very important.

So I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, then to move, seconded by the member from Cumberland:

That this Assembly urge the government to continue the initiative of working with northern communities to create community management boards which respond to the particular law enforcement needs of Aboriginal and northern communities.

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

**Hon. Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to rise to second the motion wherein we continue to work with northern communities in regards to the development of community police boards.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to second this motion from the member from . . . with the member from P.A. (Prince Albert) Carlton because of the history-making nature of a year ago.

In May last year, we had a memorandum of understanding between Saskatchewan Justice, the RCMP, and New North communities from northern Saskatchewan. I was told at that time that it was historic in the sense that it was the first one across Canada, that it was a leadership role being played by all parties concerned. So it was with great pride that I rise in my place to record this historic achievement.

Mr. Speaker, being born and raised in northern Saskatchewan, I see a lot of the evolutionary development towards greater community control taking place, and especially as we are

hitting this new century.

In the 1970s we saw the development of control by Northerners in regards to education, school boards, as well as post-secondary institutions. We also saw the control by municipalities and the evolution to the options . . . (inaudible) . . . package and The Northern Municipalities Act.

We also saw a little bit of a downward trend during the '80s when there was a recentralization away from community approaches with the previous Devine government. And we saw everything recentralized back in Regina and a lot of the development and decision making coming from Regina and not rested . . . and not resting with the people of the North.

As we enter the 1990s and we come back into government, we move back again to the time . . . move on to this concept in different areas. We saw that in the next major phase with health, and we saw the development of three health boards in northern Saskatchewan.

And we also saw the most important aspect of the new century, which was self-determination in the area of economic development. We see the rise now in northern Saskatchewan of northern development board. We see the Northern Review Board in regards to economic development and also the CREDOs — the community regional economic development organizations. So we are seeing that development evolved over time in the many sectors.

And of course in our parliamentary democracy, we had seen the evolution over history in regards to the important role of the principle of law and the aspects of the special role that it played. And in that sense I was very pleased as we were approaching the century that a decision on a community approach to policing would be taking place and that leadership to be taking place in northern Saskatchewan.

I see, reading literature internationally, whether in the United States where they have a lot of conflict in regards to the law, that they have moved away from the traditional model to the newer model of community-based policing. We see that as well in Europe, in Great Britain, the UK (United Kingdom). So we're seeing that evolution take place all over the world.

And so when we're seeing the community policing coming into northern Saskatchewan last year as the memorandum of understanding brought into place, I was very proud as a Northerner to see that evolutionary development.

People were also very pleased that there would be training. The training model involved the training of everyone concerned, because not only was it a training of the police force themselves in regards to policy creation at the community level and how not only do the police work in partnership with the community people, but dealing with cases of emergency and other things.

But we saw also the training of police. I will talk about that a little bit later on in regards to what the proposals are on the training of police.

We have looked at northern Saskatchewan over the past year and we did a survey and there was a special report that come

out under Social Services. And of course in Social Services a lot of the justice issues were brought into . . . were raised.

The justice issues that were raised were very similar to what you will find anywhere. You know, people were concerned about quick response times. People were also concerned about local input and management and involvement of themselves in regards to police and justice issues.

And people were talking about equity of service and, whether you were rural in Saskatchewan or whether you were in urban Saskatchewan or northern Saskatchewan, that you had equity of services. That indeed we should not be treated as differently except in regards to increased costs in the North as regards to policing. So there was also a concern that there would be federal input into the costs, as well as provincial input into the costs. So those types of issues were dealt with in regard to challenges raised.

I notice also that there was solutions that were brought forth in the report, and here are some of them.

People wanted to see the community approach integrated, an integrated approach between Social Services, Justice, Education, and so on, because they saw it not only as the immediate problem when the . . . when an issue of breaking the law occurred. They saw that as a development and an evolution in the educational system. So that people from the North talked about an integrated approach to the management of the justice issues.

There was also a lot of talk about prevention and solutions in regards to crime prevention over the long run, and our people could co-operate with police at the local level to make sure that some of the issues relating to crime prevention were there and had control at the community level.

There was also talk about making sure that we had a principle of inclusion. Not only do we have people from all over the world becoming police in our area, but also Aboriginal people being police as well. So the idea of Aboriginal people being trained properly in the police force was an important development.

