

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule 11 of this Assembly to present a petition signed by approximately 1,700 people on behalf of the potash miners who will be laid off at the Cory potash mine. These petitions are expressing their opposition to the announcement, and asking the Government of Saskatchewan to reverse the decision to stop production at the Cory mine and to lay off 200 workers.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — For the benefit of our guests today, I would like to remind them that customarily guests in our galleries do not participate in the debate.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Speaker, seated in your gallery this afternoon are potash miners from that same Cory mine I was mentioning a few minutes ago, and their families, including their wives and children. There are approximately 50 of them in the gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to introduce them to you, and through you to members of the House. And I'd ask that they be welcomed to this House in the customary way.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the Assembly, and to you this afternoon, a group of 52 students from Caswell School in Saskatoon Westmount constituency. They are grade 7 students and are located in the gallery facing me, the east gallery. Caswell School, I might say, Mr. Speaker, is a very old school in the city of Saskatoon, fairly central in Westmount constituency, has a good reputation and a good community organization surrounding the school of Caswell.

These students today are accompanied by Alicia Klopoushak, Patricia Jamison, Alan Reichert, Kevin Tootoosis, and also by Mr. Clifford. I know all members will join me in giving the usual round of welcome to these students from Saskatoon Caswell School.

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

**Mr. McLaren:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour and a pleasure for me to introduce — on behalf of the member from Melville who couldn't attend the Assembly this afternoon — to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, 19 students, grade 8 and 9 from the Goodeve School in Goodeve, Saskatchewan. They're seated in the west gallery, Mr. Speaker. They have their teacher Dave Petlak with them this afternoon, as well as their bus driver Cyril Denesiuk.

We hope that you enjoy the question period in the

Assembly this afternoon and that you find it interesting and educational. I will meet with them at 2:30 on the main stairs for pictures and out on the lawn to have some refreshments and to answer any questions that you might have. So I would ask all members to please introduce these students from Goodeve.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to welcome some students, and I do so on behalf of the member for Humboldt who is not able to be here today yet, and I want to bring greetings on his behalf, and welcome to the Assembly on all of our behalf, a group of 19 students from the Viscount Elementary School, grade 7 and 8. They are here with their teacher Mr. Fettis, and with their bus driver Loa Titman.

I would hope that they will have an interesting, educational, and enjoyable visit here, and on behalf of the member for Humboldt I say, welcome. May you have an enjoyable time and a safe trip home. I know that my colleague, the member for Quill Lakes, will be meeting with them later for pictures and some refreshments. And I ask the members, then, to join with me in welcoming these students and their chaperons to the Assembly.

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and to all members of the House, a group that are sitting in your gallery, sir. You can see them in uniform for the most part. They are representatives of the certified nursing assistants' association. They're here to observe the second reading debate today for professional legislation for their association, something that they've worked on for a good long time, and I must say now, Mr. Speaker, we'll have a little more to say about it in the second reading debate. But they've worked hard and they've approached this whole process with a very professional way.

I would just introduce them by name, Mr. Speaker, if I might: Jo Sandberg, Leanne Facca, Mike Wonsul, Barb Carriere, Agnes Howland, Norene Reid, and their executive director Ede Leason. They're here and I'd ask all members to join with me in welcoming them here to the House today for question period, certainly, and then for the debate, which they're looking forward to, following that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the official opposition, I, too, would like to welcome the certified nursing assistants to the legislature and to compliment them on the fine job that they have done in bringing this legislation forth. We have been working with them for a long time on it, and we're pleased to see them here today, and we're pleased that we're going to be dealing with the Bill in second reading.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Changes to Ward System

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Urban Affairs I direct the question to the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Deputy Premier, as you know, this last weekend just past, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association board had an emergency meeting. One of the purposes of this emergency meeting was to discuss the government's proposals with regard to the ward system. And during this meeting, SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), representing over 500 urban municipalities in Saskatchewan, very definitely said that this government should not proceed with the arbitrary amendments to The Urban Municipality Act, which would do away with the ward system in our cities.

I ask you, Mr. Minister: in view of this compelling argument from these elected officials representing over 500 municipalities in Saskatchewan, will you now say to this House that you will withdraw this legislation and not proceed with it until the municipalities have had a chance to have a plebiscite on this issue at these forthcoming fall elections?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, that kind of a response tells you something about the attitude of this government with regard to public opinion.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — A new question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, Mr. Minister, if you had been paying attention to the arguments that your minister, the Minister of Urban Affairs has been using, he has been saying that only people who are elected under the ward system are opposed to it. This resolution from the SUMA board of directors clearly states that the opposition is widespread and it's strong, and they've taken the trouble to relay that information to you.

I ask you then, Mr. Minister: in view of this growing opposition and strong concern to your arbitrary doing away with the ward system, will you therefore direct your Minister of Urban Affairs to at least include in that legislation the option of the ward system so that the municipalities have that to choose from, as well as the other option which he proposes?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, there are some members on that side of the House that could advance those arguments with some degree of credibility. But that particular member, Mr. Speaker, was, I think, part of the government that imposed the ward system back at the time that it was brought in, in the face of all kinds

of opposition from SUMA, city council, and others, Mr. Speaker. So from that particular member, I have a little difficulty with the question.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, that should be made is that the Bill is now before the House. There will be ample opportunity for debate, and the member knows how this place works. When a Bill is tabled, you . . . As a matter of fact, it's going to be dealt with this very afternoon, I understand. It's on the agenda, The Urban Municipality Act, Bill No. 60, in adjourned debates.

And I'm sure that all of these compelling arguments that members opposite have can be put on the record at that time, and he may even be able to persuade the Minister of Urban Affairs to make some adjustment. I don't know, and I can't speak for him, but that's the way the system works, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. House Leader, there may very well be debate on this Bill, and we welcome that, surprised that it hasn't been called for weeks running now by the members opposite.

But I ask you, Mr. Minister, to speak on behalf of government policy, not the Bill. And on behalf of government policy, representing the Premier who is not here today, will you state in this House that you are prepared to include in that legislation the option of the ward system, as well as the other options that are being proposed by the Minister of Urban Affairs?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, in order to bring a little balance to this, I'd just like to point out that the Leader of the Opposition isn't here either.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite — just a bit of a refresher, Mr. Speaker, members opposite brought in the ward system after the people of Saskatoon and Regina, I believe, voted against the imposition of such a ward system. They brought it in in the face of opposition from the cities, both through plebiscite and the city councils and SUMA and anyone else that could speak at that time, Mr. Speaker.

We believe that the modified ward system, as presented by the Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker, is an eminently reasonable course of action. And I can't speak for the minister, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure that he will be here to hear all of the compelling arguments that members opposite will advance during the course of this debate.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask . . . would like to ask the minister why all of the opinion of SUMA and the people that those elected officials represent is not important enough for the minister to pay attention to as well.

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

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Mr. Speaker, if that action in 1973 was so wrong, how then do you justify your present action which will remove any possibility of

municipalities choosing the ward system if they so choose?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I was trying to point out in earlier . . . answering earlier questions, Mr. Speaker, was the hypocrisy of members opposite.

We have been, and do continue to consult with SUMA, with business, with city councils; some former councillors from time to time get a word in. And, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to consult with those people — people involved in local government, the business community, and so on.

As you might expect, we don't have 100 per cent agreement on all issues. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's fair to say that the relationship between SUMA and this particular Minister of Urban Affairs has been a good one all along.

### Store Closing Hours

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — A question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, at the same emergency meeting — and the fact that it was an emergency meeting tells you something about the strength of the feeling that is held by municipalities around the province, elected officials in our municipalities — at this same meeting, there was a discussion of your proposed legislation to abdicate provincial responsibility from the regulation of store hours and store openings.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, in view of the fact that the SUMA board decided to advise you and the legislators here that your proposals to abdicate that responsibility and leave it to local option, which is corporate option, in view of that advice, will you now commit to this House that you will not proceed with that legislation and therefore threaten small businesses and family businesses in Saskatchewan and further undermine rural businesses throughout Saskatchewan?

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

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, this question is not an easy one to deal with, as I'm sure members opposite know. We're tried in the past to deal with this particular question and . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Easy for us.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — He says easy for them. I'm not quite sure what they would do, Mr. Speaker, because they have two different stories, one for the rural community and one for the urban community.

What they should do is go out and tell the urban community that they intend to close down Superstore, that there won't be no evening shopping, that there will be no weekend shopping, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — No Bi-Rites.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — No Bi-Rite. None of them. All of them will be . . . And that's the hypocrisy of members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

This is not an easy question to deal with, and I wish someone had a nice clean, simple, easy answer for this one. We have tried others. They ended up in the courts, Mr. Speaker, and were found wanting. We are trying another option now, Mr. Speaker.

### Lay-offs at Cory Potash Mine

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The minister will know, I think the members of the gallery and the Assembly know, that today in the gallery we have several families, workers, laid off workers, as a result of the government's decision opposite to close down and shut down the Cory mines, which the government justifies or attempts to justify on the basis that there's a world over-supply of potash.

My question to the minister is this: if that is the case, that there is a world over-supply of potash, how is it that the minister can explain, either the minister in charge of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) or the minister in charge of The Potash Resources Act, how is it that the government can explain the two played-out mines in New Mexico are now reopening, that Kalium Chemicals is preparing to announce a new solution mine in Michigan, and why the Dead Sea Works, the Jordanian potash company is planning to spend \$10 million on new expansion and production? Why is that so?

