

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 10, 1980**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Order of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** – It is my pleasure to introduce to the Assembly 29 Grade 5 students from Wilfred Hunt School in University Park here in Regina. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Miko, and a chaperone, Mrs. Fisk. I will have the pleasure of meeting with them shortly. I would like to thank them for their hospitality the other day when I had the pleasure of presenting the Celebrate Saskatchewan pins to Wilfred Hunt School. I know members of the Assembly will join with me in wishing them an enjoyable and enlightening afternoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Resignation of Dr. Mathias**

**MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek):** – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health. Today Dr. Rick Mathias, a member of your department, tendered his resignation effective March 21. What are the reasons for Dr. Mathias' resignation?

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health):** – Mr. Speaker, it is true that Dr. Rick Mathias has tendered his resignation. It is my understanding that Dr. Mathias wants to go back to British Columbia where he originally came from. It is simply a personal and professional advancement for Rick Mathias to go back to British Columbia.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** – Supplementary. It has been indicated to me that one of the reasons for his resignation is the underlying antagonism of your government toward the medical profession. How many other medical professionals in your department have tendered their resignations over the last few months? What were their reasons?

**MR. ROLFES:** – Mr. Speaker, I am aware of only two other people who have tendered their resignations, all of them for exactly the same reason – personal and professional advancement.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** – Final supplementary. Would you not say, Mr. Minister, that these resignations coupled with the fact that about one-third of the positions within psychiatric services are vacant, points to a very serious problem within your department and with the health delivery system in Saskatchewan as a whole?

**MR. ROLFES:** – No, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. If the member opposite would check with the records of other provinces in this particular area of psychiatric services she would find that vacancies in Saskatchewan are probably one of the lowest in North America. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem in being able to recruit professional people in this field, not just to Saskatchewan. I made that known to the media a couple of months ago. We are actively recruiting, not only in eastern Canada but also in England. We have to recognize that there are 10 other provinces which are also

recruiting, as well as the Northwest Territories. We also have people in the United States who are recruiting actively. It is very difficult to get people in these positions. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the people who have resigned from my department have resigned for any reason other than personal and professional advancement. I am sorry that these people are leaving but I think it speaks well of Saskatchewan that other province and the federal government are actively searching out people in Saskatchewan whom they can obtain for further advancement.

### **Storage of Spent Uranium**

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** – I understand, Mr. Premier, that there are presently informal discussions taking place between consuming countries to the effect that spent uranium or uranium waste should be returned to the country of origin for permanent storage. The basis for that, of course, is that those are the countries which are profiting from uranium development. Does the province of Saskatchewan recognize that that is a potential problem the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan can face in the next decade?

**HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):** – Mr. Speaker, I have no information which would lead me to believe that this is a potential problem for Saskatchewan or Canada. I am not aware of information from the Government of Canada addressed to us which would suggest that spent uranium would be returned to Canada or to Saskatchewan from any purchasers. When I was in Sweden last year I spoke with purchasers of Saskatchewan uranium and they discussed with me proposals for the disposal of waste from nuclear reactors. I was interested in their technology. At no time did they suggest that they were proposing or even suggesting any of the spent waste be returned to Canada. Accordingly, I have no grounds for believing this is likely to be a problem which we will be called upon to face in the foreseeable future.

**MR. ANDREW:** – As a short supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that this was in fact discussed in the United Nations? Are you indicating that you are unaware of any discussion of this sort in United Nations in the last two years?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any discussion which would reasonably lead anyone to the belief that spent uranium is likely to be returned by any purchaser to Canada.

### **Assurance from AECL re Nuclear Waste Repository**

**MR. ANDREW:** – A new question, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Limited) has recently given to the Sudbury area of Ontario the assurance that that region will not become a repository for nuclear waste? Would the present administration seek that same assurance from AECL for the province of Saskatchewan.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of assurances given by AECL to Sudbury or to groups in Sudbury, nor am I aware of any proposals by AECL to use any area in Saskatchewan as a disposal area for wastes from the nuclear reactors. I would have thought that reasonably unlikely since there is no nuclear reactor in Canada within probably 1,500 miles of Saskatchewan.

**MR. ANDREW:** – One further supplementary to the Premier. I take it you are aware of the fact that the Sudbury regional council, in spite of those assurances, still rejected the

experimental test facility in that area. Would this not indicate to the Premier that we are almost facing a hopeless problem in finding permanent storage for dangerous chemical or nuclear waste?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence that the Government of Ontario, where the existing nuclear reactors are operating and where the city of Sudbury is, will address this problem and while I have many subjects on which I would like to advise the Government of Ontario, that is not one of them. I do not think my views on the matter are particularly welcome.

### **Legal Action against CBC**

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** – Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. Last night, Mr. Attorney General, I and many other people in Saskatchewan viewed a very interesting play entitled Harvest. I hear there is some consternation on your side of the House. Is it true that you are thinking of taking legal action against the CBC?

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – Mr. Speaker, I did not see the play. I don't watch the CBC; it harms children and attacks the morals of adult people. So I didn't see the play. I think there are many people who didn't see the play. No, I'm not contemplating legal action and the Government of Saskatchewan is not contemplating legal action.

**MR. TAYLOR:** – A supplementary question to the minister in charge of SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). In the play it indicates that there was misrepresentation to the farmers of the area made by SEDCO officials. Can you assure this House that this, in fact, did not take place?

**MR. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce):** – Mr. Speaker, from the information we have, it is a fact that it did not take place.

### **Storage of PCBs**

**MR. .G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** – Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of the Environment I'll direct my question to the Premier.

In light of the report from the National Research Council of Canada (they quote this statement on page 11), 'It is essential that facilities for storage of PCBs be provided immediately.' Will the Premier inform this House where and when and what are you going to do with the PCBs at Federal Pioneer?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of the Environment put out a statement indicating the position of the government in this regard a couple of weeks ago. That was before we had received the final report of the National Research Council of Canada and I am not sure whether that has been received. Perhaps the hon. member has it. I have not seen the final report if it has come in the last day or two.