I would also say that cross-cultural sensitivity had to be there, and it was a strong thing raised for . . . both by the Dene people in northern Saskatchewan and by the Crees and also people recognizing the historical differences on law — you know as related to treaty rights and hunting and all those types of things. So that people would understand that while there were similarities for all people, that there was also unique, constitutional, and also treaty obligations that were there for people to respect. So those types of things were brought out, you know, by the people of the North.

I would like to say on the culture and language issue . . . I'd like to reflect back a little bit on a story that I myself experienced directly. When I was growing up, of course, when we were looking at the police we were not very much different from many places. There was a lot of fear of police. And today I see the change taking place. People are looking a lot more, a lot more trustworthy . . . and the trust relationship with police is being evolved and evolved and being built. But in our time,

when I was growing up, there was a little bit of a fear of police.

And I remember when I started school, and I went to school, and this one time I was out doing a little bit too much hunting on the way to school — hunting some grouse. So we came to school a little bit late. And of course this must have happened about a couple of times or more maybe. And lo and behold, of course I couldn't speak any English and all I could say was good morning, sister, because we were taught by the nuns at that time.

And so we were . . . I was going to school and here was a little grade 1 character, and so my friend and I were going up and so we were late again. And all of a sudden the sister was writing a note on a piece of paper. So she came to us and she gave us this note of piece of paper, and she said to go to the police. Of course we knew the word police in English.

And we had heard . . . and we were a little . . . I was worried about . . . I was a little grade 1 and we were supposed to go to the police. So the teacher gave us this note, and away I went down to the police. So I go to the police station. It's only about a block away. And it was very interesting experience. Here we have two grade 1 young boys and we're going in.

(1645)

And so we get in and we rattled the chain over at police . . . by the police station. And so we rattled it for a while and pretty soon somebody came out and it was the wife, you know, of a policeman that was there. So she came over and we waved this little paper. And so we gave her that piece of paper and we were ready to get the strap, you know, by the police.

So we were standing around, little wee grade 1's, and we figured it out. We said . . . she looked at us and she knew we were pretty scared. She said . . . she finally showed us the way. She said the problem . . . (inaudible) . . . and made us go back to the school. So we were pretty . . . we said wow, you know, here I am, I don't have to go and see the police.

So we were very pleased, and lo and behold on the way back we figured out, well shouldn't we be crying if we walked into the classroom? So here we were, in regards to the situation we were saying, should we be crying? And lo and behold, we were supposed to be crying, and indeed we said, well, we should punch each other so we could cry.

It was quite the story because here we were two little guys and we were trying to get into this authoritarian situation so that we could be disciplined by the police and the teacher was scaring us into it. But we went back and we sat down in our desks and we cried a little bit. But she never did say anything after that. I still don't know to this day whether or not she went back to talk to the wife and to see what happened. But it was my experience with police.

The other time on a cultural sense was this: I was asking about the word in Cree . . . we have a word in Cree, we say, simagunis. And the word simagunis is a special word, is a name that we give . . . we say to the police. I always wondered where the word came from.

Now I talked to an elder when I was doing Cree classes at the university back in 1971, and I was teaching Cree at the university back in the mid . . . I mean we were teaching Cree in La Ronge at the school back in '74. So I asked one of the elders where the word simagunis had come from. He thought that the word — Colin Charles — he said that the word simagun comes from . . . the word simagunis comes from simagun which means something of a sharp point. We know it's not the knife because the word for knife is moogoman. By the way we call the Americans, Keechimoogoman, the great knives.

It's actually the keechi actually means great; Keechimoogoman is the great knives. And some people have of course translated it to the long knives. But the word that was very important was simagun. He said it was a sharp point.

And I went to visit a place up in Manitoba. And there was on the place called South Indian Lake, they had some skulls that were washed ashore because of the hydro-electric power dam that was built there. And this person was telling me about sin agunuk simagunis, and he said these simaguns were also there. So I asked him right away because . . . I said what were they? And he said that they were spear points.