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all, that the hon. member's information is as usual totally wrong; and secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would not be at all surprised that somewhere in the world today there is a politician that has convinced someone that there is a political need for a potash mine, as the former minister responsible for the potash corporation did in 1980 and 1979, which resulted in the tremendous over-capacity here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Let me correct the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. there are not tow new mines in New Mexico that are opening. We have been through this debate now on, I believe, three different occasions. There is one mine, which is a farmer's co-operative, which chose, when prices were at disastrously low prices, to shut down production, Mr. Speaker, and buy on the open market. And I'm advised that most of their purchases were from Dead Sea producing countries, not from Canada.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there has been speculation about new mines for the last five years, led, Mr. Speaker, by a former NDP cabinet minister, Mr. Messer, who is trying to encourage the Government of Manitoba to build a new potash mine.

The simple facts of this, Mr. Speaker — and we have now been through this debate several times — because of the decision of the New Democratic government in 1979 to

have dramatic expansion to the potash industry in this province, today the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan can produce twice as much potash as it has sold in a record year, last year being a record year, Mr. Speaker, and each year our market share has increased.

We just simply, unfortunately, have twice as much as capacity in the potash corporation through the actions of that individual, Mr. Speaker, the now Leader of the Opposition, than we can possibly sell even in record years.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan who says that we don't have our facts correct. I suggest to the hon. minister that it's him and his government that is totally out of touch with the facts in the potash world . . .

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — And I'll tell you why. In 1982 and 1983 you reconfirmed the Lanigan potash mine, having the option to shut it down if you wanted. And I'll tell you more specifically — yes, it's in your annual report — and I'll tell you more specifically, I have here *Green Markets* publication, June, 1988, quote:

Dead Sea Works is currently investing \$10 million (\$10 million) to expand production to 2.3 million tonnes metric tonnes . . . A further expansion to a 2.7 . . . A further expansion of 2.7 million metric tonne level is being considered and to be approved for 1988.

*Green Markets* also talks about the two played-out mines in New Mexico. The facts are they're expanding; the facts are that the inventory level is at low since 1981. How in the world can you continue to hide behind that false and phoney excuse for penalizing all of these families and workers by shutting down Cory mine.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. members don't want to hear this, Mr. Speaker, but let me tell the people of this province that if there was ever any one and any government that ever looked at the potash industry through rose-coloured glasses, it was the New Democratic Party and that individual, Mr. Speaker.

They announced planned expansions in 1975 . . . or '79 of \$2.5 billion, Mr. Speaker, saying that Saskatchewan alone, the potash corporation would have expansions to produce 12 million tonnes of potash by 1990, Mr. Speaker. Now yes, all of the other expansions were cancelled, Mr. Speaker. And in 1982 when we took office and there was a steel framework up in Lanigan and nearly \$200 million already had been spent of our taxpayers' money, Mr. Speaker, yes, there was a fundamental question, do you throw away 200 or \$50 million, or do you try and recover, Mr. Speaker. And that's the typical question we have put in this position, and the taxpayers eventually lost \$500 million because of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker.

Again, Mr. Speaker, quite simply, decisions made in 1979 resulted in the potash corporation of this province and the taxpayers of this province, Mr. Speaker, having a company that can produce twice as much potash as it has sold in record years, and last year was a record year. There were wrong decisions made by the New Democratic Party, difficult decisions, Mr. Speaker, that have to be made now, and certainly not easy decisions.

But fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, the potash corporation of this province, owned by the people of this province, has twice as much productive capacity and ability to produce potash as it can sell even in record years with increasing market share, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, whose answer, quite frankly, flies in the face of the facts and logic. Why is it, with all the world over-supply, that New Mexico can open up, Israel can open up, the Soviet Union can open up. They're moving into the North American markets, they're taking away our production and sales market share in the United States, and yet you and PCS can't do it.

I ask the minister: isn't it correct to say that inventory levels today are as low if not lower than 1981? The inventory levels are that low, and as a result, because of those low inventories, there is a demand for potash. But because of your short-sighted, mismanaged policy, it's the Americans and the Israelis who are benefiting and our families who are going broke and starving because of your approach.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, the people of this province should know — they don't want to hear it, Mr. Speaker. They want to shout down the answers, Mr. Speaker, because they were so wrong.

Mr. Speaker, hear what they've said. This man, the Leader of the Opposition — minister responsible for the potash corporation in 1979, member responsible for the disastrous over-expansion in 1980 — made the decision himself, Mr. Speaker, to produce for inventories, Mr. Speaker, because there was an election coming. And he ballooned up inventories, he over-produced, he over-expanded potash, Mr. Speaker, because there was an election coming, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that inventories were so expanded, that had helped deflate and depress the price, Mr. Speaker.

And now he wants that wrong-headed, foolish, financially unsound, Mr. Speaker, disastrous policy to be continued. He was wrong, Mr. Speaker, in 1978; he was wrong in 1979; he was wrong in 1980; he was wrong in 1981, Mr. Speaker; and he was wrong in 1982 and cost the people of this province \$800 million and disastrous potash prices, Mr. Speaker. He was wrong then, he's wrong again, and he's wrong today, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of Finance. If that accusation of being wrong

had come from anybody other than the man who missed the budget deficit prediction by nearly a billion dollars, I might be worried — I might be worried.

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

**Mr. Romanow:** —By my new question to the minister is this, Mr. Minister: I have here *The Potash Letter*, put out by your own Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, spring of 1988, by your Mr. Chuck Childers. It says this:

The price premium in U.S. markets over offshore markets, now at about U.S. \$25 per short tonne, has clearly attracted offshore material, (has clearly attracted offshore material) to the detriment of Canadian and U.S. producers.

Now they've got the material — to whose detriment, according to your president? Our detriment. We've got the capacity in Lanigan; we've got the capacity in Cory. What do you do? You shut it down. Are you renegeing and disputing the very words of your president? Why don't you admit that your corporation and you simply don't know where you're going on potash policy? You've bungled this badly as the budget of four or five years ago that you've introduced.

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

Hon. Mr. Lane: Well, I always like the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, talking about . . . (inaudible) . . . because I happen to have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a report done by the New Democratic Party in 1980 where they said that the Heritage Fund was going to have \$6.4 billion in it by 1990; that the revenues were going to increase tenfold, Mr. Speaker, to \$13.4 billion in the Heritage Fund by 1990, Mr. Speaker.

They didn't miss it by \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker; they didn't miss it by \$2 billion, Mr. Speaker; the NDP didn't miss it by \$3 billion, Mr. Speaker; they missed it by \$10 billion, Mr. Speaker. Ten billion dollars they were out, Mr. Speaker, in 1978, '79, and '80, and here's the documents, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt, when potash prices are up, Mr. Speaker, there will be some countries around that will want to have new mines. Manitoba will want to try and have a new mine, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, its the same wrong-headed thinking, that when prices are up you increase production, that led to the disastrous potash policies of the mid 1980s, Mr. Speaker; that led to \$899 million in losses for the taxpayers of this province, Mr. Speaker; that led to potash industry losses throughout the world, Mr. Speaker.

That is the wrong track, Mr. Speaker. We have to try and bring productive capacity in line with sales. We have to try and hope that prices stay up, Mr. Speaker, so that the industry world-wide . . . The Leader of the Opposition is promoting the NDP policy of depressed prices and a bankrupt industry, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to

the minister of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, who I wish would try to get to 1988 . . . (inaudible interjection). . . Yes, I do. I do, because the chairman of the potash corporation in 1982-83, your own chairman right there who was fired by the Premier, said the following quote right from your report:

. . . is our firm believe that a new and stronger PCS can emerge. With this belief in mind, the board of directors supported management's recommendation to continue with one of our major projects in Saskatchewan. I refer to the PCS mining Lanigan phase 2 expansion which is now under way. Although the uncertainty in the market forced us to look at the extension of the construction schedule, the corporation will spend \$80 million on this project in 1983. This clearly illustrates our commitment to, and our belief in the future of, PCS as a viable commercial entity.

End quote, Mr. Minister. That was your decision. If it was our decision in '79, it was your decision too. What's happened since? I'll tell you what's happened since. You cancelled PCS International sales, and with it you cut back the markets, and your policy is to cut back on production so that our workers go unemployed.

I say to the minister: start living in 1988, reverse the policy, show the leadership that your Minister of Energy said that you would. Why don't you stand up for Saskatchewan people and not New Mexico people? Do that.

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

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have just seen today why the Leader of the Opposition wants to talk about 1988 and not 1980-81 when he was responsible for making those decisions. And it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, that he indicated — and certainly, the board decision — but he indicated on management's recommendation . . . because management recommended, because there was so much invested in the potash expansion at Lanigan, Mr. Speaker, they wanted, Mr. Speaker, that steel standing out there, rusting in Lanigan. That's what they wanted, Mr. Speaker — the steel rusting in Lanigan on the landscape in Lanigan. That's what they wanted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, to try and tell the people of this province as the Leader of the Opposition has just done, that the potash corporation is losing markets because of decision, is blatantly false, Mr. Speaker. Our market share has increased, Mr. Speaker; it has increased into the United States, Mr. Speaker; it has increased through Canpotex, Mr. Speaker, throughout the world.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, to try and tell the people that we are losing market share is false, it's wrong, and it's deliberately deceptive, Mr. Speaker.

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

## Call for Inquiry into Resignation of Saskatoon Deputy Police Chief

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make short comment with regard — a short statement with regard to the problems that have occurred recently in the city of Saskatoon as it relates to the city police.

I have now reviewed the circumstances surrounding the resignation of Deputy Chief Henderson and have considered the calls of a public inquiry into this matter. I have also considered the suggestions that, with the resignation of Mr. Henderson, the matter should be treated as entirely closed.

There are two aspects to this case. From the prospects of the Department of Justice, this is a criminal investigation. The evidence was independently reviewed by Mr. Serge Kujawa, Q.C., of the Saskatchewan Department of Justice to determine if a prosecution should proceed. That independent review is always, Mr. Speaker, always undertaken in the case involving police officers. Mr. Kujawa determined that no charges should proceed in this case as there was simply insufficient evidence on which to base a prosecution.