Our position with respect to the PCBs is that the judgment has to be made as to whether or not the first step will be the storage of the PCBs in a safe storage area, or whether they will be moved to a place where they can be satisfactorily destroyed in the first instance. It is likely the former will be the case, that the PCBs will be removed and placed in an

appropriate storage area while a facility for disposal of chemicals of that nature is constructed somewhere in Canada. Hon. members will know there is no such facility anywhere in Canada for the destruction of such chemicals as PCBs. There have been other methods tried for disposal – some up around Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta, which appear not to be as successful as one might wish. Accordingly, I expect a facility for the disposal of dangerous chemicals will necessarily be constructed in Canada. I cannot give the hon. member an indication of where it will be constructed. The likely course of action is that the PCBs will be removed and stored until such a facility is available to us.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I didn't see the report, none of us did. Will you inform this House as to when you will give us the answer and where you are going to remove them to. When will we have this answer?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. member a date as to when. As he will know and as the Minister of Environment has already indicated, we engaged consultants some six or seven weeks ago to address this very question, whether or not the PCBs should remain where they are until a facility is built and then be removed and taken to the destruction facility, or alternatively, whether they should be removed in the relatively near future and placed in safe storage facilities. When we have the opinion of the consultants who are addressing this question we will be able to give hon. members a better indication of the dates upon which the actions will be taken to deal with the PCB spill at Federal Pioneer.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** – Supplementary, Mr. Premier. In light of the history (in this particular situation) of your government secretly sitting on the information for some two years and not informing the city of Regina, would you give the assurance to the House that you will, upon, receipt, immediately release to the public the consultant's reports that you will obtain. The public, which has serious questions about your handling of the matter, now will at least be assured they will be able to insist on the actions proposed by the consultants whom you have hired.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the hon. member's question and not the assertions of fact it contains (which assertions of fact I deny, or at least do not agree with). The question is, will the report be made available as soon as it is received? The answer is substantially as soon as we can make the information available to the public we will.

### **Uranium Development Policies**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK:** – In the absence of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, I would direct my question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, can you give the House your assurance that the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan is in full support of your policies on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan with regard to uranium development as it affects northern Saskatchewan residents?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan is not in accord with the policies of the government with respect to uranium development, I am not aware of the fact. Accordingly, I give you my opinion that he is in accord with the government's policies that have been announced with respect to the development of uranium in northern Saskatchewan.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Then, Mr. Speaker, it's reasonable to assume that the minister responsible for northern Saskatchewan

supports your policy and this provincial government's policy as it relates to uranium development as opposed to the quite converse position taken by your federal leader, Mr. Broadbent?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I think we'll all forgive the hon. member but he is not aware of Mr. Broadbent's policy on this. I think he will be forgiven for that. The policy of the New Democratic Party with respect to uranium development is that the party does not oppose the mining of uranium. That was made very clear at the federal convention of the New Democratic Party in November, when resolutions on this issue were dealt with at some length. Accordingly, there is no conflict between that policy and the policy of our government. I'm not here to answer questions with respect to the policy of the New Democratic Party of Canada. I know members opposite would certainly not wish to answer for the policies of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – The answer is that our government supports the mining of uranium in northern Saskatchewan under stringent safeguards. In so far as I'm aware, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan supports that policy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

### Canada Energy Security Fund Proposal

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, at the first ministers' conference in 1978, you mentioned that you had proposed a federal security fund for the increased price of old oil and that you would be willing to offer 50 per cent of Saskatchewan's share of the increase to this fund. Do you really feel that on a depleting non-renewable resource that is a fair shake for the people of this province?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to restate the proposal for a Canada Energy Security Fund on a number of occasions. We have varied it from time to time as conditions varied. The latest statement of it in any detail was at the premiers' conference in La Malbaie, Quebec last August. At that point out position was that the ordinary royalties which would come to the province of Saskatchewan should come to the province of Saskatchewan on old oil, and that the amount flowing into the Canada Energy Security Fund should flow from amounts which might otherwise flow to the federal government or to the oil companies. That was the position put forward, and in writing at La Malbaie. I think we all have been somewhat disappointed that the price of Canadian oil has not moved closer to the world price, which it has not; the gap has widened rather than narrowed. And under those circumstances we feel some sympathy with the point raised by the hon. member for Estevan that we should get a good return for our oil. Accordingly, the proposal for a Canada Energy Security Fund was presented in that manner.

**MR. LARTER:** – Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. On March 5 in Saskatoon you stated over CFQC you would be satisfied with even a \$2 increase in the price of oil for 1980. If we were to share that (a 50 per cent share), you would be giving \$1 away and we'd have \$1 of that increase. Now that even makes it more unfair. The Clark government stated a \$4 price. Trudeau says \$3, now you say \$2 and \$1 to us. What is the right price?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – I think I'm not making myself clear or the hon. member is not fully

appreciating some of the answers. My comment with respect to \$2 was on July 1; \$2 on July 1 would pretty obviously make it \$3 for 1980 because we had \$1 on January 1. I have not indicated any price be it \$2 on July 1 or any other figure on July 1. We are entering into negotiations and I think it's not helpful for me to state what I would be prepared to accept until I know what the offer is and what Alberta is saying because we do not have the opportunity either to make the primary offer or make the primary acceptance or rejection. That really depends upon the moves of the federal government and Alberta. Those are the facts of life whether we like it or not and accordingly Saskatchewan is well advised to hold its position open in my judgment. We have done that consistently, said we're not insisting upon \$4 each; we are insisting upon the price of Saskatchewan oil moving up regularly and steadily towards the world price.

**MR. LARTER:** – Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. In this depleting scale of our light and medium oil – this is on light and medium oil only – it's forecast that there's a possibility that by 1990 based on the increased world prices up to say \$30 or \$33.70, according to what we can figure out, we could under this 50 per cent sharing agreement on the increase in price and oil give away from non-renewable resource approximately \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion. Would you agree? Does that figure come somewhere close? How much is it?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – I'm not aware of the calculations made by the hon. member but clearly we have probably, who knows, 300 million or 400 million barrels of light and medium crude that may well be pumped by 1990. One can make one's own calculations but it is entirely possible that unless the price of Saskatchewan oil and Alberta oil moves up to world levels or approaching world levels there will be very, very substantial contributions made by the people of Alberta and the people of Saskatchewan to other Canadians in the form of lower prices for oil and that is certainly not denied.