So what it is, is that in olden times the police in the Cree traditional sense would have been the spear point protectors of the people. And that would have been the origin of the word. I haven't seen it anywhere in the literature but from that experience that is probably what it was. It is probably . . . it is therefore quite an ancient institution in the pre-culture contrary to some modern views in regards to anthropological literature.

I thought I want to say those stories because these were very important in regards to the issue of policing. And it has become modernized and we're now calling on community-based policing.

I would like to, as well, celebrate the achievements of the modern day police — the constables that were graduated the other day. Yesterday there was a host of First Nations and Metis grads.

So I'd like to honour them by stating their names. We had a Cst. Chad McLeod from Nipawin who will be stationed at Red Earth. We also had Cst. Jonathan Iron from Canoe Lake who will be stationed in Southend. We also had Cst. Beau Fouquette from Prince Albert who will, of course, go back to Prince Albert; and Cst. Dale McArthur from White Bear going to Indian Head, and Cst. Grant Stebanuk from Battleford going to Carduff . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon me? It was Dale McArthur. Yes.

There will also be Cst. Shawna Poulin from Meadow Lake going to Pelican Narrows. Cst. Earl Keewatin from Starblanket going to Cut Knife. Cst. Lloyd Gerard from Cumberland House going to Blaine Lake. Cst. Elmer Russell from Regina going to Melfort. Cst. Ronald Umpherville from P.A. going to La Ronge. Cst. Doug Gardiner from Ile a la Crosse going to Sandy Bay. And Cst. Jeremy Trottier from Denare Beach going to Montreal Lake.

Cst. Jennifer Barks from P.A. going to Punnichy. Cst. Colleen Skyrpan from Swift Current going to Maple Creek. Cst. Brian

Kishayinew from Yellow Quill going to Cut Knife. Cst. Russell Clark from Preeceville going to Wadena. Cst. Gary Lariviere from Canoe Lake going to Spiritwood. And Cst. Dwayne Fleury from La Ronge going to Meadow Lake.

I'd like to honour these people who are entering the police, which is challenging work. It is one of the more challenging jobs out there. I know that some politicians would like to think that their jobs are challenging, but I must say that indeed police work is a challenging work, well worthy of mention in our society.

I'd like to also mention the work by Sgt. Tuffs from La Ronge, who has done a lot of work on community work in . . . right in the La Ronge area. And he's done some positive feedback from the community itself. And as well Sgt. Cory Lerat, who is the liaison on community policing from the RCMP to the La Ronge communities. He's a First Nations community from southern Saskatchewan.

I might also state a few additional facts, Mr. Speaker. Right now in the North, as the member from Carlton has raised, there's \$9,026,000 on total budget. The provincial amount of that total budget is \$5,646,000. The percentage that the province puts in at the provincial detachments is 70 per cent. The amount that we put in on First Nations detachments is 48 per cent. So that there is a total amount of 9 million, as I mentioned before.

Mr. Speaker, I second the motion because this is indeed a very . . . not only progressive development for northern Saskatchewan but it is following on the footsteps of what we see in the international community. We are also seeing the development — as we talk about partnerships in business development, partnerships in regards to education, partnerships on cultural development — we are seeing partnerships with policing. And that's extremely important for everybody in this province.

The other thing is that we're looking at issues of prevention and making sure that, as we're doing the education system and also as we as parents raise our children, the important issue of prevention is always there.

And also as we look at the development of boards, the evolution and the development of making sure that the proper policies are there; that indeed when we're working together with police from the community level, as parents and also with the community leadership, that indeed the forums and the mechanisms for change are there.

That indeed, in the final sense, I would say this as a Cree-speaking person — as well recognizing the different languages that have been spoken in this House — that the cultural part is very important. I know that when I was growing up and I saw that it wasn't only one of learning to understand somebody in their language, but to respect the cultural tradition whether they're from the Ukrainian community or from the German community or from the Mennonite community, or from the Cree and the Dene community. For me, it is important to recognize the cultural standards and having due respect, you know, for them as you are doing the importance of policing.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we're looking at the development and we're looking at the changes and we're seeing this important development, I think that last May when we signed the MOU, that indeed, we will be able to see this not only as an historic first for northern Saskatchewan but an historic first across Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, with due respect to all the members of the House and due respect to this historic community policing agreement, I would like to move to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS