

FOURTH SESSION - TWENTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

(HANSARD) Published under the authority of The Honourable Dan D'Autremont Speaker

N.S. VOL. 57 NO. 15A WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2014, 13:30

Bill No. 153 – The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2014

Mr. Forbes: Thank you very much. It is a pleasure to rise today and enter into this debate on this legislation. It's a hefty piece. It's some 27 pages long. And while it may seem relatively straightforward, that when we talk about legislation and modernizing our statute law, it really is interesting. As I've read through most of the explanatory notes, I have to say that I have a lot of questions, and I will take some time this afternoon to raise some of those because, you know, it's important we get our legislation correct.

It's important that it reflects the common language so people can understand it, that it's written in clear language, whether that be in English or French, because we are bilingual. Some of our bills are in both languages, and we see that, and that's an important function of our legislation. And every once in a while we have to take a look back and say, is it as current as it might be? But I will have some questions about this particular bill because of the way the process goes.

And you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will remember that a few years ago I had the privilege of introducing the R-word private member's bill because it was clear that not all the work was done in removing the R-word. Now the R-word is a very offensive term that is used, that was used in the past to describe people who had capacity issues in terms of developmental issues, cognitive delays. And it was offensive and it was . . .

It had actually gone through a process. In fact actually I think it was in the early '90s that the statutes were reviewed to make sure that they were current both in terms of modern language but in terms of gender identification, that it wasn't solely written from a masculine point of view but both reflected if possible a neutral gender and so that it reflected more of our society norms. But at that point, we found that across the world there were still offensive terms being used in our legislation. And so whatever we can do to make sure those offensive terms are removed, it's important to do, and this was one.

This initiative actually came up from America because the initiative, the drive, the

impetus of this initiative that . . . Actually it was the People First organization of Saskatchewan, related to the community living. And we're all very familiar with that. I know you are, Mr. Deputy Speaker, very familiar with the good work that they do. They want to make sure people live within their communities and they feel whole and they feel respected.

So language that would be offensive should be removed. And so this is the intent of this legislation: to modernize the language.

And I'll show you a few interesting examples as we go forward in this debate today about this legislation. Because as I will go through the legislation, and there's some 126 pages of explanatory notes, now one suggestion I would say that would be . . . You know, I did a little work here preparing for this speech because it is important. Because as I've said, I've had experience where we've gone back and we've said, so how many times was a certain word used?

And we found that in fact in this case we had to go back to 1929, a rare piece of legislation that actually wasn't online. So I think that's why it wasn't found. When you do the google search for the word, you couldn't find the word because it wasn't on the government legislative website, I think. I don't know why it escaped that.

But interestingly, interestingly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we did find when we did a search — and I shared this with the Minister of Justice at the time — that in fact the R-word was used several times in day-to-day government work, that whether it was the Ministry of Education, whether it was the Ministry of Health, whether it was the Ministry of Justice, the R-word was still being used.

And it's really important that, not only when we change legislation and what we're talking about here today, that if the government is serious about updating its language and making it current, that it happens right across the board. And that means in terms of any documents that come out, any circulars, any bulletins that explain legislation. I mean it was really interesting, and I do feel it was a bit of a negative slight on the state of affairs when we found out that actually many people who should know better were actually still using the R-word.

And so we hope in this case, when people do this review of this legislation, that they take a look and say, okay, so we are changing some of the language. We are all changing some of the language, just not in legislation. But you don't have people on one hand using certain words in the Ministry of Justice when it comes to legislation, but out in government-land they don't use that language. They use another term.

So I hope everybody's on board with this, and it's critical that they are because, as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point being, if we're going to do legislation, there's no point doing legislation if it's not enforced, if it's not carried out. And the unintended consequences are that, at the end of the day, you have confusion because here you have a certain language used in this Chamber because of the new statutes that the government has seen fit to bring forward. And I'll explain some of the concerns that I do have about

some of them because I think that actually they're vague and they're without meaning. And in fact I think it's going to add to some problems.

And one, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I go through my remarks, you'll find for example the meaning becomes more and more strayed. It's like a stray dog, you know. If it's in your backyard, it's not really a stray dog. It's just a dog off a chain. But if it's in your town, then it's a bigger problem. It's a bigger stray dog, and then you've got problems.

So this is what I'm worried about with some of the language here is that in fact I don't know if we're solving problems here. And I have some real concerns about this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because as I said, we don't have a lot of resources that, you know, people say, well you should do a good job. You should do it right the first time. Make sure you do the job right the first time. And if there's problems, we don't want to be coming back in just a few months later to have an amendment to say, wow; we didn't really understand the implications of our first go-round.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I welcome as well the guests here, from this side of the House, and recognize the family relationship. Maybe birthday wishes are in order as well. We won't ask the House to break into song, but today or tomorrow we wish you happy birthday, and that's a good thing. But anyways, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I digress here, but I think it's good when we can take a break and introduce family and friends. So welcome to your House.

I was saying though, in terms of *An Act to amend The Statute Law*, how important it is to get it right and how people look to us and look to the Ministry of Justice to make sure they are doing the best job possible, that we're not revisited later on in months to come with revisions because some of the language they thought was being introduced is not right, and that leads to bigger problems, unintended consequences.

And we don't want to see confusion. We absolutely don't want to see confusion. Because you know, as we've debated a lot in this House, especially from the Ministry of Justice, people want to see justice served and they want to see it served well and they want to see it served quickly and efficiently. You know, we don't want to have misunderstandings. We often hear that saying: justice delayed is justice denied. So if there's confusion that we're creating and we're not flagging right up front, then we have some issues.

So I do want to take a minute to review the minister's comments, and then I do want to talk about some stuff that, you know, as I said, I did some work to prepare for this because if we are . . . The intent of this legislation I understand and I hope would be to make legislation better for all of us in Saskatchewan. And we're doing a broad stroke here with many pieces of legislation. I have some suggestions that the Minister of Justice or maybe some of us should be thinking about how we could do that when it comes to this kind of thing. So I will be putting some of those points forward in the few short moments ahead.

But I do want to take a moment and talk about the minister's remarks. And actually it was just introduced just a few short days ago, when he talks about, "This bill will make

amendments to over 100 Acts to update outdated language, ensure gender-neutral language is used, and correct grammatical and reference errors.”

He talked about how the “. . . last general statute revision occurred in 1978.” And I stand corrected. He would know. I thought it was in the early '90s, but clearly it was 1978 because as I was saying earlier about the work we had done on the R-word, that I thought it was in the 1990s. But he talks about how as time progresses, certain terms have fallen out of favour. And it is interesting.

