

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**December 13, 1979**

**EVENING SESSION**

**Bill No. 46 – An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act (continued)**

**MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre):** – Mr. Speaker, prior to adjournment for dinner, I proceeded to mention the poor quality of debate given by the two members in relation to the Meewasin Valley Authority. I will not go into that at this particular time.

I do want to, however, go back to another era when this kind of a discussion arose. But not within the Assembly, because at that time they had a different kind of opposition and I wonder if I could just read to you the Debates and Proceedings of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly, April 6, 1962. It concerns an act respecting an area to be known as Wascana Centre. I notice here, the late Mr. W. Ross Thatcher, who was the leader of the opposition at that time said ‘I say it once that I rise with pleasure to support the principles of this legislation.’ And there really isn’t very much difference in concept and in principle between the Wascana Authority and the Meewasin Valley Authority.

I also want to go on and say that Mr. Thatcher went on to say, ‘I say that we support in principle this legislation.’ Also, there was a Mr. Ross McCarthy who said, ‘I am very much in favor of this type of thing . . .’ and I’ll not go into why. Also, a Mr. Foley who was a member of the opposition at that time for Turtleford, ‘Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with my leader and other speakers who have spoken in connection with the Wascana Centre project.’

I do want to say one thing, Mr. Speaker, that here you have an example in my quoting from the Debates and Proceedings of an opposition that had some substance. A noble opposition, if I may say, as compared to the members opposite who sit across from us and politicize this sort of thing. I want to, just briefly, touch again on the political bias that has been injected into this whole debate in Saskatoon and area. One political hack who has been doing the work for members opposite . . . You know I can’t fathom, Mr. Speaker, why the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party (and I don’t know where he is, I can’t see him, Mr. Speaker) . . . Well at any rate, I will address myself to you, in keeping with the tradition of the House. I can’t understand how the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, coming from Saskatoon, could manipulate those . . . well, not 17. I think half of them have taken off for sunnier climes or are about to. I can’t understand how a gentleman like that would be so violently opposed and allow those members opposite to oppose the concept of Meewasin Valley Authority. I’ll tell you one thing. In Saskatoon Centre I know all of my constituents – not all but about 90 per cent – are in favor, and should he or members opposite care to venture into my constituency I in all sincerity say I cannot guarantee you safety.

Now if I could just mention one other thing. One of these members who tried to stir up – and did some stirring up of people said (and I thought he was referring to an alderman from Saskatoon, I could be mistaken) this alderman said, yes, he accepted the legislation last year, he thought it was good, but now he admits he was duped. He never mentioned any names and that’s why I say that gentleman has to be associated with those 17. He was really a spokesman for them, because those are the kinds of tactics they have used and are using. They never name names unless it is to besmirch the honor and the integrity or a civil servant of the calibre of Wes Bolstad.

Well, I simply say that after looking at the amendments there, those amendments are just absolutely nonsense. It limits the authority to 90 metres on each side of the river bank. What they really want is an authority that has no authority at all. They want to control a river edge but they want no river edge in it. I don't know what you would want to control in there. The only things there are trees and grass, and maybe you feel you have to control them, or the fish that swim in the river. And I tell you after this, there are 17 fish that aren't in the river, they are right over there. If you think you are going to capitalize on this politically in Saskatoon and area, you're badly mistaken because 90 per cent of about 150,000 gives about 130,000 people who are foursquare behind the concept of this. And the amendments as proposed by the provincial government, I believe, are acceptable to many. I also believe they are not acceptable to all of them, but the Attorney General has said amendments will be made. He is a man of honor; his word has been good. You've accepted it before. I see the gentleman is pulling his choker. Now I would too if I found myself in the same position as you – a leader who has not leadership. I don't know but I would imagine that there should be little wires, you know, from there to there because that is what puppetry is all about.

Well, I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen opposite wish to destroy this thing. We want to listen to the people. Amendments introduced by the Attorney General show we listen to people and will continue to listen to people. If you people want to speak for the speculators, and I know you do, fine, it will rest on your consciences, not ours. I simply say that I fully support the concept of the Meewasin Valley Authority. And the residents' associations in my constituency – in fact they put an ad in the Star-Phoenix last week, probably Saturday – fully support it too. If you oppose the amendments proposed here, as I mentioned before, you will rue the day and you're selling down the drain your children and your grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be supporting the amendments put forth by the Attorney General, but the nonsensical ones put forward by the nonsensical opposition, I will be opposing them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon Sutherland):** – Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be able to enter into this debate, because for the first time in this House, in black and white, we now have a very clear example of what Progressive Conservative environmental policy is really like. We are seeing it in black and white. My desire to enter cabinet has nothing at all to do with my motivations behind this speech and I do not particularly mind whether I enter cabinet or not. I am afraid you are a great deal further away from entering cabinet than I will ever be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the main part of this debate. We are looking at an authority which has really only been operating for two months and we have had the operations of that authority clouded by comments from the Progressive Conservative Party calling the executive director of that authority a cheap hack.

