

May 2, 1994

The Assembly met at 1:30 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**Clerk:** — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 11(7) they are hereby read and received.

Of citizens of the province humbly praying that the Assembly may be pleased to cause the government to immediately investigate and offer changes to the trial procedures for child sex offenders.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me for my tardiness, I was just taking a look at the group that I was going to be introducing. And we have in the east gallery, Mr. Speaker, 56 grade 5 students. And these students come from Martensville. And I want to welcome them here this afternoon. I hope they've had a pleasant trip so far, an enjoyable afternoon. And I'll be meeting them for pictures and for drinks later on this afternoon.

They are accompanied by chaperons Linda Antaya and Sylvia Maximuk, and teachers Ms. Brenda Olson, Ms. Sue McQuen, and a Mr. Jim Golding. And I notice that my colleague from Moosomin said, hey, that's Jim up there. He is from Langbank originally apparently. And just to let you know, Jim, he did say that they hated to see you go. But I guess their loss is Martensville's gain.

And so I'd like all members, Mr. Speaker, to help me welcome these folks from Martensville.

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

### STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

#### National Forestry Week

**Mr. Keeping:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that today marks the beginning of National Forestry Week. This is sponsored by the Canadian Forestry Association, and the main purpose of the week is to increase public awareness of the importance of Canada's forests.

The National Forestry Week begins with Arbour Day, which is today. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, Arbour Day has been recognized in North America for over a hundred years. For over a hundred years children have been tidying up school grounds and planting trees. In this way they have been helping with our environment.

There is another significant fact about National Forestry Week, or Arbour Day today, Mr. Speaker, as today marks the 50th birthday of Smokey the Bear. For

50 years, Smokey the Bear has been huffing and puffing and sniffing the air and advising people that carelessness causes forest fires.

Here in Saskatchewan, at a ceremony in P.A. (Prince Albert), Smokey's birthday will be honoured . . . or Smokey will be honoured by a birthday, and the forestry association poster contest winners will be announced and a very special tree will be planted. It will be the 200 millionth tree that has been planted in Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the significance of recognizing the importance of our forests today.

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

#### Tourism in Lloydminster

**Ms. Stanger:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm both happy and proud to announce to the Assembly that tourism is thriving in Lloydminster. In fact according to the tourism and convention authority, last year's total should double, both in visitors and economically.

In 1993 the economic impact of visitors to Lloydminster reached a conservative estimate of \$38 million. Already this year the number of inquiries about Lloydminster has doubled, giving a relatively good outlook for an even better year in 1994. The inquiries are both from individuals and groups and range from economic development, business tourism, and tourism and conventions. There has also been a noticeable improvement in the number of national and bi-provincial convention organizations inquiring about holding their functions in Lloydminster.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this is good news for the city of Lloydminster; however this is also good news for the rest of Saskatchewan as well because any rise in tourism is a boost to the province as well.

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

#### Mental Health Week

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to announce to the Assembly that the week of May 2 has been officially named Mental Health Week. It's a week to recognize the dedication and tireless efforts of all those working in this field and to increase public awareness of the serious issues around mental health.

Also in recognition of Mental Health Week I would like to inform the Assembly about a new partnership between SaskPower and the Saskatchewan division, mental health association. The partnership which was announced today creates a five-year program to reduce the number of adolescent suicides in Saskatchewan.

On average 150 lives are claimed each year by suicide; 50 of these are adolescents. It is a fact that suicide ranks second in cause of death for adolescents.

This program will help develop local resources and train volunteers in communities province-wide. It will also include an education aspect for the public to raise awareness of the problem of suicide and introduce ways to deal with and help solve this tragedy.

The program will proceed in stages over the next five years. The stages include: volunteer recruitment, training, establishing local support organizations, and helping to educate and raise public awareness.

This program complements Saskatchewan Health's current programs in this area, and, Mr. Speaker, a good announcement to begin Mental Health Week in Saskatchewan.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Surgery Waiting-lists

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege once more to be able to continue on the process of participatory democracy in the province by allowing the residents of this province to ask direct questions of members opposite — the government members, the cabinet members.

This question comes from Neil from Regina, Mr. Speaker. And he asks: why are people like my mother waiting for critical surgeries such as bypass surgery for several months? My mother has been waiting for this surgery since November 1993. The government has no money for these procedures yet can find plenty of money for abortions. This is hypocritical.

And that comes from Neil.

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to mention to the person who wrote the letter that with respect to surgery that is needed, the physician prioritizes patients as to the level of their need and the urgency of their need. And if this particular individual needs surgery immediately, then she should get in touch with her physician, because when there is an emergency that is seen as an emergency by the physician, the surgery can be performed. It's a question of the medical profession prioritizing it.

And I would suggest in a situation like this, they can either contact my office, we will then put them through the Department of Health to see if there's a problem in the system or whether it's a question of the physician prioritizing. But if the person needs surgery and it's urgent, they will have access to that.

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

### Vehicle Insurance Premiums

**Mr. Martens:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question comes from Peter C. Giesbrecht from Swift Current, and it deals with SGI (Saskatchewan

Government Insurance): I want to know why insurance premiums have increased 10 to 12 per cent on car registrations for people who have had a no-fault driving record. Why does the government always punish the innocent? This business of no-fault insurance, why is it legislation just to protect the purse-strings of SGI? Why doesn't it reduce the rates of the vehicle operators that have a no-fault record also; and why doesn't SGI allow competition, as in Alberta?

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

**Hon. Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, in regards to the latter statement on competition, I think the member from across probably wants to go back in 1946 when 88 per cent, you know, of the people did not have insurance in Saskatchewan. And I know that when they were in charge of SGI they tried to . . . they spent over a million dollars alone on trying to privatize SGI. And our approach was to try and come out with a program that was fair to the people of Saskatchewan, and in that sense we established the personal injury protection plan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that indeed a lot of people will look at the 90 per cent coverage on loss of income. And of course the home-makers at \$400 a week on child care benefits, seniors who are discriminated against even in law at the present time, will now be able to get, you know, money for life if permanently injured, Mr. Speaker. So that there's a lot of good aspects to the program that need to be looked at and I feel, you know, confident that a lot of people are supporting it.

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

### Costs of Health Boards and Commissions

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The next question comes from Annie Hruska from Gerald, close to Saltcoats. How much is it costing us to administer all those health boards and provincial health councils? I certainly don't agree with spending all that money on Garf Stevenson's appointment to the one-man commission.

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

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well I don't have the details of those particular costs. In fact we have been asking the Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations to monitor the costs that are being charged.

I do know that the health boards that . . . the 30 health boards that replaced the 400 boards will also be taking on other responsibilities beyond the hospital and home care. They will be taking on public health and mental health; they will be taking on addiction services and a whole range of services. So the mandate that they have is much broader even than the boards that were in place.

They are doing a considerable amount of work in putting together the reintegration of health care services and the coordinating of health care services.

It's my understanding that they have managed to keep their costs generally under control. However I don't have the specific details of that at this time.

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

### Violent Crime

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Premier, and the question comes from Donald Richardson from Hanley. And he says: Mr. Premier, when are you going to crack down on violent crime, and also make the criminal pay? Why not bring back the death penalty for certain homicides?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Well the whole justice system is of course very concerned about violent crime — the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police), the prosecutors, the federal people — and the matter is just constantly receiving their attention; that's what they're primarily in business for. And we're, I think, doing the job to a satisfactory level in this province because I think the incidence of violent crime here compares favourably to most other parts of Canada.

So far as the death penalty is concerned, that of course is a matter for the federal parliament and nothing we in this legislature can do can affect that very much.

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

### Nursing Home Beds

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question comes from Anita Nordahl from Moosomin: Mr. Premier, when is your government going to provide more low-rental housing for persons over 50, and more nursing home beds or suitable alternatives for those people who need them?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the issue of nursing home beds, there has been a study that was done by the Health Services Utilization and Research Commission that says that the problem with nursing home beds is not a problem of supply, it's a problem of prioritizing. They made the statement in their report that level 2 people should be kept in their home as much as possible through the use of home care and that we should get in the heavier care patients more quickly.

The reason why they weren't getting in quickly is by institution-by-institution people were making the decision. There was no priority list, for example, on a district basis. Oftentimes heavy care patients would be overlooked for patients that didn't require as much care.

We are now asking district boards to look at a priority list whereby heavy care patients get the first priority. We are developing home care programs to keep more people in their homes as long as possible. And we are looking at upgrading through the new Personal Care Homes Act that was brought into force in '91, the personal care homes that are out there, and are

encouraging people to set up personal care homes wherever that's appropriate.

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

### No-fault Insurance

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for SGI. Mr. Minister, two weeks ago I asked you to tell the legislature how much money you were spending on your SGI no-fault insurance scheme in advertising. The Minister of Economic Development took notice on your behalf. I wonder if you have that information today, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, the information in regards to the expenditure, I think it's over \$150,000 in the public education side of it. My information so far is that we will be . . . we are providing good information and feedback from the public and a lot of people are asking questions.

The 1-800 number is becoming very useful, where individuals can be phoning us up. And also there was an information pamphlet that has gone down to the local households and we're getting good response on that. So I think a lot of people are very, very happy about the information that is being provided out there to the public.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping that you were getting your advertising at half price, because with your advertising you're only telling half of the story.

Mr. Minister, the president of the bar association wanted to provide the other side of the story in a debate with you, but you chickened out on that. So I guess we'll have to do it here in the legislature.

I sent you over a copy of some actual cases that were sent to me by the Yorkton bar association. The first example refers to an impaired driver who was totally at fault when he hit a 16-year-old high school student. That teenage girl wound up in a body cast for six weeks and with a five per cent permanent disability. Under no-fault insurance the bar association estimates that the impaired driver would end up with \$16,000 more, while the teenage girl would end up with \$34,000 less than under the current system.

Mr. Minister, could you explain to me why this is fair and why this type of example is not being used in your advertising campaign?

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

**Hon. Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, the members from across always have analysis out there. Now they've got, you know, some analysis from some person, you know, out in Yorkton. And I will look at the analysis to see how accurate it is, first of all.

And in regards to youth, I mean they have been discriminated against in the existing system and in this case we'll be providing up to \$13,000 a year for people who are going to school. So I think in this sense, Mr. Speaker, and even when they are hurt and they are hurt for a prolonged period, we will then take the average industrial wage of a person, if we cannot find his wage scale, in a long run if that person is a permanent injury.

So I think that in many ways, you know, the youth of this province will be helped by this program; and it will be, I think, looked forward to.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. That's our point. And that's why we have a concern about this.

Mr. Minister, I also provided you with another real-life example that we don't see in your advertising. A grade 11 student was injured by another driver who was at fault. She was totally disabled for two months but recovered in time to attend school in the fall. Under the current system this teenage girl won a settlement of between 40 and \$50,000. Under your new no-fault scheme she would have been entitled to just over \$1,000 in loss of income and would have had no opportunity to challenge that settlement.

Mr. Minister, why do you want to bring in a system that penalizes young people who have little or no income, even when they're not at fault?