The case also raises questions in relation to Mr. Henderson's continued employment with the Saskatoon city police force. That aspect of the case was dealt with by the Saskatoon board of police commissioners and resulted in Mr. Henderson's resignation.

It could accordingly be argued that the matter is closed; however, as Minister of Justice, I remain concerned with the suggestion that this affair has shaken the confidence of the Saskatoon police force. Any police force must have public confidence to do its job.

Further, before setting this matter to rest, I wish to be entirely satisfied that no further action is called for. I have accordingly asked the Saskatchewan Police Commission to conduct a confidential inquiry into the circumstances surrounding, and the results of this affair, and to report its findings and recommendations to me. The deputy Attorney General will meet with the chairman of the commission this week to discuss the process and the terms of reference. On the receipt of the commission's report, I will determine what, if any, further steps should be taken.

This course of action will give me the benefit of an independent and impartial review. The Saskatchewan Police Commission is an independent body established pursuant to The Police Act that has a broad mandate relating to the maintenance of quality police service in Saskatchewan, and a long experience in dealing with matters of this kind.

I have considered the call for a public inquiry; however, it is my decision that such an inquiry is not called for at this time. In our justice system, matters related to criminal investigation are disclosed only in the most extraordinary circumstances. It is essential that the police and the prosecutors be in a position to conduct their business confidentially.

This tradition of independence and effective . . . this tradition is intended to ensure that the administration of justice is independent and effective and to protect those touched by criminal investigation.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I have had an opportunity to read the statement as the minister, in fact, was reading it. I don't wish to throw gasoline on a fire that's already burning pretty brightly. I am not sure, however, that this is going to do the job.

The difficulty, it seems to me, Mr. speaker, with respect to the Henderson affair is been that everything has been conducted behind closed doors, and no explanation has been provided to the public, or indeed for that matter, I guess, to the police force.

It seems to me that the difficulty here is that, firstly, I think there isn't the confidence in the police commission — I'm not referring to the Saskatchewan Police Commission, members will understand — but there isn't the confidence in the independence of the Saskatoon Police Commission that there should be. There is a feeling, I think, that that commission needs to be restructured; it needs a greater degree of independence.

Secondly, I think the concern has arisen because everything has been so secretive. In the face of what looks like a serious breach of judgement and good behaviour, at an absolute minimum, not a word has been said, no explanation has been offered. We now have a continuation of this, I think, course of conduct that a confidential inquiry, which I think will solve nothing unless it's made public.

Let me end with the hope that if the inquiry is conducted confidentially, and depending on the nature of the allegations, I can see why that might have to happen if they've in fact involves a police . . . if there is a need to discuss police investigation and the manner in which investigations were undertaken and the reasons why they were undertaken, then I can see why the inquiry, or at least portions of it, might have to be public.

I earnestly hope, however, that the report is made public. If the report is not made public, then this has all been a waste, and the members opposite and the minister will have accomplished nothing.

So I end with the expression of a sincere hope that for the sake of the Saskatoon police force — which, Mr. Speaker, is a good police force and has enjoyed a good reputation over the years — for the sake of the Saskatoon police force, the minister solves the problem rather than avoids it, and makes the report which the Police Commission, Saskatchewan Police Commission, gives them, public.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

### Bill No. 102 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Railway Act

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Railway

Act.

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

**Bill No. 103 — An Act to amend The Animal Protection Amendment Act, 1987**

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Animal Protection Amendment Act, 1987.

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

**POINT OF ORDER**

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with regard to the question period earlier today. It is customary in the question period and at other times to note the presence or absence of ministers of the Executive Council. During question period that's quite often done, and I don't raise a point of order about that.

But during the question period today the Deputy Premier referred to the fact that one of the members on this side of the House was absent from the Chamber. Mr. Speaker, he did that and you did not intervene — you did not intervene with the Deputy Premier even when a point of order was raised vocally from members in the House.

I would like you to consider that matter, Mr. speaker, in conjunction with the rules of this House and, at an appropriate time, bring back a statement which will be supported by practices and procedures or citations. Would you do that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I recall the incident clearly. I will look at the verbatim record and, if necessary, I will make some statement.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**SECOND READINGS**

**Bill No. 85 — An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Association of Certified Nursing Assistants**

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As the House was informed just a few moments ago in question period, or prior to question period in the introductions of guests, I had the opportunity to introduce a group of people in the gallery who are, by and large, executive members of the certified nursing assistants in this province, people who have worked very, very hard to bring this day about, in terms of the time when we would be in this House discussing in principle, as second reading is, their new Act which gives them professional status in the province. And I think it's an important day for them, and I know they feel it's an important day.

(1445)

I first met many of the members of this group when I had other responsibilities over in the department of the then

department of advanced education and manpower. I saw at that time that they were very serious about the concerns that they brought forward. I've continued to see that into this portfolio in Health, and I just want to say a word to them on a personal basis, Mr. Speaker, before beginning. Congratulations for the way you've conducted yourselves throughout all these months.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to speak to second reading of The Certified Nursing Assistants Act, 1988, which will provide for the regulation of nursing assistants across the province. Previous to this Act, nursing assistants were regulated under The Registered Nurses Act, 1978. The 3,000 nursing assistants in the province have asked and have demonstrated the maturity to manage the affairs of their own profession. Mr. Speaker, this Act will allow the Saskatchewan association of certified nursing assistants to register set standards of conduct for, and discipline, their members.

The Act is consistent with other regulated health professions in this province, and I would like to outline some of those features now. Mr. Speaker, it will be mandatory for anyone employed as a certified nursing assistant to be registered with the association. Title protection for the term certified nursing assistant and CNA, the abbreviation, is provided in the Act. These clauses will ensure that the public is protected from receiving services from unqualified practitioners.

The Act also specifies that up to two public representatives may be appointed to the council of the association by the Lieutenant Governor in council. This type of public participation is of benefit to the association as well as to the public, and that's been noted on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, throughout various Bills dealing with professional Acts of various associations.

Nursing assistants will be responsible for registering their own members. This would, of course, include graduates of the Saskatchewan nursing assistant education program as approved by the Minister of Education. Mr. Speaker, the Act provides the association with the power to make by-laws, however, consistent with other regulated professions, by-laws that could potentially impact the public require the approval of the Minister of Health before taking effect, and that's, as I say, consistent with other professions and it makes eminent sense.

The Act ensures that complaints of incompetence or misconduct are acted upon in an effective manner. The discipline provisions of the Act outlines the manner in which complaints are investigated and discipline hearings conducted. Provision is also included that requires the complainant to be informed of the outcome of the association's actions on any complaint.

To assist in protecting the public, employers will be required to report to the association dismissals of nursing assistants for reasons of misconduct or incompetence. The association can then take the appropriate disciplinary action.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Nursing Assistants Association, as I've said earlier, has been fully consulted on the Act and looks forward to taking on their new

regulatory responsibilities.

As this Act involves a transition of responsibility for nursing assistants, the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association has also been extensively consulted, and I know the two organizations have had many, I'm sure I could say several, but I believe it to be many meetings, and the SRNA (Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association) concurs with the proposed legislation, and that's important to note.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of The Certified Nursing Assistants Act, Bill No. 85. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms. Simard:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I must say that this is certainly a great day for certified nursing assistants in the province of Saskatchewan, I know that they have been working long and hard for many years to acquire legislation that allows them to be self-governing, Mr. Speaker. And in fact the NDP caucus back in 1983 or '84 approved in principle, while not approving specific wording of any legislation, approved in principle the concept of CNAs (certified nursing assistants) being self-governing. So like the CNAs here and across the province, we are very pleased to see the legislation coming forward today.

The legislation is a recognition of their valuable contribution in the health care field, Mr. speaker, of the excellent work that they have done throughout the years. And we believe as a caucus that they deserve recognition in law, and recognition that they are a very important and crucial part of health care in the province of Saskatchewan.

This legislation will allow the association to better govern and manage their members and to better govern and manage their membership in the interests of the public as well, Mr. Speaker. They have worked long and hard in getting this legislation put forward. I, personally, have been extremely impressed with their diligence and their hard work, and I know they've had many sessions where they've been consulting with the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association, for example. And there hasn't always been agreement, Mr. Speaker, but there's been compromise and there's been co-operation, Mr. Speaker, and I think that speaks well for both CNAs in the province of Saskatchewan and registered nurses, Mr. Speaker.

And it's very, very heart-warming to see Saskatchewan people working so closely together and working so well to come forward with a piece of legislation of this nature that's going to benefit all of us in Saskatchewan.

I will have some questions, technical questions, in Committee of the Whole, but our caucus will be supporting this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a Committee of the

Whole later this day.

### **Bill No. 93 — An Act to amend The Ambulance Act**

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to explain these amendments to The Ambulance Act of 1986. This Act, which was passed two years ago, provides a consolidation of legislation dealing with ambulance issues. It establishes new standards for the system and sets the stage for the future development of pre-hospital care.

In the time since the Act was passed, my department has engaged in intensive consultation with the various interest groups in order to arrive at a complementary set of detailed regulations. I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, to report that the process is now essentially complete.

In the process of this consultation, a number of items were identified in the Act which required greater clarification. Further, new approaches were recognized which could accomplish the intent of the Act in a more appropriate manner. That is the purpose of this amendment Act, Mr. Speaker.

Several of the changes outlined in the amendment Act are housekeeping in nature, and I will not go into them in any detail. Perhaps we can talk about them in committee with the hon. member from Lakeview. I would, however, like to outline the major areas that these amendments are designed to address. The first relates to the contractual relationship between ambulance boards and the operators that provide service in the province. Because this relationship is a corner-stone of the service delivery, the interest groups involved have recommended that the essential elements of these contracts be included in legislation.

In addition, the amendment Act will include provisions that will protect the interest of individual operators and their own investment in the health delivery system of the province.