**MR. LANE:** – Supplementary to the Premier. You've talked about gradually attaining world price levels. What time frame are you looking at for Canadian oil or particularly Saskatchewan and Alberta oil reaching world price levels?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I do not have a time frame since the fact is that the world price of oil has been moving up at such a rapid rate that even a very substantial annual increase in western Canadian oil would not be sufficient to close much of the gap between the current price and world prices. I am not able to offer to hon. members an indication of when Canadian prices will reach world prices. Obviously we have an interest in Saskatchewan in having those prices move up at a consistent rate and as I have been saying at a rate more rapid than we have seen it move up in the last several years, but I am not able to speculate on when the two might come together.

**MR. LANE:** – Final supplementary. I never thought I'd see the day when you would make Pierre Trudeau look precise and you imprecise but you have indicated that you are going into negotiations and you don't want to give your position. Is it your position basically or are you starting with the premise that we should meet work prices instead of Chicago prices or 85 per cent as proposed by the former federal government, and if so are you also starting with the premise in negotiations that, in fact, we should be moving much more rapidly than the Clark government had proposed to attain world prices.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Two questions really. Do we have a goal of world prices? I think the

answer to that is we have not really articulated a goal, whether it is work prices or Chicago prices of 85 per cent of world prices or blended price. It doesn't make a great deal of difference what the ultimate goal is. It doesn't make a great deal of difference whether one is going to Toronto or Montreal if you're still in Regina and heading out for Winnipeg. You can make the decision as to the ultimate destination a bit later and nothing is harmed thereby. With respect to the second question, are we insisting on a more rapid rate of increase than the Clark government? The answer to that is no. Are we insisting on a more rapid rate of increase than was the policy of the previous Trudeau government? The answer is yes. Those are the parameters. We are not in any sense denying that the Clark proposals might have been attractive. Your question was do we insist on more than Clark and the answer is no.

### **Disposal of Waste Water, Cold Lake, Alberta**

**MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** – In the absence of the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker, I'll address this question to the Premier as well. Mr. Premier, will you briefly state to the House your government's position regarding the various proposals, specific proposals, for the disposal of the waste water in the massive heavy oil project at Cold Lake, Alberta?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** – Mr. Speaker, I am unable to give the hon. member the information he requests about specific proposals for disposal of the waste water on the proposed Imperial Oil project at Cold Lake. The Department of the Environment has made some presentations to the Alberta board which was conducting hearings with respect to that project. I regret to say I cannot give the hon. member the specific details he requests and I will ask the Minister of the Environment. I'll take notice on his behalf and he will be able to reply further.

### **Material to Advertise Saskatchewan**

**MR. H.J. SWAN:** – Question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. Recently I called at your office and asked for pictures and promotional material that you would use to advertise the province of Saskatchewan to encourage tourism. Do you have any good material to advertise Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. R.J. GROSS (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resource):** – Mr. Speaker, we have some excellent material.

**MR. SWAN:** – Could you give me some examples of that excellent material? What do you have?

**MR. GROSS:** – Mr. Speaker, if the member wants to come over to the office sometime we'd be happy to show him the material we have.

**MR. SWAN:** – All right, Mr. Minister. Here is one of your beautiful pictures. I'd just like you to take a close look at it and I'd like you to tell me at what costs does your department advertise the Minister of Highways rather than the natural beauty of Saskatchewan?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Order, order! I don't want the question period to degenerate at this point. It has gone very well up to this point. Are there any ministerial statements? Introduction of bills? I see there are none on the order paper. Orders of the day. Yes,

what is the purpose of being on your feet?

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre):** – Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Order. I said orders of the day and I was on my feet before you were. I have an item before orders of the day and I'll get to the member for Saskatoon Centre right after that.

I'm sure all members will join with me in welcoming back the member for Meadow Lake who through an unfortunate accident was not here for some time.

I want to take this opportunity, it's incumbent upon me, to lay on the Table pursuant to The Tabling of Documents Act, Section 222, sub 2 of The Election Act, a report of the returns of the candidates in Regina North-West by-election held on October 17, 1979 and I do hereby lay that report on the Table.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Congratulations to curling Rinks

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre):** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House an event of great importance which took place yesterday. I am referring to the win by the Rick Folk rink of Saskatoon of the Canadian men's curling event. Now the Rick Folk rink plays out of Saskatoon out of Nutana Curling Club. And I think I should mention that Rick Folk is, of course, the lead, Ron Mills the third, Tom Wilson the second, and Jim Wilson the lead. I said Rick Folk is the skip. Now I know that we would all want to comment the Rick Folk rink on their tremendous victory. I know that we would all want to wish them well when they participate in the world championship Silver Broom which will be coming up very shortly and will be held in Moncton, New Brunswick. I say that because the members for Saskatoon, the MLAs and of course I know all MLAs, and all people of Saskatchewan wish them luck in their endeavours.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth):** – I'm sure that Regina members and Saskatoon members are proud of the Rick Folk rink. I may say however that we in Regina are not to be outdone. We also have son, or perhaps I should say a native daughter, four native daughters, that we are pretty proud of and that is Marj Mitchell and her rink who won in the women's division. The names of the rink – I'm not going to take the chance of making the mistake that my friend did – I'll just give you the names and you can fit them into place. Marj Mitchell, Nancy Kerr, Linda McKendry, and Wendy Leach have won and are going to Perth, Scotland. I am sure that all members will want to join in congratulating them and wishing them the very best in Perth.

**MR. R.H. PICKERING (Milestone):** – Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the members on the opposition side, I would like to join the members in congratulating the Rick Folk team and the Marj Mitchell team. I question the member for Saskatoon-Centre as to where the members from the Rick Folk team play. I have played them on several occasions and I have never seen Jim Wilson skipping.

