

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY



NINTH REPORT

**Enquiry, pursuant to Rule 146(2), regarding the
State of Internal Trade in Saskatchewan**

**3rd SESSION of the 25th LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**



June 28, 2007

To the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

HONOURABLE MEMBERS:

Your Standing Committee on the Economy has the honour to present, pursuant to Rule 146(2), its report on the consultations undertaken by your committee regarding on the state of internal trade in Saskatchewan.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Doreen S. Hamilton".

Doreen Hamilton, Chair
Standing Committee on the Economy


STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMY


STATE OF INTERNAL TRADE HEARINGS


Chair:  Doreen Hamilton, MLA
Regina Wascana Plains


**Deputy
Chair:**  Randy Weekes, MLA
Biggar

Committee Members:

 Michael Chisholm, MLA
Cut Knife-Turtleford
(for Delbert Kirsch)

 Andy Iwanchuk, MLA
Saskatoon Fairview
(for Eldon Lautermilch)


 Lyle Stewart, MLA
Thunder Creek


 Joanne Crofford, MLA
Regina Rosemont
(for Hon. Deb Higgins)

 Delbert Kirsch, MLA
Batoche

 Kevin Yates, MLA
Regina Dewdney

Permanent members of the committee not participating:

 Hon. Deb Higgins, MLA
Moose Jaw Wakamow

 Eldon Lautermilch, MLA
Prince Albert Northcote

Other participating Members:

Ken Cheveldayoff, MLA Saskatoon Silver Springs
Glen Hart, MLA Last Mountain-Touchwood
Judy Junor, MLA Saskatoon Eastview

Dustin Duncan, MLA Weyburn-Big Muddy
Nancy Heppner, MLA Martensville

Committee Support:

Viktor Kaczkowski, Committee Clerk
Cheryl Behrns, Assistant Production Manager,
Hansard
Sue James, Hansard Technician
Sandra Gardner, Supervisor, Assembly Services
Zorka Ripplinger, Clerk's Office Assistant
Joelle Perras, Journals Clerk

Michel Carpentier, Research Officer
Kerry Bond, Senior Broadcast Electronics
Technician
Ihor Sywanyk, Senior Broadcast Electronics
Technician
Jeremy Phillips, Systems Administrator
Holly Schafer, Network Analyst

Table of Contents

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. METHOD OF OPERATION.....	3
3. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY	4

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Witnesses who Appeared before the Committee	17
Appendix 2: Documents Received by the Committee	21

1. INTRODUCTION

The Saskatchewan economy is highly dependent on trade both internationally and internally (i.e. inter-provincially). According to Saskatchewan's latest Provincial Economic Accounts, in 2006 the province's real (inflation-adjusted) international trade (exports plus imports) totaled \$25.8 billion, while its real internal trade was marginally lower at \$23.5 billion. As such, internal trade is now the equivalent of 68% (28% exports; 40% imports) of Saskatchewan's entire real Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Since the implementation of the Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT) in 1995, the value of Saskatchewan's real domestic exports has grown at over twice the average rate of our real GDP, which in itself has been well above the national average in recent years. Saskatchewan's key internal trade partners in terms of exports are: Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, British Columbia and Quebec. In terms of imports they are: Alberta, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, and Quebec. In 2005, Saskatchewan was, in fact, second only to New Brunswick, as the most export-oriented province in Canada and is the second most 'open' province to internal trade in Canada.

In light of the significance of internal trade to Saskatchewan's economy and the recent signing of the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA) between Alberta and British Columbia in April, 2006, the Minister of Government Relations, the Honourable Harry Van Mulligen, pursuant to Rule 146(2), requested that the Standing Committee on the Economy enquire into the state of internal trade in Saskatchewan.

The Minister indicated that the government was interested in receiving answers to the following two questions in the committee's report:

- a) **What specific impediments to internal trade, including interprovincial investment and labour mobility, are problematic for provincial interests; and**
- b) **What practical solutions and/or intergovernmental mechanisms have been identified as best suited to addressing trade impediments?**

The Minister further stated that he believed it was in the provincial and national interests to find an integrated national solution to removing internal trade barriers.

At its meeting of May 1, 2007, the committee agreed to undertake such an enquiry.

On the committee's first day of hearings on June 4, 2007, Minister Van Mulligen provided the committee with some historical context on the trade issue. The Minister informed the committee that the issue of interprovincial trade has been a challenge for federal and provincial governments to manage since Confederation.

The Minister stated that provinces have had an increasingly important role in managing Canada's economic union. With the hope of better facilitating inter-provincial trade, the AIT was successfully negotiated and signed in 1994 and came into full effect in mid-1995. As the Minister noted, the AIT was a public recognition by all first ministers that they are collectively responsible for the health and welfare of Canada's common market. The AIT was also an example of how the two orders of government in Canada have attempted to deliver to Canadians the economic benefits of belonging to a common market, while also preserving Canada's democratic and legislative authorities.

The AIT, while a very important and useful agreement, was seen to suffer from various procedural and structural deficiencies. In order to address those, the premiers' Council of the Federation adopted an ambitious 17-point internal trade work plan to address these deficiencies in 2004. The federal government has subsequently agreed to this plan, which has since been narrowed to a six-point agenda of priorities including labour mobility, energy, agri-food goods, regulations and standards, business subsidies and dispute settlement. Coincidentally, the deadline for the AIT review of the labour mobility provisions dovetails with the deadline for a review of the same issues under the TILMA, April, 2009.

Alberta and British Columbia have since created the TILMA with the goal to remove barriers to trade, investment and labour mobility between the two provinces. It was signed with the intention of establishing the second largest economic area in the country. The agreement was negotiated pursuant to Article 1800 of the AIT which allows parties to enter into bilateral enhanced trade agreements and other arrangements, provided the arrangements are open to other parties within a reasonable time frame. However, the agreement was established and announced as the sole option for consideration by the internal trade ministers' of all provinces.

Minister Van Mulligen, in describing the TILMA, stated that it "can plausibly be viewed as a proposed replacement rather than an incremental reform of a national agreement". The Minister also argued that the TILMA could be considered incompatible with the AIT. The TILMA has been described as a top-down or full-box approach, meaning that all sectors of the economy are covered by its rules and provisions unless governments decide to negotiate and include explicit exemptions. The AIT has been described as a bottom-up or empty-box approach, whereby only those matters that governments agree to put in the AIT box are affected by its rules. The TILMA also provides for legally enforceable dispute resolution procedures, including an enforcement process that allows the assessment of monetary awards against offending governments.