The second major component is the inclusion of a dispute resolution process to resolve differences that may arise between boards and their contracted operators. Rather than leave both parties with no formal system to resolve disputes, a multiple-level process has been developed. This process is designed to provide for conciliation and, if necessary, binding arbitration and is developed to ensure fairness for both parties and a continuity of service.

A final important aspect, Mr. Speaker, is the clarification that the practice of medical procedures by advance training ambulance personnel will fall under the jurisdiction of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. This is essential to ensure that high-quality, consistent standards of care are available to the residents of our province, standards of care that are delivered under proper medical control.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased with the legislation that has been developed with respect to our ambulance delivery system. It is designed to protect the interests of all the major players involved, particularly members of the public who utilize the service, and that must be and must



continue to be the major concern that we have here in the legislature.

The consultation that has gone into the development of this legislation has been most extensive, and I would like to thank those individuals and groups who participated in this process and whose views are now represented here in these amendments.

In particular, I would like to thank the members of the ambulance advisory committee for their commitment and diligence over the past few years. And, Mr. Speaker, that ambulance advisory committee represented the various sectors involved from hospital boards through members . . . operators, other people across the province, and I must say once again, their work was extensive in this area, and their work should be recognized by all members of this House who really are here to serve the same people.

There's no question, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will place Saskatchewan on the leading edge of development in the pre-hospital care system in this country. I don't think there can be any question about that, and it's recognized, our Ambulance Act of '86, and now with these amendments we will be recognized across this country as being the leaders in the country, and that's right where we believe we should be, where our people believe we should be, and these amendments will take us there, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 93, The Ambulance Amendment Act. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that I got a copy of the printed Bill today. I had a copy, a photocopy or a xerox copy of not the Bill in this form but in another form, on Friday.

I have made some phone calls with respect to the legislation. We will require more time in order to make further contacts and to consider the minister's comments.

I understand that what this Bill does is it significantly changes the relationship between boards and ambulance operators, and it as well significantly changes the concept of what is a contract, because there's provision in it that requires for the automatic extension of a contract unless there's cause to terminate it. So it does significantly change the concept of contract as we know it in Canadian and in Saskatchewan law.

I'm therefore going to ask to, in a minute, to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, in order that I make contact with boards in the province and with other members of the ambulance profession in order to discuss these amendments and make sure that these are the amendments that indeed they wish to see the government putting forward. So I therefore adjourn the debate . . . second reading debate.

Debate adjourned.

(1500)

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 86 — An Act respecting Registered Nurses

#### Clause 1

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, on my left is Sid Smith from the Department of Health, and I have Gerry Tegart from the Department of Justice who's been working with drafting of legislation.

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should point out that I was not aware that this particular piece of legislation was coming up; obviously there was a communication problem between the two sides of the House. And my material with respect to the matter is not in my office because I was working on it at home; however, I'm prepared to proceed on the basis of memory.

There was a number of concerns that I had raised with respect to this legislation in second reading. And there is another couple of concerns that I also want to put on the record that I didn't raise at that time, because the ones I was dealing with were the ones that I had hoped we could resolve through amendment, and I believe one of those has already been proposed in the House amendments before us today. The other two, I understand, from the registered nurses association are not agreeable, and they've given me their reasons for it.

The other one in particular that caused concern was the section in the Act dealing with the abandonment of patients. Nurses have indicated to me, Mr. Chairman, that they are . . . that section really bothers them. And it bothers them because they're constantly being put in a situation where they're having to make a decision between or amongst patients and who should be receiving the care, and the provision allows for nurses to be disciplined if they abandon a patient.

And I believe that this position that nurses are put in where they're constantly having to decide which patient is going to get their attention because of understaffing in hospitals, Mr. Chairman, has caused them a lot of concern and it's at the root of their concern with respect to this section.

Another aspect of that that causes them concern is the fact that it may, at some time in the future, be used as an anti-strike clause, and that they will be . . . it will be claimed that they abandoned their patient if they go out on strike. I have spoken to the SRNA about that and they assure me that it is not intended to be an anti-strike clause from their point of view, and that's . . . if there was a legal strike, that they wouldn't be invoking this section as an anti-strike clause. But when we get to that particular provision, I would like to hear from the minister what his comments are on that particular section.

Nurses have also indicated to me with respect to the fining, generally. There is a provision in the Act that deals with fining a nurse and also assessing costs against her in the event that the discipline hearings go against her and that she will be suspended until this fine and these costs are paid. And nurses have told me, Mr. Chairman, that

this imposes a great deal of strain on . . . like nurses aren't in the same position doctors or lawyers are, for example, and it's very difficult for them to pay a fine, and it's almost impossible for them to pay costs of a hearing. And if they're suspended and can't make a living, it's virtually impossible for them to pay a fine and/or costs, and so they've asked me to express this concern with respect to the legislation.

And I have discussed it with the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association, and I've been advised that, in their recollection, costs have never been assessed against a nurse, and that it provides some sort of disincentive for frivolous legal proceedings, and that a fine is something that they don't ordinarily levy also, but the right to levy it should be there in the event that some time in the future they might want to use it.

And we're not going to oppose the Bill because of this provision, but I would like the record to show that nurses have contacted me and have expressed concern about this particular provision.

The other thing that they've expressed concern to me about is the possible conflict of interest when the executive director also sits on the council which makes a decision with respect to discipline. And I have spoken to the SRNA about this, and they also assure me that this whole procedure is looked after, inasmuch as the executive director has nothing to do with discipline hearings in the initial stages.

But if the executive director did, and then sat on the council, even as a non-voting member but as a member that's visible when a decision is being made with respect to the disciplining of a nurse, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that is a conflict of interest. But I have been assured that that doesn't take place. But nevertheless, I have said that I would put these concerns forward.

The moral character question, I understand, is being dealt with in the House amendments, and that change is going to be made.

And those, basically, are the major concerns that were put forward to me by nurses, as well as the ones I discussed in second reading. And we'd be prepared to proceed now on a clause by clause basis.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say to the hon. member that we'll probably best respond to those as we come to the clause within which each of those concerns presents itself. And if we can carry forward, we'll go from there, and we can go on a item 1 agreement now, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1 agreed to.

## Clause 2

**Mr. Chairman:** — House amendment to clause 2 of the printed Bill.

Amend clause 2(n) of the printed Bill by striking out "suspended or revoked" and substituting "suspended or who is not expelled".

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

## Clause 14

**Mr. Chairman:** — House amendment to clause 14.

Amend subsection 14(3) of the printed Bill by adding "majority" after "two-thirds".

Clause 14 as amended agreed to.

## Clause 15

**Mr. Chairman:** — House amendment to clause 15.

Amend section 15 of the printed Bill:

(a) In clause (2)(a) by striking out "moral character" and substituting "good character"; and

(b) In subclause (2)(g)(i) by striking out "investigation conduct committee" and substituting "investigation committee".

Clause 15 as amended agreed to.

## Clause 16

**Mr. Chairman:** — House amendment to clause 16.

Amend subsection 16(2) of the printed Bill by striking out "that he approves" and substituting "that the minister approves".

Clause 16 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 17 and 18 agreed to.

## Clause 19

**Mr. Chairman:** — House amendment, section 19.

Amend subsection 19(2) of the printed Bill by striking out "a person outside Saskatchewan as described in subclauses 1(a)(ii)" and substituting "a person who last practised nursing in a jurisdiction outside Saskatchewan".

Clause 19 as amended agreed to.

## Clause 20

**Mr. Chairman:** — Amendment to section 20 of the printed Bill.

Amend clause 20(1)(b) of the printed Bill by striking out "paragraph 19(1)(i)(A)" and substituting "paragraph 19(1)(a)(i)(A)".

Clause 20 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 25 inclusive agreed to.

**Clause 26**

**Ms. Simard:** — I guess the minister was just standing in reply to my earlier question with respect to abandonment.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman, the member's concern was in section 26(2)(e), I believe, where the wording in here is . . . a key word there is "wrongfully" in the subsection which says "wrongfully abandoned a client".

I just want to point out to the member — and we've talked about this at some length in determining this — it's important that the term "abandonment" not be considered to be as . . . And I believe SUN (Saskatchewan Union of Nurses) when they were raising this, the Union of Nurses was interpreting the word "abandonment" as only the narrow sort of interpretation of that word to mean leave a patient or whatever. And I think the term "wrongfully" placed there will certainly — in a hearing before peers, other nurses will certainly be able to determine whether or not, you know, someone who is practising nursing did, in fact, wrongfully abandon a client at a time of need or whatever.

So I think this has been worked over for a good period of time and we believe, and all of the legal advice we have believes, that this is the best possible wording that we can come up with to serve the purposes that the nursing association needs, and that the public needs as well to have the assurance that's needed in the provision. So unless you have, you know, further sort of arguments on that we can certainly go on. The member is indicating that she disagrees with me. It won't be the first time, but I will say that I think we may have to come to the point where we're agreeing to disagree.

**Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister explicitly: did he say, and I may not have heard him say, that it is not an anti-strike clause from his point of view?

(1530)

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I'll give you the assurance that it is not intended in any way to be an anti-strike clause.

Clause 26 agreed to.

Clause 27 agreed to.

**Clause 28**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Amendment to clause 28. Will the members take the amendment as read?

Clause 28 as amended agreed to.

Clause 29 agreed to.

**Clause 30**

**Mr. Chairman:** — Amendment to clause 30. Will the members take the amendment as read?

Clause 30 as amended agreed to.

**Clause 31**

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe the member raised a concern in her preliminary remarks regarding a section of clause 31 as it relates to the levying of fines. And that's in 31(2)(a)(i) and it says a fine:

(a) that the nurse pay to the association within a fixed period:

(i) a fine in a specified amount;

The rationale behind that, and the fact that that sort of provision is in many of the professional Acts and the disciplinary provisions of those Acts, for the very reason that there may be time when some disciplinary measure should be, and is seen to be important that some disciplinary measure be imposed. But at the same time it wouldn't be warranted that that disciplinary measure be suspension or revoking of licence or anything quite so severe.