The Minister of Highways says that the lead man's name isn't Jim. Well I will have you know that his name is Jim and I am very proud of that team. I am proud of the Marj Mitchell team and I would like to list them in order: Marj Mitchell, skip; Nancy Kerr,

third; Shirley McKendry, second; and Wendy Leach, the lead. I certainly, on behalf of all members on this side, wish the ladies luck in Perth, Scotland. I think it would be very nice if also the men win the world championship down in Moncton. It would be nice for our 75th anniversary.

## SECOND READINGS

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour)** moved second reading of Bill No. 6 – **An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, 1979.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have before us today amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act, 1979. As you will recall, a new workers' compensation act was introduced and passed in the spring session of the legislature, 1979, about 10 months ago. I am pleased to report that the full act was proclaimed and came into force on January 1, 1980. We had previously, as you might recall, proclaimed certain sections of the new act which provided significant increases to the pensions of surviving spouses and dependent children and orphans.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments before us are designed for the purpose of correcting or clarifying a number of misprints contained in the original act. In certain circumstances, they provide a fine-tuning of what is truly the most innovative and far-reaching of the workers' compensation acts to be found in Canada today. We're very proud to be headed into a new decade of workers' compensation law, workers' compensation for the 1980s.

To refresh our memories for just a minute, then Mr. Speaker, please recall that our workers' compensation act is moving towards income replacement for workers injured in industry. The old method of trying to equate a worker's earning capacity by measuring this physical disability is no longer acceptable. Workers are human beings, Mr. Speaker, not statistics. While one worker may be able to make a complete economic recovery from an injury, another perhaps will have difficulty in recovering his earning level following his industrial injury.

Our new system then, Mr. Speaker, will look after workers as individuals and the effect of any injury on that worker will be measured taking into account the effects of the injury on the worker as an individual. This new earning replacement aspect of workers' compensation is further refined by indexing a worker's entitlement to increases in the cost of living and offsetting benefits by payments made under the Canada Disability Plan. In this way, workers have a guarantee that their awards will not be ravaged by inflation, on the one hand, or perhaps provide for overcompensation on the other. We provide, Mr. Speaker, this fully indexed income replacement until the normal retirement of the worker at age 65. At that point, workers may be entitled to a retirement annuity which has been accrued from moneys put away by the workers' compensation board in addition to the worker's income replacement entitlement.

The new workers' compensation system does not neglect to compensate workers for the effects of a permanent physical impairment, Mr. Speaker. In addition to the income replacement guarantee, workers left with a permanent physical impairment will receive a lump-sum payment to compensate for this permanent physical impairment. The lump sum will be a portion of \$10,000 equivalent to the permanent physical impairment, with the minimum amount being a payment of \$500.

This brief description, Mr. Speaker, really doesn't do justice to the magnitude of the

changes in workers' compensation. I think to give some further indication of how important these changes are, I am pleased to point out to the House that delegations have visited Saskatchewan from several jurisdictions to study this new and what we believe to be more equitable method of compensating injured workers. Every other workers' compensation board in Canada has asked for copies of the report and of the new act. Large delegations have visited us over the last year from Ontario and New Brunswick to meet with members of the workers' compensation board for a more thorough briefing of the act as it currently stands. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I can also tell you that a royal commission travelled all the way from Australia to study our new legislation.

In summary, we are, I think, extremely proud to be the first to move towards a system of workers' compensation which provides for both recognition of physical disability and earning loss. I mentioned earlier and will repeat again, we in Saskatchewan are headed for a new decade in workers' compensation: workers' compensation for the 1980s.

With respect to the actual piece of legislation that is before us, Mr. Speaker, you will find none of the amendments change the intent of The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979 as it was originally passed. For instance the amendments to sections 2, 51, 83(2) and 97(1) merely correct some misprints and some language errors which crept into the final form of that recently passed bill. We are recommending an amendment to section 83(1)(a) so it very clearly spells out that a surviving dependent spouse will receive 75 per cent of the deceased worker's earnings at the time of death. Section 92, similarly, has been amended to assure that the spouse's benefit is fully indexed to the consumer price index. This is something the original act intended and I believe my explanatory notes indicated that was inadvertently left out.

Section 99 has been amended so that such things as clothing allowances and medical expenses are not reduced by payments from the Canada Disability Plan. The original intent was to offset only the regular compensation payments. Finally, Mr. Speaker, section 183 assures fair treatment for all, in that the date of the occurrence of the injury has been substituted for the date of filing as the so-called cut-off point between the old act and the new act coming into force.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, then the amendments are of either a housekeeping variety or intended to clarify that which may have been slightly foggy in the original legislation.

I am pleased, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to move this bill be now read a second time.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** – As the minister has said, Mr. Speaker, basically this bill is here as well as Bill No. 7, the following bill, to clean up some printing problems in the bills which were passed last year.

The one area of concern to me (and the minister spoke about it) was clause 99 which refers to the Canada Pension Plan.

As the minister is probably aware, anybody who qualifies for payments from unemployment insurance because of injury and so forth, has had those deducted prior to us paying out on workers' compensation. I am wondering if there is an agreement of some form between the federal departments (who all get their little fingers into an accident case and have benefits under the Canada Pension Plan or under the federal plan when you are unemployed) and if all of the problems have been worked out so no

problems will develop as have in the past? That's the only question I have. Other than that this is strictly a cleaning-up bill as the minister said earlier. As far as the glowing words he spoke about the workers' compensation, I think there is no one on this side of the House who doesn't feel that a person who loses an arm and works as a laborer has lost his total capacity, whereas a school teacher or a member of this House having one arm would still be able to function. It is time we recognized that and we agree with that.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour)** moved second reading of Bill No. 7 – **An Act to amend The Occupational Health and Safety Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly simple straightforward amendment to The Occupational Health Act. It was made necessary because of a recent decision of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. This decision by the court of appeal has in effect rendered the act ineffective because, for the time being, it is entirely impractical for the Department of Labour to launch any further prosecutions which may arise from a contravention of the law no matter how blatant it may be.