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

**Hon. Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, I mean when somebody is at fault and that type of thing, for example, our system does not look at people in single vehicle accidents and when they run into a deer or something like that. Our existing system fails to recognize that.

Our new system, you know, will recognize both fault and no-fault in regards to providing, you know, half a million dollars worth of benefits on rehabilitation for the young person. And I think that's a lot better than the 10,000 that is available right now.

And overall, I'd like to say in regards to the legal side of the argument, I was listening to the statement by the paraplegic association where about 2 out of 10 people get covered in the court cases, which means 80 per cent of the people who are hurt are being left out.

And I think it's very important for us to be able to cover, you know, all the people of the province who are hurt, basically because whether you are at fault in a system there are sometimes people that have to be taken care of at home, you know, such as children, if you are an adult; and I think this system is a fairer system that we were able to come out with through the consultation process that we have had.

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

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. You're correct when you say that 80 per cent of the people don't end up in court because they're satisfied with the current system, so why are you changing it for the 20 per cent? Under your scheme it's going to be the 80 per cent who are going to be dissatisfied.

Mr. Minister, both of the examples raise a fundamental problem with your no-fault scheme. People with little or no income, such as high school students, are going to receive little or no compensation even when they receive serious injuries and are not at fault. Meanwhile someone with a high income stands to receive a great deal of compensation even if they are at fault, and even if they were drunk at the time of the accident.

Mr. Minister, does this seem fair to you? Why is it fair that an impaired driver with a high income receives more compensation than a responsible high school student with no income?

**Hon. Mr. Goulet:** — In regards to impaired drivers, Mr. Speaker, I think that a person has to recognize that the same law applies. I mean if they have the deductible right now on the vehicle, they have to pay that. I think that in many cases the insurance premiums go up in regards to the people if they are they convicted, you know, in law. And so that's the nature of the situation; it still stands today with this new program.

Now I think that in regards to your 80 per cent statement, I think you're misrepresenting the paraplegic association. I think the paraplegic association is saying that 20 per cent of our people are taken care of in this situation and 80 per cent are not and that they feel that the 80 per cent in this new system, we will now have coverage for a 100 per cent of the people. There'll be a half-million dollars on rehabilitation.

And I might add, that right now on rehabilitation, on part II benefits we're spending about five and half million. And we will be spending about 25 million with the new program, as well as 5 million on loss of income if the person had income. And we're going to be spending about 25 million in regards to income. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that indeed the benefits far outweigh, you know, the negative criticism that we have been getting so far.

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

### Health Board Decision Making

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question this afternoon is for the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, your government made a decision to pursue health reform in Saskatchewan, and you did give local people huge responsibilities. They've been asked to evaluate services, cope with budget cuts, and implement some very difficult policy decisions handed down by the Department of Health.

Madam Minister, now that you have delivered your plan and your budget to the district boards, do they have the power to make whatever changes they deem necessary to meet those budgets? Do you trust them, in other words, to set the spending priorities?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well first of all, Mr. Speaker, within the context of the global funding, the boards will have the right to move funds in a manner that's appropriate with health reform and appropriate with the goals of health reform.

We are, however, asking that funds not be moved from community-based services into institutional services. And the funds can flow the other way, for example, but they can't flow back into the institutional services. And that is because one of the goals of health reform is to improve and enhance community-based services and to enlarge the services that are provided in the community.

So boards will have flexibility within the context of the global funding formula. However, they will be required to meet provincial standards, to provide adequate health care throughout their district. They will be required to meet any policies or guidelines that are there, established by the government for the purposes of making sure that we have a uniform health system with high quality health care throughout the province.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Madam Minister. Over the last few weeks the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union), the Public Service Commission, and your Department of Health got together behind closed doors and made an agreement which says to district health boards that, thou shalt inherit employees of the Department of Health, lock, stock, and barrel.

Well, Madam Minister, what happened is you hammered out the terms of this agreement without any representation at all from the health boards themselves. If you trust local district boards to deliver bad news, to cut services and even close hospitals, why didn't you trust them enough to bring them into the negotiations?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well first of all, the Associate Minister of Health and the Department of Health and SAHO (Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations) and the unions have all been dealing at a common table with respect to what is going to happen with the devolution of employees in health reform.

Now what is taking place in the Department of Health is that a number of employees such as public health employees will be devolved to the districts. There is certainly merit, Mr. Speaker, in making sure that these employees have continuity in their employment and also making sure that we use their skills and expertise. So there is a desire to provide some security for employees.

But it is certainly my understanding that there have been ongoing discussions on these issues for months amongst the Department of Health, SAHO, the employees, and the Associate Minister of Health.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, what you're really saying is that the local health boards don't have a choice. In fact a contract has already been signed between the Public Service Commission, between the SGEU and the Department of Health.

You inked an agreement, Madam Minister, on terms of transfer of more than 1,000 employees from the Public Service Commission into the hands of the district health boards. And the fact that you've done this would imply that the district health boards authorized you to do that and that you have the full support of the Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations and the district health boards.

Madam Minister, I ask you specifically regarding this agreement which is signed: did you get the approval of the Saskatchewan Association of Health Organizations and local boards to enter these negotiations? Did they agree that you should negotiate the deal on their behalf?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well I will have to take notice on that particular question because the Associate Minister of Health has been dealing with that aspect of health reform. It is certainly my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that SAHO has been part of these discussions and SAHO represents the district boards.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Madam Minister, you've signed an agreement with employees that commits local boards to pay their salaries, their benefits, honour their seniority, and assume their pension liabilities. You've committed local boards to accept your terms of transfer of employees, terms agreed to by the unions at negotiations which excluded the new employers.

And I think this shows, and you may agree, absolutely little or no respect for the local decision makers. It means that what your government has done is to tie the hands of the health boards to reduce costs or negotiate with the staff that they will inherit.

Madam Minister, what if the local boards can't afford the deal that you've signed?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — Well first of all, Mr. Speaker, I think if the member opposite is suggesting that the employees of the Department of Health and the employees of health institutions should have no security is absolutely . . . like if that's her position, she should state it, because I think that's wrong. I think these employees do need security. It has to be worked out in such a manner that their security is retained.

The health boards are adequately funded to meet these kind of contingencies. They can meet these kind of contingencies. This will not be a problem for them. It will be part of their funding.

Now for a member who spoke out against the principle of local control by voting against all of our health reform initiatives in this legislature, who now stands up and expounds on the need for local control, I think that she is being entirely inconsistent in her approach. And I think for her to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that employees should not have security and their contract should simply be wiped out is wrong, but it's obviously the Liberal approach.

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

**Ms. Haverstock:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, you are the one that has been expounding about local control. You've tried to throw aside your responsibilities by having the local health boards accept responsibility for everything that's been handed down by the Department of Health. I asked you a specific question and I would very much appreciate an answer. What if the local boards cannot afford the deal that you've signed in this contract?

**Hon. Ms. Simard:** — First of all, Mr. Speaker, with respect to local control, we have never said that employees will be fired left, right, and centre, that their contracts will be destroyed; we have never said that health boards will be able to spend money willy-nilly on things that are irrelevant in the name of local control.

Now if the member opposite is suggesting that local control means that all Department of Health employees should be at risk, then I'm suggesting her position is wrong. I do think there has to be security for employees. I have stated already to the member that the health care budget this year recognizes this devolution — it's built in — and local boards will be funded to meet these contract and employee responsibilities. Thank you.

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

#### Crow Benefit

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question now is to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, recent events over the last few weeks have shown again how Saskatchewan farmers end up paying the price for labour unrest, labour disputes in the grain handling system and the transportation sector. The Wheat Pool has been without a contract, as you're aware, for some time now, and they've also had a strike vote taken and the threat of a full-scale strike increases with each passing day.

Mr. Minister, we would like to see some action — action taken by you before the grain system grinds to a halt, the grain transportation system. And, Mr. Minister, I believe you know what the solution is and I want you to listen carefully.

Will you ask the federal government to begin paying the Crow benefit to the producer so that Saskatchewan farmers can take their own destiny in their hands and make arrangements on their own, and so Saskatchewan farmers are not at the mercy of any Wheat Pool labour dispute that might be around the corner? Will you stand up for Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Minister, and do that?

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

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, again it's hard to understand where the official opposition is coming from with a statement like that. Obviously there is a problem with the grain moving. I have written letters to both the union, to the Wheat Pool, and to the federal government, and attended the meeting in Saskatoon where all the players were involved and I've certainly been expressing our concern that the grain moves.

We do not have control over that system jurisdictionally. Paying the Crow to the farmers I don't think makes one bit of difference to the dispute. If the railroads are shut down and the grain is not moving out of here, I don't think it matters a whole lot how the payment is paid, to farmers or the railroads. If there's no grain moving, there's no grain moving. And I think that's a total red herring to the issue at this time.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

##### New Page

**The Speaker:** — Before orders of the day, I wish to inform the Assembly that Lilia Kusiak will be assisting as page for the remainder of the session. The members will remember Lilia. She served as a page in our Assembly last year and she is replacing Troy Davies who has taken on another job, a summer job somewhere else. Lilia, will you please stand.

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

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### MOTIONS

##### *Referral of Estimates and Supplementary Estimates to the Standing Committee on Estimates*

**Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly I would move:

That the *Estimates and Supplementary Estimates* for the Legislative Assembly, being subvotes LG01 to LG06 of vote 21, for the Provincial Auditor, being vote no. 28, be withdrawn from the Committee of Finance and referred to the Standing Committee on Estimates.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## SECOND READINGS

### Bill No. 8

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Wiens that **Bill No. 8 — An Act respecting Fisheries** be now read a second time.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to talk in second reading in adjourned debates on this Bill No. 8 regarding fisheries, Mr. Speaker.

I think at the outset I would have to say that we would agree that the intent of the Bill is good in general respects. And the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that it replaces the previous federal Bill that was regulating fisheries in this province. And essentially the mechanisms that were employed at that time was that everything had to go through the feds. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, that did mean an added layer of bureaucracy; that did mean a lot more red tape, and it did mean that decisions made were very often delayed in their coming back as decisions that was good for Saskatchewan.

So from that perspective I think what this Bill is trying to do is to repatriate the fisheries legislation to Saskatchewan. And, like I said, Mr. Speaker, that is a rather positive step. And I notice that the Premier reacts immediately when I use the word repatriate, as I suppose it brings back some memories that would probably rather be forgotten at this stage.

However, Mr. Speaker, before I get carried away and pronounce the Bill good, there are certain several areas that we feel that the Bill could be improved upon. And we will be asking questions of that nature and to that effect when we have that opportunity later on in the session in the Committee of the Whole, because we do believe that more consultation could have been done.

Now I know that the members opposite will say to us, and the minister will say, that they did consult extensively. But I believe, as is very often the case, Mr. Speaker, and as for example, The Labour Standards Act and some of the other legislation before the House at this particular time . . . also we have those ministers being accused of doing a lot of consultation but there's a big difference between meaningful and real consultation where people doing the consulting will actually listen and adhere and accept some of the advice that is being given, rather than asking the questions and then going on the bent that you were directed on in the first place. So it's a matter of the minister, in several instances at least, not having listened.