And that's the thinking behind that as it relates to professional Acts across the piece. And this is one of those and that's why it's there, and it's a matter of having that provision in there which really gives more latitude or more flexibility to the association to conduct their affairs in the fairest possible way as they deal with their individual members.

Clause 31 agreed to.

Clauses 32 to 41 inclusive agreed to.

**Clause 42**

**Mr. Chairman:** — House amendment to clause 42. Will the members take the amendment as read?

Clause 42 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 43 to 49 inclusive agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, just before I move to report the Bill, I'd just like to say . . . or Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say to the committee that I notice a couple of visitors in the gallery. Jean Mahoney, the past president of the SRNA, and Jane Knox, the executive director of SRNA, are there watching as this Bill goes through its various stages. Obviously, this being the last stage in the House I'm sure they're breathing some sigh of relief as some of the officials here, who have done a great deal of work as I indicated at another day here, in bringing this Bill an all the provisions of it to fruition. Before I report the Bill, I just wanted to recognize that, Mr. Chairman, to all members of the committee.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee report the Bill.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

**Bill No. 85 — An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Association of Certified Nursing Assistants**

**Clause 1**

**Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the certified nursing assistants, there is a provision that allows for a special meeting to be called by 250 members, by request of 250 members. Now I noticed it was the same provision in the SRNA Act, and I wonder whether the minister could let me know why he chose the number 250 members, because with respect to the CNA, that would be a substantially larger number of individuals who would have to request a special meeting. And I'm wondering if that's deliberate or whether 250 was just pulled out of the air?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask for just a couple of minutes, one of the officials here is just going to go out and do a check on that. I substantively agree with what the member has just raised in terms of the difference between the number of members, but if you could just give us a moment, we'll . . . and I think I have an indication that members will agree to that. Just give us a moment, and we'll have a reply.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I said, the member raises an interesting point and I substantively agree with it. I just wanted to check to make sure that it was no surprise for the people in the CNA organization who are here.

While it's important that we not just define this, if there's any specific ratio that this should follow or anything, it makes eminent sense that if the number is 250 for a very large organization like SRNA, a smaller number would be appropriate for the CNAs. I would advance a number of 125, and I believe they'd be in agreement with that. If the hon. member would be in agreement as well, we'll provide the appropriate amendment.

**Ms. Simard:** — We're in agreement with that, Mr. Chairman, and I understand the CNAs are also in agreement with that.

Mr. Chairman, there's another thing that I would like the minister's explanation on and that is governing examinations. I've looked through the by-laws and there is some general wording in the by-laws, but I don't believe there is a specific by-law that says they have the authority to make by-laws governing examinations for CNAs. And I'm just wondering if the legal counsel on that side of the House could either assure me that authority is there for the CNAs and, if not, bring forward an amendment.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I'm assured that . . . our people believe that in section — what is it? — 14(2)(a), that section which:

Subject to this Act, by-laws made pursuant to section 13 may be made for the following purposes:

(a) prescribing the qualifications, standards and tests of competency . . .

That that's covered there, especially when it's in conjunction with section 18(c)(i). You just flip to 18(c)(i) which says . . . which refers to by-laws — that the fact that

it is in the by-laws. You look at, "has passed examinations: prescribed and conducted pursuant to the bylaws;" and those two in conjunction with each other, I'm assured, do solve the problem that you raise.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

**Clause 6**

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I'm not sure if I just need to put this on the Table, but I would just want to . . . it's the amendment that we referred to earlier in the discussion, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to offer a House amendment which would in effect:

Amend Clause 6(e)(b):

by striking out "at least 250 members" and substituting "at least 125 members."

I so move, Mr. Chairman.

(1545)

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 6 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 25 inclusive agreed to.

**Clause 26**

**Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Chairman, I notice that the SRNA Bill was amended with respect to what appears to be the equivalent of 26(7) in The CNA Act. And I'm just wondering if the minister's officials could take a look at that at this time and see whether or not a House amendment is necessary with respect to The CNA Act as well.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I am informed by counsel that the — who's been very involved in this — is that while the wording is slightly different, the effect is the same, and the two associations had slightly different ways they wanted to approach this thing and so the wording was there.

Now if there's a problem, if the member sees a way in which there is substantive difference between the two, which I don't think there is and our people don't think that there is, that we just leave it at this. And if you'll agree with that, I think we can carry on, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 26 agreed to.

Clause 27 agreed to.

**Clause 28**

**Ms. Simard:** — With respect to subsection (4) of section 28, Mr. Chairman, that section says that the discipline committee is not bound by rules of law concerning evidence. Now I know that that's a standard section there. I raised concerns about it with respect to the SRNA Act. I have looked at some other professional legislation, and I

believe it is in some other professional legislation, but I simply want to say that it really does bother me that a discipline committee that's making a decision as to whether or not someone has the right to continue in their occupation and to earn a living, is not bound by the rules of evidence.

And I suppose the practical answer to that is, is that ultimately the discipline committee is bound by the principles of natural justice according to law and therefore would ordinarily consider themselves bound by the rules of law.

But I want to put that concern on the record because I feel, in a situation where a discipline committee is deciding whether or not someone has the licence to continue practising their occupation, that they should be bound by the rules of law concerning evidence.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — The concern that the member raises is one that has been raised not only in this professional legislation and in others as we get into the standard provisions that are there.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the member, in raising the question and subsequent to raising the question, basically gave the reply to her own question, and it is that the . . . well, as she stated.

**Ms. Simard:** — There is another provision of 28, and that's 28(10) that I would like some clarification on, Mr. Chairman. 28(10) reads:

The discipline committee may, either in the absence of the member who is the subject of the complaint or with that member's consent, accept evidence on affidavit.

Now that to me reads as though the discipline committee may, in the absence of the member who's the subject of the complaint, accept evidence on affidavit. And I'm wondering whether I'm interpreting that correctly.

And if indeed that is an interpretation that's possible by that section, I find it rather strange, because I believe that in the absence of a member who's the subject of the complaint, you better not be accepting evidence on affidavit. It's even more important in the absence of that member to have viva voce evidence as opposed to affidavit evidence.

So I'm wondering whether I'm misinterpreting that provision or whether indeed that is an accurate interpretation. Could I please hear from the minister on that.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Sorry for the delay.

Mr. Chairman, while I recognize what the member's raising, it's felt, not only here but in other professional legislation, that the discipline committee, in this case, the discipline committee must have the flexibility to be able to deal with the varying circumstances that they have . . . that they must have, and that the use of affidavit evidence will be necessary from time to time. And they need, as I say, the flexibility earlier, and then the affidavit evidence

will be necessary from time to time.

I guess the point that I'm into . . . in the legal world here where you and my colleague beside me are far more comfortable than I am, for obvious reasons, I'm told that the rules of natural justice will confine the use of affidavit evidence to situations where it's deemed to be fair to use that. And I suppose the weight of that affidavit evidence is . . . And I think that's the natural process of law. In any case it will be a matter of a judgement call as to the weight that affidavit evidence is given.

But that's the reason behind it. That's the reason it's not only in this legislation but this has become a standard provision over a number of years now in some of these professional . . . pieces of professional legislation. So it's the best explanation I can give you.

You may want to get into it a little more. I just wish I could ask my colleague, the lawyer here, to stand up and you could go into a little of your lawyering here.

**An Hon. Member:** — It wouldn't do any good here.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Okay.

Clause 28 agreed to.

#### Clause 29

Ms. Simard: I wanted to state with respect to the CNAs, in the same manner that I did with respect the SRNAs, my concerns about fines and levying costs of the inquiry and the hearing against certified nursing assistants. I believe that that could be a very unfair burden to be levied on a certified nursing assistant. Although I understand and fully recognize that this is a standard provision, I simply want to state what my concern is in that regard.

Clause 29 agreed to.

Clauses 30 to 44 inclusive agreed to.

(1600)

**Mr. Chairman:** — Would the minister move to report the Bill?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just before I do that, as I said earlier today in the second reading speech and earlier in the introduction of guests where I introduced the executive members, or some of them, that are there, along with the executive director of the nursing assistants' association, I just want to say to them and to the House once again: I know that this is a landmark sort of day for their association and for the practice of that profession in this province.

And I just want to say a personal word, once again, of appreciation for the way in which they've conducted themselves throughout these negotiations that'll lead up to this stage, and just say to all members of the committee that we are well served, as I said earlier, in terms of the professional people we have in our nursing profession and the people we have operating as certified nursing assistants. Our public in Saskatchewan are well served by

both groups. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I move that we report the Bill.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill No. 86 — An Act respecting Registered Nurses

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave, I move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Leave is not granted.

#### Bill No. 85 — An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Association of Certified Nursing Assistants

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** — When shall the Bill be read a third time?

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, next sitting.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Taylor that Bill No. 50 — **An Act respecting the Control of Distribution and the Consumption of Beverage Alcohol in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my opportunity to make a few remarks this afternoon with respect to Bill 50, the liquor control Act. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are two problems that I see with this particular Bill. The first one is that it increases access to, and makes provision to increase access to, the availability of liquor in Saskatchewan; and the second, that it gives the government power away from the scrutiny of the House in a fashion which I think goes perhaps beyond the tradition of the House, as I understand it. And those are the two items that I want to deal with this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to removing of the powers from legislation into regulations, and into franchising, what this Bill does, Mr. Speaker, is it gives the cabinet a great deal of power to make regulations. Cabinet can make regulations about, first of all, who gets a franchise, where the franchise is gotten, and the number of people that can get franchises. It gives the cabinet power to put liquor into any store, virtually any store, if you look through various parts of the regulations. There are some parts of the legislation that make it appear as if it can only be done in food stores, but when you look at other parts, it leaves it wide open to

cabinet. It gives cabinet the power over control of the prices and whether or not there's going to be any kind of a regulation of pricing, and they can deregulate prices altogether.