Ms. Kathleen Macmillan of International Trade Policy Consultants Inc. provided the committee with an overview of her most recent work on the state of internal trade in Canada. Her presentation examined the significance of the problem of interprovincial trade, investment and labour mobility barriers, the accomplishments made under the AIT, the commonly cited weaknesses of the AIT, and an overview of the TILMA. She also provided options for improving internal trade.

Some of the most commonly cited barriers that Ms. Macmillan outlined for the committee included government local procurement practices, overlapping or incompatible technical standards and regulations, and securities regulation.

The Department of Government Relations also provided the committee with an overview of internal trade and its contribution to Saskatchewan's economy, the highlights of which were noted in the opening paragraphs of this introduction.

2. METHOD OF OPERATION

Minister Van Mulligen's request that the committee undertake an enquiry into the state of internal trade forms the basis for the committee's Order of Reference. In his letter of April 25, 2007, he specifically asked that:

“the [committee] invite the public and pertinent stakeholders to submit and deliver presentations concerning the state of internal trade in Saskatchewan, including trade/investment/labour mobility barriers and the impacts or potential impacts of the Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT) and the Trade, Investment, and Labour Mobility Agreement”.

Furthermore, he requested that the committee submit its report to the Legislative Assembly no later than June 29, 2007.

As noted previously, at the commencement of its hearings the committee received a briefing from the Minister of Government Relations, officials from his department, and from internal trade expert Kathleen Macmillan.

From June 5 to 8, 2007 in Regina, and from June 11 to 14, 2007 in Saskatoon, the committee conducted hearings for the purpose of receiving testimony from interested parties. The witnesses who testified before the committee expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to present their thoughts and concerns regarding this very important issue.

Despite the fairly broad mandate of the committee, the bulk of the testimony that was received by the committee focused on the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA) between British Columbia and Alberta. Many witnesses commented that neither the Alberta nor the British Columbia governments engaged the public in a similar process. While consultations with some stakeholders were undertaken by these two jurisdictions, neither charged a legislative committee with undertaking an in-depth examination of the TILMA. Witnesses thanked the committee for engaging in these public consultations.

Over the course of nine days of hearings, 81 representatives from 47 organizations, institutions, and associations, as well nine private citizens appeared before the committee. This resulted in 350 pages of Hansard verbatim transcripts. These transcripts may be accessed through the committee's website at: <http://www.legassembly.sk.ca/committees/Economy/economy.htm>. A full list of witnesses who appeared is provided in Appendix 1 of this report.

In addition, the committee received a total of 91 written submissions, 61 from those who appeared before the committee and another 30 from those who chose to submit their comments in writing only. A list of all the written submissions is provided in Appendix 2 of this report.

3. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

Over the course of the public hearings, witnesses who appeared before the committee were asked to assist the committee in determining what the real barriers were to trade, investment and labour mobility in the province, as well as what possible solutions existed in order to address those barriers. Responses to these two areas of enquiry are outlined in the next two sections.

A) What specific impediments to internal trade, including inter-provincial investment and labour mobility, are problematic for provincial interests?

Although a number of barriers to trade were identified by the witnesses, the actual impact or damage to internal trade was much more difficult to identify. One possible reason for this might result from perceptions of what the term “trade barrier” means. Many people associate tariffs or other deliberately protectionist policies as barriers to trade. Within Canada, such trade barriers are not permitted, therefore “trade barriers” within the context of AIT or TILMA were described perhaps more appropriately by many as “trade impediments”, “trade irritants” or “trade deterrents”. In many cases these types of barriers were never intended to be deliberate. Instead, the unintended consequences resulted from individual jurisdictions having passed numerous standards and regulations that, although addressing issues similar to those of other jurisdictions, were quite different in their wording.

The result was that businesses engaging in internal trade were often in the position of complying with multiple sets of similar, but not identical, standards or regulations in order to conduct their operations. Those who raised this issue found this to be time-consuming and costly, and ultimately a deterrent from conducting inter-provincial commerce.

Other types of barriers included preferential procurement practices. Such practices have the effect of excluding businesses wanting to participate and also bring about a number of protectionist policies specific to certain sectors. This includes policies affecting agriculture such as those relating to the sale of margarine in the Province of Quebec and those that restrict the distribution of alcoholic beverages to government-controlled outlets.

Overall, there are few restrictions on flows of capital within Canada; nevertheless, two main barriers to investment were identified. One was the lack of a single securities regulator. Currently, financial services companies have to deal with 13 different regulatory bodies if they want to conduct investment-related business across the country. Also, specific procurement policies on the part of various levels of government and limitations on the sale of land to out-of-province investors in some provinces were cited as factors that may inhibit investment.

The mobility of labour is, in fact, a Charter right. Nevertheless, barriers to labour mobility do exist. Such barriers consist primarily of differences in the standards prescribed by trade and professional regulatory bodies of different jurisdictions. Obstacles to mobility result from the fact that recertification or additional training may be required for anyone wishing to move from one jurisdiction to another.

In her summary, Kathleen Macmillan cited that the overall cost to the economy by these types of barriers to trade, investment, and labour mobility account for less than 0.5% of national GDP. Nevertheless, according to the Canadian Federation of Independent Business (CFIB), the total cost of regulation to Saskatchewan businesses is approximately \$876 million.

Specific examples of barriers to trade, investment, and labour mobility and the impact of such barriers that were cited by witnesses are documented in the following three sections.

Barriers to trade and the impact thereon:

Agriculture

- A rancher who moves his cattle back and forth across pasture land that spanned the Saskatchewan-Alberta border is charged by both provincial governments for brand inspections. In Saskatchewan the rate is \$1.65 per head, while the Alberta rate is \$0.50. This amounts to thousands of dollars in fees annually.
- Farmers using “purple diesel” on the Alberta side of the border are required to switch fuels as they enter Saskatchewan.
- Meat slaughtered in a provincially inspected plant may not cross provincial borders. Only federally inspected meat is eligible to move to another province.

Transportation

- Currently, commercial trucks must be re-registered for temporary travel in Alberta and British Columbia. Also, differing load regulations have meant that, for example, loads of hay had to be restacked at the border in order to comply with differing regulations.
- Serious regulatory differences exist within the transportation industry, and a reduction in licensing requirements is necessary. Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and IPSCO Saskatchewan Inc. were identified as examples of companies that were affected by differing transportation regulations. The costs resulting from complying with these regulations reduce their ability to compete, something that could be alleviated if these different regulatory regimes were harmonized.
- Doepker Industries specifically stated that given the differences in regulations between Saskatchewan and Alberta regarding tri-drive tractor units and trailer lift axles, the time and dollars have to be spent to design the same equipment twice. Furthermore, “this does not follow the lean manufacturing program that we use in our company and that is being encouraged within Saskatchewan”.
- A lack of coordination in ethanol standards across provinces has created a barrier to trade that is hindering the emergence of large-scale ethanol productions within Saskatchewan.