The particular case arose following a fatal accident which occurred at a construction site in the spring of 1978. The worker died. He had been working near the top of a large office building in Regina and he found himself in a situation where the only way he could make his way to the ground was by first lowering himself onto a piece of plywood covering an air conditioning shaft. That plywood covering was not a safe platform. It dislodged and the shaft below extended 80 feet to the basement of that building. Needless to say the worker fell down the shaft and unfortunately lost his life.

Clearly this kind of negligence, Mr. Speaker, should be against the law; certainly the Crown felt that it was against the law. Prosecuting the employer, while it could not bring the young worker back, would surely help to put a stop to this kind of carelessness in the future. A charge then was laid under section 3(a) of The Occupational Health Act and that section of the act says:

Every employer shall ensure insofar as is reasonably practicable the health, safety and welfare at work of all of his workers.

I venture to say that putting a good firm lid over an 80-foot air conditioning shaft where people are working above it is a reasonable way of ensuring their health, their safety and their welfare. Very few employers to be fair would argue against section 3(a).

So in essence, Mr. Speaker, a charge was laid under section 3(a) saying that the employer failed in his duty to protect his employee in a reasonable way. The case was dismissed by the court in November of 1978 and that decision was upheld upon appeal 10 months later. The reason given was not that there was no negligence involved. The reason for dismissal and many may find this hard to take seriously – is that there was no proof that the work being done by the unfortunate man at the time of his death was defined in the International Standard Classification of Occupations. Now to try to understand this you have to be aware of two seemingly innocuous things to be found in the act. Firstly, section 2(r) defines a worker as, and this is a quotation:

A person who is engaged in an occupation in the service of his employer.

Furthermore, section 2(j) presently defines occupations, I guess in a rather negative

way, by saying what it is not. It says:

The word 'occupation' does not include any kind of work which is not specifically covered in the generally accepted dictionary of occupations known throughout the world.

The dictionary I am referring to is known as the International Standard Classification of Occupations, published by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in Geneva. So defining an occupation by saying what it is not appears to have been a mistake in the original draft of the act, according to the recent court ruling. The Crown is still obliged to go ahead and actually prove in each and every case that the occupations of an injured worker is or was, beyond any doubt, precisely what the ILO author had in mind when he wrote his dictionary. So this burden of proof needless to say, Mr. Speaker, is quite impossible to fulfil. It would necessitate, I am told, bringing to Saskatchewan an officer of the ILO each time there is a prosecution. Such expense and such inconvenience would hardly be in keeping with the spirit of the law which is meant only to ensure reasonably safe working conditions, not to create a brand new occupation in Geneva to be known as a travelling interpreter of dictionaries or some such thing.

I believe then the solution to that is obvious, Mr. Speaker. In the interest of both justice and economy I am recommending that all reference to the International Standard Classification of Occupations be deleted. Furthermore, in clause (j) which defines the word occupation, we must keep it positive, saying only that occupation means employment, business, calling or pursuit. In retrospect, Mr. Speaker, and hindsight is always 20-20, that would have been the appropriate way of going about it in the first place. Simply put, the amendment merely restores to The Occupational Health and Safety Act the authority which was contained in it prior to a technical judicial decision being rendered by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. Accordingly I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** – Mr. Speaker, the member just gave his address on the importance of the occupational health act and it's strange that only 50 feet from where we all are presently sitting, there is an occupational health hazard happening. An employee of the government is working at a very dangerous height in the men's washroom with no safety precautions as the occupational health act calls for. And I suggest to the minister, when we're finished this discussion, he can check with the Leader-Post. They have been taking pictures of the guy hanging out of a window with no safety restraint and he can fall down 40 or 50 feet to the ground. If you remember correctly, when they built this Chamber and refurnished it, I had to come in here and call the occupational health people in to correct the unsafe practices that were happening in this room and I know that I will have to continue to correct the minister and correct the shortcomings of his department on occupational health. But all I'm suggesting to the minister is don't stand and spout about it, also make sure it's done in your own department because we all believe in occupational health and I realize this correction is necessary.

**MR. SNYDER:** – Just a very brief word, Mr. Speaker, to express my gratitude to the hon. member for Rosthern for any contribution he may make in terms of providing healthier and safer working conditions for the people in the province of Saskatchewan. I think he will acknowledge the fact that prior to 1972, the whole question of occupational health was something of a barren wilderness in the province of Saskatchewan. Since that time I think we've come a great distance in terms of providing an opportunity for workers not only to be on occupational health and safety committees to monitor the terms and

conditions under which the work is carried on in the workplace, but in addition to that, they have been provided with monitoring equipment in order that they may examine in some detail, in a technical way, the environment in which they live, in terms of the conditions of the air, the thermal conditions. So I am particularly pleased for the supportive attitude of members opposite and I know that they will continue in their support of what I believe to be the best and most far-reaching occupational health legislation that has appeared on the scene in Canada.

I suppose it has to be said that the greatest tribute or the greatest flattery that can be offered is that of imitation and we've found that virtually every province in the Dominion of Canada, the federal government itself, has made a point of copying our legislation. Perhaps they haven't done it quite as well as we have but they have in large measure taken many of the features from the Saskatchewan legislation and incorporated into their own. We regard that as a very sincere tribute when we have other jurisdictions finding themselves in a position to offer this kind of very tangible support to the concept that occupational health in the workplace and occupational safety is paramount in an industrial age that we find ourselves in, in the 1980s, so I'm extremely pleased to see that supportive attitude. I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth)** moved second reading of Bill No. 8 – **An Act to Amend the Arts Board Act.**

