

The Assembly met at 10:00.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**PRESENTING PETITIONS**

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I stand once again today to present petitions on behalf of people in and around the Humboldt area who would like to see the Humboldt territory operations office for Saskatchewan Housing Authority remain in the city of Humboldt. 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 immediately reconsider the proposed closure of the Humboldt territory operations office for Saskatchewan Housing Authority and to renew their commitment to rural Saskatchewan and maintain a full, functioning territory operations office in Humboldt.

And the signators on this petition, Mr. Speaker, are from the city of Humboldt.

I so present.

**Mr. Gantfoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise this morning on behalf of citizens concerned about the shortcomings of the current tobacco legislation. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately amend tobacco legislation that would make it illegal for anyone under the age of 18 to be in possession of any tobacco products; and furthermore, anyone found guilty of such an offence would be subject to a fine of not more than \$100.

Signatures on this petition this morning, Mr. Speaker, are all from the city of Saskatoon and I'm pleased to present on their behalf.

**Mr. Bjornerud:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a petition to present to do with overfishing at Lake of the Prairies. The prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to work with the federal government, First Nations representatives, and with other provincial governments to bring about a resolution in the Lake of the Prairies situation and to ensure that our natural resources as a whole are used in a responsible manner by all people in the future.

The signatures, Mr. Speaker, are from the communities of Churchbridge, Bredenbury, Rosthern, Saskatoon, and Waldron.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As well to present a petition regarding overfishing and I read the prayer:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon.

Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to work with the federal government, First Nations representatives, and other provincial governments to bring about a resolution in the Lake of the Prairies situation and to ensure that our natural resources as a whole are used in a responsible manner by all people in the future.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

And, Mr. Speaker, the petition I present is signed by people from the communities of Langenburg, Tantallon, and Regina.

I so present.

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a petition regarding the condition of Highway 42. And the prayer reads as:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to make the necessary repairs to Highway 42 in the Arm River constituency in order to prevent injury or loss of life and to prevent the loss of economic opportunity in the area.

This petition is signed by the people of the Riverhurst area.

**Mr. Stewart:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise this morning to present a petition signed by citizens concerned with the deplorable and dangerous condition of Highway No. 58. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take immediate action and make the necessary repairs to Highway No. 58 in order to avoid serious injury and property damage.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by individuals from the communities of Chaplin and Regina.

I so present.

**Ms. Bakken:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to present a petition on behalf of citizens of the constituency of Weyburn-Big Muddy who are concerned about crop insurance. And the prayer reads:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the provincial government to halt its plan to take money out of the crop insurance program and hike farmers' crop insurance premium rates while reducing coverage in order to pay off the provincial government's debt to the federal government.

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

And the petition is signed by residents of Weyburn and Fillmore.

I so present.

**Mr. Brkich:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition to

improve Highway 42.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to make the necessary repairs to Highway 42 in the Arm River constituency in order to prevent injury or loss of life and also to prevent the loss of economic opportunity in the area.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed by the good citizens from Brownlee, Central Butte, and Eyebrow.

I so present.

**Mr. Hart:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on behalf of constituents concerned with the new boundaries of the regional health authority. The prayer reads as follows:

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to take the necessary action to ensure the best possible health care coverage for the communities of Govan, Duval, Strasbourg, and Bulyea by placing those communities in the regional health authority as opposed to the Saskatoon health authority.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

And signatures to this petition, Mr. Speaker, come from the community of Strasbourg.

I so present.

#### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Deputy Clerk:** — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed and are hereby read and received as addendums to previously tabled petitions being sessional paper nos. 11, 22, 23, 31, 59, 157, 165, 169, and no. 174.

#### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

##### Special Committee on Regulations

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the member from Regina Dewdney:

That the first report of the Special Committee on Regulations be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

#### NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

**Mr. Weekes:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day no. 76 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Labour: how many complaints did the labour . . . Department of Labour have concerning labour standards in the hog industry in 1999 and what was the

nature of these complaints?

And the same questions for 2000 and 2001.

I so present.

**Mr. Hillson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on day 76 ask the government the following question:

To the Minister of Highways: regarding Highway No. 8 from Carievale to the North Dakota border, in view of the tremendous economic impact on small businesses and border towns, and the fact that material has been stockpiled for several years, when will construction commence on Highway No. 8 from Carievale to the American border?

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to all members of the legislature two special guests who are in the west gallery. Oda Wood — and I'd ask Oda to stand — and her grandma, Elaine Wood, are visiting.

Oda lives in Oslo, Norway, but she has many connections to Saskatchewan. Her great-grandmother worked in the Legislative Library here in 1928. Her grandpa, Elaine Wood's husband, worked for the Department of Finance — that's Oda's grandfather — and her father actually worked for a while in the auditor's office here in Saskatchewan.

And also her grandmother, who is with her today, Elaine, worked in one of the minister's offices and she has been working in my constituency office.

We welcome Oda here, who is going to spend the summer learning about her roots in Saskatchewan and also further building those connections between Saskatchewan and Norway.

Thank you.

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

#### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

##### Celebrate Regina

**Ms. Hamilton:** — There is a gathering dedicated to capturing the hearts and minds of Regina that is worth talking about, Mr. Speaker — a meeting with booths set up by Tourism Regina, Tourism Saskatchewan, the Regina Chamber of Commerce, the Regina REDA (regional economic development authority), the Regina Health District, the Street Culture Kidz, and more.

It could serve also as a template for all Saskatchewan towns and cities to hold their banner high. I'm talking of course about the launch tomorrow morning at the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts of the campaign to celebrate our Queen City — "Canada's greatest city," as the slogan proudly announces.

The purpose of the campaign is to celebrate our love for our city, to welcome new and returning residents to Regina, and to announce to the world why the capital city is the place to live,

work, play, and raise a family.

A host of worthy Regina and Saskatchewan citizens will be there to begin the campaign, including our Premier, our Mayor Fiacco, our MP (Member of Parliament), Mr. Goodale, and Paul Martin, Chair of the Regina REDA, plus many, many more.

This is an excellent way to kick off the holiday weekend. And, Mr. Speaker, in typical Regina fashion, this is a community-driven project with tremendous support from corporate sponsors and volunteers.

So tomorrow morning at 11:45, I invite all Regina to be at the Centre of the Arts to have free refreshments, to greet new Reginans, to welcome back those who have come home, and to express our deep affection for our proud city.

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

### **Restructuring of Southeast Regional College**

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday evening some 24 community leaders from Grenfell, Broadview, Cowessess First Nation, Wapella, and Estevan gathered in Whitewood to discuss a very important issue to them.

Mr. Speaker, Southeast Regional College recently announced a major restructuring of their programming. Needless to say, this raised a great deal of consternation in the Whitewood area as municipal and business leaders along with local area residents became very concerned about the longevity of programming and employment in their college.

Mr. Speaker, regional colleges have and continue to provide, a much needed educational opportunity for local residents. And recently the Whitewood college held their special care aide graduation. Of the 15 graduates, 14 already have employment opportunities, pointing to the effectiveness of the program.

On Tuesday evening, Mr. Art Whetstone, president of the college, and Mr. Ed Haye, chairman of the board, attended the meeting to explain the college's rationale for the restructuring. While assurances from Mr. Whetstone of continued and possibly new programming along with the hope that contractual agreements with the union will not result in as severe a staff reduction as earlier thought, may have alleviated some of the local concerns, the community leaders trust that indeed their concerns have been heard and the regional college will have an ongoing presence in their community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all involved for their support for the program. And I place this petition of over 500 names on the Table on their behalf. Thank you.

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

### **SunBridge Wind Power Project Officially Opens**

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today is truly an exciting day because later this afternoon, at the town of Gull Lake, our government in conjunction with officials from Suncor and Enbridge and the federal government is going to be

opening Saskatchewan's first wind power project, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Prebble:** — And, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be the first of many. In fact the second project is already under construction.

But this morning, Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on the SunBridge project, a \$22 million investment with three important partners, Mr. Speaker . . . with Suncor, Enbridge, and with the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker — a four-way partnership.

And this morning I want to express the appreciation of our government to our partners, to Suncor and Enbridge for their work with us and to the Government of Canada for the \$12 million contribution they've made to this project, Mr. Speaker. We're not only going to be selling electricity to federal government buildings, but through our own initiative at the provincial level, Mr. Speaker, we'll be making a GreenPower option available to customers right across this province from this wind power project. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

### **Armed Forces Day**

**Mr. Huyghebaert:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today I'm honoured to rise in the Assembly to ask all members of the House to formally recognize Armed Forces Day this Saturday, June 29.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces have played an extremely important role in representing Canada on the global stage over the past number of decades and continue to do so today. Although no war has been fought on Canadian soil since 1812, our forces are still relied upon to provide security for our borders. Following the events of September 11, their dedication to Canadian security efforts is even more crucial.

Canadians fought with distinction in both wars, the Korean War, and most recently the Gulf War, the Balkans war, and currently in Afghanistan. In addition to this they are involved in numerous peacekeeping efforts around the world in some noted trouble spots.

The Canadian military is one of the most well-respected militaries in the world, known for their professionalism, dedication, and tenacity. Even with outdated equipment caused by chronic underfunding, the Canadian Armed Forces have continued to perform with distinction.

Mr. Speaker, here in Saskatchewan there's a substantial military contingent in the form of the base at 15 Wing Moose Jaw, as well as a number of reserve units around the province. And also, as everyone I'm sure knows, 15 Wing is the home of the world renowned aerobatic team, the Snowbirds.

I ask all members to join with me and recognize the contribution of the Canadian military and their service to Canada.

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

### Saskatoon Hosts Fourth Agricultural Biotechnology International Conference

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From September 15 to 18, 2002, the world will look to Saskatoon as it hosts the fourth Agricultural Biotechnology International Conference. This year's theme is agbiotech: cultivating convergence, and will highlight the coming together of agricultural biotechnology. This year's conference will showcase the industry's growing strengths and exciting new directions in bio products. The conference will also provide important insights on global stewardship and benefit sharing.

Peter McCann, president of the Ag Biotech Inc. and official host of ABIC (Agricultural Biotechnology International Conference) 2002, is enthusiastic about the calibre of the conference program and the opportunity it will offer delegates, visitors, and the industry as a whole. As a world-class conference this is the . . . a must-attend event for the industry and those interested in it. ABIC will bring together world renowned scientists, investors, industry leaders, and policy makers. It will also provide a tremendous opportunity to learn about the latest life science technology.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the ABIC foundation has established two travel bursaries to enable promising young international scientists in developing nations to attend the conference — an inspiring demonstration that this province has a name for itself on the international stage and is on the way up.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

### Regina Beach Educator Receives Award

**Mr. Brkich:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise now today to talk about a constituent of mine from the town of Regina Beach. On May 2, Mrs. Brenda Edwards was presented with the Saskatchewan Council on Educational Administration Administrative Excellence Award, 2002.

The award recognizes outstanding educational administrative leadership throughout the previous year. The award was a pastel drawing by student Christie Looker of the Weyburn Comprehensive School.

Brenda was nominated for the reward by representative Terry Kuz, who also serves as vice-principal to Lumsden Elementary School. Terry spoke about Mrs. Edwards with high praise as he described her noble career in education over the years.

She has had a significant amount of experience serving as a vice-principal, superintendent, and acting director in the Buffalo Plains School Division. It is not uncommon for this hard-working educator to be found working late in her office throughout the week. This remarkable person is a very good model of an individual dedicated to the educational field across Saskatchewan.

Brenda is entering her 23rd year as an educator, 19 of which have been spent in the role of educational administrator. She began her teaching career in the community of Strasbourg

followed by a return to the University of Regina where she completed her Bachelor of Education degree. Her teaching career continued with time spent in Weyburn, Edenwold, White City, and finally as principal of the South Shore Elementary School in Regina Beach.

In 1994, Brenda completed her master's degree which is followed by her employment as superintendent of instruction for the Buffalo Plains School.

I would ask that all members of the House join me in congratulating Mrs. Brenda Edwards for her remarkable achievement in the field of education.

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

### Royal University Hospital Awards

**Ms. Junor:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Legislative Assembly Office recognized some of its employees for their 5, 10, and 20 years of service. Two days ago the Royal University Hospital Foundation in Saskatoon awarded its annual spirit award to Joyce Foulger, who has worked at the hospital for 32 years, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Foulger is a dedicated community volunteer and former board member of Autism Treatment Services of Saskatchewan. She was honoured Tuesday as the 10th recipient of the Tony Dagnone Spirit Award.

The award, established in 1992, recognizes the outstanding 25-year term of leadership by former RUH (Royal University Hospital) president, Tony Dagnone.