Business

- Currently, many businesses are required to be registered separately in each province in which they operate. As a result, this duplication of registration and licensing requirements increases the cost of doing business and is passed down to farmers and other consumers.
- There are ten provinces and ten different sets of regulations for businesses to apply for status or open up offices.

Barriers to investment and the impact thereon:

Financial Services

- Existing differences in credit union legislation between the three western provinces has limited the ability of credit unions to grow.

Barriers to labour mobility and the impact thereon:

- Alberta and British Columbia initially identified 60 occupations to which differing provincial standards apply, thus having the effect of limiting labour mobility. This list has now grown to include 247 occupations.
- Differing licensing standards across two provinces for tradespersons in Lloydminster was one specific example that was cited. Since both provinces require paramedics, for example, to pay registration fees, those paramedics wishing to work in both jurisdictions have to pay similar fees twice.
- Differing standards and regulations regarding the recognition of occupational credentials exist between the provinces and therefore impede the mobility of labour.

B) What practical solutions and/or intergovernmental mechanisms, including the Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT) and the Trade, Investment, and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA), have been identified as best suited to addressing trade impediments, and what are their impacts or potential impacts?

Although many potential solutions to barriers limiting internal trade, investment, and labour mobility were provided to committee members, either directly or through questioning by committee members, the impact or perceived impact of Saskatchewan signing onto the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility (TILMA) was overwhelmingly the focus of their commentary.

From the first day of hearings, two sides to the TILMA issue quickly emerged. Proponents and opponents of the agreement gave thoughts and concerns for why Saskatchewan should or should not sign onto the TILMA. Over the course of the hearings, the majority of witnesses stated that they were opposed to Saskatchewan signing onto the TILMA. A number of witnesses who were less definitive in their support or opposition to the TILMA nevertheless argued that Saskatchewan should at least be at the table in the negotiations with Alberta and British Columbia. Many indicated or even demanded that further consultations with key provincial stakeholders be undertaken before any negotiations surrounding the TILMA were undertaken.

The AIT has been in effect for over a decade. Some characterized this agreement as being ineffective and inordinately slow in reaching consensus between provinces relating to certain economic sectors. There were concerns regarding the dispute resolution mechanism, which was viewed as inadequate, particularly in the area of enforcement. Despite its limitations, many viewed the AIT as adequate and agreed that work needed to be continued to improve those elements of the agreement that have proven to be ineffective or unworkable. When asked, the majority of witnesses agreed that a pan-Canadian approach to resolving issues of internal trade be the preferred one. Furthermore, they favoured continuing to work within the AIT framework, particularly if the dispute resolution mechanism could be strengthened.

The committee has noted that the AIT and the TILMA are but two potential vehicles for resolving some of these issues. The committee is aware of other existing programs such as BizPal, SmartRegs, and Service Canada, which are making some progress in at least mitigating the impact of some of the barriers.

It should be noted that virtually all those appearing before the committee stated that they were not opposed to measures that would improve the economic well-being of Saskatchewan and greater opportunities for labour and investment. Many were of the belief that the reduction and mutual recognition of regulations and standards, and not necessarily their harmonization, would be beneficial to the province.

Commentary offered to the committee specifically addressing the TILMA:

1) Those supportive of the TILMA:

Witnesses in favour of Saskatchewan signing onto the TILMA cited many reasons for doing so. Some witnesses offered general reasons and some addressed the specific areas of trade, investment, and labour mobility. The arguments for signing onto the TILMA are presented according to four categories: general, trade, investment, and labour mobility.

General:

- It was felt that the TILMA will create a level playing field for businesses and permit them to fairly compete with companies in other provinces.
- Some argued that the TILMA will allow Saskatchewan companies to operate more efficiently in the other provinces, just as Alberta and British Columbia companies will be permitted to operate more efficiently in Saskatchewan.
- It was felt that it will be essential for Saskatchewan to be at the negotiating table in order to ensure that the best interests of Saskatchewan will be protected.
- There was a concern that Saskatchewan should sign on to the agreement to ensure that it can remain competitive in the western economy
- By not joining onto the TILMA, given its geographic location relative to Alberta and British Columbia, there was an apprehension that Saskatchewan might find itself unnecessarily isolated. The isolation of Saskatchewan from its nearby neighbours would not help our children, our Aboriginal citizens, new Canadians, or businesses in this province for the next century. Nor would isolation increase our province's level of influence.
- Some argued that the Conference Board of Canada (CBoC) and Dr. Eric Howe's assessment of the potential economic benefits that the TILMA could provide for Saskatchewan are reason enough to sign onto the agreement. Furthermore, some witnesses agreed with Dr. Howe's assessment that the CBoC's estimates of increased GDP growth and increased job creation are perhaps *underestimated*.

- Some highlighted the potential risks of not signing on, including further isolating our province, more of our children being attracted elsewhere, losing the current momentum of the Saskatchewan economy, and portraying a lack of confidence in ourselves.

Trade:

- It was felt that current barriers to trade (i.e. excess regulations, duplicate licensing requirements, and differences in transportation regulations) can be most effectively addressed through the provisions of the TILMA.
- Some believed that TILMA will remove multiple registration requirements, i.e. “the paper burden”.
- It was argued that the TILMA would eliminate subsidies to specific businesses, thereby allowing all business to compete in a fair and equitable manner. The Chambers of Commerce, in particular, favoured an end to any type of subsidy that, in essence, resulted in the “cherry-picking” of specific businesses by government bodies.
- Some felt that more government procurement opportunities would be available to Saskatchewan businesses.
- Businesses would be able to operate in other provinces included in the agreement without having to reside in the province.
- It was argued that market and industry benefits could be realized by facilitating communications in efforts to share information, to harmonize policies on the regulations and inspection, and to allow for freer movement of agricultural products and livestock across the provincial borders of Alberta and British Columbia.
- Some reasoned that the elimination of trade impediments would also lead to greater market access that would not only stimulate business establishment in agriculture but also create spill-over effects for other industries such as food manufacturing and transportation.
- It was felt that TILMA could offer a mechanism to address the many existing crop insurance inequities between the western provinces.
- Also, under the TILMA, commercial trucks would no longer have to re-register for temporary travel in Alberta and British Columbia
- If provincial meat inspection regulations were harmonized, additional markets would be available for many of the province’s smaller abattoirs and processors.