He said: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This will be relatively brief. I had intended at one point in time that this bill would go to the non-controversial bills committee. I think it is proper timber to do so. However I was absent from the House one day and someone rather helpfully gave it the first reading. Thus I lost the opportunity to put it in the non-controversial bills committee. It's a very simple amendment, Mr. Speaker. At the present the members of the arts board are nominated and appointed for one year. I think all members will be aware that the arts board is a body established by the Government of Saskatchewan to make grants to largely professional arts groups. Heretofore, at the end of the one year, their appointment automatically lapsed and you didn't have a board. That might on occasion create some difficulties – if for instance an order in council were not properly passed and the one year went by, you might not have a board. Or for various reasons you might not get the order in council passed which would appoint the new board. You might want to hold it up at the last moment because there had been a change of heart by someone who was going to be appointed. So, for a variety of reasons, one might be out of time with the order in council appointing a new board and you might not have one. That in effect occurred last year and for a brief period of time there was no board; there was nobody to sign cheques, no way of carrying on the proper administration of the arts board. We are by this amendment providing that the term of appointment is one year, which it has always been, but that they continue until their successors are appointed. Thus you avoid the difficulty of going for even a brief period of time without a board. So with that brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

**MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** – Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I don't have any quarrel with this, but I was interested in the minister's comment regarding members of the arts board at the present time being nominated and then appointed. Would you just expand on the nominated portion. Do the special interest groups in the arts actually nominate and are they always appointed?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** – Yes, Mr. Speaker, just to very briefly answer the member from Meadow Lake's question. It is now my policy, and I think it's been a policy of most of my successors when appointing members of the arts board, to solicit the artistic community for nominees. That's not to say that any one group has the right to nominate someone; that's just to say that groups like ACTRA will be asked for several names of which we may or may not pick one. I think members will be aware that the arts board is one board which has a history of absolute independence from government. I meet with this board perhaps once a year; it's usually done on a social occasion. They are completely independent and that is as it ought to be. The arts are a matter, I suppose, going to men's minds and going to men's view on the world. I think who gets a grant from the government in the arts should be independent of my view of what they say. Thus the board is completely independent and to ensure that we get people who are independent of government and who are knowledgeable about matters in the arts, we traditionally ask the various artistic groups, from local theatres such as the Globe Theatre, to national organizations such as ACTRA (Association of Canadian Television and Radio Artists) and CAR (Canadian Artists Representation) for nominees, and again, they do not nominate people in the sense that they have a right to appoint anyone. We simply solicit names and pick and choose from their list to try to fill in vacancies in the arts boards. To that extent, Mr. Speaker, we do get the view of the artistic community.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth)** moved second reading of Bill No. 9 – **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, fortunately it isn't going to belong. Precisely the same explanation applies here with respect to the Centre of the Arts Board. No difficulty has arisen with this board as did occur with the arts board, but just out of abundant caution we are moving the same amendment to this board so that at no period of time will the Centre of the Arts be left without a board, and the same explanation applies. Without a board the Centre of the Arts simply cannot function – no one to sign cheques, no one to make even fairly routine administrative decisions. So it will be the same amendment to this act for the same reasons.

**MR. McLEOD:** – I just wanted to point out and to say it's very much the same kind of concern that I would have regarding the nomination to the Centre of the Arts Board as the appointments to the arts board. Certainly I have not a great quarrel with it; it's just a matter of philosophy a little bit in there, and certainly this leaves itself very much open to political appointments. As long as the minister conducts himself very responsibly and is very, very sure that the political appointments don't enter into this, then I'm sure I can agree with that.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Culture and Youth)** moved second reading of Bill No. 10 – **An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment which, as the members will see provides for a longer period of time during which the annual meeting might be held. This comes about as a result of numerous requests received from the library trustees association.

Just a brief explanation about the structure of the regional libraries might be in order

for it gives the background and the reason why we had a problem with the shorter period. As the libraries are now organized the boards are made up of representatives of municipalities from a fair distance. Trustees who sit on a library board will come from a fair distance to sit on the board. I received many complaints from the individual trustees and formally in a brief from the Saskatchewan Library Trustees to the effect they were having difficulty holding their meetings in January and February because of inclement weather, and they requested that they be allowed to hold the meeting anytime up to May 15. They felt there was no point in having a period much beyond May 15 because that would get into seeding and work on the farm, but they wanted the option to hold their meetings at anytime up to May 15. It struck me as being an imminently reasonable request. It created some very minor wrinkles with respect to filing of statements, and financial statements with the public library but those have been ironed out and we are, therefore, moving this amendment which is, as I way, being done at the request formally and informally of the library trustees association . With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the bill to amend The Public Libraries Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs)** moved second reading of Bill No. 4 – **An Act to amend The Local Government Board Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments are of the same variety that my colleague has just moved second reading for three bills. The proposed amendment in respect of this act makes three changes to the definition of local authority set out in section 2 of The Local Government Board Act. One, the amendment clearly sets out the municipal corporation of Uranium City and district within the meaning of a local authority. This will not bring about any change in practice, Mr. Speaker, since the local government board has always considered the transaction carried out by Uranium City. The second change is intended to bring within the definition of local authority, all local community authorities established under The Northern Administration Act.

A local community authority performs much the same functions as a council of the village or town. The primary difference is that the local community authority derives its authority from The Northern Administration Act, whereas villages and town are established under The Urban Municipality Act.

With the continued development process taking place in northern communities it is quite conceivable that within the near future long-term borrowing may become necessary to finance local capital priorities. We believe that in order to best pursue this future probability, these communities should be included within the jurisdiction of the local government authority as defined in the local authority, section 2 of the act.

The third amendment to section 2 deals with changes in terminology under The Education Act. Under former acts reference was made to local districts and school units. The new act makes provision for designating existing school districts, high school districts and school units, as school divisions. Section 32 of The Education Act provides for a board of education to administer the affairs of a school division. the proposed amendment removes from the definition of local authority reference to boards of trustees of non-existing school districts and school units, substituting therefor the board of education of a school division.

Except, Mr. Speaker, for the inclusion of local community authorities within the definition clause which would have the effect of bringing those communities within the

jurisdiction of a local government board, the two other proposed amendments do not extend in any way, the local board's powers. Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services)** moved second reading of Bill No. 21 – **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments as proposed in respect to this bill are really intended to streamline the operations of the corporation and include several amendments which will make this particular piece of legislation consistent with other legislation dealing with Crown corporations.