One that we'll talk about is the whole issue around Internet and websites, whether it's helpful to have those two words together. I'm kind of in the camp that it is. I don't know where else you'd have websites. You might have intranet websites, but I think when you're talking about Internet websites for example, you're really talking about public websites that anybody can access. But if you're talking about intra-websites, we know that's limited to only a few select people with access either through hard-wiring or through passwords. And so it's not a public portal at all, but it's actually something else.

And he talked about how:

In 2012 an inter-ministerial committee with representatives from the ministries of Justice, Social Services, and Health provided a report with recommendations on potential amendments . . . affecting adults in vulnerable circumstances. One of the recommendations was to update antiquated and offensive language in Saskatchewan . . .

And I applaud that. That's a very important issue.

And I know that the term that they will use is capacity, and that's one that I really want to explore in a few minutes ahead, is really what does that mean? And when I look at the legislation, and we'll take a look and we'll review it, but we don't see the definitions of what capacity means. Often we think of capacity meaning, how much does this glass hold? How much does this tank hold? We also know capacity means the ability to do something. But as I'll show in the explanatory notes ahead that actually there's a whole range of what capacity can mean. And I think this is something that's maybe a problem, maybe overreaching too far to one side because they were very much explaining some very specific situations where capacity . . .

You know, we can have range of definition of capacity meaning somebody who has a difficult time, say, chairing a meeting. You know, somebody who likes to talk too much should not maybe chair a meeting because they're always interrupting. You've probably been to those kind of meetings. They don't have the capacity to chair a meeting. Well then you have very much the other extreme where someone doesn't have the capacity due to developmental delays, that type of thing where clearly, clearly we're talking about two different kinds of capacities. And so I'm curious about what that means.

He talks about amending “. . . four Acts to remove the term lunatic and another eight Acts to remove reference to mental incapacity or incompetence in favour of lacks capacity. Similarly as technology advances, terminology used in relation to technology also

changes.” Fair enough. Because you know in ’78, we were sure not using the Internet. We weren’t using email to the extent that we are now. But as we go through this, we’ll have some questions about that as well.

“What we previously referred to as telephone or facsimile transmission, [I’m quoting here] electronic mail and Internet website are now commonly referred to as fax, email, and website.” And again I think that may be problematic. We know that a facsimile comes from the word . . . A reasonable facsimile means a reproduction. And so you really understood when you were reading the legislation what you meant. Electronic facsimile meant that it was a reproduction sent electronically. I am disappointed that we’re using the word fax. I know what a fax is. But it’s, you know, we talk about . . . So where did that language come from, and what are we using for a basis for that? It’s commonly used, but I think that something may be lost in translation here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And so I have some concerns about that.

So he talks about updating “. . . this terminology in 18 Acts. This bill will also amend over 40 Acts to repeal the terms chairman and vice-chairman in favour of gender-neutral chairperson and vice-chairperson.” And that’s fair enough, you know. I mean I do have a little story here to say actually, with chairman, that actually . . . It’s interesting that I’ve heard debates about where the word chairman came from. And I know you’re a historical fan. That actually might be related to the Latin *manus*, referring to the hand, the hand of the Chair as opposed to the gender of the Chair. The hand of the Chair controlling the meeting; that’s where chairman came from.

Now I don’t know if that’s true or not, or whether that’s an old myth. But I find it very interesting that it’s actually not a gender term. It’s an old Latin term from manual, hand, hand of . . . [inaudible] . . . So I found that very interesting that sometimes we react to it. But the common understanding is chairman comes from, is a gender-based term. And so it’s fair enough that we move to chairperson, and that’s good. And so we’ll see if all the pieces of legislation are doing that.

And one I might have an interest in, you know, the chairman of the Workers’ Compensation Board. Will that go to a chairperson? I’ll have to take a look in the statute law and see if that is in fact the case, because it’s pretty critical. You know, some of these terms, the chairman of the Workers’ Compensation Board, is just part of our lexicon. So if we take it . . . And we can. We can change it. It’s fair enough. We know that it has come to be in society really accepted that we should change it. So that’s fair enough.

So and “. . . also repeal and replace words that have a variety of spellings such as extra-provincial, in so far, subject matter, safe keeping, judgement, pipe line to work toward more consistency. [And] this will assist in more accurate electronic searches of Saskatchewan’s legislation.” And that’s fair enough and I think that’s great.

But you know, in many ways, and I think this is an important piece of legislation, but I do have to say that, you know, when we think about important pieces of legislation that’s before the House, you know, as we’re coming up to an election, that in fact this is the extent to the priority of this government, is how you can make sure you have hyphens in

certain words and other words are joined together, that it really does show that maybe this government is getting a little tired, getting a little weary, getting a little . . . running out of ideas. If the best thing they can do is go back and do a spellcheck or maybe this . . . Maybe they're all researchers over there.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe you've been . . . People have just been sending you notes about how I cannot operate after seven long years. We cannot operate search engines to find out pipelines. Now I don't know if that's a problem over there. But you can put in two or three different versions of how you spell pipelines. You might find that out. Maybe it's an issue over there. Maybe they're running out of ideas. I think this is an example of them running out of ideas and this is the best they can come up with is how to make sure you spell insofar or safekeeping.

This is where we've come to, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Is this where we've come to? Is this where we're at? This is the height of the best legislation the Minister of Justice can put forward? Is this the best work they can put forward? I'm not sure. In the year before, in months before we come to an election, in the months we're coming before an election, this is where we're at.

You know, and I see the two pieces of very good legislation we had today before us, and just in comparison, here we have this piece where we're correcting the right way to spell pipeline and insofar. And what are the other words? Safekeeping and judgment. Don't put an e in judgment. That's for sure. Don't put an e in judgment. That's the best this government can do? I don't know. I don't know if they've been laying awake at night worried about how to spell judgment. I don't know.

Is the court system falling apart over there because they . . . Is this government falling apart . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I don't know. Campfires, is that one word or with a hyphenated? I'm not sure about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I won't sleep. I am going to lie awake tonight, and I think we're going to have to have a debate on that tomorrow.

But campfires didn't make it into the top 10 words here that this government . . . I don't know. I wonder if the, you know, member from Watrous, whether he was worried about pipelines, whether he was worried about safekeeping, or subject matter. That would be a . . . Is that one word or two words? You know, and so I've got to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this is the best that we've got from this government in this term, this is a sad state of affairs.

In comparison, in comparison, two bills that came before us today, you know, for example *An Act respecting the Transparency and Accountability of Public-Private Partnerships*, now I have to tell you, public-private has a hyphen in it. And so I think that will be searchable, so it will be good. But here is a good piece of legislation. Here not so much, not so much. And I don't know if not so much is one word or if it's hyphenated or if it's all together, but really . . .