Now in particular, we have received some extensive concerns from the Saskatchewan Outfitters Association . Now the Saskatchewan Outfitters Association by and large will support this legislation, and quite frankly, if they are the ones that are supporting the legislation then far be it from us to oppose — other than to bring forward some of that organization's concerns that they have even though they support the Bill in its large measure.

They believe, for example, that this Bill is negative in tone, Mr. Speaker, that it puts too much emphasis, for example, on enforcement and punishment and not enough emphasis on positive fisheries policy.

So it's also felt by outfitters that many of the areas of the Bill are potentially in conflict with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. And that's a serious charge and one that the government, I believe, and the minister in particular in this case, has the obligation to investigate and make sure that in fact and indeed that is not the case.

The Bill also, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of the outfitters association, creates a number of situations of legal reverse onus — reverse onus on outfitters and other fishers. And although reverse onus is not necessarily bad in some instances, it is however, Mr. Speaker, the premiss of being presumed innocent until proven guilty, in those instances has been removed. And again I would just simply say that the government should show some caution before getting into this questionable legal area.

Another concern, Mr. Speaker, that we want to address in the Committee of the Whole from the outfitters association, is that they fear that they may be held liable for their clients' actions — clients' actions that may have been, in certain circumstances at least, beyond the outfitters' control. But because of the action of some of their clients the outfitters then may indeed be held liable for that. And that is a concern that they have and I think that it is a legitimate concern that we will be bringing up, Mr. Speaker.

Now another concern — and this seems to be a trend in some of the other legislation, particularly from this minister — is the sweeping powers that it gives to fisheries officers, in many cases going beyond the powers normally given and allowed to normal police officers.

And as well, Mr. Speaker, it is virtually silent on the issue of training for officers on topics such as the search-and-seizure law. There's no real, concerted effort to make sure that top-notch training is indeed available for the officers. It does not say that it may not be given, but certainly it will be given in passing as opposed to being part of the legislation. And certainly we should make sure that these powers given to these officers, that there will not be that potential for an abuse of these kinds of powers, Mr. Speaker.

There's another issue that the Act is silent on and that is the issue of privately owned lakes or other fishing resources that do not fall under the direct authority of

the minister or the Act itself. This again is a great concern of the outfitters which so far the government has chosen to ignore. And again during the Committee of the Whole we will be questioning the minister on this particular aspect.

There's another concern that has been expressed to me, and that is the simply sweeping powers of discretion of the minister, Mr. Speaker, on everything from the conditions and the granting of licences to the actions of officers and then all the way to the management of lakes.

(1415)

Now, Mr. Speaker, any time such powers of discretion are granted to a minister, one has to wonder how they impact on the rule of law. If the minister can, willy-nilly on the spur of the moment, make a decision, a discretion call, how is that going to relate to the rule of law?

And one has to wonder also, Mr. Speaker, how . . . and what recourse citizens will have from arbitrary decisions made by the minister. And one must also wonder if the minister will be at all constrained to consult with the people affected.

And again, Mr. Speaker, I have to emphasize the concern that has been expressed to me and the concern is this: that the issues that I've raised so far are not being addressed by this Bill as they should be.

Now time and again this session, Mr. Speaker, and last session, we have seen the government extend its power of discretion at the expense of the rights of ordinary citizens. We have seen them becoming more intrusive, intruding upon more and more into the rights of individuals and into the administration of private boards and organizations.

So the question that could be raised, not by the outfitters' association but myself at this stage, is where will this empire-building of the government stop? It's a legitimate question I think that must be asked. Why does the government, for example, feel such compulsion to extend its control on the everyday, day-to-day life of its citizens?

And I think, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, that this Bill is reminiscent of the series of assaults on the rights of citizens and on the rule of the law that we saw over the last past years, particularly the last session, Mr. Speaker.

And we could take a look . . . and I won't take up the time of the Assembly, but I remember Bill 3 particularly, to amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act which allows government employees to enter private property without a search warrant.

Or Bill 14, An Act to amend The Child and Family Services Act, allowing the minister to divulge personal records to the public, Mr. Speaker. Or Bill 13, An Act to amend The Adoption Act, allowing the minister to

forbid a court of law from hearing or receiving evidence held by a government employee, that might be relevant to the proper determining of a person's innocence or guilt. Bill 10, for example, was An Act to amend The Crown Minerals Act, allowing a minister to retroactively increase taxes on oil, gas, or mining companies.

And the litany of these examples could go on, Mr. Speaker, which I believe is a direct government assault on the very foundations of a democratic society.

So again I say, ministerial discretion used conscientiously can be of some benefit. But at the same time it can, and very often is, a dangerous tool to be used by the government.

And so, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the issues that have been raised by concerned people to me, and some of the issues that I have come upon and some of the concerns. And so by the few comments that I've made so far this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I give notice to the minister that these are the points that we will be discussing in Committee of the Whole. And I certainly hope that the minister and his officials will come here prepared so that we can take care of this matter judiciously.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I was just going to say, Mr. Speaker, before I was abruptly concluded there, that as far as we're concerned we have no problem with this Bill now going to Committee of the Whole.

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

### Bill No. 58

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Mitchell that **Bill No. 58 — An Act respecting Representation in the Legislative Assembly** be now read a second time.

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

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Animal Protection Act

**The Chair:** — At this time I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to please introduce the officials who have joined us here this afternoon.

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have with me Terry Scott, the assistant deputy minister; and I have Rick Armstrong and Peter Rempel directly behind me.

### Clause 1



**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a few questions just before we proceed through the Bill.

I understand that what the Act intends to do is to expand protection for farm animals. Presently the present Act I believe currently gives protection to cattle, horses, pigs, and poultry. And we're quite well aware of the changes that have been taking place in agriculture across this province and the way farmers have diversified and the number of other species that farmers are into raising now for production, such as ostriches.

And one of the major problems that still continues to arise is the harassment that animals face in light of dogs or neighbours' dogs or dogs that aren't being controlled by the neighbours. And if I understand correctly, this Act is going to address some of those concerns.

(1430)

The amendments expand the list of protected animals to include all farm animals where a justice of the peace can issue an order to destroy a dog that has attacked a protected animal. It increases the fine for failing to carry out an order from 20 to \$100. The Act increases the summary convictions penalties in part III of the Act, where a person is found guilty of an offence or where a person fails to carry out a provision of the regulations, the minimum fine is increased from 25 to 100, the maximum increased from 500 to a thousand.

I have just a few short questions. I understand the fact that the Bill is expanding protection to more farm produce and farm animals that are used for farm production. Mr. Minister, I guess a couple of questions I'd like to pose immediately: why are you making the amendments at this time, and were there any requests from specific groups regarding the amendments brought to your attention? Is that why you're making it?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Chairman, the requests came mainly from sheep producers in the province who were covered . . . the sheep were covered under a separate Act which was repealed, and left the sheep producers, who have the largest problem with dogs of any of the livestock producers . . . And at meetings that I've had with different sheep producers, they have definitely wanted protection for sheep.

And although we haven't had problems with some of the new livestock; as you pointed out, we have elk and fallow deer and ostriches and wild boar and so on — so at the same time we're opening up the Act, we wanted to make it inclusive of all farm-produced livestock.

**Mr. Toth:** — So as you've indicated, Mr. Minister, this Act certainly has been brought to the forefront because of the problem that sheep producers are having, but is including all livestock now, as I was discussing earlier. And I just wanted to clarify that.

Section 15(5) is amended. Why has the fine for failing to carry out a court order to destroy a dog increased from 20 to \$100? First of all, who would that fine be applied to? And why such a significant increase in that fine? And what would be the reasoning for that type of a fine?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. The old Act was passed in 1972, and I guess \$100 was probably a more appropriate fine. This would be a fine that would apply to somebody who had a justice of the peace order the dog destroyed and not carry out that order.

I think the reasons are obvious. With the livestock industry, some of the high prices of livestock damaged by dogs can be in the thousands of dollars; and failing to carry out an order and being fined \$20 might not solve the problem if it again results in large damage to agriculture producers.

So I think it's simply a matter of trying to bring the fine in line with similar situations. And with over 20 years since the Act has been updated, that that was thought to be appropriate level of fine.

**Mr. Toth:** — So, Mr. Minister, what you're saying is the fine would be levelled against the owner of the dog that was found to be disturbing the livestock at the time.

How many orders for failing to destroy a dog were given out during the last fiscal year? Do you have any information on that? And secondly, how much revenue was collected from these fines in the last fiscal year?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — In the past fiscal year, apparently there were no orders to destroy dogs or no fines levied.

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Minister, is this a major problem? I realize that we do have complaints from time to time. And does the department envision that there's going to be a number of problems or complaints being brought to light? The fact that we're changing the Act now, so we're including more animals, is this going to bring a number of additional cases to the department?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — No, we don't anticipate any major problems in this area, and certainly in my communication with sheep producers they were concerned about this legislation. Certainly there may be isolated incidents that we have to deal with. We certainly don't anticipate . . . it hasn't been a large problem in the past nor do we anticipate huge problems in the future. But in those isolated incidents where it does occur, we feel we should be equipped to properly deal with it.

**Mr. Toth:** — I note in section 18 there are a couple of fine limits set there. The minimum fine for committing offences is increasing from 25 to \$100, the maximum going from 500 to 1,000. Again I would wonder . . . I would suggest that the fines seem to be fairly

substantial; they've gone up dramatically.

What determines what the fine will be? I gather from the fines as we're laying them out there, there's no if's, and's or but's. It's moving from 25 to \$100 and that's what the fine will be if you're charged. And who determines what the fines are? Is this just the department and why would we have such a dramatic increase in these fine levels?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — These are the fines that would be levied against a dog owner in a situation where the dog did damage to livestock. The movement upwards of the fines is basically to keep pace with present times and inflation. Going from a maximum of 500 to 1,000 is just a doubling, and that probably wouldn't account for inflation in the past 22 years since this Act has been redone.

The fine levels will be determined by a judge; this will be a court and the judge will presumably assign an appropriate fine compared to the damage and the problem that was created.

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Minister, as I indicated a few moments earlier on the other increase in fines from 20 to \$100, regarding the fines here that we're talking of, have there been any significant fines handed out in the last year, or are there any significant increases projected for the new year?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — No, we did not have any fines assessed in this past fiscal year and we don't anticipate it to be a problem. I think most often neighbours are able to work out their problems over dogs; but again given the value of some of the livestock, we certainly want to be prepared if isolated instances do arise.

**Mr. Toth:** — Who administers the collection of these fines, or this fine revenue, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — The fines would be assigned by and collected by a court, so a judge would determine the fines and the money would go into the general revenues.