Investment:

- From the financial services perspective, credit unions welcome the opportunity for harmonized federal and provincial regulation that would provide for a competitive business environment on a national scale. Constructive harmonization could lead to business opportunity in a stronger economic region providing for increased market diversification and access to greater opportunity for scale economies.

- Currently, 53% of Saskatchewan citizens belong to a credit union. It was argued that credit unions potentially could have an even more significant role to play with a reduction in investment barriers. Credit unions in Saskatchewan account for 25% of the outstanding loans in small and medium-sized business sector, hold 29% of the mortgage market, and 27.5 % of outstanding farm debt.
- It was felt that TILMA could remove duplicate registration, permitting and reporting requirements, eliminate residency requirements, make transportation easier, and extinguish unfair subsidies. For example, a business would be able to operate in both provinces without the added cost of establishing another office.
- It was reasoned that standardized regulation would, in turn, lead to reduced costs for producers, and therefore encourage business investment growth in the province.
- Some, including the Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce, indicated that “inaction [i.e. by Saskatchewan not signing on] really only isolates our province from opportunities. This agreement presents and exposes us to the risk of not signing as the rest of our region captures these opportunities, attracts the resulting investment, and uses our children as the workers they need”.
- As was pointed out by Kathleen Macmillan, the actual barriers to trade have less of an impact than do the perceived barriers to trade by international investors. By joining the TILMA, the perception of an effort to reduce trade impediments would therefore attract greater investment in Saskatchewan.

Labour mobility:

- It was felt that TILMA could help to address the number one issue in the business community today – the labour shortage, particularly regarding skilled workers.
- Some argued that workers would be afforded far more mobility under TILMA. Certification in one jurisdiction for regulated occupations would eventually become certified in all provinces that are part of the agreement. The agreement could reduce time and costs associated with licenses so that workers could be fully mobile.
- There was a belief that enhanced labour mobility would position Saskatchewan business even more favorably to take advantage of the current trends that show more people are moving back from Alberta.
- It was felt that full credential recognition and reduced licensing requirements are needed to assist the freer movement of workers. Some professional groups, including the Engineers and Geoscientists and the Land Surveyors’ Association, support the objectives of the TILMA even though their standards differ between provinces.

Groups who supported Saskatchewan signing onto the TILMA included:

Agricultural Producers Association of Saskatchewan; Canada West Foundation; Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses; Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association; Credit Union Central of Saskatchewan (SaskCentral); Association of Engineers and Geoscientists in Saskatchewan; Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce; Lloydminster Chamber of Commerce; Robert H. McKercher; North

Saskatoon Business Association; Regina Chamber of Commerce; Saskatchewan Business Council, Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, Saskatchewan Construction Association, Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association.

2) Those opposed to the TILMA:

Witnesses against Saskatchewan signing onto the TILMA cited many reasons for their position. Some witnesses offered general reasons, including the implementation and enforcement provisions of the TILMA, the view that signing on to the TILMA would limit the ability of elected provincial and municipal bodies to perform their duties, and the belief that the TILMA posed a threat to public policy initiatives relating to health care, social services, and health care. Other arguments focused on the specific areas of trade, investment, and labour mobility. The arguments against signing onto the TILMA are again presented according to four categories: general, trade, investment, and labour mobility.

General:

- Some felt that there are really next to no barriers to trade, investment, and labour mobility; the problem is being overly exaggerated by proponents of the TILMA.
- The reports of Conference Board of Canada and the analysis of it by Dr. Eric Howe of the University of Saskatchewan, which projected that once all net benefits from joining the trade agreement are realized, Saskatchewan has the potential to add \$291 million or (0.92%) to its real GDP. These projections were challenged as being overly optimistic by Dr. John Helliwell of the University of British Columbia and consultant Patrick Grady, but also by Erin Weir of the Canadian Labour Congress and Steven Shrybman who has studied the TILMA on behalf of the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the Ontario Federation of Labour.
- It was felt that the few barriers that might exist are minor in nature and do not require such a far-reaching agreement such as the TILMA to resolve them. They can and already are being resolved by current efforts to address the minor barriers that exist.
- The harmonization or reconciliation of regulatory differences between the parties was a major concern expressed by many witnesses. The concern was that due to challenges, this would result in the lowest possible standard or regulation being adopted by the parties, effectively, a “race to the bottom”. This was especially a concern to groups who argued that lower occupational health and safety regulations, for example, would be detrimental.
- Concerns were raised about the composition of the trade dispute panels, in that the appointees would be unaccountable for their decisions, Saskatchewan’s appointees would be outnumbered by the Alberta and British Columbia appointees, and that there was no appeal process.
- Some believed the use of unelected trade panels would constrain the democratic authority and ability of governments, at all levels, to make policy decisions. It was felt that through the rulings of the trade dispute panel, against governments that were seen to be restricting trade, public policy making would effectively be handed over to corporations and individuals who challenge government policies, legislation and regulation. The TILMA would, in essence, threaten the democratic process.

- Several witnesses also expressed their concern about the effect that the TILMA would have on municipal governments, academic institutions, school boards and health care (i.e. the MASH sector). These levels of government would be severely constrained by the dispute resolution mechanism and would be severely hampered if found in violation.
- The inability of municipalities to defend themselves in front of the dispute panels was also a concern.
- There was also an apprehension about the potential of parties being fined up to \$5 million, which would be beyond all governments' ability to afford the potential fines. It was felt that parties would simply avoid implementing certain policies if they were concerned about the potential challenges from individuals or corporations.
- A concern was raised regarding the fact that TILMA does not limit the number of complaints that can be brought forward or the number of concurrent complaints that can be pursued by individuals or corporations against governments who are perceived to be in violation of the TILMA.
- It was argued that, unlike the AIT, which contains a mechanism or a screening process that prevent complaints which are frivolous or vexatious or intended to harass, the TILMA contains no such provisions. Continuous and multiple challenges to government legislation, regulations and general policies would therefore result.
- The TILMA was argued to be not about trade or labour mobility at all. Instead, the TILMA is perceived to be a "corporate bill of rights" that will permit corporations to sue governments or invest in any or all areas of the Saskatchewan economy.
- It was argued that it is imperative that legislative harmonization move toward national standards and not the lowest common denominator, which is what is feared would happen by signing on to the TILMA. Saskatchewan's existing high standards in the areas of *The Trade Union Act*, *The Occupational Health and Safety Act*, and *The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code*, could therefore be threatened.
- Fears were expressed that the exemptions in the agreement were only temporary. With the yearly review mechanism, they would be reduced in scope and thus a considerable threat to public policy could result, particularly in areas of public health. The consequence would be that health care and other government services would be forced to privatize.
- It was felt that the TILMA would have a negative effect on existing post-secondary institutions in the province, in that credentials of private educational institutions would not meet the high standards established by Saskatchewan post-secondary education institutions, yet they would be equally recognized.
- There was a concern that the quality of education as well as the provincial government's authority in the area of education would be adversely affected. Fostering the standardization of services across jurisdictions and glossing over the significant differences that have developed over time, even if for very sound public policy reasons, would put the quality of education at risk.