Or insofar. Well when we get to committee, when we get to committee in May or June, I tell you, we'll have lots of questions for this. We'll have lots of questions for this.

But here is a good piece of legislation that these folks on the other side should be laying awake thinking about how are we going to get our best value from our P3s, not about whether pipelines has a hyphen or not. Here we have . . . This shows where we've come to. This is where we've come to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think it's a real shame.

And today we had great questions. We had great questions about senior care. Unfortunately we had a family come, and it was a very sombre moment. It's always sombre in the House when we have people who feel they have to come to the House.

Here we have another bill. We should be really considering it, and I hope this government considers this. They should be laying awake at night, and I hope the Minister of Health is laying awake thinking about that, thinking about that as opposed to whether insofar is one word or is it three. You know I mean, really I think we have to have some . . . We have to think about priorities as we're coming into an election.

This is a tired, old government that it sort of, you know, it sort of reminds me of the old teacher in the school, and you know, who would make sure . . . Yesterday, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't know if you remember me talking about legibility, legibility. We had the Minister of Culture, you know, saying and he's going to legislate that the ministers have to have legible cursive handwriting. And the Minister of Education chirped in and said he was going to standardize handwriting . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Just the cursive part, just the cursive. And here we are standardizing words like this. This is something else and they're all after consistency.

So this is what we've arrived at. This is what we've arrived at in this House, Mr. Speaker. This is a shame, Mr. Speaker, because . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can always tell when I hit a nerve when the member from Moose Jaw wakes up with his, you don't know what you're talking about. I clearly have hit a nerve, Mr. Speaker, when I've hit that note, Mr. Speaker. It's unbelievable, unbelievable, unbelievable that you know so . . . I don't know. I bet it was the member from Moose Jaw who is laying awake at night or couldn't find these words like subject matter, insofar, judgment. I wonder if that's the one that got him.

So here we have bills before the House that really show innovation, vision, leadership, commitment to people. And we're talking about the public-private partnerships, transparency, accountability, and *An Act respecting the Rights of Residents in Special Care Facilities and Personal Care Homes*. These are bills that really show vision and integrity and, you know, the issues that people are talking about in Saskatchewan. And then we have this bill before us, Bill No. 153, *An Act to amend the Statute Law* which really I have to say, while there is a place for that, I have to say it should be like Bill No. 75. How many bills do we have before us today? About maybe 20, of which five are consequential bills. We really have a pretty lean agenda, pretty lean agenda. And this is the best that this government could come up with, you know.

They take, you know, and we often hear about they take a lot of pride every summer going out and having conversations with their constituents. And I'm not sure. I mean which member came back to their huddle, their conference in August to say, do you know what we've got to do? What we've got to do is improve the language in our

statutes. And so this is something that we really have to think about.

So anyways, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet got to the explanatory notes, and I do want to go through that because they are pretty significant. They're about 126 pages, and I do want to review some of those pages. But I have to tell you that I do have some suggestions, and I told the minister earlier that I would. I did some homework, and I did take a look at what are people talking about. How can they improve people's access to fully understanding the statutes that we have before us? How can we more...Howcanwemeetthatinabetterway?

And of course, you know, one thing I have to say: hats off to the people across the way and how we work together in terms ...AndIhopeoneofthethingsweneversee...Andoneof the things that I would really would have liked to see, if there's a way of doing this, but we did do the directives, and that was around the whole issue of the omnibus legislation. We won't see that kind of stuff here in Saskatchewan. That's really, really important, so we both have agreed to that, the directives. And I know the former House leader worked very hard on that, and that was a good thing.

And when we come to people understanding . . . Now I don't know if those members over there are saying no, repeal that, that we actually want omnibus legislation. I don't know. You know, I don't think they could . . . It would be a poor imitation of Mr. Harper's omnibus legislation when he can do bills that are hundreds of pages long, hundreds of pages long, and ram them through the House. So I'm not sure if the opposite side, when I heard them chirping over there, if that's what they're calling for. Now the Minister of Health is weighing in on this debate here. Is he looking for . . .

An Hon. Member: Not on this debate.

Mr. Forbes: Not on this debate. I won't bring him in, fairly, if he's . . . But I am concerned because that's a good thing we don't get in omnibus legislation because then speeches would get really long. And that would be a problem; we don't want really long speeches. We don't want long speeches because, you know, yesterday we had concerns about the fact that we're not doing our homework. But I got to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're doing our homework. We're doing our homework. But you know when we go out and knock on doors and say, so what do you think about this word or that word, we're going to have a hard sell. But some of them are good. Some of them are fair, you know.

And as I said earlier, around the R-word, and I have to say to the Minister of Justice that he was part of that conversation I had about the R-word, and he was really, he was really appropriate to that.

Now I am in debate right now, so it's very hard for me to read this. But oh yes, so here we go. But what I am saying, I am agreeing. I am agreeing. But no props in this. No props are allowed, right, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

At any rate, I do want to say about the omnibus bills that it's good that we don't have

them, that they're not part of the process here. And we have worked together to do that, and that's a good thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Quite often people say we don't work well together. But you know what? That's not the case. Sometimes we do work well together, and this is one. And so I appreciate the member opposite for sharing that piece with me because it is the fact here. And we won't be seeing that kind of thing.

The other thing that I saw — you know, it's interesting that the minister talked about technology and the importance of that — but we're seeing . . . And I just went online, just before I came back in here to say . . . So what are people calling for when it comes to improving statutes and improving the circumstances around how people can best respond to legislation? And there's a movement afoot in North America — and you may find this interesting, other members may find this interesting that we can do this — that actually that they're looking forward in the States to have a 72-hour notice, that before any legislation is debated in a House or in a Chamber, it must be online for 72 hours. So essentially that adds a three-day window.

So of course what we have is, they're introduced in the House here. I think it's appropriate that it would be here. But there's a 72-hour window where it must be online so any concerned citizen can have a chance for reviewing that. I think that has a lot of merit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because then you can have input. Things are not rushed through. And we're seeing that, we see that in the States too much.

And I do want to think that sometimes there's an appropriate time when we do put legislation forward, we pass it very quickly. And I think about on Monday when we recognized the new member from Lloydminster. That was quite an appropriate piece of legislation to push through. The people have spoken, and I want to welcome her. And that was the right thing to do. So in those cases it would not be right to delay.

But sometimes I think we should strive to make sure that we do our best to make sure people have the information before them. And then they could put ideas forward because, you know, sometimes the government, especially at the beginning we don't have a lot of legislation before us. And that's the case before us now. We're halfway through the fall session and we should be seeing the bulk, if not almost all of the government legislation, except for those budget bills that will come in the spring obviously because they're budget bills. But we're not seeing bills to the same extent that we would have seen a year ago or two years ago or three years ago.