**Mr. Toth:** — Is the municipality held accountable or responsible for any of these fines or collection of these fines, Mr. Minister?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — No, they are not.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

### **Bill No. 35 — An Act respecting Agrologists**

**The Chair:** — If the minister could introduce the new official that has joined us.

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Yes, Mr. Chair. Joining us from the Department of Justice, Susan Amrud.

### **Clause 1**

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to support this Bill with respect and pleasure.

The agrologists are the professionals whose energies are directed to the maintenance and improvement of all aspects of the food producing and processing industries. They have served this province well and their self-regulating Act is a credit to their integrity as professionals.

I note that it was in Saskatchewan that those who had taken advanced training in the many facets of agriculture first recognized the value of forming a professional organization and which subsequently spread to all the provinces.

The key change contained in the new Act represents the fair and conscientious way that agrologists view themselves as part of the food industry. Here they have asked for a minister-appointed member to their council to strengthen the links with legislation and regulations. It must be the intention of the government to make this a two-way communication since agrologists have so much to contribute when new concerns are addressed by this legislature.

In closing, I wish to congratulate the agrologists who will be holding their annual meeting in Yorkton on May 20 and 21 and their national federation, the Agricultural Institute of Canada, which will meet in Regina July 10 to 14.

I have one question I would like to put to the minister at this time. What will be the process for selecting the province's appointee to the council?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — The government position will be appointed by order in council. It can be anybody from the public and obviously it will be done with consultation with different agricultural groups and with the SIA (Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists).

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, it's our understanding that this Bill was essentially drafted by the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists. We've had discussion with them on a number of occasions. And I'm wondering, just from our discussion and a question, has your department inserted or deleted anything from what the agrologists were basically looking for in the Bill? Have you changed any areas of the Bill, that we should be aware of?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — No, the member is absolutely right. This was drafted by the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists. We certainly looked at it as a government to see that it complied with other professional Acts that we have. But we found it to be very much in order and, other than some minor suggestions for change, it is basically the Bill as was drafted by the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in section 8 we notice that the institute's council provides for two forms of representation for the government. And one was just addressed by the member from Regina North West where the Lieutenant Governor in Council would make a recommendation.

There is however an additional provision that is less often used, and that's for the deputy minister of your department to sit as an ex officio member of the council. We're wondering, why was it felt that this additional representation was needed?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Yes, my understanding is that the deputy minister used to be a member of the council and is now an ex officio member of the council, and that was again at the request of the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists.

(1445)

**Mr. Toth:** — Now you had indicated just a few moments ago that one member of the council would be an individual who must be actively involved in farming, if I understand correctly. And this selection will be made . . . actually I guess this selection will be made by the council, if I understand correctly; that your selection, of the selection by the Lieutenant Governor or executive arm of government, will be made in consultation with, but the council will be selecting a member. And I'm wondering, will the council have sole discretion as to the appointment of this member? Or will there be consultation with various agricultural organizations to select this person?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that refers to the elected members of the board. The members are elected by the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists. And this simply stipulates that one of the members that they elect has to be actively engaged in farming, so that they do have one member on the board who is actively engaged in farming.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, under section 15(2) the council is given quite a lengthy time, five months to be exact, to notify members of by-laws which have been passed. Yet under section 15(3) there is also the normal provision that failure to comply with the notification provision does not invalidate the by-laws. And I'm just wondering if there is any kind of penalty that the council would incur for failure to meet the notification provision.

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Chairman, my understanding is this is a fairly common provision to professional Acts. It just allows them to mail out their by-laws with their regular mailing so they don't have to do extra mailings to get the by-laws out. And again my understanding is that's fairly common amongst the professional Acts.

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, thank

you. Under section 15, we notice that it contains the normal provision that the minister shall have final approval over the institute's by-laws. As we've asked with other legislation like this, are there any circumstances where the minister or you yourself would withhold approval for a by-law?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Yes, there may be circumstances where a minister might withhold consent; would be in a situation where the by-law was not within the authority of the institute to make with regards to the Act or one that was deemed not to be in the public interest.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Under sections 24 and 25, the composition of the professional conduct and discipline committees is described. According to these sections, someone sitting on one committee cannot sit on the other. Why is this? We see in the legislation for other professional organizations that often these sorts of committees are one and the same. It would seem logical that you would need to have a background on the member's offence to be able to make a fair decision about discipline.

What is the rationale for doing it this way in this case?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — I'm told that again this is common to all professional Acts, that some of the old Acts still do have situations where the committees are the same. But in all the new Acts they're being constructed where the committee cannot be the same, and we're told that they may not stand up in court with the same committee. So that's the reason for having a separate committee, so that justice can clearly be seen to be done.

**Mr. Toth:** — So what you're saying, Mr. Minister, is that possibly other departments will place the same types of changes as their Acts are updated and changed.

Under section 26(4), Mr. Minister, the discipline committee is exempted from having to follow any legal rules of evidence, so presumably it can accept hearsay evidence and the like. Why is it necessary for the committee to have this broad and rather unusual leeway, especially since the rest of the committee's proceedings appear to be so strictly quasi-judicial?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Again this is a standard in most professional Acts. The theory is that these committees are not courts; they're not legal people, and therefore they are allowed to accept whatever evidence they consider is appropriate. If they stray from that, the member always has the option of taking him to court and getting his hearing there.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Under section 47, you specify the acceptable methods for serving documents. In other legislation you have included fax machines as an acceptable method, and you have promoted this as being an important reform of bringing the service of documents in the electronic age. I understand that this wasn't included in this case, and I'm wondering why you wouldn't allow the fax to

be used in this circumstance.

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Yes, I think the member makes a good point. I'm told that they will be able to use their by-laws to modify it if they so desire, but it's not in this particular Act that they can use fax.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, just one other question has come to my attention. If a complaint is raised against a particular agrologist or against the agrologists, who would a person go to? Let's say it's someone out in the field, a person, a farmer, or a farm group and have some concerns with some of the information that may have been brought to them by an agrologist or the way an agrologist has been conducting themselves in the area regarding specific crops.

Who would they complain to? Would they complain to this disciplinary committee? Would they complain to your department? How would they handle some of the concerns they may have?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — They should complain to the Institute of Agrologists, to the organization. Certainly if they complained to the department, we would certainly pass that on to the institute.

**Mr. Toth:** — Mr. Minister, just one other question. If a complaint is registered with the agrologists and a person just feels that they haven't received an adequate answer, is there an avenue, can they come through the Department of Agriculture . . . to the department as a follow-up to check and see whether or not the complaint was properly adhered to and listened to and get a response, a suitable response?

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Certainly, as the member opposite knows, the department is always wanting to be helpful and we would certainly work with somebody who had a complaint to be sure that it did get to the SIA and that it was dealt with properly.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 49 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

**Mr. Toth:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to extend a thank you to the minister and his officials for taking the time to be with us to review both The Animal Protection Act and The Agrologists Act. Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Cunningham:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the members for their questions and their cooperation and also the officials for giving me the brilliant answers. Thank you very much.

### **Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act**

**The Chair:** — I would ask the minister to introduce the officials who have joined us here this afternoon, before we proceed to clause-by-clause study.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I'd like to introduce Les Cooke, the associate deputy minister in charge of policy and programs. And behind me, Dave Phillips, the manager of fisheries; and Bob Blackwell, the assistant deputy minister in charge of management services.

### **Clause 1**

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Mr. Minister, and officials. I wonder if you'd mind explaining, Mr. Minister, exactly what the purpose for this amendment is. Why was it necessary?

(1500)

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, there are two purposes to the amendment of this Act. One is to clarify the regulatory role of the department with respect to fisheries which was previously regulated by the federal Fisheries Act. The other is to put in place the legal authority to establish, by discussion and future regulation, the financial sureties for mine decommissioning.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'd like to deal first with clause 3 of the Bill which deals with section 18 of the Act. It talks about a body of water. I wonder if you'd mind explaining for the purposes of this Bill exactly what you mean by a body of water. How long, how wide, how deep? Just exactly what.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, in the definition section of the Act, it describes the bodies of water:

. . . means (the) water which is above the surface of land and in a river, stream, lake, creek, spring, ravine, coulee, canyon, lagoon, swamp, marsh or other watercourse or body of water;

Generally rivers, streams, lakes.

There'll be a House amendment coming forward later on to clarify the fact that it does not include small bodies of water enclosed by private lands. There were some concerns expressed about that but we'll be introducing that amendment at the end of the discussion.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, because indeed a number of people did have some concerns that it might be dealing with sloughs, it might be dealing with their dugouts, their sewage lagoons, or whatever it might be — so there was some concerns about this.

I wonder if you'd mind explaining what you see as the concern or the problem with altering the course or cause of . . . alter or cause to be altered the configuration of the bed. Now what I'm thinking of here is if an RM (rural municipality) is building a road, obviously if they're going through a creek they're going to alter the bed of the road. What impact is this going to have on RMs?

Because I received a phone call from an RM that was concerned about this piece of legislation, about this section of the Act and how it was going to impact on RMs when it came time to build roads; or he also . . . this person also mentioned putting in a rock crossing on a creek. I know this person was from down in the south-west in Val Marie country; and I've hunted in that area and I cross a river out in the community pastures and I don't know whether it's natural or not, but there's sure a lot of rocks in the bottom of that crossing.

So what impact is it going to have if the RM wants to build a rock crossing across a creek rather than putting a road, and a bridge in, etc.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the question. The intent of the change is not to have any impact on the present permitting system that's there for RMs. But what it's there to do is in cases where fish habitat might be affected, that in fact there would be an opportunity to make sure that the fish habitat is restored if it has to be disturbed, or preferably not to be disturbed if possible. But the permitting system is intended not to change in any way the way in which RMs have done their traditional business.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'm hoping the RMs can take that as a confirmation that they will be allowed to carry on.

Mr. Minister, I think I'll wait on that, on your amendment to discuss it. I was interested in . . . Well we might as well do it now.

It talks about wholly within a piece of property owned by one individual. I'm wondering, if you have a body of water, say on an Indian reserve, will this — either the Act or the amendment that you will propose — have any impact on those waters?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The land in the circumstances which you describe, or water in that area, would not be affected as long as it wasn't part of a water system that flowed out from that private land you described. So smaller bodies of water that were not part of a lake system would be outside of the jurisdiction of this Act, but bodies where the water flowed from that private land would be subject to the condition of the Act.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Have you discussed this with the Minister of Justice in dealing with reserves? Because there are some constitutional questions as to who has rights and who doesn't have rights within the boundaries of the reserve, and the land, air, and water within that boundary. Have you discussed any of those aspects?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. The House amendment has been drafted in consultation with Justice to consider the important questions with respect to water movement.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. But have you considered it in respect to Indian reserves

and the constitutional rights they may have?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — This issue has been discussed with Justice more in relation to The Fisheries Act which is coming later, which is again a response to the fact that the federal government is vacating part of this turf to us. So the issue you raise has been discussed with Justice in relation to The Fisheries Act but it is applicable also to this amendment which is in this particular Act because of the application to the particular Act within which it is.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Will this Act have jurisdiction on Indian reserves? I'm thinking of the situation now of the gaming Act in Saskatchewan, which the natives are contesting as not having jurisdiction within their boundaries of their reserves. Will this Act have jurisdiction within the boundaries of the Indian reserves?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — This Act is equally applicable to Indian reserves as it is to other private lands.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Is it equally applicable as the gaming regulations and gaming Act are?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I don't have constitutional experts with me with respect to the gaming industry, but I've been assured by my officials that all the considerations of the application of this Act to Indian lands has been considered in the drafting of the Act.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I bring it up because I think we need to be conscious, with the expanding role that the natives are playing in our society and the expanding role of the jurisdictions they're seeking to gain, as to how legislation is going to impact in those areas. I think it's very important that we be conscious of those kind of things.