In addition to her work at the hospital Ms. Foulger is an active canvasser for two health-related charities and has worked on behalf of the annual Saskatoon Children's Festival and the 1989 Jeux Canada Games. Co-workers have described Ms. Foulger as the embodiment of the value of respect and well deserving of this award.

Mr. Speaker, the RUH Foundation presented a number of other awards on Tuesday. Lorrie Alberts, a registered nurse in the pediatric unit, received the Bernice A. England scholarship for advancement in clinical nursing. The F.P. Bourgault memorial scholarship for education in nursing went to Cybelle Oscvirk, an RN (registered nurse) in the neonatal intensive care unit. Tracey McCaig-Beattie, a nurse in the emergency department, received the F. J. Gathercole memorial scholarship.

Recent College of Medicine graduate, Mark Fenton, was awarded the Ali Rajput Prize for Excellence in Neurology. The RUH foundation also recognized four other nurses with foundation scholarships: Colleen Buehler, Andrea Clinton, Peter Graham, and Dianna Lange.

These award recipients are all working on furthering their education and in turn making themselves even more valuable to the hospital they work with.

Congratulations to all of them, Mr. Speaker.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

## Federal Financial Assistance for Agriculture

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is in Halifax at the Ag ministers' meeting and we're wondering if the Premier can give us an update on how that's going; which provinces plan on signing the federal government's ag policy framework, which provinces are not going to sign the agreement? And has there been any progress made on getting the federal government to live up to its responsibilities and fund the entire cost of a trade injury program?

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

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, I had opportunity to speak with the Minister of Agriculture yesterday after their initial discussions with other provincial ministers. I think as the members know it's only, as we speak, it's only today that the ministers are sitting down with the federal minister. And I anticipate a call later this day from the Minister of Agriculture, reporting.

Generally, I may say a number of provinces have agreed to continue the fight for 100 per cent funding for trade injury argument. We've got a challenge here, Mr. Speaker, in that our own federal government seems to want now to deny there is even an issue around trade injury. They want to describe the monies available in some other fashion.

They're not fooling us and they're not fooling the Canadian producers. Our producers are being injured by trade actions taken in Washington and the European Union, and that needs to be recognized in this package. The money needs to be more and it needs to be 100 per cent federally funded.

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

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell us which provinces, or how many provinces are still saying that they're not about to sign the agreement? And if we do not sign the agriculture — new agriculture framework, the question that farmers are asking, what exactly that's going to mean for Saskatchewan farmers. Is Saskatchewan going to participate in part of the framework, and not in other parts? Are they just going to not participate in the trade injury? Will Saskatchewan receive the federal share of the \$1.2 billion emergency funding even if the province does not sign on? How much of the new funding is going to come to Saskatchewan; how much will be paid out to the farmers? And could the Premier please answer a few of those questions?

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

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the challenges facing our Minister of Agriculture and other ministers of Agriculture in the meeting today is some of the lack of detail being provided by the federal government, answers to some of the questions that I believe the Agriculture critic appropriately raises. These are questions we all share.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the meeting is happening as we speak. We do not have an update from the course of the meeting.

But here's where we're at, Mr. Speaker. We're not going to be signing a program, one where we don't know the detail. We're not going to be signing a program that isn't going to be of value to Saskatchewan producers.

We have said from the beginning of this . . . if the Leader of the Opposition would care to listen, we have said from the beginning that we want to be a constructive player and partner in determining and developing the long-term agricultural strategy. We have been there, our Minister of Agriculture particularly has given Canadian leadership on this file.

But I don't believe there's a taxpayer in Saskatchewan, I don't believe there's a taxpayer in Saskatchewan that wants their government today to sign on when the detail is not available to us, or to sign on while a federal government denies its responsibility for trade injury to our farmers.

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

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, could the Premier please tell us if our Agriculture minister has contacted all of the different Agriculture ministers and found out prior to today — prior to the signing, does he know which ones are considering signing, and which ones are saying no they will not sign? And if so, could he share some of that information with us today?

And in . . . also the story in today's paper says the federal government plans to axe its income support program. Can we assume that that means the CFIP (Canadian Farm Income Program) program? Is that what the federal government is proposing to doing? And if the federal government does get rid of the CFIP, do they plan on replacing it with some other income support program? Do they plan on putting money into crop insurance and NISA (Net Income Stabilization Account) in the future, or is simply that amount of the federal funding going to disappear in the new framework?

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

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — Mr. Speaker, there's no denying that the member opposite asks some very good questions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping, I'm hoping that her cousins and colleagues in Ottawa, the Alliance/Reform members in Ottawa are asking some of these very same questions. I know New Democrats in the House of Commons have been asking some of these very same questions.

The fact of the matter is I am unable to speak on behalf of other governments. I am unable to speak on behalf of other ministers of Agriculture. I can speak on behalf of this government and I will speak on behalf of this Minister of Agriculture.

Our position has not changed, and with the member opposite, we await from our federal government some of the detail that she asks that we ask that producers across Canada are asking today.

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

**Ms. Harpauer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, indeed we're asking and the producers of the province are asking, and we're

hoping that our Minister of Agriculture is asking because it doesn't seem to be too many answers coming back here.

Many of the news headlines have been grossly deceptive, and so the Saskatchewan farmers are wondering how much of the federal government new ag policy is actually going to the farmers. Because the bulk of the federal money seems to be targeted towards things like food safety and environment concerns.

So we're wondering how much is actually going to find its way into the farm family, and do we have any idea at this point how that will be paid out?

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

**Hon. Mr. Calvert:** — We've heard, I think all Canadians have heard a variety of proposals that have been made by the federal government. It is precisely to determine these questions that we have our Minister of Agriculture and provincial ministers of Agriculture from across Canada sitting down, as we speak in this House, with the federal Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, if the member has a series of questions, which we share, that's fair enough. But we've been pretty upfront, Mr. Speaker, about our, our plan, our policy, our position on these issues. But I think it's time now we heard is, in addition to the questions, are some comments and suggestions from the opposition party in this House.

What is their position on programming for farmers in Saskatchewan? What is their position on the federal proposals now laid out?

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

(10:30)

### Funding for New Contract with Teachers

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Learning. Yesterday the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, which represents all boards of education in the province, publicly criticized this NDP (New Democratic Party) government for not making a commitment to cover all the costs from a new contract for our teachers.

The SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association) wrote to the minister in May stating their concerns of how these additional costs were going to be covered in the 2002 budgets. In response, the minister told the SSTA that the government will assess the cost implications after a new agreement is reached and only then will they decide additional funding that can be made available to school divisions for this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, this non-commitment from the government and its shrugging off of its responsibilities is just not good enough for the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, will the NDP government commit today to cover any additional costs for school boards that is going to result from the collective agreement?

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

**Hon. Mr. Melenchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, negotiations with teachers in this province have been going on for some time now. They started in March.

We've had a process that has been in existence for almost 30 years and I can inform the members opposite that, over those 30 years, there has been a collective agreement signed on every occasion that bargaining occurred. And these have been signed successfully.

And what I said and what I have said and what we said when our budget was released in March is that, at the time a collective agreement is signed and ratified by the membership, then we would be prepared to look at that.

But I will also mention, Mr. Speaker, that, in the last agreement, we provided a special warrant to cover the costs and we also covered 100 per cent of the pension and benefits increase to teachers.

And all . . . all I can say today, Mr. Speaker, is that this government is prepared to put the money behind our actions when we have a chance to look at what those actions will be, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about the agreement that was signed previously. We're talking about the agreement we're working on right now. Everything is working well except this government.

Mr. Speaker, the SSTA has the responsibility for paying the bills and handling the budgets for the school divisions.

**The Speaker:** — Order, please. Order.

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, the SSTA has the responsibility for paying the bills and handling the budgets for the school divisions. But the government has the majority control and the final say on the management committee which is negotiating a new agreement. So here's a government negotiating a new teachers' contract, yet not committing to funding any of the increases and costs due to that new contract.

The NDP is telling school boards and ultimately the taxpayers across this province that the government will agree to a new deal but school boards will have to take what they're given and the property taxpayers are just going to have to pick up the rest.

Mr. Speaker, the government in negotiating a new contract with teachers and they won't commit to paying an increased cost that will result from this wage settlement. Has the NDP already decided that the property taxpayers in Saskatchewan are going to get another bill? And will the minister tell property taxpayers today whether the responsibility is going to fall on them again?

**Hon. Mr. Melenchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, there's only one taxpayer in the province of Saskatchewan and we recognize that we have a shared responsibility with school boards to provide public education in the K to 12 system. And we have a shared responsibility; where the provincial government has delegated authority to school divisions to tax the local tax base, they have

ratepayers. The provincial government then uses general funds to provide the remaining costs on an equalization basis.

But I can tell the members opposite that since 1999 we have increased our foundation operating grant 20 per cent, far exceeding the rate of inflation. Mr. Speaker, we have covered 100 per cent of the improvements to pension and benefits for teachers, all absorbed by the general revenue. And I can tell the members opposite that in their platform they promised not one penny.

And where would their offloading occur? I can tell you that not one penny would have resulted in offloading of nearly \$70 million in our Learning budget, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that minister would care to tell the House what he . . . his platform said about education funding.

Mr. Speaker, if the minister . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, please. Order.

**Ms. Draude:** — Mr. Speaker, if the minister and his NDP government were truly committed to education, they would have put aside money to deal with the contract negotiations. The minister knew that bargaining was going to happen this year. The minister knew that they have the final clout on the decision for the increases because they make up the majority of the bargaining team. The minister knew that the wage increases for teachers have to happen if we're going to recruit and retain teachers in this province. And yet the minister won't commit to any of the money it's going to take.

This is the same government that can find \$80 million to invest in Australia; the same government that can find \$70 million to invest in a computerized land titles system that won't work. And now they plan on dumping \$70 million into a fantasy TV cable company.

Mr. Speaker, why won't this minister insist to his cabinet colleagues that investing in our children is a better way to grow Saskatchewan than investing in risky business deals across this country?

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

**Hon. Mr. Melenchuk:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, day in and day out for some time now the members opposite say why are we spending taxpayers' dollars in investments? Well the reality is that when we make investments we use dollars that are not coming from the General Revenue Fund, but I can guarantee to the members opposite that every single cent of those dollars that come back here are spent in Saskatchewan to support public education, to support health care.

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

**Hon. Mr. Melenchuk:** — And when you look at the members opposite in their platform, Mr. Speaker, not one penny, not one penny for education . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, please. Order. Order. Order.

#### **Conflict of Interest Guidelines for Senior Civil Servants**

**Mr. Wall:** — The problem, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the problem is, is that all of these investment schemes all over the world are losing taxpayer dollars. That's the problem with the argument.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister for the Crown Investments . . .

**The Speaker:** — There may be a question but I've got to be able to hear it, members. Ask all members to tone it down.

**Mr. Wall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the minister responsible for CIC (Crown Investment Corporation of Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, as a result of the 1998 investigation into corruption, scandal, and the multi-million dollar losses in the NDP's operation and sale of Channel Lake Petroleum in 1998, the Crown Corporations Committee made a number of recommendations to guard against such as scandal happening again.

Recommendation 21 in the 1998 Channel Lake report says, and I quote:

It is recommended that . . . Crown Corporations and Government of Saskatchewan require conflict of interest guidelines for senior employees both during their years of service and upon leaving the public service.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, has the NDP implemented conflict of interest rules for senior Crown corporation employees recommended in the wake of the Channel Lake scandal in 1998?

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

**The Speaker:** — Order, please. Order. Order, please. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, as Government House Leader, I want to inform the member from Swift Current that the NDP can be found at 1122 Saskatchewan Drive.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the official opposition, thanks for the update. Thanks for the update. And that's where they're . . . that's about the only place they're going to be found after the next election. They're won't be any over there, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, here's the question for the minister now that he's done with his little geographical lesson.

The Channel Lake report recommended that this NDP government implement conflict of interest guidelines for senior civil service employees both during their years of service and

quote, “upon leaving the public service.” Have they implemented that recommendation?

**Hon. Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government, I can say yes.

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

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, we would ask, through you, we’d ask the government to table those conflict of interest guidelines.

And, Mr. Speaker, we would also like to ask a question with respect to a recent development involving the former CEO (chief executive officer) of the Information Services Corporation.

**The Speaker:** — Order, please. Order, please.

**Mr. Wall:** — Mr. Speaker, the NDP appointed Fraser Nicholson president of ISC (Information Services Corporation of Saskatchewan) when the government set up the Crown in January of 2000. Since that time ISC has paid more than \$7 million to contracts with EDS (Electronic Data Systems) as a major project consultant.