So just to reiterate my point, you know, it really does seem like the government is running out of ideas because we're not seeing the legislation. They're not bringing it forward. And we're getting the kind of housekeeping legislation that, while it has merit, really clearly has not the impact it should have on people here in Saskatchewan.

The other thing, there's two other points I want to make in terms of good ideas. And I really want to see, actually this government hasn't done it, but it's again the thing the federal government has done an awful lot of. And I really hope we don't see this happening with this government here, is the rise of private member bills from the government side that really is government business. And we see that federally around

justice bills that really should be coming from the ministry of Justice, or we saw labour bills federally that really should have been coming from the Minister of Labour but they were coming from private members. And it was a way to go around a process of checks, checks and balances.

You know, we do value, and I think both sides of this House value public service And I'm not sure completely when those folks did their 16 or their four-by-four cutbacks. I mean that's an odd sign to say, we value you, and you're cutting back. Here's your pink slip. But we do need to have our public servants scrutinize our legislation, if not only to make sure insofar is spelled correctly. That's an important one. Or judgment's spelled correctly . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . All words. Well we're singling out one or two words because there's seems to be a top 10 words that this government is fixated on.

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not me who made that list. It's not me who made the list. You know, if I had my way, there'd be many other words on that list. But of course there are foreign words to these folks like, you know, social housing. That's one that's not on that list. Transgendered rights is not on that list. You know, we need to have those words on that list. We need to have gay-straight alliances. It's not on that list. And so we need to make sure this is . . . Seniors' care, that's not on that list, you know. Public-private partnerships, transparency and accountability, not making that list. So those would be the kind of words I would want on that list.

But, Mr. Speaker, I digress just a little bit, not much because I do think this is an important piece of legislation. But I do want to say about private member bills, I have a lot of respect for private member bills because, you know, they are an important tool. But we do see some governments misusing them.

And we see in Saskatchewan that they, I believe, that they're used quite well. I can remember when the Minister of Health introduced his private member's bill about reservists, and we were glad to work with him, in opposition. I do want to acknowledge the Minister of Labour, when we worked both on Jimmy's law and the asbestos registry. We can work on these things, and it's an appropriate way to see things move forward.

I am concerned, and I want to put a flag out right here right now, that they can be abused by a government who doesn't want to use the scrutiny of their own public service and put forward bills that they know will get passed. And we see that in Ottawa where there was completely inappropriate labour bills, questionable justice bills, bills that should have gone through those departments but would have been vetted much stronger if they had gone through the appropriate way.

But before I go on to the part that I really want to talk about, and that is around the explanatory notes, because I want to go through this and I want to explain about how some of these words are problematic, I want to raise the whole issue around explanatory notes. And that is the fact that online we don't have . . . And I could be corrected on this, but bills are posted online but the explanatory notes are not posted online. And that's a problem.

And I would say to the government and to the Speaker and to those who might have . . . Minister of Justice, that if they really want to have an impact, here we have a bill that's 27 pages long, but the explanatory notes, 126 pages, are not accessible to the public, are only accessible to the members here.

Now I don't know if somebody came in off the street and asked for them whether they would get a copy. I assume they would, but for some reason they are not online. And I would think that would be a good idea, and if we could correct that, that would be great. Because I know I've been home in Saskatoon — and you know, we're all from all over Saskatchewan — and if we could access those explanatory notes from home, that would be a big improvement. So I hope that's something that we can take back, particularly in this case. I've just noticed that, you know, I've often looked for explanatory notes online and they're not there. The bill is there, but not the notes that go along with them.

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I get into the explanatory notes discussion — because they are 126 pages and I know other people have other bills they want to get to today — but I want to talk a bit about them. I want to illustrate the point about some of the language I'm not sure is appropriate, or not so much appropriate, but appropriate in the meaning that it doesn't help a lot. And not that it's offensive or anything like that; there are no offensive terms that were used in the making of this bill.

But I have to say that one of the things I was hoping that the minister would have cleared up, you know, when you listen to CBC [Canadian Broadcasting Corporation] every once in a while they'll make a reference to where they . . . what guide they use for their pronunciation guide or their spelling guide.

I think if you went to CBC you could say, so what guide do you use? What is your standard? Is it the Oxford dictionary? Is it *The World Book Dictionary*? What dictionary do you use? Is it the Winston school dictionary that I used, you know? The Wikipedia, we often use Wikipedia. Wikipedia is good. They have a dictionary as well.

So what dictionary are they . . . What is their standard, and where is that, if I were to ask the minister in a written question, what is the standard book that they're using for this . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Now I will have to . . . I heard something there, so I'm glad that there seems to be a standard, but I would have liked to have seen that in the book. OED [*Oxford English Dictionary*] is the, apparently, standard. OED. And so this is something that was missed out in this.

And I think, as I look through this, it does list the different bills and how they're amended, whether it goes from *The Accounting Profession Act* and what's . . . It was a tabling part that needed to be upgraded. And then we're talking about telephone transmission facsimile and substituting fax; safe-keeping, taking out the hyphen and putting them together, and going through like that. And I will talk about some of these: him and hers, how we've dealt with that.

But what I did not notice in the, as I said, the whole issue around these terms, I would have appreciated what the definition is. And I would have thought that it would have

been appropriate to be in the legislation what the definition is. And it is interesting as you go through this and what it means. You have pipe line and, you know, with that then you take out the space and it looks like a double space and now you have no spaces. I would have thought there would have been definitions and that would have been helpful.

Especially, as I say, some of them don't need definitions. But I think fax needs definition because when you are going from the word facsimile, which means a copy of, and one has a telephone transmission copy, then we understood what it meant. But now we have fax and so what is a fax? You know, and there is no definition of what a fax is.

As I said earlier about the word capacity, we had the whole thing about what does capacity mean? And it's quite a range, and I'll take a few minutes to talk about that. But going from, you know, the ability, what is the capacity, how much does a glass or a tank hold, or the ability to do a certain task or something much more than that. Now where are those definitions coming from? Particularly in terms of the word capacity, is it the American Psychiatric Association, their definition of capacity? Is there a Canadian equivalent to that definition of capacity?

These are legal documents, and so what does capacity mean? Is it just simply the inability to carry out a task? Or is it a much deeper, deeper meaning? And relating to a person who has an ongoing disability, is that what we're referring to? And that's not clear in the new legislation because they're just taking out one word and substituting another word, and I think that may be problematic down the road. I'm not a lawyer but I can say that I think we could have done better in that, you know.