Mr. Minister, how will this clause affect cottage owners around various bodies of water? I know that some cottage owners like to remove vegetation from in front of their property so that they can have a better swimming area. And I'm not sure whether they do this with anyone's permission or not, but it does happen.

What impact will this piece of legislation have on that?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — There has been a permitting system with respect to the issue you raise as well as for our RM applications, and this revision of the Act includes no change in those provisions. The same permitting system that was there before will continue to apply.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Okay thank you, Mr. Minister. If there's no change to it, well then I'm sure cottage owners are aware of what the rules are and have been up till now existing with them, whether they're happy with them or not.

Mr. Minister, we'll go on to the second part of the Bill, dealing with the reclamations and decommissioning

of mines. You talk about bringing some changes through regulations; in particular, I would suspect that will deal with the fees that may be assessed and the time frames. Could you give us some indication of what your thoughts are along that line, or what is going to happen, unless you happen to have the regulations handy and able to present them?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Just to clarify the role of the amendments to the Act. The amendments will not be describing a fee structure but rather putting in place the capacity to establish regulations to establish financial sureties. These are financial instruments that the mining companies would make available to ensure that money is available to do environmental clean-ups at the time of decommissioning, whether that's the disposition of tailings from mines or whatever might be part of their mining ventures.

The reason the regulations are not presently available is because we have with the mining industry a cooperative discussion going on. There are four subcommittees looking at the issues of what financial instruments are most appropriate, that serve both the needs of the mining industry and the people of Saskatchewan; what the time frame should be within which these should be put in place.

This consultation process will go on, and when we have the report back from the committees that are working, we expect by June we'll be able to outline the details of what's been worked out cooperatively with the mining sector.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. It's good to hear that you're working with the mining industry on this, because obviously they're one of the major players that are going to be dealing with this.

Who else might be affected, other than the mining industry on this? I'm thinking now of petroleum production. Because I know that there are a number of orphan sites scattered across this province from old drilling sites that it's difficult to find an owner for today, and yet decommissioning is a serious problem, particularly if it's sitting on private land and the farmer is responsible for this. He had nothing to do with it perhaps. He didn't drill the oil well, but somebody is left holding the bill for it. Will this have any impact on that type of a situation?

(1515)

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I don't want to answer this at too great a length, but there are really three phases of preventing the circumstance you describe for the farmer who might find him or herself with the problem that they're left holding. One is to have the best management in the field now with respect to that issue. Secondly, it is to make sure that in . . .

I should preface my remarks by saying that this Act does not deal with that question; this Act deals with mines. But just to say that, in the parallel you use, the object is to not leave the Saskatchewan people in the circumstance where they would be holding the bag as

the farmer is now; in fact to provide a mechanism by which this by-product of mining is dealt with at the point in which mining discontinues; to put the money aside while active mining is going on so it's available through an instrument that the mining companies would choose, within the range of those acceptable options that will be worked out with them, so that at the time of decommissioning there will be enough money there to ensure that that can happen.

On the question you ask about the farmers, again, with the oil fields on their property, we'll be working over the next year in consultation on the contaminated-site liability legislation to determine a pathway to determine who's responsible and to help resolve that to the best of our ability.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. When you talk of a financial surety and you also mention environmental clean-up, now these funds that will be available, are they for the decommissioning and reclamation, or if there's an environmental problem between start-up and decommissioning, will those funds be used for that?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The day-to-day environmental management of a mine site is the responsibility of the mining company, and our department's monitoring of that will determine that if something is not being done properly currently, it will be done properly. The object of the financial surety is to provide the best estimate of an amount of money that will ensure that should the mine in operation cease operation and that there are elements of, as I say, the by-product of the mining operation that need to be dealt with at the time of the decommissioning, that there are funds in place to do that.

I think the question you ask deals with the activity of the mining company while it's functioning, and their day-to-day management has to look after those clean-ups as they go if there were a spill or that kind of difficulty.

This is for the post-mining phase when a mine is being decommissioned that there is money available for that purpose. The best estimate in the writing of the regulation will, I presume, also include something at the edges for possible contaminants that might have been accumulating over the life of the mine. But to make sure that that site can be reclaimed to its original purpose before the mining company is granted a release from the site.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. When this financial vehicle is being set up, I believe you said that the mining companies will be able to choose within an area what suits them. Who controls those funds and who benefits from, say the interest being collected off of those funds if there is money put aside in a particular account?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The intent of this legislation is simply to make sure that the companies set aside an amount of money accessible to the people of Saskatchewan at a time when it may need to be called

upon.

So it needs to be . . . not knowing the names of all the financial instruments that are around, but the notion of bonding, the notion of irrevocable letters of credit, I've heard names like that thrown around with respect to this issue. That financiers could tell you more about it than I can, but that these are funds that belong to the company to which we have guaranteed access in the event that they have to be called upon.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. So you would actually . . . while the company would have control of that vehicle, you would have a claim on it such that they would not be able to dispose of it in any way, shape, or form. And they would continue to benefit from any interest which may accrue on those funds. Is that correct?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Yes. The purpose of the regulation is to . . . the consultation on the regulation is to establish what the appropriate amount of money is that guarantees Saskatchewan people that we will not be left paying for a clean-up activity that was the responsibility of a mining company. But having established that amount, then the manner in which the company manages those funds is their concern, as long as we have guaranteed access to it if we need it.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Okay. Thank you, Mr. Minister. What happens in the case of where a company becomes insolvent and there are other creditors who are seeking access to funds? What mechanisms will be in place to ensure that those funds are available for any decommissioning; or will an attachment be able to be put on them by other creditors?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The purpose of establishing these funds and the way the wording is . . . I've used the surety funding. This money has to be in an instrument that is guaranteed to be accessible to the province of Saskatchewan, so that it cannot be money that it would in any way be put at risk in the event of a financial failure. It has to be a financial instrument that is guaranteed accessible to us in the event of a failure, which might be one of the reasons why a company may, midstream, discontinue operations. So the money has to be in an instrument that guarantees access by the province.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Would the company be able to pledge those funds for any other purpose; or are they solely for the purpose of the decommissioning and reclamation?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — These funds have to be exclusively available for the purpose of reclamation. They cannot be at risk for any other purpose.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Minister, what would happen in the case of a federally regulated corporation? What jurisdictions will the province have in those particular kinds of situations?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — This authority is an authority that we have under our Act and it applies equally to

federally regulated companies as it does to provincial companies. This is an Act that applies to any mining activity going on in the province.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Minister, I'm not sure if this is going to be the situation or not, but if there's a federally . . . controlled by the government, a Crown corporation in mining, will this legislation still be relevant in those particular cases?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, yes.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. What kind of time frames are you looking at for this legislation? I'm from the south-east corner so I'm familiar with the coal mining operations at Estevan where there is a substantial environmental, obvious environmental impact.

Now when you have that kind of an industry, are they going to be expected to come up with the money immediately to deal with any old mine sites? Is there a time frame over which that is going to be implemented? And if so, what kind of a time frame?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The discussions that are taking place, which hopefully will conclude this summer, will be . . . the present understanding I have is that there will be . . . the last discussions I was involved in, it was a three- to four-year time frame within which the companies will be able to put the financial instruments in place. So during that period of time they would be making their assessments and coming into compliance with the regulations that they've helped us draw.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, thinking again of the coalfields, if you're looking at a three- to four-year time frame to put your financial instruments into place, if those instruments are expected to cover all of the cost of reclamation and decommissioning, you have a very major amount of money. And I'm sure that those coal companies, unless SaskPower is going to pay them a lot more for their coal, do not have the financial wherewithal to put that kind of money up in three to four years.

So if they can't do that, what kind of a frame are you looking at? Are you going to be able to put in a certain amount of money every year over the expected lifetime of the mine, or how is that going to work?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, the coal industry is a good example of how I think a sound mining exercise does function. The coal industry's very comfortable with the approach we've taken.

The coal industry is now doing their reclamation as they mine. And so the amount of money that would be required to be put in place in the surety funding mechanism would simply be the funds required to clean up that which is disturbed during any particular mining phase. So that if you looked out in the coalfields now and took a snapshot of that which is disturbed and placed a financial value on restoring that amount of disturbance to its natural condition,

that would be the estimated value of the surety that would be put in place.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, what about past operations? Some of these coalmines, I believe, go back into the 1930s and perhaps earlier than that. Will this legislation have any direct impact on that? Will the companies that may still own that property be expected to provide funds for reclamation in those areas?

That area has been decommissioned; it's no longer used as a coalmine. I'm not sure if you can use the term decommissioning in that sense because they simply just moved over to another spot. But they're no longer mining there.

Now will funds be put in place for the reclamation of those sites, or are those past and will not be impacted on?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, for a company that's presently in operation, those past sites would become part of their complete plan.

For sites that are the result of mining companies no longer in operation, that will become part of that larger discussion of contaminated-sites liability that we will be pursuing in the next year.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would suspect that while the names may have changed, there's been a direct progression to the coal companies that are operating there now to the ones that were there before. That I know of, very few of them became insolvent and moved . . . were no longer in existence. They may have sold out to another company. In that particular case, will the company that is presently there operating be responsible for those mine sites from 50 years ago?

(1530)

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. My officials advise me that if there's a direct-descendant relationship operating within the same mining permit, that this will be covered within this Act, and other provisions would be then pursued with respect to the contaminated-site liability that would apply to sites that didn't have that connection.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. In the case of the coalmines, when you're looking at setting up your financial vehicle for the reclamation and decommissioning, will the funds available cover the total costs of the decommissioning and reclamation? Will that include both current operations since the Act comes into place plus going back, if there's a direct lineage?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, yes.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Mr. Minister, isn't this going to tie up a very, very large amount of capital that these corporations would normally use in their day-to-day operations? I'm sure that even if we took SaskPower as

an example, which had a hundred million dollar profit, give or take some; but if you took all of the impacts that SaskPower has across this province, all the holes that are dug for their power poles, you have a very serious amount of environmental impact.

Now how is a corporation to come up with the full amount of the reclamation and decommissioning costs without in a very serious way increasing the cost of the product that they're selling?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, it would be my belief that for a private sector company the need to clean up something already incurred, the need to clean up a past activity, would already be listed as a liability in their present accounting system. So that the companies would within their own financial statements already be needing to provide for that.