- Regarding the environment, it was argued that governments would be constrained from making ecologically sound policies in regard to soil and water degradation, pest control, the use of pesticides, or restrictions on the use of genetically modified organisms. Saskatchewan might also be required to reconcile its environmental policies with other signatories.

Trade:

- Witnesses opposed to the TILMA were also concerned that local procurement policies that give preferences to local businesses and current tax abatement policies would be challenged and disallowed under the TILMA.
- It was felt that existing procurement policies which favour or support regional economic development goals (such as developing northern Saskatchewan) or which favour independent local businesses could be open to challenge.
- Concerns were raised that challenges to local procurement policies could result in the lowering of standards and specifications for goods and services.
- According to the Consulting Engineers of Saskatchewan, the TILMA appears to promote lowest-price bidding for professional services. They went on to state that procurement choices based solely on the lowest fee does not always result in the most cost efficient overall solution, nor does it guarantee a satisfactory performance.

Investment:

- It was argued that all government programs or regulations that could be viewed under the TILMA as a restriction on private investment would be threatened.
- With regard to Crown corporations, the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives stated that the TILMA could effectively preclude the expansion of existing non-monopoly Crown corporations, effectively preclude the creation of new non-monopoly Crown corporations, constrain the activities of monopoly Crown corporations, and expose Saskatchewan to binding disputes brought by private individuals and corporations against the activities of its Crown corporations.

Labour mobility:

- Many witnesses argued that labour mobility issues are already being effectively addressed by the AIT, occupational regulatory bodies, and through such programs such as Red Seal. It was recently announced that by April 2009 under the AIT, there is to be full regulatory convergence between professional regulatory bodies.
- Professional regulatory bodies fear a loss of revenue due to the reduced licensing and membership fees that would result from a professional having to belong to only one professional body in order to practice in any of the signatory provinces.
- Some, including the Chartered Accountants of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, felt that the TILMA would have a detrimental effect on the existing processes to recognize and, if necessary, reconcile occupational qualifications or standards between jurisdictions.

- It was argued that under the AIT, professional standards are required to be “reconciled upwards”, whereas under the TILMA, a “race to the bottom” with regard to standard would be the result. Furthermore, it was believed by the Chartered Accountants of Saskatchewan that “high occupational standards are less a barrier to mobility than they are a requirement for mobility”.
- Regarding nurses in particular, existing licensing bodies felt best suited to determine the qualifications and entrance standards for their own membership in accordance with the authority vested in them via legislation. The Saskatchewan Union of Nurses was unaware of any problems with regards to the internal labour mobility of nurses between provinces in Canada.
- The Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association expressed its concern that the British Columbia Veterinary Medical Association was in gridlock over a number of legal challenges, and that the Alberta veterinary legislation is vastly different from Saskatchewan’s. As a result, the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association recommended the current nationwide uniformity of veterinary licensure remain as is.
- The Conference Board of Canada report raises the specter of “short-term increased provincial out-migration”, i.e. a loss of labour, as a result of signing on to the TILMA.

Groups who opposed Saskatchewan signing onto the TILMA included:

Ad Hoc Trade Committee – Saskatchewan Federation of Labour; Bill Adamson; Roy Atkinson; The Beyond Factory Farming Coalition; Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives; Canadian Labour Congress – National Office; Canadian Labour Congress (Prairie Region); Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Saskatchewan; Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), Locals #7 and #21; Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), Local 974; Coalition for a Citizen-Friendly Regina & the Saskatchewan Health Coalition; Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union (CEP), National Division; Council of Canadians (Moose Jaw Chapter); Dean Coppock; Marilyn Gillis; Paule Hjertaas; Dale Holmberg; Stan Hovedebo; Elaine Hughes; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), Local 2067; Don Kossick; Joe Kuchta; Steve Lawrence; Isabel Muzichuk; National Farmers’ Union; Joyce Neufeld; Wes Norheim; David Orchard; Public Service Alliance of Canada (Prairie Region); Regina and District Labour Council; Regina Community Clinic; Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union; Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations; The Saskatchewan Environmental Society; Saskatchewan Federation of Labour; Saskatchewan Federation of Union Retirees; Saskatchewan Government Employees Union (SGEU); Saskatchewan Government Employees Union (SGEU), Provincial Anti-Privatization Standing Committee; Saskatchewan Government Employees Union, Local 6080; Saskatchewan Provincial Building and Construction Trades Council; Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association; Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism; Saskatchewan Teachers Federation; Saskatchewan Union of Nurses; Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association; Saskatoon and District Labour Council & the Humboldt and District Labour Council; Saskatoon Food Coalition; Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Locals #299, #336, and #333; Dr. A. Gerhard Scholten; Jessica Sinclair, Hillary Aitken, and Kathleen Wilson; Town of Leader; Jammie Townsend; United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1400; United Steelworkers District 3; University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association; B.L. Wagner.

Additional points:

A number of witnesses did not necessarily offer a definitive opinion on whether or not Saskatchewan should sign on to the TILMA. Instead they either indicated that there were just too many unanswered questions about the TILMA to offer an opinion or else they chose to raise specific concerns about how TILMA may or may not affect their own interests.

With respect to unanswered questions, they generally fell into two areas. One was the unknowns surrounding the interpretation of the existing articles of the TILMA by the dispute resolution panel. Questions were raised both about the composition and operations of the dispute resolution panel and also how this panel would, through its ruling interpret specific provisions of the TILMA.

Secondly, there are numerous unanswered questions related to the outcome of the negotiations undertaken during the two-year transition period (April 1, 2007 to April 1, 2009). During this time, an opportunity is provided for the two signatories to undertake further consultations and negotiate any required special provisions. These transitional measures include the areas of investment, business subsidies, labour mobility, procurements, transportation, financial institutions, Crown corporations, agriculture, energy, labour mobility, financial services, government-owned commercial enterprises, municipalities, municipal organizations, school boards, and publicly-funded academic health and social service entities (MASH sector). Until this work is completed, it is difficult to know what the ultimate potential impact of the TILMA will be on these areas.