I understand I've got some lawyers who've got my back here, and I've got them in the front too. I'm surrounded by lawyers here. I'm glad I am looking this way here. But I'm just saying, you know, our job here is to see problems and say, so in this case it's a little bit more complicated than that, you know.

We see a whole range of what we're assigning to one word through many pieces of legislation. And in the old legislation, it was very clear about what it meant even though now that term — and I'm referring to the term lunatic — is offensive and is not helpful. But at the time, it really set the stage of what it meant at that time because of a certain mental health or mental condition or state. And so I have problems with that word in that it's not . . . I can see how we're going to have issues as we go down the road here. And maybe I'll just take a minute to highlight that.

And so we were talking about *The Business Names Registration Act*. And again, you know, we're talking about fax. They've taken out the word "telephone transmission, facsimile". But clause 16(1), and this is clause (c)(b)(11), and it's amended that:

(4) Clause 16(1) is amended by striking out "mental incompetence" and substituting "lack of capacity".

And then the next clause:

Clause 18(1)(e) is amended by striking out "becomes

mentally incompetent” **and substituting** “lacks capacity”.

And that’s what they’re doing there. That’s fair enough if that’s what that means in that situation. But again there’s no definition to say, this is what the parameters are around capacity.

The Cities Act is also amended. And *The Cities Act* is a fairly important piece of legislation. Again it goes through the “facsimile or electronic mail” and substituting “fax or email.” And it goes through that. And I mean I don’t think that’s going to be a huge, huge problem, but again I don’t think it’s as clear as it might be.

But section:

309(9) is amended in the portion preceding the clause (a) by striking out “, a mentally incompetent person or a person of unsound mind” and substituting “or a person who lacks capacity”.

And so now you have that same word capacity, but now you’ve added person of unsound mind, and maybe that seems . . . And I’m not a psychologist, but I don’t know if that means the same as a mentally incompetent person.

But here, when we get into *The Companies Act* section:

. . . **108(1) is amended by striking out “lunatic” and substituting “a person who lacks capacity”.**

So you’re starting to add a dimension, several dimensions to the word capacity that I’m not sure capacity means that, and is there a better word for meaning, you know, in today’s language? What is the modern meaning of the word lunatic, and what do the psychologists and people in the professions, in the field, what do they say a better word for that is now? Is it people who lack capacity?

And because you have that range — mentally incompetent, person of unsound mind, now you’re introducing lunatic — so you’re getting a pretty wide range of what does it mean to be lacking capacity. And again:

. . . ***The Conservation and Development Act* is amended by striking out “, a lunatic or person of unsound mind” and substituting “or a person who lacks capacity”.**

And, Mr. Speaker, this goes on in several examples, and I could go through some of these. Well, and this is another one here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is from *The Municipalities Act* and *The Municipalities Act* is amended . . . Oh no, sorry, my mistake here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It’s *The Provincial Lands Act*, section 57(1) is amended by saying a person who has become insane or mentally incompetent now lacks capacity.

So now you have four, you’re taking out four words that lacking capacity means: you can have becoming insane, you could have lunatic, you could have mentally incompetent and

mental incompetence, all of those, or unsound mind. Is that the definition of lacking capacity?

So I think I'm just saying that, you know, I look at this Act and I say, so those four phrases — granted it's inappropriate language now, very inappropriate language now — but I think that we need to think about maybe there's a bit of . . . it could be . . . There should be more clarity here, more clarity. I'm looking for the right word. I'm looking for the right word, especially in this debate. It's important to have the right word, you know. Maybe I'm not spelling it right but I . . . this is not lacking, this is lacking clarity because you have four dimensions to the word capacity, or lacking capacity, right from becoming insane to mental incompetence. And so, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a real issue. This is a real issue and we could do better. We could do better. And I have some real concerns about that.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I say, if this is the best this government's come up with and they couldn't take the time to say, okay, we have these four words. Are there four words that mean in today's language, lexicon, that really hits that spot clearly so we don't have . . . because . . . Oh.

Mr. Forbes: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to enter into the debate again, and say hello from the opposition side to the guests in the gallery as well and wish Brie a happy birthday. This is our second happy birthday person in the House today. We have somebody from Yorkton, but he's not in the House. But anyways it seems to be a good day for birthdays, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And while I had a chance to sit down, I did want to thank the members opposite for sending over this piece about the rules in the House here and section 74(1) about omnibus bills. And that really, I think this is an important piece, that we don't have omnibus legislation.

And it's important that we do all that we can to make sure that we have legislation that is clear, straightforward, so it can be debated in a very meaningful and pithy, straightforward manner. That we don't have situations where we have people going on and on. It's very important that we have legislation that is straightforward.

So as I was saying though, Mr. Speaker, as you're joining us here today, that I do have some questions about some of the work that's before us and how I would have liked to have seen more thought put into this. And I do have a lot of tags on my explanatory notes. As I was saying though, my biggest concern was just the issue around capacity and the fact that we have some real issues about definitions, and how will this add to clarity or will this cause more problems?

And what about the definitions of some of the language and whether they're by the professionals in the field of psychiatry or psychology or the World Health Organization? That's an issue, because particularly as I've illustrated with the word capacity, it's a well-used word and many of us have different ideas of what that means.

But when it comes to legislation, we really have to say what we mean and mean what we say. And then we have these four circumstances where capacity can reflect on somebody

who, the old term was somebody who's insane or somebody who's a lunatic or mental incompetence or unsound mind. Are all those four words interchangeable? I'm not sure they are. And especially when it comes to, you know, if someone has a permanent disability, or is it just a certain situation, you know. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to really, have to think on this.

Now I heard members opposite talking about this the worst piece of legislation they've heard, but I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker. You know, we had a discussion earlier about how this seems to be a tired, old government because if this is one of their flagship pieces of legislation that they're bringing forward . . . They're bringing forward this piece of legislation and really what it talks about . . . And the minister talked about how we spell certain words correctly, and they have their top 10. And I understand the member from Moose Jaw gets really kind of worked up about these kind of things, about making sure that we spell extraprovincial correct, insofar correct, subject matter correct, safekeeping. Is this the best we have? We're seeing really good pieces of legislation come from this side talking about issues that are really important, like seniors and senior health care, transparency and accountability in P3. But here we have from this side their top 10 spelling words.

And I think this is something that, while it's very important, that at this point where we should be seeing 30 or 40 pieces of legislation — because we should be seeing the bulk of their legislative agenda by now — I am really concerned that we're actually not. We're not. And if this is . . . Is this sort of how we're wrapping it up? This is not a good sign for people of Saskatchewan, except for those who are using search engines to search for certain things.