We need to ensure that it's understood that it has access to that amount of capital that is necessary. And that could be through a letter of credit or a bond or whatever instruments come to be agreed upon as acceptable instruments. But that there won't be idle cash sitting around doing nothing. It will be an asset of the company which it can use, but it has to have guaranteed access by us in the event that there is a shut-down.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, while it is an asset of the corporation if it's in the bank or the bond or whatever it is, if they can't pledge it as a security some place, it's of no value to them other than the interest that they can collect off of it.

You mentioned that the reclamations and decommissioning will already have been built into the products that they're selling. If I look at the situation down at Estevan and area with the coal mining, there is some reclamation being done. The overburden is taken off the mine and the coal is harvested below it. The overburden is stacked off to the side. Now as the mining equipment moves along and moves to the side, some of that overburden is then dumped into the first trench. But that first trench, the overburden sits above the surface.

Now it's rounded off and smoothed off and there's some grass planted on it. But it is not returned to the original environmental state. So if you're going to reclaim that dirt, that overburden that's removed, there's an added cost built into that. It's going to have to be transported over to the other edge of the property, and that may be a mile, or maybe more in some cases, to return everything to its original environmental state. And just returning the rest of the land to the original environmental state is going to be a significant cost because you're going to have to strip the topsoil off, the black dirt, to spread it back on again.

What kind of an impact have you assessed that this will have on a corporation such as SaskPower which is obviously going to have to pay more for the coal that it's buying from these companies who are going to have to reclaim this property?



**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — As I said earlier, the mining companies that are involved in coal mining are already using appropriate practices, so reclamation is going on as part of their mining exercise.

The detail of whether or not there can be a slight hump over here and a slight hollow a mile away is a detail the department would have to answer. I suspect that it would be more environmentally acceptable to have a slightly different contour at the end of the day than to be hauling too many hills for a mile. But that would be a detail I would leave up to the department in setting out final decommissioning plans with the coal mining companies.

I can say again that the coal mining companies are very comfortable with the procedure we're using, with the time frames within which we're allowing for the financial sureties to be put in place, and to the general framework within which they're functioning.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. Then you're not going to be returning a site to its original environmental state. Is that the case?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — We as a species alter many, many things in the carrying out of our daily business of living. And it would be difficult to define an identical state. The importance is that an area be restored to a similar productivity to that which it was before it was disturbed.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, at some point in time, perhaps down the road, somebody will be in a court of law trying to explain what this Bill was supposed to do. And they will quote you in saying, an original environmental state.

On that environmental tour that we took with the Environment Committee, there were a number of people who came forward. And they wanted specifically a return to the original state the property was in before someone touched it, before a mining company came on site. They wanted it returned to exactly that state again.

So, Mr. Minister, when you say that, some people are going to take you at your word on that, that it is to be returned to the exact same state that it was in before. And if you're going to leave a 50-foot pile of overburden on one end of the property and a 50-foot hole on the other end of the property, that's not returning it to the original state.

So, Mr. Minister, I think you have to make that clear, that your intention is not to return it to the original state, but to an environmentally acceptable state.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I hope anybody making future reference to this debate will refer to the Act and not to your or my interpretation of the words as I try to explain to you what it means. Essentially since what you are asking is unachievable, I have to agree with you. I could not return a cultivated field on my farm to the state at which it was before it was cultivated,

because that system will be . . . because I don't know what it was exactly and it's impossible to return it identically to the same ecological state. It is certainly hopefully possible to return it to a similar condition.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. We agree on that point that you can't return it to the original state. But there are a number of people around this province who would like indeed that very thing to happen.

Mr. Minister, when you're tying up this large amount of capital for the reclamation and the decommissioning, will that need for the capital be put in place in the first three to four years, was the time frame you had quoted, that total amount needed? Or will that money come in then over a period of time as the operation of the mine takes place?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the amount will be in place. And if then there is ongoing work that is done in the course of mining that reduces that liability, then that amount could be reduced. But the amount necessary at the time, four years from now, to decommission activities as they presently exist will be in place in four years.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And how about the ongoing operations of the mine? As the coal companies in Estevan continue to remove the overburden, extract the coal, they are having an impact on a greater amount of property. Will that fund increase then as they continue their operation? Or if you take an underground mine as they sink shaft and run stoke, will they then have to put more money into the operation, or are we talking simply about the surface of a mine?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The requirement for funding will be that required to restore the agreed-upon condition on the surface, and presumably if there were a hazard in some shallow underground activity, that as well. But that the public interest is protected and that that which has to be done in decommissioning for public safety and restoring the environment will be covered at any given time.

That amount will be a rolling amount of money that might increase during some particular phase and decrease during another, so that should decommissioning need to occur at any moment on that time scale, there would be sufficient funds in a guaranteed access position to deal with that issue.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. In a deep shaft mine, as the mining material is taken out and the ore is extracted from it, will that remaining compound, whatever kind of rock it might be, be returned to the mine or will it be allowed to remain on the surface, or what will happen in those particular circumstances?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I should qualify an earlier comment when I spoke about four years. As I said earlier, the discussion, last time I was updated on it, was intending to put these instruments in place in the

three- to four-year range. Those discussions are part of a regulatory detail discussion that's going on, as is the discussion that you're now raising.

But in brief, the intent of the amount of surety that we can put in place would be an amount which would either manage in perpetuity, a particular environmental risk resulting from mining and leaving an amount of tailings somewhere, or the amount of money required to possibly put it back into a cavern, if that was a logical alternative. So that a proper environmental protection is guaranteed to the people of Saskatchewan by the amount of money that is allocated there.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Well while I don't disagree with the need to reclaim these sites, I am concerned as to the amount of money that it is going to cost to do this. And I can see that there will be a substantial increase in the costs for certain corporations to operate because they have to put this commissioning money up front.

Mr. Minister, how do you determine just what amount of bond or fund will be necessary to decommission and to reclaim a mine?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — As I stated a minute ago, what the regulations will outline is . . . what the regulations will outline is the method of calculating the amount of money that will be necessary to manage in perpetuity an environmental risk; or to restore, as you suggested, some of these risks into the original mining caverns in that event. So that there will be procedures put in place to calculate the money necessary to restore that site to an acceptable environmental condition or to manage it in perpetuity so that there is no risk to the environment or to humans.

(1545)

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. What will happen to those sites that we have around the province to which there is no longer an owner or a corporation that the government can go to to say, this is how much fund is needed for the reclamation of this site? An owner no longer exists. What responsibilities will the government have in those cases, if the mining companies are going to be decommissioning and reclaiming the sites that they are currently operating, or that they currently own even if they're not operating; what will happen to those sites where there is no one left that's responsible?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The short answer is that is outside the jurisdiction of this Act, if we wanted to restrict the discussion to this Act.

The longer answer is that, having said that, there are two approaches. We will be again pursuing discussion of a contaminated-site liability legislation in the next year, we will be discussing what that legislation should look like that deals with the very question you raised.

There has been a small program, accessible by the

provinces, put out by the federal government on contaminated site clean-up for orphaned sites, which we have the capacity to apply in certain areas — one to actually physically do work for orphaned sites, and the second is to develop new technologies to deal with some of these contaminated sites.

So we will continue to work with the federal government to see if we cannot establish resources to begin to clean some of those up, but our contaminated-site liability legislation will also help determine a path by which we approach the management of those sites.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. What kind of dollars are we looking at, say, for an underground gold mine, one in which you're not concerned about say, radiation and those types of concerns that the general public thinks of when we talk about northern mining, particularly in the uranium industry, but a hard-rock mine dealing with a metal like gold or copper or something along that line. What kind of dollar figures are you looking at for a reclamation and decommissioning?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — My officials inform me that for a small gold mine operation that meets your kind of conditions, that is, managing the disposition of their materials as they go, that it could be as little as a few hundred thousand dollars.

One of the examples of the first application of this principle was in the McArthur River underground exploration program where there wasn't a major radiation component. There the amount was \$500,000.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. You mentioned \$500,000 for the exploration. Now just what did this entail? Was this sinking a shaft, or was this drilling, say, a 3-inch or a 4-inch hole to determine what the ore body was below? Just what was involved in this operation?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — In that case the surety included an amount to deal with the surface buildings related to the sinking of a shaft and the treatment of drilling materials to do exploratory drilling and the treatment of water that might have entered the shaft during the process of drilling.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. I will allow our Liberal colleagues to ask you a few questions now. Thank you.

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to welcome your officials here this afternoon.

Mr. Minister, we are all concerned with the additional rules and regulations that must be accepted if in fact Saskatchewan is to become environmentally sustainable. Everyone must cooperate and carry the added costs that will inevitably result from improved and changed practices; however, the imposition of regulations must also be reasonable and appropriate to the problem being resolved.

Today I'd like to question the minister and his officials about the intent of the Bill. My first question is related to the new section 18.1. We find in reading this amendment that good intentions seem to have been run away with by language which attempts to plug every possible loophole that might occur. It is to the point that there is more than a risk that the management procedures that are required on a day-to-day basis for farm and ranch management can be stymied.

In particular, the extension of the wording to include as well as rivers and streams where of course the free flow of waters must be regulated, the Bill goes on to include "marsh or other watercourse or body of water." It seems that this broad description includes backwaters and marshes from irrigation systems, dugouts, temporary overflows brought on by ice build-up, or overnight beaver dams and the like. These can all be considered bodies of water. Surely it was never intended that a farmer could not relieve flooding of his or her barnyard without a permit.

The amendment goes further to suggest that one could not mow the banks of a ditch or dredge out the weedy end of a dugout without first consulting with some government official who may or may not understand the circumstances of the procedure and may or may not appear until the damage has been done. This strikes us as a case where neither the carrot nor the stick has been used, but rather a club is proposed where common sense would be more appropriate.

Mr. Minister, could you please advise this House if the scenarios I presented are in fact possible under your amended legislation?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, I've asked the Clerk, and apparently you've been . . . forwarded to you is a copy of a House amendment to deal with the concerns that you raise. These concerns were raised to us, and the House amendment . . . it was not the intent to have the kind of scenario you described to become reality for anyone. And the House amendment, which has been forwarded to you, of the amended Bill deals with those questions and makes sure that common sense will prevail.

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you for clarifying that.

The explanatory notes that accompanied this Bill indicated that this new section — and I don't have it in front of me right now — is intended to authorize activities relating to fish habitat and fish-bearing waters, yet those words do not appear in the Bill itself.

Would not a more precise definition that uses those words eliminate the potential for this amendment to go further than you intended? In fact are you saying this amendment covers that?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, the member asks a reasonable question which has been discussed by the officials in carrying this forward. The use of that language was avoided because of the federal

responsibility for fisheries. So to make it sure that we would not have it interfered with, but using other language to make sure that the proper regulatory capacity was there to deal with the fact of fish-bearing waters.

And the new amendment which has been forwarded ensures that that will not be applied in a fashion which will be disruptive to farmers or municipalities or other private owners.