A recurring criticism of the implementation process for the TILMA in Alberta and British Columbia was that although there was some consultation with stakeholders, there was no legislative consultation with the public at large, nor was there very little debate in their respective legislatures.

In response, some witnesses, the City of Regina in particular, specifically recommended that comprehensive consultations with municipalities should be undertaken and that, as such, a working group be established to properly consult with municipalities. The Saskatchewan city mayors and managers have undertaken to proceed with an in-depth study of TILMA. The study will identify known impacts on city jurisdictions, obtain feedback from key stakeholders, and formulate a paper addressing city jurisdictional issues that could be discussed and resolved at the city level.

With regard to the implications of the TILMA, the following organizations expressed an interest in more extensive studies being undertaken: the City of North Battleford, City of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan Applied Science and Technologists and Technicians, and Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association.

Both the Regina Qu'Appelle Health Region and the Saskatchewan School Boards Association indicated that they, given the committee's deadlines, did not have enough time to analyze the trade issue sufficiently enough to offer the committee an opinion.

The committee, having agreed to the request of the Minister of Government Relations to undertake this enquiry, is satisfied that this report accurately reflects the testimony that was received by the committee.

The committee wishes to extend its appreciation to all those who made oral presentations and submitted written briefs. The information presented and the opinions expressed were fundamental to the committee's understanding of both the realities and, just as importantly, the perceptions of the state of internal trade in Saskatchewan as well as the impact of the AIT and the potential impact of the TILMA on the province of Saskatchewan.

APPENDIX 1: WITNESSES WHO APPEARED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

Ad Hoc Trade Committee – Saskatchewan Federation of Labour

Gary Schoenfeldt

Agricultural Producers Association of Saskatchewan

Ken McBride, President

Roy Atkinson

The Beyond Factory Farming Coalition

Cathy Holtslander, Community Organizer

Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives

Lynn Gidluck, Director

Jim Grieshaber-Otto, Research Associate

Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses

Marilyn Braun-Pollon, Vice-President

Canadian Labour Congress – National Office

Erin Weir, Economist

Canadian Labour Congress – Prairie Region

David Winter, Regional Director

Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) - Saskatchewan Division

Tom Graham, President

Steven Shrybman, Attorney, Sack, Goldblatt, Mitchell

Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), Locals #7 & #21 (City Hall Administrative Staff & Regina City Outside Workers)

Tim Anderson, President, Local #21

Marvin Meickel, President, Local #7

Tracy Gramchuk, Recording Secretary Local #7

Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), Local #974 (Saskatoon and Westside Community Clinics)

Carla Smith, President

Jacquie Griffiths, Union Representative

City of Regina

Pat Fiacco, Mayor

Neil Robertson, Q.C., City Solicitor

Jana-Marie Odling, Barrister and Solicitor

Coalition for a Citizen Friendly Regina & the Saskatchewan Health Coalition

Jim Holmes, President

John Murray, Director

Appendix 1: Witnesses (continued)...

Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union (CEP) – National Division

Gordon Hunter, National Representative

Council of Canadians – Moose Jaw Chapter

Don Mitchell, Council Member

Dale Holmberg, Council Member

Credit Union Central of Saskatchewan (SaskCentral)

Sid Bildfell, Chief Executive Officer

Gordon Lightfoot, President, Board of Directors

Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce

Kent Smith-Windsor, Executive Director

Stan Hovdebo

Elaine Hughes

**International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local #2067
(Powerline Technicians, SaskPower)**

Ron Hitchcock, Assistant Business Manager

Garth Ormiston, Assistant Business Manager

Lloydminster Chamber of Commerce

Robert Lundquist, Vice-President

Pat Tinney, Executive Director

Isabel Muzichuk

Wes Norheim

North Saskatoon Business Association

Shirley Ryan, Executive Director

Kevin Smith, Committee Member

David Orchard

Public Service Alliance of Canada – Prairie Region

Marianne Hladun

Regina and District Labour Council

Terry Zahorski, President

Regina Chamber of Commerce

John Hopkins, Chief Executive Officer

Fred Titanich, First Vice-President

Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union

Larry Kowalchuk, Legal Counsel

Appendix 1: Witnesses (continued)...

Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations

Alex Taylor, Chair

Susan Antosh, Chief Executive Officer

Saskatchewan Bio-fuels Development Council

Judie Dyck, President

Saskatchewan Business Council

Shirley Ryan, Council Member

Alan Thomarat, Council Member

Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce

Mike Carr, Co-chairman, Human Resources Committee

Alan Thomarat, Co-chairman, Human Resources Committee

Saskatchewan College of Pharmacists

Ray Joubert, Registrar

Saskatchewan Construction Association

Michael Fougere, President

Saskatchewan Environmental Society

Murray Hidlebaugh, Member at Large, Board of Directors

Saskatchewan Federation of Labour

Larry Hubich, President

Cara Banks, Communications Officer

Saskatchewan Federation of Union Retirees

Blake McGrath, President

Gilbert (Gibb) Todd, Vice-president

Saskatchewan Government Employees Union (SGEU)

Bob Bymoen, President, SGEU Saskatchewan

**Saskatchewan Government Employees Union (SGEU) –
Provincial Anti-Privatization Standing Committee**

Gayle Marteniuk, Co-ordinator/Chair

**Saskatchewan Government Employees Union (SGEU), Local #6080
(Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority)**

Kenton Emery, Chair

Pat Bidochka, Vice-chair

Saskatchewan Pork Development Board

Mark Ferguson, Manager, Industry and Policy and Analyst

Saskatchewan Provincial Building and Construction Trades Council

Bert Royer, President

Terry Parker, Business Manager

Appendix 1: Witnesses (continued)...

Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association

Colleen Toye, President

Donna Brunskill, Executive Director

Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism

Joanne McDonald, President

Beverly McLeod, Executive Director

Les Lye, Treasurer

Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation

Ken Moore, STF Executive Assistant

Saskatchewan Union of Nurses

Marlene Brown, First Vice-President

Loretta Gerlach, Employment Relations Officer

Saskatoon and District Labour Council & Humboldt and District Labour Council

Brian Nixon, President (Saskatoon)

Sharon Cameron, Recording Secretary (Humboldt)

Kelly Harrington, Vice-President (Saskatoon)

Sandy Weyland, Vice-President (Humboldt)

Darla Leard, Canadian Labour Congress Representative

Saskatoon Food Coalition

Janice Sanford Beck, Co-ordinator

Val Veillard, Member

Service Employees International Union Local #333

(Saskatoon and Heartland Health Regions)

Ken Winton-Grey, President

Sandy Weyland, Chair, Political Action Committee

Tom Howe, Member, Political Action Committee

Service Employees International Union Locals #299 & #336

(Moose Jaw and Swift Current)

Barbara Cape, President, Local #299

Connie Jattansingh, Executive Board Member,

Janice Platzke, President, Local #336

Jessica Sinclair, Hillary Aitken, & Kathleen Wilson

United Steelworkers District 3 (Western Provinces and Territories)

Kim Pollock, Researcher, Canadian National Office

University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association

Tracy Marchant, Chair

APPENDIX 2: DOCUMENTS RECEIVED BY THE COMMITTEE

ECO 52/25 City of North Battleford: Written submission consisting of a letter to the Premier, dated May 14, 2007

ECO 53/25 B. L. Wagner: Written submission (email), dated May 24, 2007.

ECO 54/25 Joyce Neufeld: Written submission (email), dated May 27, 2007.

ECO 55/25 City of Saskatoon: Written submission dated May 31, 2007.

ECO 56/25 Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association: Written submission dated May 31, 2007.

ECO 57/25 National Farmers Union: Written submission dated June 2007.

ECO 58/25 Department of Government Relations: Briefing binder entitled “Legislative Committee Hearings on Internal Trade Background Information for Committee Members”.

ECO 59/25 Dale Holmberg: Written submission (email), dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 60/25 Canadian Union of Public Employees Local #7 and Local #21: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Legislative Committee of Saskatchewan” [sic], dated June 5, 2006.

ECO 61/25 Canadian Labour Congress, National Office: Written submission entitled “TILMA’s Supposed Economic Benefits”, dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 62/25 Saskatchewan Construction Association: Written submission dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 63/25 Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism: Written submission “Saskatchewan Seniors Mechanism Presentation to the Legislative Committee of the Economy on the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA)”, dated June, 2007.

ECO 64/25 Service Employees International Union Locals #299 & #336: Written submission entitled “TILMA Presentation: Brief to the Committees”, dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 65/25 Jessica Sinclair, Hillary Aitken, & Kathleen Wilson: Written submission entitled “The Trade, Investment, and Labour Mobility Agreement – Selected Issues and their Effects on Young People in Saskatchewan”, dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 66/25 Saskatchewan Provincial Building & Construction Trades Council: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Legislative Committee of Saskatchewan”, dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 67/25 Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives: Written submission.

ECO 68/25 Kathleen Macmillan: Speaking notes entitled “Presentation to Government of Saskatchewan Legislative Committee on the Economy”, dated June 4, 2007.

Appendix 2: Documents (continued)...

ECO 69/25 Canadian Labour Congress, Prairie Region: Written submission entitled “Submission by David Winter of the Canadian Labour Congress Prairie Region”, dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 70/25 Trade Committee of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour: Written submission entitled “The Submission of the Trade Committee, Saskatchewan Federation of Labour”, dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 71/25 Public Service Alliance of Canada, Prairie Region Council: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan Standing Committee on the Economy on the ‘State of Internal Trade in Saskatchewan’”, dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 72/25 Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority, Local #6080: Written submissions entitled “Reducing Alcohol-Related Harm in Canada: Toward a Culture of Moderation” and “SLGA Fact Sheet 2005-06 Results at a Glance”.

ECO 73/25 Wes Norheim: Written submission entitled “Brief to the Saskatchewan Standing Committee on the Economy”, dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 74/25 Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations: Written submission entitled “TILMA’s Potential Impacts on the Health Sector”, dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 75/25 Trade Committee of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour: Response to questions raised during its presentation at the June 6, 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on the Economy.

ECO 76/25 Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada: Written submission.

ECO 77/25 Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation: Written submission entitled “Submission to the Standing Committee on the Economy Regarding the Implications of the Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT) and the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA)”, dated June, 2007.

ECO 78/25 Council of Canadians, Moose Jaw Chapter: Written submission entitled “Submission on behalf on Council of Canadians Moose Jaw Chapter to the Standing Committee on the Economy, Saskatchewan Legislature”, dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 79/25 Council of Canadians, Moose Jaw Chapter: Article entitled “TILMA’s fuzzy math”.

ECO 80/25 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local #2067: Written submission entitled “Written Submission to the Standing Committee on the Economy”, dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 81/25 Agricultural Producers Association of Saskatchewan: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Standing Committee on the Economy on Internal Trade (AIT) and the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA) It’s Effect on ‘Saskatchewan Agriculture’” [sic], dated June 7, 2007.

Appendix 2: Documents (continued)...

ECO 82/25 Coalition for a Citizen-Friendly Regina: Written submission entitled “Presentation of the Coalition for a Citizen-Friendly Regina to the Standing Committee on the Economy”, dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 83/25 Saskatchewan Health Coalition: Written submission entitled “Saskatchewan Health Coalition Presentation to the Standing Committee on the Economy”, dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 84/25 Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union: Written submissions entitled “The Next Centennial: Will Saskatchewan be the Place that Workers Choose to Call Home” and “Labour Standards for the 21st Century”.

ECO 85/25 Saskatchewan College of Pharmacists: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Standing Committee on Human Services” [sic], dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 86/25 Steve Lawrence: Written submission (email) dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 87/25 Saskatchewan Union of Nurses: Written submission entitled “Submission to the Standing Committee on the Economy, Government of Saskatchewan”, dated June 8, 2007.

ECO 88/25 Saskatchewan Government Employees Union: Written submissions entitled “SGEU President’s Brief Saskatchewan Standing Committee on the Economy TILMA Hearings” dated June 6, 2007, “Red Alert: It’s time to stop waltzing with TILMA”, and “The Myth of Interprovincial Trade Barriers and TILMA’s Alleged Economic Benefits”.

ECO 89/25 City of Regina: Written submission entitled “Decision of City Council Meeting of May 28, 2007” “Presentation to the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan Standing Committee on the Economy on the ‘State of Internal Trade in Saskatchewan’”, dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 90/25 Regina and District Chamber of Commerce: Written submission.

ECO 91/25 Saskatchewan School Boards Association: Written submission dated June 1, 2007.

ECO 92/25 Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association: Written submission entitled “Aligning Trade, Investment & Labour Mobility (TILMA) with Healthy Public Policy”, dated June 11, 2007.