The *Leader-Post* is reporting this morning that Mr. Nicholson is going to go work for EDS now after he blew, with the NDP approval, \$60 million on this particular project and travelled the world without making a single sale.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister just stood up in the House and said that they have conflict of interest guidelines for senior employees, both while they’re working for the government and upon their exit. Were these conflict of interest guidelines examined in the context of Mr. Nicholson’s leaving ISC and joining a company that benefited greatly from ISC while he was there?

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

**Hon. Mr. Axworthy:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in short, the answer to the member’s question is yes.

And perhaps he’d like to read the second page of the article he quoted from in the *Leader-Post* today.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. Order, members.

### North Battleford Water Inquiry

**Mr. Hillson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s now three months since the North Battleford Water Inquiry was wrapped up and made its final report — wrapped up except for one small detail. According to the Saskatchewan government Web site, the special adviser to the North Battleford Water Inquiry continues on the job.

Constituents are asking me, in view of the fact there was no competition for this position, where can they too apply to get a \$100,000 job advising an inquiry that doesn’t exist? What

education and training is required in order to advise a defunct inquiry? What are the duties? Where do they get an application form?

**Hon. Mr. Belanger:** — Mr. Speaker, this province initiated a water strategy that’s very comprehensive, Mr. Speaker. It talks about partnerships. And, Mr. Speaker, the most important lesson that we’ve learned is that we can’t take safe water for granted. That’s where the focus should be, Mr. Speaker. And that’s where the focus is at with this government.

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

**Mr. Hillson:** — Mr. Speaker, in the name of economy, this government laid off civil servants earning half and a third what this special adviser to a non-existent commission is making.

Well my question is for the Premier. Last year the Premier told North Battleford, I will be there for you. Last week, the Minister of Environment told the North Battleford City Council they were getting nothing; they should look to their reserves and pay everything out of their reserves because they would get no help from the provincial government.

Who speaks for this government? The Premier who says there will be help to municipalities facing water problems or the Minister of Environment who tells municipalities to go fly a kite?

**Hon. Mr. Belanger:** — Mr. Speaker, it’s very important that we maintain the partnership approach to this whole process. We have always maintained that’s very important, Mr. Speaker.

And when we talk about a partnership, we say municipalities, towns and villages, and RMs (rural municipality) all have a role to play. We’ve been very forthright and very honest with that approach, Mr. Speaker.

(10:45)

And I would remind that member not to play politics with this very important issue. Why? Because we can turn around and we can say, Mr. Speaker, November 29, 1995 an article in the North Battleford *News-Optimist*, and I quote:

Councillor Jack Hillson inquired whether the small increase was necessary with reserves of \$1.2 million . . . (inaudible) . . . pointed out there are major capital projects over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, as a former councillor he knew very well that it’s always, always necessary to put money in reserves to make sure water and sewer systems are very carefully monitored and built-up, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Hillson:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment talks about partnership, but that’s not what he said to the city council. He said they would get nothing on a \$13 million project, and as he just quoted 1 million in reserves is going to pay for that \$13 million project.



Mr. Speaker, the NDP's chances in North Battleford are somewhere between slim and none, and I think slim just rode out of town.

Will the Premier, will the Premier tell us why his Minister of the Environment says there will be no help for municipalities with water problems, but he still keeps on a special adviser earning \$111,000 a year to advise an inquiry that doesn't exist?

**Hon. Mr. Belanger:** — Mr. Speaker, this government takes their role in water strategy very important. That's why in a partnership forum we have never pointed fingers, Mr. Speaker. We have always maintained the partnership approach is the best way to handle this water strategy.

And by way of that, Mr. Speaker, what we have done as a province, as municipalities, and certainly as . . . and the federal government's involvement, we have announced a five-year \$170 million program to assist in waste water and water projects, Mr. Speaker.

What we have not said is we have not challenged the communities. We have not said to them, raise your rates. We have said, make sure that your systems are fair; make sure that you're paying a fair amount for your water, Mr. Speaker. And what we're trying to do is engage the communities.

And sometimes, Mr. Speaker, what we've got to do is tell people out there that when it comes to this particular challenge of trying to play politics with water, I have a request for them. And that request, Mr. Speaker, it's a song called "Hit the Road, Jack."

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

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. I would just, before we proceed any further, remind . . . Order. I would, before we go any further, I would just want to remind the minister of Sask Water that in his comments any referrals to members sitting in the Assembly should be only through their title . . . Order. Or their constituency.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Fortieth Anniversary of Medicare

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of medicare.

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

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — Mr. Speaker, the roots of medicare as we know it today are here in this province. Forty years ago in the summer of 1962 we saw the introduction of universal, publicly funded, compulsory medical insurance in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the beginning of this health care reform was in 1946 when the citizens of Swift Current established the first public health insurance program in North America. This program allowed approximately 18,000 families in southwestern Saskatchewan to receive coverage for doctor's fees, child dental care, and most of the costs of hospitalization.

In 1947, Mr. Speaker, then premier T.C. Douglas and his CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) government took the Swift Current example an enormous step forward by modelling the first provincial hospital insurance program in Canada after this concept.

Mr. Speaker, this program meant that every Saskatchewan resident, regardless of ability to pay, was entitled to hospital care paid for by the provincial government. In 1961, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan passed the medicare Act, the first of its kind in North America.

This Act provided for publicly administered, prepaid, universal health care coverage in this province. It took 10 years, Mr. Speaker, before medicare was a reality for the rest of Canada, and all Canadians were then secure in the knowledge that they too would receive the medical care they needed regardless of their ability to pay.

That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that the passing of Saskatchewan's medicare Act in 1962 was without controversy. But all Saskatchewan's health care partners made a commitment at that time. And today, Mr. Speaker, we are proud in this province of our legacy to the health and well-being of all Canadians.

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

**Hon. Mr. Nilson:** — This province was the first to create a health care system of universal accessibility. Mr. Speaker, our province is again leading the way in Canada in health care reform. Premier Calvert and I, the member from Saskatoon Riversdale and I, were proud to introduce the Action Plan for Saskatchewan Health Care in December last year — a blueprint to secure the future of health care services in Saskatchewan.

In 1962, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan formed the first publicly funded, publicly administered health care system with universal medical coverage for all residents. Forty years later, Mr. Speaker, we have introduced a health plan to strengthen medicare. This government has recognized a need for a made-in-Saskatchewan approach to providing health care services. We support good health for every resident of our province. Healthy people and healthy communities, that was the goal in 1962 with the introduction of the medicare Act. It remains our goal today.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand in the legislature today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of medicare and to share my optimism for the future of health care in this country. By working together with health care providers and the people of Saskatchewan, we will build a new sense of pride in our publicly funded system of medicare. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave, to respond to the ministerial statement.

**The Speaker:** — Member will proceed.

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is

a pleasure for me to respond to the minister's statement on the 40th anniversary of medicare in Canada. Mr. Speaker, indeed this has been a milestone — not only in Saskatchewan but in Canada — and in many countries of the world they look at the Canadian system of medicare as an example of a very quality health care system that was founded on some very strong principles.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to also recognize and to point out that the whole system started from the very southwest corner of our province in Swift Current in 1946 where people realized that there would be a benefit to their communities if they banded together to provide basic health care coverage. And the government of the day, Mr. Douglas's government, recognized that this was indeed a good model and I think that that is an important recognition. It took until 1962 to really bring the medical care act into Saskatchewan which served as the basis of the Canada Health Act which we now have in our country.

Mr. Speaker, our system of medicare and the publicly funded medical system has been a cornerstone of what Canada has been all about and how we consider ourselves as Canadians. It was interesting to watch the comments across the country as Mr. Romanow, who is currently one of the people that are reviewing the health care system, solicited input from Canadians across this country both by way of polling and by direct representation. And one of the common comments that you heard across this country is that how Canadians value the health care system that is rather unique in the world and something that we as Canadians use as a benchmark of who we are and how we care about each other.

Mr. Speaker, I think all Canadians, not only those of us in Saskatchewan but in every province, of every political stripe and background, recognize the importance of the fundamentals of the Canadian health care system. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it's universally accepted as well that that system cannot remain static and cannot remain as it has been 40 years ago and survive the challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, when the health . . . when the medicare system was first developed, it was primary a system that was responding to the need for acute care and trauma care. It didn't provide for outreaches in a positive sense to the community in terms of dealing with the fundamental principles and indicators of health and to look forward in a proactive way in terms of how we can prevent diseases rather than just manage its treatment.

Mr. Speaker, that is an ongoing challenge for all of us as Canadians. And while this government certainly likes to bask in the decisions that were made 40 years ago, the challenge is today to meet the future of the next generation in the next 40 years. And in many instances, Mr. Speaker, this government in Saskatchewan has not been living up to the expectation of 40 years ago created by Mr. Douglas's government.

We sit in this province and we look at having the longest waiting lists in the country. We have a drastic and a serious shortage of health care professionals that has been exacerbated by this government's decisions to cut back on training programs over the last decade.

Mr. Speaker, while these individuals opposite in the NDP government of today like to bask in the decisions that were made 40 years ago, the people of Saskatchewan are going to hold them accountable for the decisions they've made in the last 10 years.

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

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Mr. Speaker, looking forward to the future, I think that people in this country, in this province know that there's going to have to be important decisions made, and we look forward to being the government in this province that builds the health care system for the 21st century.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

**Mr. Prebble:** — Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. With leave to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Prebble:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, and my thanks to my colleagues in the Assembly. It's my pleasure this morning, Mr. Speaker, to introduce three guests who are all deeply committed to our publicly funded health care system in the province.

I'm pleased to draw to your attention in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker, three representatives from Service Employees' International Union. The first, to your left, Mr. Speaker, is Shawna Colpitts from SEIU (Service Employees' International Union). And sitting next to her in the middle, Mr. Speaker, is Maureen Fryett, who is the national representative of SEIU and is also, Mr. Speaker, a resident of my constituency and a good friend and is involved in many, many community activities in Saskatoon. And sitting next to her, Mr. Speaker, is Sharleen Stewart, who's the Canadian vice-president of SEIU.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that all members will join me in extending to our three guests a very, very warm welcome and our appreciation for all the work that they're doing in the health care system, in the trade union movement, and in our communities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

**Mr. Yates:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm extremely pleased today to stand on behalf of the government and table responses to written questions 393 through 410 inclusive.

**The Speaker:** — Responses to questions 393 through 410

inclusive have been submitted.

(11:00)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

##### Bill No. 57

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Sonntag that **Bill No. 57 — The Automobile Accident Insurance Amendment Act, 2002** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Heppner:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 57. This is an interesting Bill and it's been an interesting day so far so we'll try and keep the interest factor up.

It was kind of interesting when we went through the question period, Mr. Speaker, and all that we got was the NDP address. I'm not sure if that was a fundraiser. I think on doing some research in the interim we found out that the actual address of the NDP is 666 Chaos Drive. And we'll just see how much money they collected at that particular address. But that's for the public to go ahead and send their notes to because it'll be about as important as where they'll go to in any other situation.

Bill No. 57, dealing with the new change to the no-fault system. And what I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is at some length look at the background to the whole no-fault concept, and then looking at where this government is today in the whole idea of no-fault, and then back to this Bill. Because if we don't go through the history of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we'll tend to make a lot of mistakes that have been made before and repeat them.

And so even though Henry Ford said that history was dull bunk, I think we've also been told by people who probably knew more about history than Henry Ford did, that if we don't look carefully at it we're bound to repeat the same mistakes all over again.

Concept of no-fault. This is one of those things that was developed to a large extent in Saskatchewan and then moved throughout the rest of Canada in some form or other. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, in all cases provinces have moved away from it because it's become a system that actually doesn't work.

It is a real strange concept when you look at it, that you have an accident, one vehicle goes through a red light or a stop sign, hits another vehicle, and then the NDP would say, and we have a no-fault system.

Now how in the world can you have a no-fault system when someone ploughs through a red light or stop sign and hits someone else? Only in Saskatchewan in a system where you have an NDP government could you dream up something that would actually say that that is no-fault.

It comes back from an NDP government that is extremely and totally paternalistic. They have this idea that it's their job to wet

nurse the whole province. That without them, there is no opportunity for people to take care of themselves. That they are the ones and only the ones that can go ahead and take care of the people of Saskatchewan.

But that's not true, but that is a typical NDP attitude. The fact is the NDP would have made great colonial . . . colonizers. So they could then run it from on high, whatever address they gave today. They could run the whole system, centralize government, and just tell everybody else what to do.

And that is exactly what's been happening in Saskatchewan. This NDP government is a colonizing type of government. They're paternalistic in their attitude, thinking that they have to tell absolutely everyone what to say.

And I think we have to follow that concept through a little bit, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You see our Premier is probably the best of these socialistic colonizers. The idea that it's his job to take care of everything, that nobody else in this province possibly has any opportunity, any abilities, any intellect to go ahead and take care of their own affairs. That's the kind of Premier we have, and he's done this.