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you. Regarding the permit you refer to in the section, how will that permit be obtained? Could you please explain for me where one would go to apply for such a permit, who will approve it, what it will cost, and what the criteria for it will be for judging the merits of permit applications.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, the fisheries branch issues those permits. They issue them now, and the procedure would remain exactly the same after the passage of this amendment as it was before, that the fisheries branch has issued their permits in the past and will continue to do so.

**Mrs. Bergman:** — And that includes the cost of the permits?

Mr. Minister, with respect to another part of this legislation, the proposed amendments to section 38(1), you are taking steps to ensure the province is not stuck with the costs of cleaning up decommissioned mine sites, and you were speaking with my Conservative colleagues about that.

Responsible mining companies in this province do not have any difficulty with accepting their responsibility to the environment. Some of them, however, have expressed concern that you will require them to post performance bonds worth millions of dollars where instead they could assign non-cash assets that would not impinge on their operating revenues.

In the absence of clearly defined financial assurances that you will seek from these mining companies, and considering that you previously indicated that your officials will be consulting with mining companies to ensure this type of security instrument that is required is acceptable to the mining industry, what have those consultations yielded so far in terms of what security instrument is most desirable to the players in the mining industry? I'm not sure when you were discussing it if you covered that end of it.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, the officials are looking at a full menu of potential financial instruments. Both are bringing their needs to the table. We are bringing the need for absolute certainty of access to the funds, and the mining companies are bringing their wish that it be the least intrusive instrument into their operations. So there is . . . the mutual need is recognized, and the mining industry's working cooperatively with our department in defining what those particular instruments will be.

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And I do have the House amendment here. I thank you for your answers to the questions.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. The minister thought he was rid of me for the day, but I'm back again.

Mr. Minister, you came up with the figure of \$500,000 for the McArthur River test sites and approximately 2 to \$300,000 for a small mining site. What kind of numbers would we be looking at for a major operation such as the coal mining at Estevan or some of the other uranium mines up North?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — This is a number, Mr. Chairman, that would be probably inappropriate speculation, because in giving mining companies the go-ahead to mine, they have to file decommissioning plans. And depending on the nature of those decommissioning plans and the appropriateness of those, there needs to be an assessment done of the costs required to carry out those decommissioning plans.

So there is an orderly process that will determine what the number is, and it's certainly conceivable that some of those numbers could be of a significant size, which is the reason why we are working cooperatively with the mining sector.

They acknowledge that the public ought not to be vulnerable for paying those kinds of expenses. They acknowledge that it's important for them to cooperate in this kind of a process. And what we are committed to is, in working out the detail with them, that the protection of the Saskatchewan public from those costs will be in place, the protection of the environment will be appropriate because of the decommissioning plans that will be approved, and that we will have a common agreement on the nature of those amounts and the quality of that work to reach the goals I just described.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. With a new site it's certainly understandable that that decommissioning cost would be built into the process, and therefore it's reasonably not that difficult to determine what those costs would be. But when you have an old site, how do you determine what the costs are?

Surely you must have made those determinations because there are a number of older mines around the province that are still operating, and those decommissioning costs will have to be determined.

Now when you're planning this legislation, I would suspect — or at least I would hope — that you would have made the determination as to what the cost will be for one of these older sites. Or is it going to be a situation where each one will be site specific, the costs for the older mines?

(1600)

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — This is . . . the issue the member

opposite raises is an important one because it identifies that operations in the past were not required before proceeding to file decommissioning plans. So what the purpose of the time frame that's being discussed, that's in the three- to four-year vicinity, is, in addition to providing an opportunity to put the financial instruments in place, is to in fact determine the decommissioning plan that the company wishes to follow so that the appropriate amount of financial instrument can be determined.

So this, under this legislation at this time, companies will now — that are in existence without decommissioning plans — will have an opportunity over the next number of years to develop those plans and to put the financial instruments in place to provide for that decommissioning.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. When we're talking of reclamation of sites, who sets the standards and the regulations as to what the reclamations will entail? Is it you and your department, or is it in consultation with the mining industry? How and what is determined to be the proper reclamations?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The process that's used is a cooperative process that, if it's in the southern municipalities, would involve the municipalities there, the mining company and the department, to work out interactively an appropriate protective mechanism. And if it were in the North, it would be with the northern peoples as we've demonstrated through the approval of some new mining activities over the last year.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — So the department is sitting at the table. The northern people, or in the southern half of the province, the municipalities, and the mining company.

Now what is the starting point going to be? Is it going to be, as we discussed earlier, a return to its original state? And we determined that that can't be done. So will you be starting at some point somewhat less than the original state, and what will be acceptable? What are the guidelines here? What is the measure?

Obviously with this legislation, simply the mining and the leaving of the tailings of the overburden on the surface is at one end and the complete restoration at the other. So what is in between? Where is that determination made in between as to what the proper amount of reclamation will be?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I think, as we identified in the discussion earlier with respect to the coalmining industry, that the same principles would apply, that we would want to re-establish areas that have been disturbed to an acceptable environmental productive state.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. A good, acceptable environmental state. But who makes that determination? And once that determination is made, what rights of appeal does

anyone have on that determination?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The government is, in these circumstances, the representative of the people of the province and we will ensure that appropriate environmental standards are met. But the people of the province will also have an opportunity to review the decommissioning plans and make sure they're acceptable to them. All of us want to protect the earth on which we live. We want to have it remain in a productive state for our children. And so the public of the province will have an opportunity to review these kinds of plans to make sure that they're acceptable in their minds as well.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Now I believe you said that the government will set the standards and that the people will then be able to review the site after the reclamation has taken place. How will these people be chosen? Or is it simply John Q. Public decides to go up North on a fishing trip and to review the reclamation of a certain mine site there, and it's acceptable if he likes it and it's not acceptable if he doesn't? How are these people chosen that will be doing these reviews?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, in a process where a new, major project was being undertaken, the environmental impact process would be the initiation where, along with a proposal for a project, a proponent would put forward an environmental impact statement which would include all of the things including decommissioning plans.

In this case, where we're beginning halfway with projects already underway, again the proponent will have to respond to established departmental guidelines and establish a decommissioning plan.

Because at this point it's not known for sure whether the decommissioning plan may be subjected to environmental impact assessment or not, what we will commit is that their decommissioning plans will be reviewed by the department for compliance with our standards and will be therefore also available to the public for review, so that the public can comment on the decommissioning plan before final approval is given by the department for it.

So it kind of would entail the public review process which is at the tail-end of present environmental impact assessment processes.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I think what we have here is an embryo of a growing bureaucracy, that as this Act goes along you're going to have more and more people within your department doing these environmental impact studies for the decommissioning as it goes on.

Mr. Minister, who is responsible or who will pay if there's a change to the regulations? Now you're going to set out some regulations as to the amount of monies needed for decommissioning, for a reclamation, but three years down the road the rules change, all of a sudden there's not enough money in there any more

— who's responsible? And do the corporations, who I would suspect are going to be the ones who have to pay at the end of the day . . . is there an appeal mechanism in place for them to contest those kind of . . . the regulations, the standards that you might set, and the review process?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — The standards that are established for mining or any other form of environmental management are those standards which the public information establishes. One certainly cannot guarantee that a standard established today might not change if something is found out about a health or environmental risk resulting from existing standards today, even though those have progressed a long way.

It is also equally true that the public should not be left accountable to pay for the impacts of any business activity on the environment. The object of good environmental legislation is that polluters should pay for the cost of making sure the environment is protected.

It is just a matter of good business, now and in the future, for the expectation to be with companies to predict environmental impact and to manage and design their operations in such a way that those operations do not . . . that those operations do not have a negative environmental impact or impact on the health and safety of the public.

Therefore it is a reasonable assumption that should those standards change, even though one may believe they have them established firmly today, that the cost of . . . the additional cost of meeting a new standard would be a cost allocated to the proponent. The only alternative to that being the taxpayer picking up the cost.

A good environmental management assumes that a proponent knows their business best, that they can predict the potential risk to the environment of their operation if they continually review the operations that they're engaged in to minimize environmental impacts, so at decommissioning there is a minimal cost to ensuring the public environmental good management.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Most corporations that are dealing with mining in this province — if not all, I should say — are responsible citizens and are concerned about the environmental impact their operations are having and do attempt to minimize those impacts. But my concern is with the costs that are going to be built into this system, and ultimately the consumer is going to pay for that. So I think we need to minimize those costs as much as possible and to minimize the amount of bureaucracy and regulation needed to enforce this type of an Act.

I would encourage you to carry on with the consultations with the mining industry and that the regulations for this Act go forward only after consultations and agreement with the mining industries. There's no point in talking to them and consulting with them if you don't listen to them and

act on their concerns.

So, Mr. Minister, I think most people across the province are concerned about the environment and are concerned about the reclamation of mining sites, but there is a need to do it properly and there is a need to be aware of the financial costs that are going to be associated both for the corporations and for the general public.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Yes, thank you for those comments; I agree with them. It's been my direction as Minister of the Environment, I know it's part of the economic development plan, that we create as little intrusion as possible, as little roadblock as possible to good business by trying to make our regulatory system as streamlined as can be.

When I was president of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment it also became one of our goals nationally to reduce regulatory intrusion to a minimum that protects public safety and the public interest. So I concur with you on the goal and commit our department to work with the industry in achieving that kind of goal.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

(1615)

### Clause 3

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to:

Amend section 18.1 of the Act as being enacted by section 3 of the printed Bill:

(a) by renumbering it as subsection 18.1(1); and

(b) by adding the following subsection after subsection (1):

“(2) Subsection (1) does not apply where

(a) the watercourse or body of water is located wholly within the boundaries of land that is owned by or in the lawful possession of the person carrying out any activity mentioned in subsection (1); and

(b) the surface water of that watercourse or body of water does not flow directly or indirectly, other than by percolation, into other surface water that is not located wholly within the boundaries of that land.”

That is the amendment which I move.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill as amended.

### Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The State of the Environment Report Act

**The Chair:** — It is the same officials . . . there's one different official. I'll ask the minister to introduce the official who has joined the committee for this Bill.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Directly behind me is Doug Mazer, the director of sustainable land management. The other officials are the same.

### Clause 1

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I'd like to welcome the new official here this afternoon.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could explain the purpose for changing this reporting from one year to two year — what you hope to accomplish by this change.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — There are several purposes. One is to reduce the cost of publishing reports. The other is that it is difficult within a one-year time frame to come up with full reviews that reflect significant change in the environment because the environmental changes are modest within a year. And so the purpose is to also then put it into greater harmony with most other districts in Canada, most of which report on a two- to five-year time frame.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I wonder if you could give us a breakdown on the other provinces' reporting. How many are two and how many are five, or what's the spreads?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, we do not have a complete list. If the member opposite continues to have an interest in that issue, I can have the officials research that question. My understanding is that Alberta's two, Manitoba's two, the federal government's five, the others I don't have information on at the moment.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Okay, thank you, Mr. Minister. What kind of a cost saving are you looking at? What's the budget for this and what kind of a cost saving are you planning with this change?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, the publishing costs are about \$20,000 but the staff work going into reviewing the documents for a report are more significant and I don't have an estimate of that; but again, the time for review is limited on the shorter time frame and a two-year time frame for reporting is a more practical sort of time frame just to logistically get the job done.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, if you were looking at mainly cost as being the important factor

here, why wouldn't you go to a longer time frame then? Why wouldn't you have looked at the five-year one?