And we're talking about certain words that we would like to see in the legislation but we're just not seeing them, Mr. Speaker. But I did raise . . . And some of the things that we think we should be doing that would improve access and people's ability to . . . And talk about search engines. You know, there is a movement afoot that we had talked about that bills should be posted 72 hours prior to debate in the House so people could search and find them and talk about issues that are important, and make sure that people are up to date on those issues.

So one of the things that we talked about earlier, Mr. Speaker, we talked about how some of the stuff that's online right now . . . The bills are online but unfortunately the explanatory notes are not online, and we think that could be something that could be improved. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to go through some of these bills that I think are very, very important in terms of the explanatory notes. And I will tell you that this is something else, because while the bill's 27 pages, the explanatory notes are 126 pages.

And they talk about certain pieces of legislation that are important. And you know, when we are changing this, this is really, you know . . . The language really shows who we are and, you know, what are our priorities. And as we said earlier, there's certain words that we would like to see more in the statutes. And we're talking about whether that would be gay-straight alliances, transgender rights, affordable housing, that type of thing that's really important.

So we look through the business . . . You know, there's Acts that are amended like *The Accounting Profession Act*, and we think that's a hugely important thing. But that's really around updating the language from faxing. Also *The Archives Act*.

Now here's an interesting one, *The Archives Act*. So mark my words, Minister of Justice, mark my words. Here we are amending *The Archives Act* of 2004 to update the spelling of safekeeping. But are we not dealing with *The Archives Act* to get rid of it? Aren't we getting rid of *The Archives Act*? And now it's going to become *The Archives and Public Records Management Act*. So why are we updating an old piece of legislation that is going to be repealed? So we're already in the business of setting up for another piece of legislation. So if you want to credit me with that amendment, I don't know why we're updating *The Archives Act*. Mark my words, we'll be back to do that one. So don't think we don't read these things, Mr. Speaker. We read these things, and I think it's important. So I don't know why we're doing that.

But you have the automobile insurance Act, and it's amending the spelling of judgment. And just very clear, at TV and at home, judgment is without an e. There's no e in judgment in the province of Saskatchewan, except for the province of Saskatchewan has an e. We want to make sure you spell Saskatchewan correctly. All right?

So anyways, this goes on and on. There's some really important pieces of legislation that I do want to reflect on. And as I said, we were talking about the . . . Now this is about again when we were talking about updating the language respecting persons who lack capacity, updating the spelling of judgment, extraprovincial, and the language around *The Business Corporations Act*.

And again I'm talking about capacity, and you see the evolution from meeting someone who just may not have the ability to do the work but how we move forward. And again, it goes through this quite extensively. And it's important to do this every once in a while, as I've said, but I want to get to the piece around *The Crown Minerals Act*. Again, you know, what they're updating here is around an Internet website. And it may seem to be a small thing, but there are different kinds of websites. There's intranet websites; there's Internet websites. Now I'm not a real techie type guy, but I know there's internal websites and there's external websites. So you know, we want to make sure that people have access to the public websites for sure.

[16:30]

So in this case are we talking about, and we are talking about . . . And the quote is, if the minister . . . And this is section 27.54(1):

The minister may require specific information or types of information to be provided to the ministry in paper form.

(2) If the minister requires information to be provided in paper form pursuant to subsection (1), the minister shall give notice of the requirement in any manner that the minister considers appropriate to bring the requirement to the public's

attention, including posting the requirement on the ministry's Internet website.

So clearly that's the public website. That's not the internal website. All right. So this adds clarity. You take out the word Internet, and you have which website? Which website are we talking about? Are we talking about . . . And I assume, I assume . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes. So which websites are we talking about? So this is a problem here. Now I could be wrong on this, and we'll get into committee and we'll ask questions about this, but websites have different meanings, Mr. Speaker. Okay.

And in here, going further on, this is about the Chief Electoral Officer. This is *The Election Act*. And again this is an important piece of legislation that we have. And it talks about 87.1:

A voter who wishes to be considered an absentee voter shall apply to the returning officer or the Chief Electoral Officer by submitting:

This is clearly . . . And this is becoming a bigger, bigger issue all the time, Mr. Speaker.

(a) the satisfactory evidence of the voter's identity and ordinary residence required pursuant to section 72.1 to the returning officer or the Chief Electoral Officer, as the case may be; and

(b) a prescribed voter's declaration form . . . is fully completed.

And then it talks about an application that has to be done at least eight days before polling day.

(3) An application pursuant to this section:

(a) may be made by facsimile or other means of electronic transmission; and

. . . voter's signature in a graphical representation.

So you know, again this is where I think facsimile is a reasonable word. Facsimile means a copy, a representation. What does it look like? You know, a fax. I think that we're in fact cheapening our language by saying we use shorter words. But a facsimile means a facsimile and I think that's hugely, hugely important.

Well you know, this is an interesting concept when we talk about 3-D printing and facsimile could mean, and I don't know if the ministry has taken into account 3-D printing and 3-D facsimiles. But facsimiles would mean a copy of that. A fax is something quite two-dimensional.

And I think that if we're anticipating new changes, it would be interesting to hear particularly from those in the know about what are the upcoming changes to language that we should be anticipating. And I think this is an important issue, Mr. Speaker, because I think that as we move forward and . . . Particularly when we talk about voting, I

think that we may be moving into a much more electronic world. It's the Old World where you had to go in or maybe you had a thumbprint in this purple ink so everybody knew if you had voted because your thumb was purple. Well we're moving away from that.

We're moving into a much more technologically advanced age. We're moving into a much more technological age where we should be thinking, anticipating the kind of changes in particular that we want to make sure that language does. So I am disappointed to see that we're moving away from using the word facsimile and using the word fax. It just does not capture the meaning of the intention of the words here.

And so again, you know, they talk about *The Election Act*. It's safekeeping and faxing again. Here's a word, safekeeping. What does safekeeping mean? What does safekeeping mean? I mean it could mean a whole variety of things to a certain person. To another person, it's just street money that, you know, doesn't really matter because you've got a, you know, a wide tolerance of what that really means.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just, again I speak about what do these words really mean? And I have some real concerns about that. Now *The Foreign Worker Recruitment and Immigration Services Act* is amended to remove the word Internet because the current drafting standard is to refer to website, not an Internet website. And you know, I find that interesting because that's not that old a piece of legislation and I think that we would . . . I again, especially when we talk about foreign workers, we want to be clear on what we mean. Is website just an internal portal for the government or when we talk about . . . And particularly in this case where we have people who are coming to work in Saskatchewan and our province, and that's a good thing, of course we want to make sure we follow the rules. And interestingly, interestingly, and I don't know if many of the members over there would know that in fact this piece of legislation is highly regarded by people in the labour world, that if it is followed, it can be a good standard. But the question is, is it followed and is it understood?