Visualize this, Mr. Speaker, with us: that at the helm of the good ship Saskatchewan is captain Calvert guiding the ship Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And there he is at the helm of the good ship Saskatchewan, one hand on the wheel, and in the other hand guiding his . . . his guiding light is the *Regina Manifesto*.

And then we wonder, Mr. Speaker, with that picture that we each visualize, why this particular province could go so wildly amuck in this particular millennium — in this particular millennium.

However, Mr. Speaker, interesting as that picture is, that picture isn't quite correct — it isn't quite correct. Because what we've seen from this session, Mr. Speaker, and we're going to want to go into this a little bit this morning, because if we don't go into it we won't quite understand this government, where it's coming from, and what it's all about.

Actually the good ship Saskatchewan is not steered by the Premier. This good ship Saskatchewan is very much at sea. The only place you can find the good Premier is up in the crow's nest. No control of where the ship's going; no plan on where it should go. He can comment from time to time about where they're at on an immediate situation on a day-to-day basis. He's not steering. He just doesn't have a vision, but he can sort of report. And we had that in question period today.

He reported in question period that he talked to the Minister of Agriculture. But was there any information? No. No idea of what was going on; no idea of what they were doing; no idea of where they were going to go.

It's that kind of leadership of the good ship Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that has led to no-fault and the concepts that are out here right now, Mr. Speaker.

And it's interesting as we're discussing this, we have the member from Cumberland, from his corner again, doing what

he does so often. Well I suggest that instead of sitting there, as a cabinet minister with no work to do, he should go down to the library and read a very impressive tome that was written in the spring of this year, discussing how well the NDP has done in northern Saskatchewan, called . . . about the CCF and the NDP colonialism in northern Saskatchewan, saying very well exactly why his government and his constituency is doing as poorly as it is; is doing as poorly as it is.

And I would suggest that instead of chirping from their corners, they would do very well to read that document. Admittedly it's some 2 or 300 pages and it's very well documented. And he'd find out something very well that would lead him to understand why some of the difficulties that exist in his constituency are there. It's because of NDP-CCF (New Democratic Party-Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) rule since the 1940s. That's what it is, Mr. Speaker.

But let's go back to what we're all about this morning, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 57. This government is totally at sea. Where are they today? This no-fault mentality. Let's just follow that through because there is a mentality there, Mr. Speaker, and it's been demonstrated very much this spring. And once we finished demonstrating this no-fault mentality, Mr. Speaker, we'll go into some of the specifics in Bill No. 57 and how they indicate that.

Let's just look what happened. Well we had the member from Nutana at a meeting in Cypress Hills some time ago, had a major falling apart with the rest of the cabinet. So what should the Premier have done? The Premier should have moved that member to the back row out of cabinet. But instead we just had a sideways shuffle to the left — that's all, that's all.

Let's look at a few other things that indicate that they're very much at sea and how the no-fault mentality follows this through, Mr. Speaker.

We had the Minister of Justice, we had the Minister of Justice — we're talking no-fault — Minister of Justice basically sign off on a particular document saying that malicious prosecution took place and has signed away \$1.3 million. Then a day or two later in this House, Mr. Speaker, in this House he stood in his place and read a prepared statement — we're not sure who prepared it yet but I think we'll find out — read a prepared statement saying that oh, he was wrong on this and there really was no-fault to the prosecutors. There was no-fault and that actually he was totally wrong and he hadn't meant to say what he said, and anyone that had heard what he said should forget what he said because it wasn't what he meant. And so he still sits in his place.

Now we have some hope for the Minister of Justice because, as we've discussed earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he's made it well known that, as July 1, he's going to be entering into a new sphere of influence. And so, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be very interesting to see, when we come back after the break that we're taking, whether he's actually still here, whether he's in his place, or whether he's here in the legislature at all, Mr. Speaker.

Anyways, Bill No. 57 dealing with the automobile accident insurance. Now, Mr. Speaker, and we'll come back to some of these things about the mentality of no-fault, how pervasive it is

in the NDP cabinet and how it shows itself in this particular piece of legislation.

Now over the past two years there have been across this province numbers of meetings held by an organization called the Victims of No Fault. Because the Victims of No Fault looked at the old no-fault insurance situation and said there are many issues that involve no-fault, issues that the people of Saskatchewan actually suffer because of, because the legislation that was there under no-fault weren't adequate, or actually allowed that particular Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, to do things with the citizens of Saskatchewan that were totally unfair.

And so as the Victims of No Fault met around this province, Mr. Speaker, I was one of many Sask Party MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) that attended those meetings. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe I only missed two across the whole province.

And it was interesting because as we went from location to location to location, it was the local people, it was the local people that came there and presented their concerns. At no time did we have the same people presenting the same concern over and over again, which is what happens, Mr. Speaker, when the NDP run their little dog and pony shows around the province.

Because they'll have the NFU (National Farmers Union) and Nettie Wiebe show up time after time after time, giving the same presentation. And the real grassroots never comes up to have an opportunity to speak to the NDP, Mr. Speaker. They never have that opportunity.

But the Victims of No Fault did an admirable job in going across the province and hearing from new people in those particular areas of the province presenting their concerns. And there were some very serious concerns that they had, Mr. Speaker.

One of the concerns was that when there was an accident who should be making some of the decisions in the no-fault situation? Who should be making the decisions as to what treatment takes place and who is at fault and how is this whole system going to work?

And one of the concerns that came through in many, many cases is that the family doctors, the ones who knew the victims of that accident the best had very little say and almost no real input, Mr. Speaker, almost no real input into what was happening with the victim themselves.

And so it would happen, Mr. Speaker, is that the victim would suffer an injury and then the doctor that would treat them would make a particular statement about it and then who would make the final decision? It would be, Mr. Speaker — and this sounds somewhat bizarre, Mr. Speaker, but it's true — in many cases it would be the adjuster. The adjuster would be the ones who would be making final decisions on health care and treatment. The family doctor could not make that final decision.

The person who knew the medical history could not make that final decision. The person who had been at the bedside in many situations with this individual could not make that decision. It

happened to be not a medical person but an adjuster.

That is utterly bizarre, Mr. Speaker. It's very much the same situation that happens very often in WCB (Workers' Compensation Board). And we've had workers who've come through, who've been injured and come through WCB, and said, I want my family doctor to have some input. That family doctor has very little opportunity to have an input and virtually no opportunity to have any final decision-making say in WCB. And it's the same in victims of no-fault.

Mr. Speaker, in many areas there should be an opportunity for the victim to have some choice of treatment, because which treatment works is very often a subjective sort of a thing. And as we well know, if we believe that a treatment's going to work and there are two or three treatments that probably all would have an equal opportunity of being successful, if the person has trust and respect and faith in a particular treatment it's much more likely to work and be successful than if that person has to go to a treatment that they say I have no faith in this particular treatment and fact is, I think it's absolutely a painful treatment, my situation is actually getting worse. Why would they not allow the victim to have some choice in what their treatment's going to be?

(11:15)

But no, it would be the adjuster, Mr. Speaker, not the family doctor, not an expert, but adjuster would be making that decision. That, Mr. Speaker, is obviously and clearly an infraction of giving any respect to the intelligence of the victim, to the family doctor, to the family, to those people who know the situation the best.

Those are the stories that we heard around this province, Mr. Speaker. We heard them from very many people. And it was sort of an underlying theme that would run through.

There were situations, Mr. Speaker, where people said, here's a settlement that I received, a cash settlement, and it is nowhere near adequate to what I have suffered, it is nowhere near adequate. And those things need to be addressed as well.

Point in fact, Mr. Speaker. If an individual had just purchased a business that had been highly successful over the years, and this person had purchased this business and was going to take over and run that business starting tomorrow, and on this particular day, today, they were driving across this province to take over that business and they were hurt in an accident — seriously hurt so they could not perform the duties required in that new business — what would SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) say? They would say, we'll take you back to what you were earning before. What you would have very likely earned, what is almost a sure thing you would have earned, that is not at all part of the picture. That is not at all part of the picture.

That, Mr. Speaker, is an example that did occur in this province. Exactly that example. Totally unfair. These are decisions made by adjusters who were not concerned about the individual, who were not concerned about the medical history, who were not concerned about the family, what the family physician had to say. They were concerned only on trying to have a good case

record. That's all.

This, Mr. Speaker, coming from the NDP-CCF who claim they have a social conscience. We would have thought exactly the opposite of them where they would say, well let's look at the individual, see the kind of situation they're actually in, and let's have a bit of the milk of human kindness. But not from a socialist government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We won't find that from them. In those cases they can be the most hard-hearted group you're going to run across anywheres.

We had a fire in our community, Mr. Speaker, early this spring. Fortunately the individual had insurance other than through the government system. He could go there and, Mr. Speaker, he put the whole plan on the table with that particular adjuster and said, here's what I all want to have happen. Ordinarily as you know, Mr. Speaker, money is doled out bit by bit as the process takes place, as the cleanup takes place, as the new basement's built, as the new house is put on. But this individual went to his insurance company and said I'd like to do this in a different sort of a way.

That insurance company — a private insurance company — sat down with him over the table and said we're quite prepared to deal with this. They sat down at one sitting on that table, drew up the final settlement, and the whole thing was settled. They were very happy, they were very impressed.

You wouldn't find that with the system that the CCF-NDP set up. You wouldn't find that because they wouldn't be prepared to say okay here's an individual, let's deal with him as an individual and if he has a little different concept let's listen to some common sense, to some reality. And maybe we can accomplish what we as a company need to accomplish and meet the needs of the individual that happen. It wouldn't happen with a Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as we travelled around the province with the Victims of No Fault there were many stories. Stories that told of rough treatment where the treatment that was prescribed — and they had to be there — if the treatment became that painful that they felt we just couldn't possibly survive another one of those treatments, there was no alternative because the adjuster would say you be there or we cut you off.

Mr. Speaker, I have a situation just like that in my home constituency going on today. There's a woman who was hurt very seriously in an accident, some very serious back and neck injuries, almost totally incapable of movement, requires oxygen almost at all times to survive . . . was supposed to go Saskatoon to the University Hospital for some treatment, needed two people basically, Mr. Speaker, to get her there. That's as serious as her condition is.

But what did her adjuster say? And again underline this, Mr. Speaker, what did her adjuster say? It wasn't her family physician who made this recommendation. Her adjuster says, you go down to Calgary and get a particular assessment made. But she can't travel in her condition, Mr. Speaker. She cannot travel.

The adjuster says, you get there or you're cut off. That's the situation she finds herself in. That's no-fault, that's the reality

of no-fault. That's the reality of no-fault, Mr. Speaker, taking place today in Saskatchewan with the citizens of this particular province.

Yes it needed to be looked at, Mr. Speaker, there was no doubt about that. The victims of no-fault underline that time and again. One of the concerns that the Victims of No Fault underline — and we weren't even sure if it was as serious as they said it was — and that, Mr. Speaker, came to the concept of being spied on. And to what extent, and what purpose, and why. And so we've raised that in the House this particular spring session, Mr. Speaker. Every insurance company, Mr. Speaker, every insurance company has to ensure that fraud doesn't take place. And they have to make sure that they're very vigilant in those areas. But under what circumstances, what criteria?

You know, Mr. Speaker, the insurance industry has very definite criteria. These are not secretive documents, Mr. Speaker. These are documents that are readily available. It's the insurance industry has very definite criteria on what their surveillance regulations, rules, criteria are.

Now when we ask this government what is the NDP's criteria they said, well we don't know what they are, we don't know if we have them, we don't know if they're broken. We remember the minister very well getting up in the House saying one thing, and then he hid in his vestibule back there, Mr. Speaker, he hid in his vestibule for 45 minutes to an hour before going out to talk to the media. And then he would talk to the media and he had a different story than he had in here. And then at the end of the day we found out he wasn't sure which was right.

He didn't know what he was talking about. Neither did his advisers back there know what they were talking about. So we spent about \$50,000 to find out what happened. And you know what, lo and behold, he managed to be able to blame his advisers, that they gave him bad information. But they're still there giving him advice. Well I can see why when he comes in this House, Mr. Speaker, he huddles behind his desk and doesn't want to be seen. He's hoping that we're not going to ask him another question. Because when he goes back to check with his advisers, he still doesn't know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what kind of information they're actually giving him.

So we asked that question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the surveillance. But no, they didn't know what the criteria were. So then we brought in an example. We brought an example of people that SGI had hired to do some investigation and some surveillance. Now remember, Mr. Speaker, the person that needed to be surveilled — if anyone did need to be surveilled, and we don't know because we're not sure of their criteria — most of the individuals on that tape of surveillance were people other than the individual involved in the accident. They followed all sorts of other people around. They followed all kinds of other individuals. They followed around family members. They followed around friends. They basically had an hour to two hours of tape of people other — other — than the client themselves; other than the client themselves, Mr. Speaker.