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I believe there would be public concern if we had the reporting too infrequently. We'll work at the two-year time frame. If this in fact is in agreement with others in the House and if in fact it becomes apparent that a longer time frame might be desirable, that certainly could be considered in the future.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I was in no means giving the intention that I thought a five-year reporting period was better; but if cost is your motivating factor here, well then you would go for the five-year one.

You suggest that you can't get the proper information in place over a year, but I would suspect, Mr. Minister, that if you were reporting on a yearly basis, if you were following the trends, that you would get a much quicker handle on a situation that was developing than you would if you're looking at these reports on a two-year or a five-year basis, as far as that goes.

So, Mr. Minister, can you give us some comments on that and can you explain in this report exactly what kind of subjects you cover and in how much detail do you cover them.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Chairman, the state of environmental reporting is not yet a fully defined art. If I may, the first state of the environment report attempted to measure many elements of the environment — the water, wildlife, forests, air, basically the elements of the ecology as we know it. But because change is so slow and unmeasurable in such a short period of time, there wasn't a lot of purpose in reproducing a document like that. So the second document that was produced actually looked at what acceptable indicators would be of environmental change. The second report wasn't a numbers document at all but a document looking at ways in which we might determine environmental change.

It's conceivable that as we report in future years, that themes might be used where one might, for example, focus on air in one report, or water, or land, or other breakdowns of environmental reporting for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. The exact form of this report is not yet fixed because we've had two very different reports in the first two that have been published by the province.

So that the intent of environmental reporting is to help people understand where we are at with respect to environmental management. We'll continue to review the format in which that's done to be most helpful to the people of the province, to help understand what the state of the environment is and what they personally might do to make it better.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I think when the report comes out that it would be important

that it be done in a standard form, therefore it makes it a lot more useful to the general public. When they pick it up, they can compare what happened in the year before. So I think as you proceed with this, I think it's important that you start to use a standard format for the production. Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Thank you very much. That's certainly the goal. The time frames, and the way in which that would be addressed over time will be evolutionary in the early reports. But clearly that's the purpose, is so that we can track our performance over time and so the public can see it with us. Thank you very much.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Before I move that, I'd like to thank my officials for their contribution here. And I would like to move that The State of the Environment Report Act be reported without amendment.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

**Mr. D'Autremont:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I would like to thank the minister and his officials for coming in today and for working with us on these two particular Bills. Thank you.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Animal Protection Act

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

#### Bill No. 35 — An Act respecting Agrologists

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I move this Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

#### Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — I move that the amendments be now read the first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

#### Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The State of the

## Environment Report Act

**Hon. Mr. Wiens:** — Mr. Speaker, I move this Bill be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a third time and passed under its title.

(1630)

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

### General Revenue Fund Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat Vote 25

#### Item 1

**Mr. Neudorf:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister. Checking back in *Hansard* it looks to me that at 5:02 on April 27 you and I were in a discussion and you were saved by the bell at that time. And it looks as if we're going to be short of time again.

Mr. Minister, I was just about finished, and to refresh your memory, we were talking about the Bronson forest area and that part of the province that was being contemplated being sold as a treaty land entitlement settlement. And I was expressing some concerns or passing on to you some of the concerns of some of the local folks in other areas of the province as well.

And I asked you the question, why were you selling wilderness land basically when we are already only about halfway there in terms of our protected spaces that we are committed to and that your colleague, the minister of Natural Resources, has committed to.

So on one hand we find you going around the parks in the southern part of the province buying private land to put it into the protected spaces part of other parks, and now when we have an area that has protected land, you're contemplating selling that off. And that seemed to me to be counter-productive. Your response to my question essentially was, well we made a commitment under the Blakeney government. Minister Bowerman made a commitment to the folks up in that area, either 1980 or '81, and that you are now honouring that commitment. So I think essentially, Mr. Minister, that brings us back to where we were when the bell rang on April 27.

Specifically now, as a follow-up question, could you inform me as to when Mr. Bowerman made that commitment? Under what conditions did he make that commitment; where did he make that commitment? Could you be a little bit more specific on that, please?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Chair, and to the member, we don't have with us the letter nor the date of the letter, but it was written in the early 1980s from Mr. Bowerman. It was pursuant to negotiations that were going on between the government and the Thunderchild Band, and those negotiations were pursuant to the 1976 formula with respect to the unsatisfied treaty land claims.

And this letter exists and it can be obtained, but I don't have it with me today.

**Mr. Neudorf:** — I'm familiar with the general aspect of the negotiations during that time, Mr. Minister. Now please confirm for me then that it was an agreement entered upon by Mr. Bowerman and the Thunderchild Indian Band, and that in response and pursuant to those negotiations Mr. Bowerman wrote the Thunderchild Band a letter making the commitment. What kind of commitment did he make? Would you be specific on that?

Mr. Minister, we could probably facilitate matters if you would take it upon yourself and make a commitment here that you will give me a copy, or perhaps even table in this legislature, the letter where Mr. Bowerman makes that commitment so that we have all the information. Because this is a significant turn of events for any government to make and I think we should have the material at hand so we can judge the appropriateness of your actions.

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Yes, we'll provide you with a copy of that letter, hopefully today.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — In light of the arrival of the Lieutenant Governor, I move we rise and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I think we have to for the Lieutenant Governor coming. We've got to move out of committee.

I move we rise, report progress and we'll ask for leave to sit later this day.

**The Chair:** — The Government Deputy House Leader has moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask for leave to sit again. Is that agreed? Carried.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — . . . the opposition for the interruption of their questions. She's not here; it was a false alarm.

**The Chair:** — Yes, is leave granted to return to the Committee of Finance? It is?

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — My sincere apologies to the opposition and ask for leave to resume the proceedings in committee.

**The Chair:** — Is leave granted? Agreed.

Leave granted.

#### Item 1

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, finally we get to talk. As you may know, we are interested in talking about vision, objectives, plans, and guidelines for government departments.

Recognizing the volume of department estimates yet to be considered and the relative size of the Indian and Metis Affairs Secretariat, I'll limit the range of my questioning.



Mr. Minister, what is your vision for this department?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — Mr. Chair, and to the member, we are moving into the 21st century, and in that century we envision Saskatchewan as a community in which all cultural groups achieve social equity and live together in harmony.

And in reference to Indian and Metis people within Saskatchewan, which are a growing portion of the population, our vision is that they will be able to experience and develop their own distinctive cultures and participate as full partners in the processes and benefits of social and economic development. That is our vision and that is the centre-piece of the activities of the secretariat.

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Thank you. Mr. Minister, how has this vision changed during the last few years that have brought us to this point?

(1645)

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — I think that we have all become very much more conscious of the social problems facing Indian and Metis people in this province and in this country. Indeed I think it accurate to say that these are social problems which dwarf any others that one can think of, because of their severity and because of their unhappy consequences and because of their relevance to Saskatchewan, considering our demographics. So we have become increasingly conscious of the depth and the breadth of those problems.

At the same time we have, as has every other jurisdiction in this country, accepted the existence of the inherent right of aboriginal people to govern themselves. That's not something that Saskatchewan thought of, so neither the preceding government nor our government can take credit for it, but it is an idea that grew up and was given voice to in the preparations for the Charlottetown round of constitutional negotiations and was accepted by public statements made by the premiers of each of the provinces and the leaders of the Territories, and by the past and the present prime ministers of Canada.

So that is something that is different and has affected the shape of the vision as well as the methods by which we begin to attack these problems. All of the jurisdictions in this country are approaching these problems within the general framework of the inherent right. And it has this advantage which I think is so important: it is involving Indian and Metis and Inuit people in a direct way in the resolution of their own problems.

The time when senior governments, if I can use that term, "prescribe" what program should be good for Indian and Metis people, those times are long gone. Now we have finally realized, even at this late date, that the only way in which progress can be made in these areas is to involve the people themselves. That's a difficult question to answer but I try to do the best I can in the short time we have available.

**Mrs. Bergman:** — Yes, you did a good job; answered it for me. What are the specific public policy objectives that drive your department?

**Hon. Mr. Mitchell:** — As we see these, the principles are as follows. First of all the principle of equity, by which we mean that the government is committed to fairness and inclusiveness in our society.

Secondly, cooperation, which is to say that the government will work cooperatively with aboriginal people to facilitate their goals and their aspirations for their social, economic, and cultural development.

Third is the principle of community by which the government recognizes and respects the unique cultures of Indian and Metis people and their communities within the fabric of the larger Saskatchewan community.

Fourth, the principles of openness and accountability by which the government will communicate openly with aboriginal communities on decisions affecting social and economic development in those communities. All partners involved in these joint actions will be accountable for the results achieved and the public resources used.

Fifth, of course the principle of affordability, which all of us have to live with at every level of government in this nation. We are, for our part, committed to living within our means, and we must employ what I can describe as efficient approaches to achieve the effective delivery of programs and services to aboriginal people.

The sixth principle I've already mentioned, the principle of self-determination, in which we attempt to maximize self-reliance and self-determination of aboriginal peoples in balance with our responsibility to the whole community of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — Let me say before I begin, Mr. Chairman, that I sincerely hope my mother is not watching this. Not a soul is going to believe me when I tell you that the Lieutenant Governor is here. And I therefore move we rise, we report progress, and ask for leave to sit later this day.

The committee reported progress.

## ROYAL ASSENT

At 4:51 p.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

- Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act
- Bill No. 22 — An Act to establish Crown Foundations for Saskatchewan Universities
- Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act

- Bill No. 49 — An Act to amend The Traffic Safety Court of Saskatchewan Act, 1988/Une Loi modifiant la Loi de 1988 sur le Tribunal de la sécurité routière de la Saskatchewan
- Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act, 1990
- Bill No. 40 — An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act to provide for Mediation
- Bill No. 46 — An Act to amend The Provincial Court Act and to enact certain other provisions
- Bill No. 2 — An Act to amend The Department of Economic Development Act, 1993
- Bill No. 6 — An Act to amend The Community Bonds Act
- Bill No. 5 — An Act to establish the Tourism Authority
- Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Animal Protection Act
- Bill No. 35 — An Act respecting Agrologists
- Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act
- Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend the State of the Environment Report Act

**Her Honour:** — In Her Majesty's name I assent to these Bills.

- Bill No. 60 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending on March 31, 1995

**Her Honour:** — In Her Majesty's name, I thank the Legislative Assembly, accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill.

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 4:54 p.m.

#### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

##### **General Revenue Fund Agriculture and Food Vote 1**

**The Chair:** — It now being near 5 o'clock, the committee will stand recessed until 7 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.