So what could happen is, in Saskatchewan we may end up with price sales and price wars in alcohol. It gives cabinet the power also to set the hours or to deregulate the hours, which could include then the sale of liquor even on Sundays. And particularly, if the legislation on store opening hours goes through, and if you combine that with accessibility of liquor in grocery stores and corner stores, then of course would leave that wide open for purchase of liquor at any time.

Now in addition to the regulations, I mention that the liquor legislation here also deals with the possibility of giving out franchises.

Now the franchising aspect is a kind of a thing that I'd even wonder why a government would want to get into it, because you would have liquor franchises which will be viewed by many, I think, as tickets to the good life — tickets to a good financial life. And in many places in the States, little businesses dream only of having a liquor franchise, and once you get a liquor franchise, that brings in business and clientele and brings in money that ordinarily might not accrue to that business. So while some businesses — those that get the liquor license — would have the advantage of that traffic, those that were unable to get that franchise of course would not have that luxury and would feel that it would be quite unfair.

This leads then the government to be held at ransom by a person who's specifically looking for a franchise. It leads to people almost demanding that they get a franchise or, if not, they're holding at ransom support to the government. I don't know if the government would really want that. I certainly think that if I was in cabinet I wouldn't want to make my regulations or rules about who does or who does not have a franchise on the basis of political support. And that's what it'll lead to.

On the reverse, you get exactly the same thing, where the government will be put in a position or leave itself open in a position of being accused of patronage franchisees. Now that's again a government putting itself in a position where I don't think we want a government to be.

If there were any guarantee in this legislation that franchises would go out by tendering or by a fair tendering process, then we may be able to look at it in a more positive light. However, this government has a very doubtful and a very pitiful record when it comes to their record on tendering. There have been ... I recall very distinctly, back in the late '60s and into early '70s, where one business by the name of Hackl Motors in Prince Albert made a public statement about the corruption that was going on in the government in the '60s, and that was the Thatcher Government. And they ... and Hackl accused ... Mr. Hackl accused the government and their agents of coming to him and asking for donations to the political party, and if not, they were going to remove their government business from them.

I have, since that time, and in the '70s, although I haven't

heard anybody say so publicly, but I've had architects that have told me privately that they also are in a position where they literally have to buy themselves . . . they have to buy their business. They're expected to donate.

What I'm afraid of is this kind of franchise operation leaves itself open, and leaves the province and the people of the province open, to more of this type of disreputable action. So I'm very wary, Mr. Speaker, of the possible selling of liquor stores that might happen, the franchising that'll come as a result of it.

Another difficulty with the franchising is that it would be accompanied with the selling of liquor stores, of the existing liquor stores. Many of the medium-sized towns in the province that now have liquor stores, we have a case where there will be a family or two which has got a good solid wage, the money coming . . . accruing from the liquor, part of it at least, is spent by . . . in wages to that person who accumulates it and makes it his lifetime work. With the franchising, that picture will change. Those communities will quite likely lose the people who had the good jobs with the good wages, and as a result it will be a detriment to the entire community. You lose that person, and the people that are going to be selling the liquor will be people who are going to be hired at \$4.50 an hour, possibly ranging up to 7 or 8, but certainly not a good, full-time job and a full-time wage as is done right now through the liquor stores.

I have to ask the question, Mr. Speaker, when we go through this deregulation of liquor, and what the government is doing through this liquor legislation, whether or not the government has asked itself the question of: where do we really want to go with liquor legislation? Or has the government simply answered to the demands that, well, we should open everything up, we should deregulate, and we should just do whatever a group of 10 or 12 business people have decided and requested us to do.

(1615)

I think when it comes to control of liquor or deregulating liquor that we have to consider all factors, and it is admittedly not a very easy thing to deal with. But I think we should consider all of the factors — the positive ones and the negative one — and there are some positive ones. Liquor is something that most of us have kind of grown up with, alcohol being something that's very much used socially. And we're all in a position where it's difficult . . . and we don't necessarily want to condemn the use of alcohol, particularly when it's used judicially, and we know that in Saskatchewan over half of our population, or very close to half of our population, are moderate drinkers.

So we have to, when we're making legislation, we want to do some kind of a balance. We want to be able to accommodate the moderate drinkers who we generally feel, and is accepted in society, as being responsible, and at the same time be mindful that in Saskatchewan, while there are 586,000 moderate drinkers, there are also 46,000 what we call problem drinkers, and that half of those are between the ages of 15 and 24. And we have a responsibility here in this House to assure that those

people who are affected by liquor in a negative sense are also looked after, and that their voices are heard and that we speak on their behalf.

There are other statistics, Mr. speaker, that point to the problems of alcohol. One that is quite well accepted is the cost, the actual dollar cost of alcohol to Canada, and the figure has been used this year is it's \$21 million a day is the actual cost of alcohol in Canada. If you prorate that to Saskatchewan, assuming that we drink our . . . and have our share of problems of Canada, the figure will come out to be approximately \$1 million a day loss in productivity and staff morale in car accidents. So it's not a proud picture, Mr. Speaker. It's not a pretty picture. It's a picture that needs to be looked at very, very seriously in view of the difficulties.

Now those are some of the tangible and some of the more measurable problems or difficulties with alcohol. There are also the more intangible ones which are maybe even more tragic than looking at just the dollar figures. They certainly bring out the tragedy, or just looking at the numbers, and that is something that you and I and everybody, I guess, knows but we sometimes don't bring to light and don't think of often enough, and that is the effect that liquor has on individuals — the loss of esteem, the loss of personal possessions that many people go through when they're involved with access or rather an excess of liquor, and sometimes what happens to families where the person, as an individual, will be withdrawn or cast away from the family because of problems with alcohol.

This has a tremendous difficulty . . . it is a tremendous difficulty for children, in particular. We know that in many cases progress at school is retarded if one or more family members has a liquor problem. It goes to the extent of the children having reduced access to food and clothing, and as a result, in some cases, even goes to as far as abandonment.

So we have to ask ourselves a question in our society, is just how far do we want to go with respect to increasing the access in liquor? We ask, we have to ask ourselves the questions: what does it do to an individual; what does it do to a family; what does it do to our society; as well as what does it do to our economy?

And as I mentioned again, Mr. Speaker, we have to keep in balance the fact that liquor is an accepted thing here in our Saskatchewan, in our Canada.

So I'm asking the government members opposite, and the minister opposite, that when he introduced this legislation . . . I'm asking: why is it that you're setting it up to increase the accessibility knowing these things? And why is it that when you're increasing this accessibility, why is it that you are making provision for more government control which will only naturally lead, or which can naturally lead, to pressure on the government which can lead to patronage and also to corruption of government?

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, with one other reference. And that reference is again to something that has happened in the past over the last three or four years, and

that is what is happening to the access? It was this government that allowed liquor advertising on television. Prior to this government's promotion of liquor through the allowing of advertising, there was not any Saskatchewan-based advertising, just that that sneaked in without being filtered out on television.

And the first beer ads that we saw were beer ads which associated the beverage of beer with youthful and athletic activity. And although the ad makers and the brewers laid claim that this would not increase consumption — and I don't think it did increase consumption, and I don't know if that's the thing to argue at any rate — we know that what it did is it planted in the minds of our young people, those in that 15 or vulnerable age below that, planted in their minds the idea that if you're having a good time on the beach, or if you're having a good time on the softball field, softball diamond, or whether it's playing basketball, or skiing, that liquor would be associated with that.

And there was a bit of a public outcry on that, and I notice that now those type of ads are more . . . have been pulled. I have not seen as many of them as I did three or four years ago. And I'm glad to see that, that they're selling beer in a different way, rather than trying to implant the sale of beer through using that type of advertising.

But what it did is it showed me, Mr. Speaker, that the direction that this government is going in — that access to advertising in addition to this, which is deregulating the liquor laws more and more — tells me that the government is going in a direction which I don't think it should be. I don't think it should be going in the direction of increasing the accessibility.

I will close, then, Mr. Speaker, with a summary remark — those two remarks — that I am opposed in principle to two things that this Bill does: one, that it increases the accessibility; second, that it opens the Bill up for patronage and franchising.

**Mr. Shillington:** — Thank you very much. I want to add my comments briefly to those of the member from Prince Albert with respect to these amendments on The Liquor Act. This has been a recurring theme in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, members opposite having taken steps, passed legislation, changed policies, which make alcohol more accessible. And their response is: I guess the public want it. Our response to all of this has been: but it is not in the best interests of society, whatever they want.

Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing I think all members would agree upon, that is that there's no need in our society to promote the consumption of alcohol. The product has no danger of disappearing from our society of its own volition. And yet members opposite seem to do that. The toll I . . . My mother, Mr. Speaker, for many years was very active in the WCTU (Women's Christian Temperance Union), quite a strong chapter in Moose Jaw. I do not want to use the sort of phraseology which was typical of that group at that time — they've changed in the '40s and '50s — but I may say I share some of their concerns as I look around society.

The toll taken by alcohol abuse in terms of health costs, in

traffic accidents, time lost from work, and production lost from our society is very, very considerable. It is probably fair to say that there isn't any chemical in our society, there isn't any drug which is abused, which costs us as much as alcohol.

This government opposite has adopted a policy of promoting alcohol consumption and making it more accessible. And they've done both.

Mr. Speaker, I'm still not sure what prompted members opposite to allow alcohol advertising. Certainly the publishers and the owners of the media and the liquor industry itself would have been in favour of it, but I still do not understand fully why they would take such a step. It is clear advertising encourages consumption; it is equally clear our society needs to move in the opposite direction, and yet those steps were taken and have never been changed.