Now under what — what — criteria would the NDP start investigating and surveilling citizens of this province that had

absolutely nothing to do with the accident?

It just follows the big brother, colonial, paternalistic attitude that a CCF government has in all cases. They feel they need to know everything about everybody all the time, and they don't know why. When we asked them why, what was their criteria, they had absolutely no idea. They still have no idea.

This individual, Mr. Speaker, is getting about \$80 a month in health care help. They spent over \$3,000 in surveillance to surveil all kinds of other people but the client themselves. And then, Mr. Speaker, when this client asked their insuring agent, is there any surveillance going on, the insurance agent said no. That was another SGI person. That's the kind of system the SGI runs, Mr. Speaker.

No wonder the people of this province asked for a change. No wonder Victims of No Fault could get the crowds they got all across this province saying that it's time to look . . . re-look at the insurance system in Saskatchewan.

Let's just look at what happens, Mr. Speaker, when we look at something very simple like a fender-bender. Let's take something very concrete and solid. Now a previous minister that they had in charge of SGI said that the cost of insurance went up because now they're dealing in big parts like fenders. Big parts like fenders. That was the expensive thing. Well it shows the knowledge of the NDP-CCF, that the expensive part on a car would be a fender; a fender, Mr. Speaker, 2, 3, \$400. A lot of the other garnish parts, electronic parts run into thousands of dollars immediately. But the minister got up and said oh, SGI is so expensive because now we're putting on big parts like fenders. It was a totally ludicrous answer. But it was, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the best answer that a CCF-NDP could give and it shows how much they actually know about the particular system.

What happens if you have a disagreement with your adjuster on the metal parts, the metal parts, the fix-up parts on a car? We're not dealing with human people right now. This should be easily addressed.

So let's say if there is a disagreement, and the owner of the damaged vehicle says you want to write this vehicle off, you want to call it a total write-off, but I think that my vehicle is worth more than yours is.

So what happens then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that both sides will get an individual to represent themselves, and sort of plead the case in front of the adjuster, but the adjuster gets to pick who he wants on his side. This happened in my hometown in the last three weeks, Mr. Speaker.

The SGI representative came up with a list of values for this vehicle. And where did he get his list from, Mr. Speaker? From the *Leader-Post*, vehicles for sale, from dealerships in Saskatchewan, from *The StarPhoenix*, from the *Wakaw Recorder*? No, they got the list, Mr. Speaker, from Florida. The SGI representative had this big long list of cars for sale — happened to be a Mercedes, by the way — and on that list were vehicles for sale in Florida. Now what a ludicrous way to go ahead and try and find out what an individual's value on a vehicle actually is.

You take a vehicle from Florida. You have to be able to get down there to bring it back. You've got the cost of bringing it back. You've got to bring it across the border. You've got to pay the taxes. You've got to give it the safety inspection. Now you have all those variable costs.

And SGI wanted to use the cost of a vehicle in Florida to pay out the damage on a vehicle from a Saskatchewan citizen. That shows you how totally out of touch SGI and the CCF is in running SGI and Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill has had a whole lot of attention. This particular speaker . . . this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, the NDP a day or two ago was going to make a big issue about why the Saskatchewan Party wasn't going to pass this thing before July 1. Because if it didn't get passed by July 1, Mr. Speaker, then what was going to happen is all those people who were hoping to get a break on their drivers' licences, because that's where your good driving record actually shows up in a reduction of premiums . . . And I'm proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that when I received my document just a week or so ago, I'll actually be getting a substantial reduction because the people on this side, the Saskatchewan Party people, are good drivers, Mr. Speaker. We are responsible people — we are responsible people.

**An Hon. Member:** — I get a reduction too.

**Mr. Heppner:** — I have the Minister of Finance saying he gets a reduction as well. And I could see that, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Finance, the only way to balance his budget will be that if SGI doesn't incur another \$100 in cost. So that's fine.

(11:30)

But anyways, they said that if we didn't pass this thing, and they were making a big issue of it. They contacted the media and said, guess what, because the Saskatchewan Party isn't going to pass this piece of legislation by the long weekend, we're going to have all the people who renew their licences in July aren't going to get their premium.

Well first of all, that was a shylock piece of information they passed around. Because in actuality they have created an omnibus Bill, Mr. Speaker. And you know what an omnibus Bill is, is where a government has a good piece of legislation, then they slide another piece of legislation over top and say, you have to pass these two together, so you get all or nothing. And so they're going to make the big media issue on that one little piece.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here's what happened. We made a very definite statement that the Sask Party was quite prepared to listen to any amendments to accommodate this piece of legislation so that all those citizens who would have had that reduction, that premium reduced because of good driving during the month of July, would get it.

But, Mr. Speaker, just to make sure that the NDP knew what they were talking about, we made a phone call to the head of SGI. And he said, well we knew this piece of legislation probably wasn't going to pass before July 1 so we've already made accommodations for that.

This government was so out of touch with SGI that the SGI president had to take care of the legislation as it was going through this House to accommodate the citizens of Saskatchewan, but the NDP wasn't going to do that.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation needs a lot of discussion. I have just barely touched on some of the things that need to be said. I have a lot to say and a number of parties have a lot to say about the no-fault mentality.

And I talked about that when I talked about the Minister of Justice and the fault that showed up in cabinet. I could say something about the Minister of SERM (Saskatchewan Environment and Resource Management) and bad water. I could even talk about the Whip, the Whip, who just about a year ago, his ineptitude resulted in the government losing a vote for the first time in this millennium, Mr. Speaker — the first time in this millennium.

We have very much more to say on this Bill. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I at this time move adjournment of Bill No. 57.

The division bells rang from 11:33 until 11:43.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 22

Hermanson	Heppner
-----------	---------

**The Speaker:** — Order, please. Order. Order. Order. Order. Order. Order, please. Order. I would ask members to remain in order throughout the entire voting procedure so that the Clerk is able to get the voting correctly. And I will insist on that, members. Order.

Julé	Draude	Gantefer
Bjornerud	Toth	Wakefield
Stewart	McMorris	D'Autremont
Bakken	Wall	Brkich
Wiberg	Weekes	Harpauer
Hart	Allchurch	Peters
Huyghebaert	Hillson	

#### Nays — 27

Calvert	Addley	Atkinson
Hagel	Lautermilch	Melenchuk
Cline	Osika	Kasperski
Goulet	Van Mulligen	Prebble
Belanger	Crofford	Axworthy
Nilson	Junor	Hamilton
Harper	Forbes	Jones
Higgins	Trew	Wartman
Thomson	Yates	McCall

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise to join the debate on the automobile . . .

Bill No. 57, The Automobile Accident Insurance Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important bit of legislation and it absolutely amazes me that this government does not want to allow proper time for due consultation and investigation of the implications of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, as I recall, no-fault accident insurance legislation was introduced some seven or eight years ago. We've been operating under this no-fault system for the last seven years and it's taken all of this time and all of the hearings and all of the meetings that were held across this province by one group or the other to finally get it through this government's thick heads that this legislation had serious faults in it.

And it took this government seven years to wake up to that fact and, Mr. Speaker, now they want to ram it through in a couple of days. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of heavy-handed, autocratic attitude that this government has on the way they think government should be conducted. Their attitude, Mr. Speaker, is they know best and everybody else — the ordinary folks right through this province — know absolutely nothing compared to the supreme wisdom of this NDP government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, quite simply that's dead wrong. This government is dead wrong.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed by the attitude of this government. On one hand they take forever to be brought to reality about the mistaken direction that their legislation has taken this province's situation for people and victims of serious accidents.

Mr. Speaker, they got this into their heads seven or eight years ago that they had the great enlightenment of the world and their new system was going to be best. Come hell or high water they were going to stick to it and see to it that it was going to be something everybody had to live with.

And gradually, gradually, gradually as people from all corners of this province expressed the concerns that they had about the unfairness and the arbitrary way in which victims were being dealt with, finally — finally — it sunk through this government's head is that their single-minded devotion to the one option was simply not going to be accepted to the people of this province.

And all of a sudden just as if they found inspiration on the road to Damascus, all of a sudden they come up with a changed plan for consideration by the people of the province. And good that finally they did that. Good for them that finally they smartened up after seven years.

The Minister of Finance sits there and smiles as if this is a great improvement. Well it is some improvement, the question is why did it take you so long? Why did it take you so long to smarten up? Why is the government so thick headed about these kinds of decisions that they will not listen?

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — And then, Mr. Speaker, and then, Mr. Speaker, when finally, when finally they do catch on, finally they realize that there's something wrong with it and maybe it's the reality of the fact that all the polling that is showing that their government is falling apart in the estimation of Saskatchewan people, maybe that's what's led to the conversion, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Because even the Liberals, when they poll all of their 35 members in the province, realize that they're falling out of favour, Mr. Speaker. Everybody understands that this government's agenda is falling off the rails, Mr. Speaker. And maybe that's what explains a sudden willingness to change, Mr. Speaker.

And then when they finally realize that they've been on the wrong track, then they want to jam this thing through before the long weekend. They want to make sure that they jam this thing through without proper time for scrutiny and debate. And quite simply, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province will no longer tolerate that kind of heavy handedness.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, democracy simply cannot be ignored by this NDP government. This official opposition and the third party member simply will stand here and say this issue needs to be debated. This issue needs to be discussed. This issue needs to be talked about so that people of this province can understand the ramifications of the system we had in the past and where this potentially is going. And, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House will see to it that that happens in a proper and effective way as the official opposition.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that the government would actually learn something. I mean, they tried to ram through earlier in this session arbitrary and totally unacceptable changes to the long-term care fee structure. And only after day after day and week after week of telling them that they were wrong, after mobilizing people across this province to write in and send petitions, finally they backed off of that track. Mr. Speaker, why are they so determined to try to push through legislation that the people of this province do not have time to look at and scrutinize and have a due process of proper investigation? Mr. Speaker, it's wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise my voice to some of the issues that are implied in the . . . where we've been over the last seven years with no-fault and to raise some concerns and to point out some issues that people need to think about in the way this legislation is being presented. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about a fundamental attitude that I see in the no-fault system and I have also seen in the way this government is moving in many fronts on the legislative agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what seems to be the attitude of this NDP government is that for some reason they have been granted some special kind of enlightenment in this province that no one else in the province has. They've been somehow destined to have this great wisdom about what's needed for the people of this province, and it doesn't matter if



the people of this province do not agree with it, do not like it, do not accept it. They are going to make sure that their will be done no matter what, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a fundamental problem and it is entirely disconnected with the real people of our province.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, this government and any government should know that the only way that you can properly relate and provide good governance for people of their jurisdiction is to remain connected with the needs and desires and dreams, and be connected to what people's aspirations and dreams are for the province. You can't . . .

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — You can't sit in this ivory tower in the high-rises of government department buildings in Regina and sit there in isolation and say, I'm sorry people of Saskatchewan, you're dead wrong and we're absolutely right so get used to it, we're going to decide what's best for you.

And, Mr. Speaker, that attitude has not only been an attitude that we see exhibited in their approach to no-fault. It is going into the health system. It's going into the education system. It's going into the way this government is coming into a bunker mentality almost and saying it doesn't matter what people think.

What matters is what we decide. And we're going to go to our little meetings with each other in an increasingly small group of people because everybody is either leaving or supporting the opposition.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — And this small little cadre of people who have all this wisdom in the world are making decisions because they know what's best. Well I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, they don't know what's best.

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

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that they've just been there too long. They've lost touch and connection with the people that they need to serve and the people are going to make adjustments to that situation soon enough.

Mr. Speaker, when they put in no-fault, they again had this attitude and they said we know what's best for you. If you're a victim of no-fault and you're an accident victim, many times — in almost all instances — these people have had varying degrees of injury as a result of an accident. And in some instances . . . in many instances the degree of injury was very severe.

And this government said we know what's best for you; it's no problem. We're going to take care of you because we know better what's best for you than your parents or your spouse or your family. We know better what's best for you than the family physician or the specialist that may have been consulted on the referral of the family physician. We know what's best for you.

No matter what all of this other evidence is, we know what is best and to make sure you're going to listen to our advice, we control the purse strings. We're going to decide what's going to be paid for and what's going to be covered. Where you're going to go to get this service, who you're going to talk to, and what referrals are going to be made.

Mr. Speaker, this closed shop attitude is simply not in the spirit of the way this system should work. Mr. Speaker, there needs to be meaningful consultation and input from the family members, from the health care providers, from the family physicians and the referred-to specialists. And not just a small group of medical people who are more answerable to the system than they are answerable to the clients that they should be serving. Mr. Speaker, time and time again across this province, people have come forward and expressed the fact that this was a fundamental flaw in the no-fault system.