I particularly in the opening part of my comments want to point out how thoroughly disgusting I find that comment about a gentleman whom I believe almost all citizens in Saskatoon and Regina know as a very, very honorable man whose integrity is beyond question. It is truly disgusting, in this House, that Mr. Wes Bolstad has to come under this kind of attack.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it has been very clear that the Meewasin Valley Authority had no intention of interfering with ordinary, day-to-day land transfers which were taking place within the control zone or the buffer zone, ordinary improvements that were being proposed or ordinary construction which was being proposed by local residents. I think we see that indication, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that almost immediately when the authority began operation, it delegated to the city of Saskatoon the authority to look after all proposed developments in R-1 and R-2 areas. Unfortunately the Meewasin Valley Authority's efforts have been hampered by the recent SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strike and naturally that has meant a great inconvenience in terms of land transfers because people have not been able to transfer the title to their land. I fear this is one of the things which has led to misunderstanding about the kind of authority and the kinds of intention which the Meewasin Valley Authority actually had.

Now, I want to say that there has been much talk on the part of the opposition, much concern about interference with agricultural lands outside of the city of Saskatoon. I want to say that it was very clearly established by the authority, from its very beginning, that one of the major goals of the Meewasin Valley Authority was the retention of agriculture as a major part of the authority. One of its major goals was to see agriculture retained outside of Saskatoon.

That has been demonstrated by its announcement that it intends to set up an agricultural advisory committee. Its good intention toward local farmers in the Corman Park area has been clearly demonstrated by the fact that the authority has already given notice that any approvals of an agricultural nature which are approved by the Department of Agriculture had the automatic approval of the Meewasin Valley Authority. It is not attempting to exercise powers over and above those that would normally be exercised by the Department of Agriculture. We had that announced just a couple of weeks ago.

I want to say in regard to agriculture, the intent of the authority (which I regret has been misunderstood by the members opposite) has been to focus development in certain specific areas along the river, to relieve farmers of the current problem which they have experienced from dozens and on some days hundreds of people crossing their potato fields and their grain fields, interrupting their farming operations. One of the intentions of the authority was to deal with that problem and focus development along specific areas of the river.

The authority stated from the beginning that the master plan was a broad vision. It committed itself at the very stages to public participation – to comprehensively involve the public and local residents who would be affected in any specific implementation of the plans which were being contemplated.

In this context, Mr. Speaker, I think we must look at the Conservative proposal and find it extremely unfortunate. I want to point, for all members of the House and particularly for members opposite and for the public, the implications which the Conservative amendment would have for the operation of the Meewasin Valley Authority and the operation of the overall plan that the authority laid out. The overall vision, not a specific plan, Mr. Speaker, but a vision that the Meewasin Valley Authority and all those people who have been involved in this Saskatoon area in planning it had.

I want to start, Mr. Speaker, by looking at the southern end of the river valley. I remind all members of the House we are talking about the protection of a river valley and not just

about the protection of the river edge. The protection of the valley is fundamental to the overall well-being of the river edge, one of the basic points the Conservative amendment overlooks. I want to start by turning to page 51 of the Meewasin Valley Project, a booklet I'm sure all members will be familiar with now and have had several months to review and consider. I want to turn to page 51 and look first at the proposed Oxbow Lakes Sanctuary. If you look at the proposal for the sanctuary which spreads over an area of approximately two miles and which called for the establishment of a conservation, research and passive recreation area within the sanctuary, if you look at the intention establishing an interpretive centre that would provide an opportunity for students and all members of the public to better understand the process of glaciation that took place in the area, to better understand the history of the Moon Lake archaeological site (which I'd like to point out to all members is outside the 92 meter zone they are proposing) that was going to look at preserving fine ecology and wildlife on the Meander Plains of that sanctuary, we find almost the entire proposed sanctuary would be outside the 92 metre boundary that is being proposed by the members opposite.

If we go to the next major project proposed by Moriyama in this overall vision we had, a vision that would be developed with comprehensive public participation for the local people who were going to be affected, if we look at that we find that the Conservative proposal would stop the plan to develop Beaver Creek as a conservation area. It would stop the plan to halt the destructive use by many persons within that area right now so it could return to its natural condition. It would hinder the plan greatly to establishing an outdoor education and archaeological study site in the Beaver Creek area because once again the Beaver Creek area, Mr. Speaker, lies almost entirely outside the 92 metre zone that's being proposed by the Progressive Conservative Party.

And if we turn to page 55 of this broad vision Moriyama has outlined and we look at Cranberry Flats we see the Progressive Conservative proposal would greatly hinder though it would not stop completely the preservation of Cranberry Flats. A good part of the flats does lie within the 92 metre area proposed by portions of it lie outside. The plan to develop an alternative site to be used by all-terrain vehicles so we don't have cars driving up and down Cranberry Flats all the time would virtually be destroyed by the PC amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to look, Mr. Speaker, at the northern portion, the portion of the river valley authority north of Saskatoon for a minute. I want to look at one of the key parts of the vision, Petursson's Ravine. The intention there was to establish a conservation area. I want to refer all members of the House to page 69 of the report and read into the record, Mr. Speaker, what Moriyama proposed for this area. He said the Petursson's Ravine area includes not only Petursson's Ravine but the underground water emerging at the bank west of the penal hospital, rare sedges and saline vegetation 300 to 350 metres south of Petursson's Ravine together with essentially undisturbed geological formations showing the series of glaciating. Illegal dumping is damaging this area. There are only two sets of words to describe the area and to suggest action. It is beautiful; clean it up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the proposal by the Progressive Conservative Party to limit development to 92 metres from the riverbank would once again upset the development that is proposed for this area because the intention Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You will have your opportunity to present your case member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). You will have a full opportunity to present your case and if you wish to rebut me at the time, I will listen with interest to your rebuttal. Now, Mr.