They've also made alcohol more accessible. We had a debate some time ago about the consumption of alcohol in sporting events at Taylor Field and so on.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a Bill, and while the minister has not been very forthcoming about what he's doing and why he's doing it, those of us on this side of the House who over the years have watched this government promote the consumption of alcohol and make the alcohol more accessible, view this with some alarm.

Clearly, Bill 50 is designed to provide for private franchising of alcohol. We've had that for some time in very small community where one can't justify a liquor board store, but heretofore we have confined it to those very small communities where one can't justify a liquor board store, but heretofore we have confined it to those very small community where there may well not be the problem with consumption of alcohol that may exist in larger centres.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see how one can come to any other conclusion but what the private retail sale of alcohol is going to increase consumption. It is in the nature of businesses everywhere to want to increase product and want to increase product sales and want to increase profit; that's what they're there for. I cannot see how they will do other than to try to promote sales.

Mr. Speaker, we . . . probably all of us have visited in U.S. states. The two border states particularly, North Dakota and Montana, both have private sales. We see them promoting the sale of alcohol, trying to increase sales, trying to increase profit. That's going to happen here, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate. The last thing our society needs is anything which makes alcohol more accessible, anything which makes it more . . . which promotes its consumption.

Mr. Speaker, we have, in Saskatchewan, I think an effort which many of us applaud, although I gather not universally so, and that is the alcohol-free grads. As I was driving to work this morning I was listening to apparently a controversy between the Regina school board, who are promoting alcohol-free graduations and some parents which apparently are not warm to the notion. And I gather there are some people present who think that's not realistic, I guess, to be fair.



Mr. Speaker, whether or not it's realistic I guess is a question which parents of children of that age could answer better than I. I don't have children who are of that age. Our children are younger than that, but I think we would all like to see graduations at schools and universities which are not fraught with the problems and consumption of alcohol which has been the case in the past. We may, I guess . . . honest people may differ, I guess, about how you achieve that, and that's perhaps all we're saying here.

(1630)

But I don't see how we can honestly and consistently . . . on one side society saying, we want alcohol-free grads; on the other hand, have ads on television which promote consumption of beer and wine by young people — and they're always young people, or almost always young people on those beer and wine ads — and make alcohol more accessible to private franchises with private business people promoting the sale and consumption of alcohol. It is the nature of business. It is not in their nature to try to restrict consumption. And that was always why I thought the Crown sold alcohol, was because there was no way to sell it through private outlets without have the sales and consumption of alcohol promoted.

We're now going to get away from that system at a most unfortunate time, Mr. Speaker. I think the statistics will show that the consumption of hard liquor is actually decreasing. The consumption of beer and wine is not. I think that's in part due because we have advertising of beer and wine. I think that's one of the reasons why it has not decreased.

I think, as well, it perhaps has something to do, to be fair, with the life-style. People today pursue healthier life-styles. The lighter alcoholic products are thought to be healthier. I am not sure that one grows any stronger on the consumption of beer, any more than one grows any wiser with the consumption of beer, but that's the popular myth today that beer and wine will make you healthier than the consumption of the hard liquor.

I said I didn't intend to go on for long. I don't intend to go on for long. We will have some questions in the Committee of the Whole.

I do not understand why we're apparently making provision for the sale of alcohol on buses. The section provides for the sale of alcohol on trains, ships, and buses. Now the number of ships which ply their way back and forth across Saskatchewan is not large, nor indeed given the current state of the drought would the ships be very large. Any ship that tries to get across Saskatchewan wants to be light enough so that somebody can carry it on their backs because there's no other way to go.

Notwithstanding the optimism of the member from Melfort in bringing in a Bill on private railways, I don't frankly expect to see travel by rail increase within this province.

That means that the only purpose in the section must be to allow consumption of alcohol on buses, and I question

that as well, and we are going to be questioning the minister of alcohol . . . that was a slip, but a Freudian slip . . . the minister in charge of the Liquor Board. We're going to be questioning him in the Committee of the Whole.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, the whole thrust of this Bill appears to be to make alcohol more accessible, and that is going to increase consumption. I, for my part, think that's most unfortunate. The member from Prince Albert's quite right — alcohol is a part of our society. Whether or not, if we had to do it all over again, we'd make it illegal, is something academics may enjoy discussing, but for us practical politicians it hasn't much relevance because we're never going to do it.

But I would have hoped we would all agree that we should not be encouraging its consumption, and this government clearly is. They've done it with liquor advertising. They've done it . . . They promoted it with respect to the consumption of alcohol at sporting events, which took . . . That debate took place a couple of years ago.

And now we've got a Bill which is going to turn the sale over to private people who by their very nature — I'm in business myself; I know — who by their very nature seek to increase profits. They do that by increasing sales. And they are almost certainly going to be doing it.

So I join other members of this Assembly who have expressed concern about the thrust of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to on division, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Berntson that Bill No. 56 — **An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Thompson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to take part in debate on Bill No. 56, the reorganization of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate just how SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) was first created and when it was created. And I want to turn to the annual report of 1978-79, Mr. Speaker, and that was a report that indicates when SMDC was created.

In June of 1974 the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation was formed to participate in the development of the province's hard rock mineral sector. And that was to take part in the development of the uranium industry and hard rock minerals, base metals, and precious metals.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in 1977 SMD was created by an order in council under the legislative authority of The Crown Corporations Act, and at that time it was given its own Act as other Crown corporations in the province also have. It

was getting to be a big corporation and had to have its own Act.

Also, Mr. Speaker, SMDC, when it was created, it was also created to create a window to the world, especially in the uranium industry at that time.

Now we have Bill 56 before us, Mr. Speaker, An Act respecting the Reorganization of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, and it has three parts to it. Number one was: there are three primary purposes of this Bill. First, we want to provide for merger of Eldorado Nuclear Limited of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation in to a single company which is far stronger than either corporation could have ever imagined before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we take a look at this, we know that SMDC was a big corporation, and probably the biggest corporation and one of the better corporations in the world as far as the uranium industry is concerned.

Second, we want to ensure that the head offices of this world-scale resource company is here in Saskatchewan. And I want to touch on that a little later.

And third, we want to allow for the only divestiture of the companies — I mean, the government's ownership in this new company, and that are the words of the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Speaker, as far as SMD is concerned — and Deputy Premier indicated that by creating this merger we would now have the biggest uranium corporation and the most powerful in the world — and I say, Mr. Speaker, if you just take a look at how that happened, and it could never happen unless they were to amalgamate SMDC with Eldorado Nuclear. And of course we know that SMDC is a Saskatchewan-owned corporation, solely owned by the citizens of this province, and I feel that that is the way it should be.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty that SMDC, regardless of the amalgamation, would still be the largest and the richest corporation in the mining industry in the world, regardless. We would not have to take on a weak sister to become a powerful organization in the uranium industry in the world. And I might add — and I want to emphasize that again, Mr. Speaker — it is owned solely, 100 per cent, by the citizens of Saskatchewan.

And it didn't just happen by chance. There was a lot of work and a lot of money spent in creating SMDC and making it the powerful organization that it was. As I indicated, it was started in 1974. But then you take a look at the exploration program that went along with SMDC — and I give some figures: in 1980, there was \$80 million spent on exploration, mainly in the uranium industry in this province, and that is a lot of money; in 1981, there was \$70 million spent in exploration, and that starts to go down when you get to 1983.

And you take a look at the high of 80 million in 1980, and then you get down to '83 and it goes down to \$24 million in exploration, and '84 that had dropped, Mr. Speaker, down to \$18 million, and that was a large drop.

They talk about the head offices remaining in Saskatchewan, and I might add that there are, I believe, six head offices right now in the city of Saskatoon, head offices in the mining industry, and I speak specifically of the uranium mining industry. Key Lake, most certainly, is an important part, and the Saskatchewan government, SMDC, own 50 per cent of that corporation, and their head office is in Saskatoon. And Key Lake, Mr. Speaker, is the largest mine in the world, the largest operating mine of any place in the world, and their head offices solely are in Saskatoon.

And Cigar Lake, which the citizens of Saskatchewan own 50 per cent of, their head office also, Mr. Speaker, are in Saskatoon. And of course we have SMDC, which no longer will be SMDC; its head office is in Saskatoon, and of course that's 100 per cent owned by the citizens of Saskatchewan. And you have another head office in Saskatoon, and that's Eldorado Nuclear, or Eldor Mines, which is the federal Crown corporation, and they also have a head office in Saskatoon.

So I think that when the Deputy Premier was talking about creating a head office in Saskatoon, I think that we have to be very careful, and I think that he has to be very careful, that when you take and you amalgamate SMDC and Cigar Lake and Eldorado Nuclear and you create the one organization, then I think that there's a possibility and a very real possibility that we will lose some of the jobs in Saskatoon, because the offices that are there right now, Mr. Speaker, are going to be amalgamated into one.

And I suggest that this amalgamation, rather than creating a brand-new head office, may just be what it indicates — an amalgamation of some of the major players and the major head offices in Saskatoon. And I would be very, very careful on that one, and I think time will tell whether this is going to be a good move or a bad move.

Then we have to take a look, Mr. Speaker, at the main reason. They say they want to create the world's largest uranium corporation, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, it already is the biggest operation in the world. SMDC most certainly is the biggest uranium operation in the world when you take a look at its assets, and not only in uranium, but in gold also. It is a big operation. If you take a look at the assets of SMDC and the 50 per cent share in Cigar Lake alone, Mr. Speaker, that deposit is worth \$10 billion Canadian — that's \$10 billion; and we in Saskatchewan have one of the highest royalty rates of any place in the world, and that guarantees that this type of moneys are going to come back to Saskatchewan people.