Mr. Speaker, when you end up with that kind of a situation, you end up with the government — in many cases SGI insurance representatives, client representatives — making decisions that could impact negatively on a person's long-term health outcomes. They might be making decisions that are based on short-term financial expediency, and that could have tremendous long-term implications on an individual's health. And that potentially is again one of those things that aren't in the best interests for the client but are in the best interest of SGI. And so, Mr. Speaker, I think that that issue has come to the fore time and time again as people have said this system, in its current configuration, is unacceptable to us.

Mr. Speaker, far too often in my experience as the official opposition Health critic, I have seen that decisions have been made that have been expedient in the short term and have had serious long-term ramifications not only to the individual but on to the health care system. And it's ended up with a situation where what seemed to be a short-term expedient decision has ended up impacting in a significant way on a person's long-term care or long-term health outcomes and have impacted very negatively on the very expensive requirements for further interventions that have been only made necessary by poor decisions that were made in the short term. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about that.

We have a situation where we have tremendous waiting lists. We have tremendous pressures on our medical professionals. And we simply have got to do everything we can to make sure that decisions that are made today are going to be good decisions for the long term. And they have to be thoughtful and they have to be done collaboratively, not just with a small exclusive group of people that have come to the favour of the SGI system, but of their referred-to professionals and family physicians and the family members themselves. We got to think about what the ramifications of this are on the long term.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important when we discuss this legislation and its serious implications and ramifications for the health outcomes and the health status of people who are affected by the no-fault system, we've got to think about it in terms of the bigger picture and the larger parameters. It just simply is not good enough to take it into a little narrow thing and to look at a bit of legislation that is over 100 pages in length and think that we can do this in a day or two. We need proper

time to discuss it and debate it.

(12:00)

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that has been told to us when we talk to people that have been affected by the no-fault system, they're saying that even if the decisions are working in terms of the health outcome, I have to do every single thing that big brother government and SGI client service representatives are going to decide for me. There is no latitude on a personal level or on a family level or on an adult individual, to make some decisions for themselves. Everything is funnelled through big brother in the centralized decision-making core, and these people then make these decisions.

And so you create an environment of total dependence and reliance on someone else making these decisions, rather than empowering people and allowing them to make some decisions for themselves about their future and their needs as a victim of no-fault, all of this is done for them by this great centralized bureaucratic system that this NDP government loves so much.

And, Mr. Speaker, that simply is not where the best interests of Saskatchewan people are going to be found.

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

**Mr. Gantfoer:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, what this legislation envisages is at least moving to some extent into a parallel system that will allow options for people. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't know why it has taken so long to open up any opportunities for a parallel path. I understand that for a number of years now, that people that had proposed a premiere option that was going to create a balance between what the current system had and what was going to be a system that allowed more flexibility, but the government just couldn't accept this good advice. They just couldn't simply say, you know the people of the province have looked at this issue and they've come up with a good plan. They've got to come up with their own system that's now going to create I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a fair bit of confusion in the system.

As the legislation outlines, each individual who is going to register with their driver's licence is going to have to make a decision as to if they're going to stay under the no-fault system as being proposed or in the new tort system that is going to be the option.

And, Mr. Speaker, everybody is going to rely on the impartial advice that's going to come from SGI adjusters and client representatives to weigh out all the factors that need to be considered in deciding which system to go to. And that, Mr. Speaker, is going to require that there's proper consultation and there's proper discussion about this legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a shame that this government's attitude has been one to say we know what's best for you, we are going to decide for you. We are going to centralize all the decision making about this and every other aspect of your life. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite simply, the people of this province will have no more of it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that this legislation needs proper

time and an opportunity for members in this House to properly debate and discuss this resolution. And I certainly was pleased to state today, by my vote not to adjourn this debate, to voice my concern that proper debate should not be stifled and that reasonable, practical solutions to the time realities should be met.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the government said yesterday, I believe, that we have to pass this by July 1 in order to have people who are going to qualify for deductions, because of a good driving record, to apply. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that simply is nonsense.

We talked to Mr. Fogg, the head of SGI, who said that isn't the big deal problem. We can easily put in an amendment that will make this particular clause of the legislation, will be retroactive to July 1, so everybody that qualifies for a deduction on their premium is going to get a deduction on their premium on July 1 as planned. And we not only accepted that advice from Mr. Fogg in our speech yesterday, we actually proposed that. And we said to the government here's a suggestion from the head of SGI as to how to take care of the . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order. Order. I'm having difficulty hearing the speaker because — the member who has the floor — because of individual conversations. So I would ask all hon. members to stay in order.

**Mr. Gantfoer:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we listened to what Mr. Fogg said, the president of SGI. And yesterday the member from Cannington, in his speech, said, look it, members opposite, NDP government, we think that this is a practical solution. Obviously the president of SGI thinks it's a good solution. It's something that's easy to work, we've said that we as the official opposition would support that kind of an amendment. We said if the government is always so worried about getting credit for everything, even if they haven't had an original idea in the last decade . . .

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

**Mr. Gantfoer:** — We can . . . we're prepared to let you do it as a House amendment. We will support a House amendment that'll make this provision retroactive to July 1, no problem. And so this absolutely takes away any need to have this legislation rammed through this legislature.

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not see or understand why this government is so determined to limit debate on this issue. I don't see why they're in such a big hurry to ram this thing forward, to not allow proper time for discussion and interaction between members of this Assembly and the people of this province about such an important piece of legislation — legislation that's taken the government opposite seven years to even get to this point. Now they want to have it over in two days of debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know and I know, we all know that that's simply unacceptable.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we proposed a practical alternative. We consulted with Mr. Fogg about the implications and he said this is a very legitimate and a good idea. We offered it to the government to say we'll support that as a House amendment so

that there's proper time for discussion of this important piece of legislation to occur in this House.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, I was proud to stand in this House today and not let the government shut off debate on this issue. I'm proud to have taken my place and be able to debate it. And I trust that other members of this House will rise in their place as well to debate this important issue and make sure that this government does not limit the debate and cannot shut this legislation down so people of this province will not have a chance to have any input.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government can try to ram this stuff down the people of Saskatchewan's throats. But the people will have the final say. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Hillson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been two years. It's been two years since the No-Fault Review Committee reported. It took this government two years to make a decision and come up with legislation. Now after taking two years, they finally wait two months into this session before they bring down the amendments — amendments that were . . . (inaudible) . . . down several months ago. So it takes them two months to bring in amendments after two years when they got the report.

And now they're saying they have to get it passed immediately. There's no time for consultation to the people involved. There's no time for consultation with Saskatchewan motorists and the opposition must be muzzled.

Now we can take our sweet time. We can take two years, they tell us, two years from the report. We can have this legislature sitting for a couple of months without seeing the amendments. They won't let us see the amendments. They hold them back, even though we know they've been done but they hold them back. But, by golly, once they come down, it's imperative that they be passed and passed now because they're not going to allow any consultation. They're not going to allow any deliberation.

Well this, Mr. Speaker, just doesn't make sense. We should have had these amendments before us on day one of the session. They should have been before us last year when the government already had plenty of time from the review committee's report.

They can take all the time in the world but the opposition, the stakeholders, and Saskatchewan motorists and licence holders, they are not allowed the same luxury as this government.

I think we also have to look at what is in, what is . . . I think what is in this Act also tells us a lot about the way this government operates. Now first of all let me say there are some good things here. We know that after no-fault came in, some outrageous court decisions came down as a result of the loopy writing of the original legislation.

The original legislation was so flawed that we had one case where a man used his motor vehicle, used his car as a weapon to run down a woman. This was not an accident. There was no accident involved. This was a deliberate assault, a deliberate attempt to run down a woman who could not sue because of the

no-fault legislation.

Now this was outrageous but this was a situation created by the original flawed wording of the original Act. It needed to be corrected. Well finally, finally the government has moved to correct that judgment and correct the wrong wording in the initial legislation. Why it's taken so long I don't know, but at least we have to say better late than never.

Another, another court decision again arising out of the flawed wording of the original Act provided that when there is manufacturer's defect, that you cannot sue for a defect in the manufacture of a motor vehicle. Again because of the no-fault legislation. Well clearly it was outrageous that no-fault legislation was being used to protect car companies who had put a defective vehicle on the market. And yet that was the situation.

Well again this was a crazy situation which came about because of the defective wording of the initial legislation. Finally, finally, finally the government is moving to correct it, and I congratulate them for it. I still wonder why it took so long and I still wonder why, when they take so long to move, they say that the opposition is playing games when they want more than a couple of weeks to talk to stakeholders, to talk to Saskatchewan motorists.

They've also told us that they're worried about the rebate program. But the rebate program too, Mr. Speaker, is terribly flawed because it hasn't been properly thought out. Under the rebate program, and I have a situation now with constituents in this category, if you hold a licence jointly, even if both of you qualify for the maximum, you get nothing.

Now I don't know if you can get your mind around that, Mr. Speaker, I can't — I can't. How is it that this program is so flawed, so badly worded, so badly drafted that because they hold their licence plates jointly there is no rebate, but both of them if they held a licence plate in their own name solely would qualify for the maximum rebate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously we want the July people to get the rebate, and we will support that — personally I'd like the February people to get the rebate — but I think that this is another example of where the government would do well to go back to the drawing board and get this cleaned up, because here is another example of bad drafting has resulted in I think a situation they can't possibly have intended. It's too loony for even them. And so when you have joint title, joint ownership of a licence plate, where both owners qualify for the maximum, surely they should get the maximum rather than be told because it's joint they can get zero.

So here's another thing, if you've got an extra few days in this debate, here's another thing you can look at. This gives you a chance to clean up the mess before it's passed. So why don't you go about and do your work and then when it does get passed, it will hopefully be . . . you'll get it right.

Mr. Speaker, it's I think in November that the government announced the changes they were going to bring about to the no-fault legislation. And I think the changes they announced speak volumes about this government. I think we have all

worried that this government is directionless, it is aimless, it lacks any program. They obviously don't want an election. Now the member from Melfort-Tisdale says they don't want an election because of the polls. That's probably part of the story but I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that another reason why there can't be an election is they have no program to present to the people of Saskatchewan.

(12:15)

So one of the problems with having an election is that normally in an election you present a program, an agenda to the people of Saskatchewan and ask them to support your vision of where this province should be moving. But we all know this government doesn't have an agenda, doesn't have a program. They have sailed out into the middle of the ocean and thrown the compass overboard. And now they're all wondering where to go from here and nobody, nobody has any idea.

So what they did in the case of no-fault, Mr. Speaker, was they couldn't decide whether to endorse no-fault, to modify no-fault, or to move back to the old tort system. And so when anybody doesn't know what direction they're going, when any . . . when someone doesn't know what they should be doing, when somebody sees a . . . sees two ways of going and doesn't know which way to take, they do what this government did. They bring in an amendment that says, well we'll have tort and we'll have no-fault.

You know, they're clearly following the advice of Yogi Berra who once said, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." And that's what they've done. This is no-fault if necessary, but not necessarily no-fault. And I don't know . . . I don't know who coined that one, Mr. Speaker.

Well here is a government that doesn't know where it's headed. It doesn't have a program. It doesn't have a direction. So they came up . . . they come up with amendments that give no direction, no plan. And I think this is a microcosm, I think this is a microcosm of where the government is headed or not headed generally. This is a government that simply doesn't know what it's about, doesn't know where it's headed, and it thinks that by trying to please everyone, they can somehow get out of this.

But, Mr. Speaker, we know that when you try and please everyone, you usually end up pleasing no one. Because you don't stand for anything. You don't have a program. You don't have an agenda. You don't have an idea as to how to build this province, how to move us forward. And that is, as I say, that is very clear in the lack of direction, the lack of courage, the lack of conviction we see in these amendments to the no-fault Bill, a no-fault Bill that is neither fish nor fowl, that simply cannot decide what the government wants to do with its program.

I also suggest that this is an example of where the government is saying they're offering something that they really aren't offering. I think the intention is that ultimately those who opt for the old tort system will be charged premiums as to make it unattractive. That is my prediction. That this is an attempt to set up the tort system to be an unattractive option so that it will fail. I think it's designed to fail so that they can stick with the no-fault.

Well I've talked as a MLA, I've talked to so many people who were through the no-fault system, that it seems to me that one of the major issues which is not addressed in this Bill, one of the major issues, is that those who have been through claims as a result of a motor vehicle mishap, so many of them have stories about insensitive, thoughtless adjusters who seemed to take the view that everybody's whining and complaining about aches and pains no matter how severely injured they were.