There is a proposed new section 41 being introduced, and this will remove the existing requirement to make appointments to the SaskComp board from a specified segment of the civil servant customers and public at large. It would also remove the minimum and maximum number of directors that must be appointed. The proposed section will allow greater flexibility in making appointments to the SaskComp board of directors, both in terms of numbers and in terms of the background from which the directors are appointed.

The language used in the proposed section is identical to that appearing in the majority of legislation creating Crown corporations. New sections providing for the creation of an executive committee of the board are included in the legislation. And this provides that an individual board can have executive committees and part of the role of the board can be delegated to the committee and it reports back to the board. Again, the wording used is identical to that appearing in other Crown corporation legislation as for example, in section 7 of The Crown Corporations Act.

A new section 7 is proposed. This section outlines the powers of the corporation and removes the necessity of obtaining an order in council to authorize the corporation to provide services to various customers, including educational institutions and local governing authorities, or to authorize agreements with other entities providing services similar to SaskComp. As SaskComp has matured, interest in utilizing its services has been expressed by departments of Government of Canada, by municipalities and by private individuals and organizations. It seems to me that the continuing necessity to obtain an order in council to authorize the provision of services to these groups has often resulted delay and in this way we leave more autonomy with the board. The elimination of this requirement will allow the corporation to expedite the provisions of services tot these groups.

In addition, since the adoption of The Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation Act in 1972, the University of Regina has been incorporated as a separate entity. An amendment has been included in the proposed section 7 to reflect this reality.

I want to say in conclusion that this is primarily rearranging the need for the appointment of a board of directors in line with other corporations. I just want to draw to the attention of the members opposite, if any particular member is attending to this bill, that in the committee of the whole there will be a couple of clarification points where I can be more specific, if you want. But in section 5.1(1)(b) in part, it says 'and the business of the board.' The change that I will be introducing in the committee of the

whole will have that read 'the business of the corporation instead of 'board.' It's just a clarification point. Similarly in section 5.2(2)(c) it says in part '. . . submit to the members of the board at each meeting of the board.' I will be proposing just to change that, (it's not of a substantive nature) to 'submit to the members of the board of directors,' just so it's perfectly clear, 'at each meeting of the board of directors.' So it's just adding to section 5.2(2)(c) – 'board of directors.' In section 5.3 there's one clarification. The last line is 'conduct of the affairs and the business of the board.' (that's what it reads); change that to 'conduct of the affairs and business of the corporation' rather than 'of the board.' I will move those when I come to the committee of the whole but I just want to clarify it to the members on the other side.

As I indicated, there are no real substantive changes here other than that we're moving to have the board appointed without specifying any particular number – minimum or maximum. We're also not requiring that the board be chosen from a specific group of the public or customers or of the civil service, and we're also allowing that the board have executive committees.

I so move second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G.M. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** – Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House somewhat. This is a bill that I am responsible for. There are a couple of things that I would like to look into further and from that point of view I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**HON. MR. D.W. CODY (Minister of Telephones)** moved second reading of Bill No. 14 – **An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.**

He said: It is with a great deal of pleasure today that I have the opportunity to give second reading to amendments to this bill. As everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, credit unions are a trademark of this province. They are a financial institution designed by people for people. And, Mr. Speaker, their ability to serve their membership is very evident today. On June 30 the credit union movement in this province exceeded the 50 per cent mark in terms of membership among the people of Saskatchewan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, more than one out of every two persons in Saskatchewan communities believe in the credit union way.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more significant is that in the last four years the credit union movement has experienced a greater growth than in the entire previous 35 years from 1929 to 1974. The assets of credit union today stand at well over \$2 billion. This \$2 billion reflects the significant confidence that people have in this province and in the team of employees which operate the many credit union branches around it. I can look at the many credit unions which serve my own constituency of Kinistino and look at places like very small communities such as Albino, Prud'homme, Weldon, Birch Hills, and Wakaw, and I can readily see their contribution, even if the members opposite do from time to time think credit unions do not make this contribution.

Mr. Speaker, the credit unions operate under the rules and regulations set down in this Assembly. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today to bring forth legislative changes to assist this fine segment of the Saskatchewan co-operative movement. The amendments contained in this bill are in part necessitated by the expected new federal bank act which will produce added pressures on the credit unions and in part by projections that the consumer financial market will become even more important in the

1980s. The amendment to section 75(3) will exempt funds deposited by the members in registered retirement savings plans (RRSPs) or registered home owner savings plans (RHOSPs) from being applied to a member's loan or other indebtedness in the event of non-payment of that debt by a member. Presently a credit union may apply all shares and other funds held in deposit accounts by a member. Loans such as an RRSP or an RHOSP cannot be considered to be funds deposited by the member but rather investments for the future held in the trust of the credit union. Our amendments are required to bring these registered programs in line with the income tax legislation. We therefore ask that RRSPs and RHOSPs be exempt from such right of offset.

Section 24(1)(c) will allow credit unions to sell fixed-term annuities to their members and thus provide them with a further service presently unavailable. The amendments that are of a housekeeping nature are related to sections 31(1) and 105(a) of The Credit Union Act. These amendments are necessitated by amendments to the regulations governing all savings in credit unions and to correct discrepancies that occurred in the present legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned previously, the credit union system is one of the fundamental reasons why rural Saskatchewan continues to survive as well as it does. It is a clear indication that despite what comes across the Assembly floor from the opposition from time to time, there are many people who believe in Saskatchewan, who have the confidence in this province, its people and its government as well. In return this government intends to ensure that the legislative framework under which the credit unions operate are both up-to-date and in tune with the needs of today.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** – Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to first say that I welcome the comments of the minister responsible for co-operation and co-operative development on Bill No. 14 – An Act to amend The Credit Union Act. I think it's a fair opportunity to make comments with regard to the credit union development in the province of Saskatchewan and to commend the credit unions for their tremendous rate of growth. I understand over half the population in this province are members of the credit unions. The member for Saskatoon who makes comments that I've changed my mind might be reminded that I have never been in any other position. If he would care to check the records – and it might be a good time as you're leaving, Paul. As a matter of fact, I'm very close to people who had a great deal to do with the very development of the credit union and the co-operative movement in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that any time the Assembly looks to approving amendments to legislation affecting the credit union that will put them in a more competitive position, or at least in a fair competitive position with the chartered banks throughout our province, is legislation, or amendments to legislation, that all sides of the House could support. Certainly, we realize that the legislative committee of the credit union has proposed a lot of these changes and in fact your government is only carrying out the changes that they themselves proposed. So it might be noted, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is the local autonomous groups of people, individual people in this province, who are proposing the kinds of changes that have made the credit union successful. So basically what I am saying is that it was individuals collectively forming credit union, not governments. It has been, since the beginning of time, individuals collectively making changes to enhance the progression of those credit unions, which they have on their own.