So I have a circumstance here where, what does it mean? And I mean we have people coming whose first language, spoken and written language, may not be English, may not be English. They want to be clear when we talk about website, that they can find it on the Internet. Like where do you mean website? Is it the government website? Is it one that it's in the office website? Or is it one that I can go to the library or I can access at home? So this is huge. This is huge. So I have some problems with that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other one that I wanted to talk about, and this is one that just caught my eye, just caught my eye, and I thought we should have a discussion about this today because it's an important piece of legislation. And this is under *The Funeral and Cremation Services Act*. And I'm thinking, you know, as we're modernizing language, funeral is not a very modern language, is it? I mean people do many things to recognize and celebrate the passing of their loved ones, but it's not . . . They're referred to in a whole host of different words.

So I'm not sure, if you're . . . [inaudible] . . . language, you might — and I see the

minister is not able to take a note right now — but he may want to think about that piece of legislation, the funeral and cremation Act.

Cremation is pretty well straightforward. We all know what cremation means and that's straightforward. But what is the word funeral, and is that offensive to some people? Are there different cultures where we don't have funerals? I'm not sure. I haven't had the ability to go back and do the homework on that. That might have been something that I should have thought of a little bit about, but I don't think funerals is a pan-cultural term. I mean even with our own, you know, family, I think that we have funerals, but we have also celebrations. And we have different ways to mark the passing of our loved ones, and it's very important that we use the right terminology.

So a note for the Minister of Justice that I have found yet another problem here on page 49, that I think that we need to rename the funeral and cremation Act because I'm not sure funeral is the best phrase for that event, because it's not a pan-cultural term. People do recognize what that is, and of course when we get into such things as the owner of a funeral home or funeral services, people may not say that they provide funeral services. They provide other services that are appropriate to mark the passing of loved ones. But funeral homes, I'm not sure if they call themselves funeral homes. Wakes is another example of how we recognize the passing of our loved ones.

And of course they were just focusing on, in that Act, *The Funeral and Cremation Services Act*, the idea of faxing and safekeeping. And again, safekeeping in that term, safekeeping when it comes to, especially to human remains, it may be quite different than when we were talking earlier about those in the business community when we talked about records or archives and that type of thing.

So that's an important piece of language. *The Homesteads Act*, which is a huge piece of legislation, when we talk about spouses and their relationships and the one who owns and the non-owner, this is a very complicated but very important piece. This is an interesting one because here again we have that issue is raised again about capacity. Because it talks about the application to dispense with consent, which is hugely, hugely important.

You know, when you dispense of the ability with the consent . . . And there's three circumstances where you can dispense with consent:

11(1) Where:

an owning spouse and non-owning spouse are living separate and apart;

the whereabouts of the non-owning spouse are unknown; or

the non-owning spouse is a mentally incompetent person or a person of unsound mind.

So again here we see that phrase. The word capacity will be introduced. And so again the dimensions of that word, capacity, will not be defined in *The Homesteads Act*. It probably should be. It should be defined somewhere because we're talking about the four different

dimensions of what capacity may mean and again, you know, as I was hoping the minister could have been more clear about what he was using as a benchmark or a definition. Is it the World Health Organization, WHO? Is it a Canadian or an American professional organization that deals with psychological situations such as this? Because we know we have to modernize our language. Again I think this is simply dismissed.

Again you know, *The Hotel Keepers Act*, a very important thing. We're talking about safekeeping there. You know, I think that I would liked to have seen . . . You know, it's interesting when we have standards for drafters of legislation, and they like to have common language so that it can be used across many pieces of legislation. But here you have the hotel keepers legislation, when we talk about safekeeping, and then you have funeral home operators and their world view of safekeeping. I think this is something that we should be looking at very carefully.

And so I think that, Mr. Speaker, there's lots of meat here to talk about, and I really am concerned that maybe . . . And you know, I could go on, but I know that there is other issues that we want to talk about. But I do want to review this because I do think that it goes on and on about the Acts that have been amended in this way, and I hope that we do have some time further on to talk further about this.

But I think it's not just a simple piece of legislation and it's one that we do need to take time to make sure that we've got it right, that people do have the ability to access and understand and utilize, use fully the statutes of our province. And if we don't do a good job of that, if we're just trying to make it easier, then that's a problem. And as I said earlier, I think we do have concerns in a major way that here we are in this week, just one week left in November. In fact if I'm not mistaken, there's only three more government days in November, three more government days in November, and yet this is one of their flagship pieces of legislation.

And it's a situation of woe betide the province of Saskatchewan because we should be seeing some bigger pieces of legislation. Nothing wrong with this legislation in terms of the fact that we should be reflecting on how we can make our legislation the very best that we can. But the fact of the matter is that here we are, and we should be seeing bigger, better pieces of legislation and ones that will affect people so we can get out and talk to our constituents about this, and that we're not just talking about, how do you spell insofar? And not just spelling, not worrying about whether pipeline is hyphenated or not.

I mean that's . . . And it is interesting that on a go-forward basis that we're seeing issues that we talked about, say with *The Election Act*. How do we anticipate and make sure we have the best language here? I don't know. And maybe it would be interesting to hear from the drafters of legislation that they have some real concerns about misunderstandings that may spring up between pieces of legislation if there are inconsistencies.

But I just have a bad feeling that we're going to see some issues here because some of these things can be too broad sweeping, and particularly around words, like I've said, around capacity. Now I've been educated myself now that capacity, not having capacity,

can have at least four different meanings here. And I'm not sure, and we'd be very interested to hear from the people in the field about whether or not this is a fair benchmark. Because essentially that's what it is, a benchmark. You're going to be measured, you know. And as I said with the homesteads piece of legislation, when you're dismissing consent, it's just a simple term of capacity. In a law, that might be a harder or an easier thing to justify.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that we do have some concerns. And as I said, and I would hope that some of the people will take to heart some of the concerns that I raised earlier about how we can improve this. And one of them is the fact that we do make our explanatory notes online. We had a bit of a discussion earlier about that and how important it is that we can access complete notes about what does this really mean.

And I do have to say that we have a phenomenal service in the Legislative Service and how they do their very, very best. And this is something that I haven't raised, I don't think, so it's news to them. But I think it is something that would make us . . . It would be a good thing. But we do phenomenal work, and I think *Hansard* does a phenomenal job of helping in terms of people getting to know what the debates are. And I don't know whether anybody will be listening to this speech or not or read this speech. And I won't have an opportunity to do a repeat. I could do it in French maybe next Monday night.