And these stories about insensitivity, these stories of how they were mistreated and insulted by the people with whom they dealt, I've heard so many of them that I have to conclude that it isn't just one bad experience.

I mean we all know that in any program, any program in the world, somebody somewhere is going to have a bad experience with some person. Maybe it was an off-day for that official or whatever, these things happen.

But what has struck me in the case of the no-fault program is I just hear these tales from my constituents and from others again, and again, and again. That they say that they were dealt with by people who were unsympathetic, and insensitive, and bureaucratic, and they just didn't seem to receive any consideration or empathy for the problems that they were suffering. In fact they came away with the feeling that they were being written off as malingerers, complainers, and not people who had truly suffered injury here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government says they want questions, they've got them. The government says they listened and in the case of nursing homes, beat them over the head enough and I guess they did finally listen.

But on this one they have taken so long to bring the legislation down, now they say it's rush, rush, rush. The reason it's rushed is because of a rebate program which I submit needs to be looked at again because there's some clear unfairness and inequity in the rebate program as well.

So let's have a look at this. Let's talk to the stakeholders. Let's talk to Saskatchewan motorists and let's come up with an insurance program that really has the confidence of Saskatchewan people and can serve the needs of Saskatchewan motorists, both in terms of paying premiums and in terms of insurance coverage.

I don't know what's so offensive about that to the government. I don't know why it took so long after the PIPP (personal injury protection plan) report came down before they finally prepared legislation. I don't know why, I don't know why we didn't have these amendments before us on the first day of the House. I don't know why they had to come down only a few . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order. I'm having difficulty hearing the member who has the floor.

**Mr. Hillson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the intervention but I have to admit I've already said what I had to say. And I apologize to the House. I realize this hasn't lasted nearly as long as the hon. member for Saskatoon Meewasin who had . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well that, yes. I hear . . . The member for Prince Albert says just repeat it. That's of

course what the member for Saskatoon Meewasin did.

I wondered how you can make, how you can make a speech for two hours with no material, and we all found out this week. What you do is you have five minutes of material but then you keep repeating 120 times and magically it becomes two hours.

But in this case, Mr. Speaker, I've said what I have to say. These are cogent arguments. These are points the government would do well to take into account. And so with that, rather than repeat it again and again and again, I'm going to sit down to give other members a chance to enter this debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to speak to the Bill before this Assembly this afternoon. And I think and I believe and my colleagues believe, that this piece of legislation is certainly one of the more in-depth pieces of legislation that we've seen in this Assembly for this past spring and currently. And it certainly demands a lot more time and effort and in-depth review by members than the government would appear that it would like to allow the Assembly.

In fact when you look at the Bill, you look at Bill No. 57, you look at its implications, you look at the length of the Bill, and the fact that we've been sitting here since the third week in March, and yet the Bill didn't come forward to the Assembly until May 28. And then the government would argue today that we have had more than ample time to debate the Bill. But it was introduced on May 28, Mr. Speaker, second reading was given on 7th. It was brought forward once more on the 14th and the 19th, and then until yesterday and today it has not been raised or brought forward in this Assembly by the government.

And, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the government actually controls if you will, what comes forward and they propose what they would like to see on the order paper. And on many occasions the Government House Leader could have moved this specific Bill to the forefront for debate over the past number of weeks.

However, Mr. Speaker, when we look at this piece of legislation, and we take a careful look at it, this piece of legislation is just another way to try and address a major problem that this government brought for themselves when they introduced the no-fault Bill back in 1995 or '94. And then the resulting problems that have arisen with the Bill, and then the government's commitment to a review of the no-fault piece of legislation, and their commitment to address the inequities that were in that piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, each and every MLA in this Assembly today is aware of many people throughout their ridings, throughout this province, who have been dealt a serious blow in their lives and in their livelihoods as a result of the no-fault legislation.

We know of a family here in the city of Regina who — the husband was a firefighter in this city — and they were on their way to watch their daughter curl in the provincial curling championships, and tragically involved in a very serious accident that claimed their younger daughter and then injured

significantly the husband. Resulting in his inability, even after many attempts, to find gainful and full-time employment back with the firefighters service that he had worked with for so long and so hard. A family that really was devoted to their children, really had a commitment to their family, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and as a result of the no-fault legislation they're livelihoods were just put in total turmoil and uncertainty.

And as I chatted with the family and as we lobbied on behalf of the government in regards to this family, Mr. Speaker, it just seemed that no matter what efforts we made or what efforts they made and the lobbying they did to address the many physical and painful problems that they were facing in their lives and the struggles they had to try and maintain the household and their house at the time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, everything they did seemed to fall on a cold shoulder.

And of course, the minister of the day and the government of the day continued to say well, you got to deal with SGI, it's their problem. Well the unfortunate part, as some of my colleagues have already related, when you're dealing with what appears to be and what has happened to be over the past number of years a very cold-hearted Crown corporation in dealing with individuals like this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can understand why people have become so frustrated.

I've had people in my own constituency. They've struggled in their lives. They've struggled with the ongoing programming that they've been asked to be involved in, with therapy sessions and what have you, to try and put their lives back together, to try and bring some . . . an ability, a physical ability to actually go out and find full-time employment that would give them the same opportunities that would . . . presented themselves prior to their accident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, only to find that no level of and ongoing therapy was going to give them back what they had prior to that injury.

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this piece of legislation is just what it would appear to be, a flawed attempt to address a total inequity in the former legislation, the no-fault legislation that has become an eyesore for this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And as a result, we have Bill 57 before us, a piece of legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is trying to address those inequities.

And unfortunately, the government has also brought forward another piece of . . . part to this legislation that they're trying to sell the public of Saskatchewan on, saying that it is good for you because we're going to offer you an opportunity whereby you can actually create some . . . raise some credits through the good driving program and therefore reduce your . . . the cost of your . . . of licensing your vehicle in the year or each and every year as . . . based on the number of credits that you build for yourself through a period of good driving habits in the province of Saskatchewan.

(12:30)

So on one hand, we have an attempt to address a major problem and a major flaw and, in trying to do that, rather than bringing in a separate piece of legislation to say to the . . . as the minister I think indicated in his second reading speech through . . . he says:

... through a formal customer feedback campaign ... directly asked its customers how SGI could serve them better.

He mentions:

... (one of) the first ... amendments ... (we) would like to outline today will allow SGI to respond to the number one desire of its customers — the introduction of discounts on vehicle insurance premiums.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe that is ... we commend SGI and we commend the government for recognizing the fact that maybe, maybe good drivers need to receive some credit for their good driving habits. And as a result of those credits, Mr. Deputy Speaker, part of this piece of legislation is going to recognize those good driving habits.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many members in this Assembly have probably been asked already when ... and I think certainly have been brought ... it's been brought to my attention, I believe the letter that went out to customers came out sometime in May indicating that this program was in place and that it will be ... that you ... If you looked at the letter that you received, you will have been given a list of the credits you've attained as a result of the good driving that you have done over the past number of years.

And I think most people, when they received the letter, were under the impression that they were now ... would qualify for up to seven ... a 7 per cent reduction in the licensing of their vehicle. Unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that will not take place until July 1.

Now the government is arguing, if this piece of legislation isn't moved forward that they're going to lose that and it's going to be delayed for maybe another even three months. Rather than July 1 it could be September 1.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been in this Assembly for a long time; I've been here for a number of years. And on many occasions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government has, and upfront they have actually designed into legislation the fact that certain portions of that legislation will be retroactive to a time period when they have indicated — whether the Premier has or whether a minister has at times — that we're going to introduce a Bill in this upcoming session and while the Bill may not get passed before the time period in which we want to implement the piece of legislation, we've made provisions by bringing forward an amendment that would allow for the ... that portion of the legislation to be retroactive to a period in time that we said we would ... that that piece of legislation would become law.

So if the government wants to argue that we're holding up the Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the facts are we need to debate ... (inaudible interjection) ... And the member from Regina South is asking why we're holding up this Bill? And the answer is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because there's an important debate that needs to take place in regards to this Bill. And I invite the member from Regina South, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to enter the debate and to stand up and to speak on behalf of his constituents and represent his constituents in regards to the debate on Bill

No. 57.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the facts are whether it's July 1, there are many people across this province who would argue that if the government was going to come forward with a credit recognition for good driving, that they should have implemented that good driving credit program, made back to April 1, which is the beginning of the fiscal year for the government ... province of Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would seem to me that would have been the appropriate thing to do.

However having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will agree with the fact that this Bill comes into force on July 1, whether or not it's passed before July 15 or whatever day down the road that this Bill is actually passed through this Assembly and receives Royal Assent, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And a simple amendment just addresses that concern.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there ... we need to address the problems of the no-fault and the tort options that the government is bringing forward.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you may have — and I know many members in this Assembly have — been contacted by a number of SGI agents across this province or insurance agencies that handle SGI registrations. And one of the big concerns that is coming, that has been brought to my attention, is what kind of information am I going to have and will I be able to ... When a customer comes to me and basically to renew their licence and they ask to know, what should I do? Should I choose tort or should I just stay with the no-fault? And Mr. Speaker, that's ... Deputy Speaker, that is a good question.

And the agents have been saying, why should it be left up to me to try to counsel a customer that ... as to the benefits of the no-fault system versus the benefits of the tort system and say, well I think, I think in your case maybe you'd be just as well off to stay with no-fault or, I think in your case, maybe you should, maybe you should choose the tort option, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The facts are that in many cases no-fault is a good option. But as we've seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the tort system is a ... will be a real benefit to, I would suggest, a small minority of the population. And I believe as we've debated being ... been debating this before, that with some slight changes even to the no-fault insurance, we could have addressed the areas within the piece of legislation that have been a major downfall to many customers across the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the individuals who are really speaking out against the no-fault program, while they're a ... and the government argued, well they're just a small portion of the province, of the population. There's only a small percentage, 5 to 10 per cent. The facts are, it's had a major impact on their lives and it's created a major problem for them.

As I was talking about this family earlier, the Markwart family and the problems they faced. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can say this: they have found, through this ongoing process, that a deep faith has helped them to get beyond where they were and to help them actually bring some stability and to rebuild their lives. And we want to compliment them for that.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's no reason why they should have had to continue to argue with SGI and continue to lobby for a fairer way of dealing with the complications that have been brought to their lives as a result of the no-fault legislation.

And I just don't understand why SGI themselves could not have sat down and said, you know, we've got a major problem here. And rather than wait — well we're going to review this piece of legislation in five years time to see how well it has worked in the province of Saskatchewan and then after the review we will decide whether or not we need to bring amendments to our legislation forward, which we now have before this Assembly in Bill No. 57 — I don't know why SGI could not have sat down and started to take a serious look at the problems that the no-fault piece of legislation was bringing forward and address those concerns directly.

Why take seven years to come forward with a piece of legislation that in many ways does not address those problems and in fact is going to complicate the whole process as people begin to try to understand what this Bill No. 57 means to them? What it will mean when they go in to renew their licences. What decisions they're going to be forced to make. Whether or not they continue to just stay with the no fault piece of legislation or they would adopt the tort system of addressing an accident problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's unfortunate that SGI could not have taken a very careful look prior to this and come forward with a very simple response to the problems that the no-fault Bill has created for themselves and dealt with the questions that have been coming forward by the individuals who have been bringing forward the problems that have been brought to their attention through the years.

And it's not just people that have been standing up, defending and trying to assist people who have been caught in no-fault problem, people who have had their lives disrupted, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or Mr. Speaker, many individuals who've been forced through no fault of their own to deal with SGI and how it treats people when it . . . when they are forced into a situation of having to turn to the insurance company that they insured their lives with, and were expecting that company would treat them fairly, and, Mr. Deputy . . . Mr. Speaker, find that actually that insurance company has turned its back on them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker these past number of weeks we've had a debate in this Assembly about SGI surveillance. And our caucus has spoken up and we . . . And, Mr. Speaker, we are not opposed to the fact that SGI needs to be frugal and they need to ensure that when they are handing out insurance to individuals that the insurance is going to those who desperately need it and that they are very careful that there are not people that . . . not taking advantage of their insurance program. Because we know that if individuals take advantage of a program, at the end of the day, it becomes a costlier problem for the rest of . . . all consumers and it results in higher premiums. So, Mr. Speaker, SGI finds themselves in the position of making sure they verify that the claimants indeed are worthy of the insurance adjustments that have been made on their behalf.

However, Mr. Speaker, what we've been trying to point out is

the way SGI goes about determining who they're going to create surveillance on, who they're going to follow, who they're going to watch. And that's what my colleague, the member from Rosthern, was trying to ask of the minister. What is the criteria? What criteria do they follow? What game plan do they follow? What rules and guidelines do they follow so that they aren't maliciously attacking the goodwill of individuals in doing surveillance on individuals?

So, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is not one that should be taken lightly. It's imperative that as members we debate this piece of legislation at length. And it's not new, Mr. Speaker. It's happened in the past and no doubt it will happen in the future when a government, as they get through a legislative session and as they look forward to the pieces of legislation or the number of Bills they want to present to the House, that — as I believe we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of close to 80 pieces of legislation before this Assembly today — that some of those pieces of legislation will be somewhat controversial.

And what happens, Mr. Speaker, is through the process of time — we've seen it — governments will hold back on those pieces of legislation that they may find would be somewhat controversial. Because they would want to limit the debate, and limit the exposure in this Assembly in regards to the ability of the opposition to quiz the government and ask them why they would hold off and why they would try to ram through a Bill of such serious consequences in just a few days.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact that they put . . . they introduce the discounts in this piece of legislation is just . . . appears to be a deliberate attempt by a government trying to address the problem they created seven years ago and trying to move it through hastily so that they can get behind them the problems that they've created, and not allow the opposition the opportunity, and people across this province the opportunity to look seriously at the Bill to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill addresses the inequities and the problems that were created by the no-fault legislation. It's imperative, Mr. Speaker, that we take the time, that we take the time to address this appropriately, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the individuals who've been affected by no-fault, they've waited seven years. And if I understand correctly, there are some provisions in the Bill that actually will allow members to go back to 1995 and that the attempt will be to try to correct some of those inequities that were created at the time to address some of the problems that were brought forward at that time.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the government wants to argue that you're putting on hold the well-being of these individuals and that you're just delaying the process of addressing those problems, Mr. Speaker, one would have to say what's the difference of a day or two when . . . And most SGI complainants I'm sure would say the same thing. What's the difference of one or two more days versus the seven years it's taken for this government to come forward and address this problem and correct the problems that the no-fault insurance created on their behalf?

Mr. Speaker, one has to shake their head when you look at how this government operates. And you take a look at where the

government is today. I can see why the government would want to move this Bill forward. I can see why the government wants to get this piece of legislation passed.

It's not just Bill 57, Mr. Speaker. It's a fact that they want this House to close down. They want to get out of here because, Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, assisted by thousands of people in the province of Saskatchewan, have been holding this government's feet to the fire. And we want to thank the government and her ministers for every opportunity that they have afforded to the opposition and the media to criticize this government and this Premier for their inability and lack of direction that they are giving the people of Saskatchewan.

You wonder why, Mr. Speaker, we see people leaving the province. Well a good example is the type of legislation and lack of leadership that we are seeing coming from that side of the House at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

(12:45)

**Mr. Toth:** — And, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, with that lack of leadership it hasn't been very difficult for the opposition to raise these concerns, to bring forward the concerns of individuals. And I can see why this House Leader and why this Premier wants to close the House down and, Mr. Speaker, maybe they need Bill No. 57 for their bus tour.

They want to make sure that they've got all the problems with SGI addressed before . . . addressed before they get their bus on the road and have to drive on the roads across the . . . and across this province of Saskatchewan. Especially if they were to choose to drive down Highway No. 47 in the constituency of Moosomin, they better make sure they've got a good insurance plan on that bus, Mr. Speaker, and on themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, it's . . . And I hear the Minister of Finance talking about buffalo. Yes, they better be careful when they're driving down these roads because you never know what may appear in front of you and the problems that you could run into, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's . . . we need to be careful. And Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition wants to make sure that we have addressed all of the concerns. And my colleague, the member from Swift Current, the critic for CIC, responsible for SGI, has sent a number of letters out and we've had a number of responses. We . . . (inaudible) . . . have a number of groups.

The Law Society, for example, the insurance agents, insurance brokers across this province want to . . . are asking us to make sure that we address this Bill fairly, that we address each clause; that we don't allow something to slip through that they're going to have to deal with in the future that again puts the residents of this province at risk through an insurance program that they thought they were buying that would protect them in the need . . . in the event of an accident in the . . . that they may find themselves in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, no one looks forward to being in an accident. No

one asks to be in an accident. No one . . . There isn't a member in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that would want to see even a family member involved in an accident. But should they be involved in an accident, Mr. Speaker, they want and they hope and they believe that the insurance company that they're, that they're carrying their accident insurance on and risk insurance on is going to be there to protect them, not turn a cold shoulder when they seek assistance from that insurance company to address the problems that they are facing — whether they be mental, whether they be physical, whether they disrupt the lives of individuals, and take away from them their ability to continue to provide for themselves and provide for their family.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can see why this government wants to move on. We can see why this government wants to wind this session up. But, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you — I can assure you — that my colleagues and I are prepared to sit in this Legislative Assembly as long as it takes for this government to recognize that the problems they have created are theirs and theirs alone. And we want to make . . . we want to assure them and we want to assure the residents of the province of Saskatchewan that we will do whatever is necessary, with their help, to hold this government accountable for their actions.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we look at Bill No. 57, what is Bill No. 57 doing? Is Bill No. 57 actually addressing all the problems? Is Bill No. 57 going to say to the Markwarts, well they finally recognized that the problems that we have had to put up with, the delays in actually getting our lives back, trying to renew our lives, that this piece of legislation is going to correct a fault that individuals down the road will not have to go through as a result of their accidents versus where we are today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the minister states that there is some improvements to the current no-fault plan. He says improvements that, the minister states, will give an injured person the right to sue at no-fault a convicted impaired driver for pain and suffering.

He says, there's also a change, for the injured person will now have the right to sue for pain and suffering in cases where the driver is convicted of using their vehicle to deliberately injure someone.

And, Mr. Speaker, these are positive attempts. And the member from North Battleford just spoke about that a few minutes ago as well. And I know my colleague, the member from Swift Current, and the member from Rosthern, just raised those points.

Mr. Speaker, there are some positive points to this piece of legislation and we agree with them. But, Mr. Speaker, as we look through the legislation, we want to make sure that this legislation addresses all of the problems that have arisen over the past seven years.

And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, you have to ask ourselves why it has taken this government and this Premier seven years to address those problems. Mr. Speaker, I know we need to address some major concerns. We need to address the concerns that have been brought forward by individuals.



And we need to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of the day this piece of legislation corrects all of the problems that are out there so that people like the Markwarts and like Brenda Kienas from Grenfell do not have to . . . individuals down the road do not have to stall . . . face the same pitfalls and the same concerns and the same hurtles just trying to get their lives back on track as a result of an accident that they didn't ask for. They weren't looking for it. And yet, Mr. Speaker, they were hope . . . when the accident happened, they were hoping that the insurance agency that was . . . that they had looked to for protection would be there to provide for them, to protect them in the time of need.

Mr. Speaker, does this Bill do it? This Bill goes a long ways to addressing those concerns. Yes, it does. But it also . . . it's imperative that we take the time to address other problems within this piece of legislation. And the member from . . . the Government House Leader says, every day we will have the opportunity.

And I can assure the member from North Battleford that we will take every opportunity given to us to address these concerns. And whether it takes us into August, whether it takes us into September, we will use every opportunity to address those problems and to make sure that this piece of legislation, before it finally moves through this Assembly, is indeed a piece of legislation that will protect the people of Saskatchewan, that the people of Saskatchewan can look forward to.

And if they choose SGI as the vehicle of . . . And in this province, really, we don't have any other opportunity when it comes to vehicle insurance, SGI is basically the only coverer. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, it's imperative that we hold the government accountable for their actions and for the changes to this legislation to make sure that it addresses every concern that's been brought forward.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, one has to, one has to look at this legislation and when . . . I believe it's somewhere around 100 pages or so, 100 so of pages. This, Mr. Speaker, is not a piece of legislation. We've seen some pieces of legislation in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that are maybe two or three, two or three pages. And in a very simple way, they make corrections to former pieces of legislation and bring them up to date. But this, Mr. Speaker, is a piece of legislation that has some 100 pages of clauses and sections that need to be looked at very carefully.

And, Mr. Speaker, I . . . the member from Swift Current is taking his time to do that and, as his colleagues, we are just offering him every piece of support that he can to make sure that this government is held accountable for their actions. That when we get out of this Assembly today and we leave for the long weekend, Mr. Speaker, that the insurance, the insurance that we have that is covering our vehicle and that is covering each and every one of us and for everything . . . every Saskatchewan resident who will be travelling this weekend, that their insurance policy will indeed protect them should they, unfortunately — unfortunately, Mr. Speaker — find themselves involved in a mishap or a situation that forces them to call upon their insurance to protect them, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you know as members of the Legislative Assembly and cabinet ministers in the province of

Saskatchewan, at the end of the day when a person runs into a problem, runs into a problem dealing with government, who do they come to? Do they run to SGI? Do they run to their insurance agent? No. They come to us as legislators. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because at the end of the day, each and every one of us in this Assembly are responsible for the legislation . . . legislative pieces that are passed and moved through the Assembly. And we're responsible to make sure that their voice is heard.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, that's why my colleagues and I have received many letters of complaint regarding the no-fault insurance program. And the committee that has been addressing these problems, Mr. Speaker, have come forward offering many positive suggestions and ideas that could address the problems with no-fault and bring them up to speed.

And, Mr. Speaker, as we look through Bill No. 57, I'm not exactly sure that all of the problems are being addressed. And I don't know why, Mr. Speaker, an individual in the province of Saskatchewan should have to — when they go to fill out their licence — have to decide when there's . . . when they're filling out their licence, when they're applying for a licence renewal, should have to decide okay, now do I take no-fault or do I take tort? Which is going to best serve me, Mr. Speaker.

And one has to ask themselves . . . I wonder if the Minister of Finance has the ability to stand in an office and to counsel a customer and say, well I think you should take the no-fault; I think that will work for you best. Or, you know, maybe you're the type of person that maybe you should settle for the tort situation because that might serve you best down the road, should you find yourself unfortunately in an accident situation; and I'm just guessing that that might be the best avenue that is open to you, and maybe that's what you need to choose.

And those are the questions, Mr. Speaker, that the constituents of Moosomin — individuals who have been looking at this legislation, individuals who have had family members that have been impacted very significantly by the old no-fault insurance — they've been asking, asking myself, and I'm sure my colleagues have faced the same question as we look at this legislation. Is Bill No. 57 going to actually correct the problems that no-fault has done through the years? Is Bill No. 57 going to address those concerns and actually make sure that I don't face the same problems that a family member of mine has had to go through the past seven years, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, it's imperative that we correct those problems today and that we don't look . . . have to look at, a year or two down the road, and find that Bill No. 57 didn't go far enough and address all of the concerns, and then we're back in this Assembly changing the legislation again because we failed to address all those concerns, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, that's why my colleagues and I feel so strongly about this. That's why, Mr. Speaker, we feel that it's time to debate it and no government is going to tell us that, you're going to pass this in a day or two because we're going to criticize you for addressing that problem of the vehicle insurance premiums that could be addressed . . .

credit on premiums, Mr. Speaker.

The Assembly adjourned at 13:00.

Mr. Speaker, this Premier needs to take responsibility for his actions and the actions of his government. And my colleagues and the member from Rosetown-Biggar, the Leader of the Opposition, and the members on this side of the House are going to hold this Premier, his feet to the fire over the actions or the inaction that we have seen as a result of his failure to give leadership in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I — and I think you've sensed that over the time of this debate — have spoken very passionately because people have come to us with very difficult circumstances.

In fact I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, other members have felt the same thing. They've had people come to us in tears because of the pain and the suffering that has been afflicted upon them, upon their families, upon their lives, as a result of a cold and callous government that hasn't given any real leadership in the province of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — And it's time, Mr. Speaker, it's time, Mr. Speaker, if what it takes to cause this government to call an election and to allow a political party that has a vision to grow the province, if what it takes is to hold up this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, for this Premier to call an election and give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to have a voice, then, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to do that today.

We're prepared to stand in this Assembly and debate this piece of legislation, calling on this Premier to call an election and allow the people of Saskatchewan to finally look at the options as they're asking people to do in regards to the tort and the no-fault, ask us . . . give the people of Saskatchewan the same opportunity to look at the options and say, I think I'm going to choose the Saskatchewan Party this time round.

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

**Mr. Toth:** — I think they've got a plan to grow this province of Saskatchewan. I think the Saskatchewan Party has a vision as to how we can deal with the no-fault problem, Mr. Speaker. And I believe they seem to be a party that has a heart, that appears to have a heart; that certainly shows they have a heart and have the conscience of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

(13:00)

**The Speaker:** — Order.

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

**The Speaker:** — Order please, members. It now being past the time set for adjournment, first I would like to wish all members of the Assembly a pleasant Canada Day weekend at home with their family and friends, and secondly declare that this House stands adjourned until Tuesday, July 2 at . . . to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.