ECO 93/25 Dean Coppock: Written submission dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 94/25 Canada West Foundation: Written submission entitled “Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan Standing Committee on the Economy: The State of Internal Trade in Saskatchewan”, dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 95/25 Saskatchewan Applied Science Technologists and Technicians: Written submission dated June 4, 2007.

ECO 96/25 Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association: Written submission entitled “SUMA Board Position on TILMA Implication for Urban Municipalities”, dated June 4, 2007.

ECO 97/25 Joe Kuchta: Written submission dated June 6, 2007.

Appendix 2: Documents (continued)...

ECO 98/25 Town of Leader: Written submission dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 99/25 Paule Hjertaas: Written submission (email), dated June 8, 2007.

ECO 100/25 Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association: Written submission dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 101/25 Don Kossick: Written submission dated June 8, 2007.

ECO 102/25 Marilyn Gillis: Written submission dated May 7, 2007.

ECO 103/25 Chartered Accountants of Saskatchewan: Written submission dated June 8, 2007.

ECO 104/25 Dr. A. Gerhard Scholten: Written submission (email), dated June 4, 2007.

ECO 105/25 Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association: Written submission dated June 5, 2007.

ECO 106/25 United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1400: Written submission dated June 6, 2007.

ECO 107/25 Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan: Written submission entitled “The Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT) and the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA) as they Relate to the Mobility of Engineers and Geoscientists in Saskatchewan”, dated June 8, 2007.

ECO 108/25 Saskatchewan Federation of Union Retirees: Written submission entitled “Brief to the Standing Committee on the Economy”, dated June 11, 2007.

ECO 109/25 Saskatchewan Federation of Labour: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Standing Committee on the Economy”, dated June 12, 2007.

ECO 110/25 North Saskatoon Business Association: Written submission entitled “The NSBA Position on the BC-Alberta Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (‘TILMA’)”.

ECO 111/25 Roy Atkinson: Written submissions including *Toronto Star* article entitled “Canada Beating Industrial Retreat”, *Reuters* article entitled “Alcoa launches \$27 bln hostile bid for Alcan”, *Globeinvestorgold* article entitled “Ipsco on the block”, and *Toronto Star* article entitled “Fall of Corporate Canada”.

ECO 112/25 Elaine Hughes: Written submission entitled “TILMA – The Key to North American Union”, dated June 12, 2007.

ECO 113/25 Service Employees International Union Local #333: Written submission entitled “The Submission of the Service Employees International Union, Local 333”.

ECO 114/25 Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) Saskatchewan: Written submission entitled “Submission to the Standing Committee on the Economy”, dated June 2007.

Appendix 2: Documents (continued)...

ECO 115/25 Saskatchewan Pork Development Board: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Standing Committee on the Economy State of Internal Trade in the Pork Industry”, dated June 12, 2007.

ECO 116/25 Stan Hovdebo: Written submission entitled “Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement”.

ECO 117/25 University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association: Written submission entitled “The Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement: What does it mean for post-secondary education?”, dated June 13, 2007.

ECO 118/25 Saskatchewan Environmental Society: Written submission entitled “Position Paper Concerning the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement by the Saskatchewan Environmental Society”, dated June 13, 2007.

ECO 119/25 Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce: Written submission entitled “Position Paper on Submission on behalf on Council of Canadians Moose Jaw Chapter to the Standing Committee on the Economy, Saskatchewan Legislature”, dated June 13, 2007.

ECO 120/25 Lloydminster Chamber of Commerce: Written submission.

ECO 121/25 Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local #974: Written submission entitled “Submission to the Standing Committee on the Economy”.

ECO 122/25 Saskatoon Food Coalition: Written submission entitled “Saskatoon Food Coalition Presentation to the Standing Committee on the Economy Regarding TILMA”.

ECO 123/25 Regina and District Labour Council: Written submission entitled “Submission by Terry Zahorski President, Regina & District Labour Council, to the Standing Committee on the Economy, Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly on the Trade, Investment & Labour Mobility Agreement”, dated June 13, 2007.

ECO 124/25 Saskatoon and District Labour Council, and Humboldt and District Labour Council: Written submission entitled “Submission to the Standing Committee on the Economy Government of Saskatchewan”.

ECO 125/25 Canadian Federation of Independent Business: Written submission entitled “Saskatchewan Small Business Owners Say Join TILMA”, dated June 8, 2007.

ECO 126/25 The Beyond Factory Farming Coalition: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Standing Committee on the Economy – TILMA”, dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 127/25 Saskatchewan Bio-fuels Development Council: Written submission entitled “Presentation to the Standing Committee on the Economy Agreement on Internal Trade (AIT) and the Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA) Saskatchewan Biofuels Industry”, dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 128/25 Saskatchewan Business Council: Written submission entitled “Sign on Saskatchewan, It’s our Turn”, dated June 8, 2007.

Appendix 2: Documents (continued) ...

ECO 129/25 Jammie Townsend: Written submission dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 130/25 SaskCentral: Written submission entitled “Saskatchewan Credit Unions: Interprovincial Trade & Financial Services”, dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 131/25 SGEU Provincial Anti-Privatization Standing Committee: Written submission dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 132/25 Isabel Muzichuk: Written submission entitled “The Trade, Investment, and Labour Mobility Agreement”, dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 133/25 United Steelworkers District 3: Written submission entitled “TILMA: A Solution in Search of a Problem, or The Chocolate on Evrim Lazar’s Pillow”, dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 134/25 Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce: Written submission entitled “A Submission on the State of Internal Trade in Saskatchewan”, dated June 2007.

ECO 135/25 Consulting Engineers of Saskatchewan: Written submission entitled “Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement in Relation to the Consulting Engineers and Consulting Geoscientists of Saskatchewan”, dated June 2007.

ECO 136/25 City of Regina: Supplementary information dated June 11, 2007.

ECO 137/25 Bill Adamson: Written submission (email) dated June 14, 2007.

ECO 138/25 Regina Community Clinic: Written submission dated June 15, 2007

ECO 139/25 Elaine Hughes: Written submissions entitled “Whose Canada?” and “Threat to our Waters: NAFTA, the SPP and Super-Corridors”.

ECO 140/25 Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada: Written submission dated June 7, 2007.

ECO 141/25 Robert H. McKercher: Written submission dated June 19, 2007.

ECO 142/25 Regina Qu’Appelle Health Region: Written submission dated June 12, 2007.

ECO 143/25 Elaine Hughes: Written submissions (emails), dated June 18 and June 20, 2007.