I will give the government credit in this area and in this area only, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for carrying out the wishes of the credit union people and all of their memberships. It

might be noted, and the minister responsible for co-operation and co-operative development should just pay attention and realize, that we have very fruitful meetings with credit union central. We're very pleased to meet with them. We've had some very informative discussions and it might be to your benefit, and to the benefit of all member on that side of the House, to realize that we do not have any great differences with the credit union. We do not have great differences in those areas. They are very successful meetings because we, on this side of the House, represent individuals' abilities to aspire. We represent groups that get together collectively as individuals to aspire to things as they have in credit unions, Federated Co-operatives and in the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. It's that individuals, strong individual local autonomy which makes them a success and no minister of any government of any political stripe can deny those people that credit which they have rightfully coming due to them.

It always encourages me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Attorney General makes a few comments when I am on my feet. I always get the feeling I must be doing something right. Surely I must be. It is a sure thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that our position is not like that of the Attorney General who says that co-ops were designed to be a defence against free enterprise. That's what the Attorney General says. I will tell you the co-op membership throughout this province does not look very kindly on the Attorney General.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not address my remarks more specifically to the bill. As I look at the bill I see changes which will only be of assistance to credit union members. Mr. Minister, we on this side of the House do not have any objections contained within Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Credit Union Act.

There is one question, before I take my place, which I might pose to the minister, just for my personal reassurance. It is something which I am not sure of myself. I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he is going to be more than happy to answer the question. I wish to know, in the interest of the credit union people, if the changes we have within this bill are approved by the Bank of Canada Act and also that there are going to be no problems in that particular area. If that has been cleared and if there are no problems in that particular area (if the minister can reply to that particular question as it relates to the changed outlined in the bill), then Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would conclude by saying we in this House would support the amendments.

**MR. CODY:** – Mr. Deputy Speaker, in answer to a few of the question which the hon. member for Moosomin posed, first of all with regard to the bank act, yes, my understanding is that it is comparable legislation to the bank act amendments which are proposed. With regard to actually checking with the federal people, I don't believe that would have been done. We get the copies of their acts and as nearly as we can understand they are a comparable type of amendment. Yes, we have checked with the legislative people who look after the drafting of amendments and asking for amendments and look after legislative types of things. With the credit union central, we have talked with them as well.

I was very interested in listening to the member for Moosomin, particularly when he talked about local autonomous groups of people. It is very interesting to think that now the Tories have taken over the complete opportunity to say that local autonomous groups are the ones which they have been listening to. Over the last 30 to 40 years I don't think there is a party which has listened less to the general public in this country than have the Tories, whether they were in Ottawa or wherever they were.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. CODY:** – All of a sudden we have the Tory party in Saskatchewan saying they are going to be the great saviours of autonomous groups of people. Well I can assure the hon. member for Moosomin we have been listening to autonomous groups. We have listened to the people in the credit union movement; we have listened to the people in the co-operative movement. I can tell you it is a far cry from the things which I heard in the last session when the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley said we shouldn't be having resource materials of a co-operative nature in the schools.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. CODY:** – Those are autonomous bodies. Those are people who have asked us to put resource materials in the schools. We are now doing it. At the same time the member for Moosomin says they have the market cornered on those autonomous groups of people. I can assure you they haven't. We have talked to these various groups. We have talked to FCL (Federated Co-operatives Limited). We have talked to Co-op trust. We have talked to the wheat pool people. All of them (to an individual) have asked us to put more and more resource material into the schools so that people at a young and early age can get going in co-operatives.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. CODY:** – He also mentioned that they had been talking to the wheat pool. Well I can tell you the position that the Tory party in this province is talking with regard to marketing boards, to the wheat board and to the Crow's Nest Pass, is simply completely different.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Order! Order! I'd have to caution the hon. member to try to contain himself to the bill before use, Bill No. 14 – credit unions. I don't think the wheat pool and co-op education is really contained in this bill. I know that the hon. member on my left got carried away too, so I think it's kind of tit for tat now and if we can get back to the bill . . .

**MR. CODY:** – Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I certainly do plan on containing my remarks to the bill, but I thought it would only be right and reasonable for me to answer some of the accusations made or answer some of his questions. When he decided to talk about the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I just decided I would give a reasonable answer to him.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle says I don't know anything about the bill. Well there's one thing about it, he certainly does because I don't think he reads anything that has anything to do with co-operatives. That's for sure. I'm very doubtful and I hear him talking about CPN (Co-operative Programming Network). I hear him talking about CPN. Yes, it would be a good idea for us to talk about CPN. That was a venture that you people opposed from the day it started and I can tell you something, it hasn't been that unsuccessful. And the hon. member laughs but that's all he can do is laugh. I can assure him that you have to have some bit of co-operative spirit about you if you want to talk about co-operatives and that's certainly something that the member for Qu'Appelle can't do.

Well, the member for Moosomin says we go to the people in the co-operative movement to find out what they want. Well, I'll tell you something. With regard to

co-operatives, I believe that, because they have to go to someone. They don't know very much about co-operatives on their own. As a result of that, I'm very pleased to see that the member for Moosomin did decide to have some meetings with Credit Union Central and some of the co-operatives, because it certainly would be enlightening to them to know a little about the co-operative movement.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the hon. member has decided to go along with the amendments. I think the amendments go a long way to helping credit union members and, therefore, I'm very happy to see that the people in the opposition are now finally on the side of the co-operative movement in this province.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 3:35 p.m.