(1645)

And there's something deeper here, and I feel, when you take a look at the type of privatization that has been taking place around the country, you just have to take a look at the federal government, who want to privatize Air Canada.

And we take a look at the forest industry that has now been privatized, and Weyerhaeuser, a big corporation from the United States that has 8 million acres of our

prime forest land and they're administering that 8 million acres, and reports have indicated prior to that sale that we had 25 years of prosperity ahead of us in the forest industry. Things looked bright; all reports indicate that we have 25 years of prosperity ahead in the forest industry. So then why, I say, at that time would they want to get rid of the assets of Saskatchewan government, Sask Forest Products? But they've done that, and I suspect that you will see, if we get a federal Conservative government back in Canada, that Air Canada would also be nationalized.

Right now they have pulled back, and then again, they've brought forward legislation where they want to go ahead with privatization, and I think this is what's behind SMDC and Eldorado. You have the two Conservative governments in the . . . We know what's happening in privatization in this province, and they're going to privatize it whether we like it or not.

And once again I say that you can compare the uranium industry to the forest industry. All indicators are showing that the uranium industry has a bright future in this province, and we have the largest reserves in the western world, and easily accessible and rich deposits.

And here we are with a mineral that would help diversify this province, especially now when we really need diversification, so that we can't just stay back and rely on the ups and downs of the agricultural industry. We need this type of diversification, and that is one of the reasons why, in the 1970s, in the early '80s, that SMDC was created so that this province could take advantage of that type of diversification.

We are now losing that. We are going to lose that and we are not going to have any say as to what is taking place in that industry, because once it's privatized — then you get down to and they indicate 25 per cent is the most that anybody can hold — but you can just see down the road a few years, they're going to get rid of 30 per cent in the first two years and then gradually privatize it.

And that really concerns me because right now, you take a look at the surface lease that we have, the agreement that's in place in northern Saskatchewan. It's not only in place in the uranium industry but also in the gold industry, and that surface lease says to the industry that you shall hire 50 per cent of northern labour, and that has been carried out in one mine and that's at Amok, at Cluff Lake. They have always stayed at 50 per cent or 53 per cent, which they were just last week, and that is the type of development that we need in northern Saskatchewan. And through SMDC we could control that.

And I think what you're seeing now and in the last number of years, Key Lake has gone from a less than 20 per cent and now I believe is up over 30 per cent northern content, and I say that we have to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 36 per cent, the Deputy Premier says, and that's coming up, and we have to move that up in order to give Northerners their fair share. I really am concerned that if SMDC is privatized with Eldorado Nuclear, then we're going to lose control over that surface lease and as to how the jobs are carried out, and so is the province going to be a big loser.

I also worry about the workers' health and safety. We had set up through SMDC some of the toughest health and safety laws in any place in the world, and that is something that we have to maintain because this is an industry we don't want to make any mistakes in. And we have set that up and those rules and regulations are there, and once that is privatized, Mr. Speaker, I say that we are going to lose that, and the province is going to be the big losers.

And that, when I speak of jobs, I think that's important to maintain SMDC to give us that window on the world and to give us that type of clout that we need to enforce those types of laws and make sure that everybody has a fair share for health and worker safety.

And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is very important when we deal with environmental laws, Saskatchewan and the Minister of the Environment has continually indicated that he will adhere to this and will implement the toughest environmental laws of any place in the world. And we have those laws in place right now. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when we're dealing with the environment, especially the environment in northern Saskatchewan, we have to be very careful because it's fragile and we have to make sure that we can control what is taking place in the environment. And if the government goes ahead with this amalgamation, I say that we will lose that, and I think it's going to be bad for the province as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, once again I say it's an ideology that Conservatives both federally and provincially are working on. It's the way they're going down the road, and I think that it's bad for this province. And I say that, you know, you just have to take a look at the forest industry is gone, Sask Minerals is gone, and we see the problems that we're having now. We see the potash corporations that are having a lot of problems. We see all the families that are losing their jobs and being destroyed. And the same with the northern mines, with Eldorado.

And you can go back to the Highways equipment and that was privatization and 200 families lost their jobs just with one fell sweep. And I say that's bad for Saskatchewan. It's almost like 1929 to '34 all over again where you had a federal government in Ottawa which was Conservative and a provincial government. And that's how they operated this province. And as a result, they were thrown out and really thrown out where they didn't get any seats in 1934. It's not the way to go.

And I just say that this type of destruction is something that the Conservative government of Saskatchewan does not have a mandate for. And I say this in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, when the Conservative government was out campaigning in the 1986 provincial election, they never indicated to the electorate out there that they were going to amalgamate SMDC and the privatize it. And of course they didn't indicate at that time that they were going to eliminate the drug plan, and they didn't indicate that they were going to put a gas tax on. As a matter of fact, they indicated that the gas tax . . . they would never put that gas tax on again.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government does not have the mandate to do what they're doing. They do not have that mandate, because if they had gone out and campaigned and said they were going to do away with the drug plan, and they were going to do away with the dental nurses, and they were going to put the gas tax back on, and they were going to amalgamate SMDC with Eldorado Nuclear, well I can just say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there would be very few members of the Conservative Party left, and they would be sitting on this side, not over on the government side.

So I say, in all fairness, they do not have that mandate to go out and privatize this province and get rid of the assets that every man, woman, and child have worked so hard over this years to build up, assets that we need to diversify this province that we have. And I say that that has to come to an end, and I think that the members opposite, the private members, they should stand up and be counted, because it's not too long down the road we're going to have a provincial election, and let me tell you, the way this province is going there's not going to be much left.

And there's a number of Conservative members on that side that are in their first terms and I'm sure that they would like to come back in here for a second term. And there's absolutely no way. And I say to those private members over there, there's no way you're ever going to get elected on a Conservative ticket, not after what has taken place in this province.

You know, we had a debt in this . . . a surplus in this side of \$129 million when Allan Blakeney was the premier. Now we have close to \$4 billion under the Finance minister that we have here. And I might add, not only that but he was even out \$800 million in his budget. So I say to the members, that's fine, the Finance minister, the former Liberal member, he's not going to be running again, he's not going to be around here, but he's taken you all down the garden path.

And I say it's time for the private members to stand up and start fighting back and stop this privatization and, I might add, centralization which has taken place in this province.

And when you talk about centralization and you talk about a region of this province where we have poverty and unemployment, just severe, and you see the type of localized development that just went in and announced the other day, into Meadow Lake, a hundred million dollars worth of capital, all put in to the one member's, in Meadow Lake. And what happened in the rest of that region? Nothing. Nothing. It's all localized.

And I say to the private members on the other side, you have a few senior cabinet ministers who are pulling the strings, but they're not going to be around in the next election to be campaigning on your behalf. And I say to you as private members, stand up and be counted, don't allow this destruction of our provincial parks and our public parks, and don't allow the destruction of such programs as the dental programs and the drug program. Fight for that.

And now once again we see SMDC, the leader in the

world mining industry, going to be amalgamated with a weak sister in Ottawa to create such a large corporation, and then it's going to be privatized.

And I would just ask, I would ask the members on the other side to think that over, because it's not going to be too long before we have another provincial election and you're going to have to go out and you're going to have to campaign on the policies that have been implemented by this government.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest to the comments of the member who spoke before me, and he's raised a number of interesting points about this valuable resource, Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation.

And some of the points he's raised have to do with the control of the corporation and loss of direct control over the corporation by the province of Saskatchewan, therefore the people of Saskatchewan being unable to directly affect that very important corporation. And I think Saskatchewan people would agree that this corporation is one of the important corporations in the province of Saskatchewan, and any changes with regard to that corporation should have careful consideration by this Legislative Assembly.

My colleague has also raised some questions with regard to environmental controls relating to the industry that's involved here and this concern with regard to that.

The Government of Saskatchewan's record with regard to privatization in Saskatchewan has been deceptive at best — deceptive at best. There have been a number of the predictions that we have made with regard to privatization by this government in Saskatchewan that have already begun to come true, and that is a matter of concern for us and for the people of Saskatchewan — that there be some change in the manner in which this government approaches privatization.

Obviously they have the votes to go ahead with privatization, but I think we should have some serious consideration of that matter. And I intend to give the matter some consideration further myself, Mr. Speaker, and move adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned.

(1700)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Taylor that Bill No. 81 — **An Act to amend the Automobile Accident Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have considered this Bill. We have some questions which we will want to ask during committee. I have no comments I want to make at this time, and so we're prepared to let this Bill go to the committee.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Berntson that Bill No. 69 — **An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a few brief comments before allowing this Bill — brief, Mr. Speaker, my usual brevity and so on — before allowing this Bill to go to committee, Mr. Speaker.

Members of the Assembly will be aware, Mr. Speaker, that coming to this stage has involved a relatively interesting kind of history, Mr. Speaker. The Workers' Compensation Act amendments that are before us, as a matter of fact, largely came out of the recommendations of the committee of review that was struck back in December of 1985 and then reported to . . . filed this report in September of 1986 — nearly two years ago. Interestingly enough then, Mr. Speaker, we waited nearly two years before this Act came to the Assembly. Then on day 53 of this session it was finally introduced, with second reading asked for just two sitting days later.

And so I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, in second reading, that I consider it to be indicative of the commitment of this government towards worker protection when they have dillied and dallied as long as they have in bringing these recommendations forth. It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the large majority of the recommendations . . . or large majority of the amendments, I should say, within this Act are consistent with the recommendations made by the committee, and with that I do concur.

I do note, however, that the committee made three legislative-related recommendations that are not touched within this Act, and so therefore I serve notice to the minister that, when dealing with this Bill in committee, that I will, along with a number of questions, will be proposing some amendments, and I do refer the minister to the committee's recommendations.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to allow the Bill to go to committee.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

#### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.