But I think that as we're approaching this, and I am going to wind up my remarks just before we end the day, but I do think it's an important piece of legislation. Because as I said, the other issue really before us, and I've said this earlier, but for some people who are tuning in and maybe some folks in government-land, that not only do we make things consistent between pieces of legislation but consistent about what happens with our forms, with our circulars, with our bulletins, with our other notes, that we're not using different language. But again as I say, words like capacity I think will prove to be a problem because we've tried to reach too far with one term.

Now I don't have a problem with pipeline, whether it's hyphenated or not. I don't think that's a big problem. Or insofar. And I don't know whether the members opposite will sleep easier tonight because they don't have to worry about inconsistency. I would have loved to have heard the debates around their caucus table about whether insofar is three words. And maybe the fellow from Moose Jaw would say, it's a three worder. That's for sure, you know.

The next thing we're going to see: Moose Jaw, is Moose Jaw hyphenated or is it one word? I think this is going to be . . . That will be the debate of the day. Is that the debate of the day over on the other side? I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker. I think that . . .

An Hon. Member: What about Lloydminster?

Mr. Forbes: Or Lloydminster. Now you have Lloydminster hyphenated. But why they need two Ls, I don't know. I don't know why they need two Ls. I think this is an issue, Mr. Speaker.

And I think that once . . . Now I don't know who the keeper of the names, whether it's the Minister of Justice. Maybe the Minister of Education is the keeper of . . . Now I know the Minister of Health's thinking about this. Is he the keeper of the names? How we start to standardize that . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . He's in charge of capacity.

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation. It's good that we take a look every once in a while. The minister said it was 1978 when they last looked at this but, you know, as I was saying earlier, we did find a piece, we did find a piece of legislation from 1929 that had escaped the eye of the drafter.

But interestingly that was not where we found the problems. The problems were not in the legislation so much as it was in government-land where certain words we're using were inappropriate. And I'm talking about the R-word. Really I don't know if there may be more, but I was looking only for the R-word. So I don't know if this is a bigger problem that this government has discovered in terms of the ability to spell in government. I've not run into that problem. It's not the one thing that I've had a problem with.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, it was when I was working on my master's, and I was able to do that online myself. It's funny how when you first . . . Now younger folks may not relate to this, but when I did my first degree I had to pay the person 25 cents a page to type it out for me, and I expected great work, right, and to finish the uncompleted sentences and that type of thing. But now when I did my master's, I was able to do it myself, and I was able to do a standard, and it was just great.

But I still would get grief from my supervisor about spelling mistakes or different things, and he would call it white noise. This is white noise. I said, well what's white noise? It's the stuff you hear in the background. It's the traffic. You know, it's that kind of stuff . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, it's like the backbenchers across the way. They're the white noise. You know, you just sort of hear them like the semis going down a road that are either too flat, haven't been inflated properly, that type of thing.

But you know, is this what we're really trying to do here is to fix those kind of issues here, Mr. Speaker? So I would say that, and I do hope . . . And I saw the Minister of Justice, he did take note of the issue around *The Archives Act*, that it is interesting that we're amending Acts that will no longer be with us all that long. So but at least it's consistent, consistent while it's alive. But I do think that it's an important piece that we have the ability to talk about that and that we work as hard as we can to make sure that, as I say, the statutes are as accessible as possible to people, and that we do look online to say, how can we make sure that they are? That's a very, very important piece.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important piece of legislation before us. And I know others will want to get in and talk about this as I only got to page 55 of the explanatory notes. And I know others will want to go from page 56. But I don't think, I have to really stop the explanatory notes because I don't think it's allowed to read them aloud while I'm going through this.

And I know that we're getting close to the end of the day.

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that, I know others will want to get into the debate on this piece of legislation, and I think that it's really important that we take a look at this. And I do feel encouraged. It's good that . . . You know, last week when I got applauded, I have to thank the members opposite for the, you know . . . And I know especially the Minister of Culture is appreciative of the good work that the Archives . . . Now it will be interesting. It will be interesting. I guess what I'll have to, what I may add, what I may add at this point, Mr. Speaker, is the question that, have the . . .

Well and now I have been complaining here a bit about the lack of the legislative agenda, that we're only up to 16 or 20 bills before us. Now you know, has there been a coordinated . . . Have they done a search, or what's up with this? You know, has there been a search for the language here? Are pipelines . . . And what are the terms that we're looking for here?

You know, and I'm curious about this because if we could find out, and I know we've got lots of researchers over there, but in the legislation that's coming before us, is it gender neutral? When we talk about the Archives Board, is it gender neutral? Or do we talk about the chairman, or chairperson? I am curious about that. What are we talking about when we talk about *The Archives Act*? This is really, and so we're . . . I think I may have to come back and talk a little more about this because I'm not sure. I didn't have a chance to take a look at the new legislation. I don't know. I don't know. We have an example of Justice wasn't on the same page as Culture about bringing *The Archives Act* here. Now was Culture aware of what Justice was doing? I don't know. I mean, were they on the same page? Now maybe they were. As I said, it would have been priceless to be in that caucus when they were debating, you know.

It would have been priceless to hear those folks over there because sometimes they're described as dinosaurs. They're the dinosaurs of the political universe over there. And dinosaurs would be quite appropriate. It's gender neutral. So how did that debate go about replacing the gender-neutral "chairperson"? How did they . . . I would have loved to have heard that debate, been a fly on the wall to hear what some of those folks over there had to say about we are changing, we are changing the Archives chairman to the Archives Board chairperson.

What would have happened? What would have happened? Now it would have depended on what time of day we had that debate, you know. But when the dinosaurs over there get revved up, these certain things are really, really important to them, Mr. Speaker. And so here we have, I mean we know what's kept some of them awake at night, and it's really . . . So this is important that we have this kind of debate before us. But you know, and it's important.

But as I said, we could be debating important pieces of legislation like we saw that were tabled today, that were tabled today. We could be debating *An Act respecting the Transparency and Accountability of Public-Private Partnerships*. That shows real vision. That shows real commitment to the people of Saskatchewan. We're heading into an

election year. But what are we debating here? The statute law amendment of 2014 that talks about how you spell certain words in Saskatchewan, certain words that only dinosaurs would think are important.

So, Mr. Speaker, and we could be debating *An Act respecting the Rights of Residents in Special Care Facilities and Personal Care Homes*, but we're not. We're talking about whether insofar is three words or one word. Is it three words or one word? That's the state of which we are.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move adjournment of Bill 153, *The Statute Law Amendment Act, 2014*. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.