Speaker, I want to say it is my belief that the Progressive Conservative proposal will hamper our ability to fully develop the Medicine Wheel Park that is being proposed and it will hamper our ability to develop as Moriyama proposed, an in-city recreation area somewhat to the south of that.

I want to say to members opposite that it is not just enough for the city of Saskatoon, if it were to later own and control that area, to develop it. The whole notion behind the establishment of this authority was to have them place a vehicle that would look at development with a special eye to the sensitive nature of the river. That is the special intention of the Meewasin Valley Authority and that is the intention that you are in fact destroying by way of your amendment.

Now I want to look at Cathedral Bluffs node that was being proposed further north of Petursson's Ravine. That was another fundamental part of the Moriyama concept. I want to say that the intention was to create a lake, a ski hill and to develop an interpretive centre. Once again, the Progressive Conservative proposal interferes with the fundamental intent of the Meewasin Valley Authority to develop this as a recreational area to the north of Saskatoon. The whole intent behind the plan was to preserve the southern portions of the river valley for ecological purposes and to move recreational development to the north. The amendment destroys the opportunity of the authority to implement that plan.

I want to turn especially to the subject continuously being raised by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) which is the question of the refinery – the uranium refinery. I want to say that under the PC plan, the refinery would no longer be under the control of the authority at all. It would no longer be under the buffer zone. Under the PC proposal it would simply be left to the private market forces to develop the refinery in whatever way they want. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Meewasin Valley Authority would exercise no control over that area, which seems to run in complete conflict to what the member for Rosthern was advocating.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. PREBBLE:** – I want further to say, Mr. Speaker, the PC plan would greatly hinder our ability to develop a lake between the river and the downtown city core which is another of the basic concepts that Moriyama and the authority have advocated. The plan was for the authority to play a role in preserving historical sites and preserving the character of portions of the downtown area. The 92 metre restriction would virtually make that impossible, Mr. Speaker. It would also make impossible the ability of the authority to stop highrises anywhere outside the 92 metres which potentially could mean that within 150 yards of the river, we could be looking at highrises that could not be controlled by the Meewasin Valley Authority at all. We would be looking at all kinds of opportunities for land speculators to come in and to violate the basic character of the downtown area, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to say that the authority was to play an important role in developing a continual linkage of green space and open space along the river valley and within the downtown area. It was to play an important role in placing controls on private developers to assure that continuous green space, continuous linkage was developed over a period of time. Again, removing the ability of the authority to exercise any control outside the 92 metre area would make it virtually impossible for that goal to be implemented.

If we look, Mr. Speaker, at the fact that a lot of the sloughs and ponds and small lakes are essentially an integral part of Moriyama's plan, an integral part of developing a linkage between the city and the rural community, and playing an important role in assuring water retention, we see once again that the opportunity to exercise that vision is destroyed by the PC proposal. I think that what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker, is in effect a proposal amendment from the Progressive Conservatives that would destroy the river valley authority concept completely.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. PREBBLE:** – What they are proposing is allowing the most sensitive ecological areas outside the 92 metre area to be destroyed. They are saying that they are not willing to protect many of the most precious ecological preserves that, for the most part, fell outside the 92 metre area. They are saying that they are not willing to prevent dumping and pollution in sensitive areas that lie outside the 92 metre area. They are saying, Mr. Speaker, that they are not willing to take action to preserve the precious drainage system, the Coulee, the wooded areas, that for the most part lie outside the 92 metre area.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. PREBBLE:** – They are essentially saying, Mr. Speaker, leave that to the private land speculators to develop in the way that they want to, to exercise the full pressure on rural municipalities which are not fully equipped to deal with that kind of pressure. Now I want to say that in my view the proposed amendments as put forward by the Attorney General which I am willing to support and to live with, are in fact a compromise because there are many person who would like to see the powers of the river valley authority strengthened, or at last would like to see the amendments not carried to the point that they do. It's my view, Mr. Speaker, that some of the amendments run the risk of weakening the authority to the point where it may not be the kind of effective vehicle that we need to take the kind of comprehensive action that I believe is needed to preserve the river valley.

I want particularly to say with regard to the proposal repeal of section 50, that I do have some concerns that the repeal of this section will make it very difficult to keep track of proposed land transfers that are going to be taking place. This will mean that the Meewasin Valley Authority will miss opportunities to purchase land in the ordinary way through the ordinary process, because it will not be notified of the proposed interest of some parties in selling their land. Mr. Speaker, I think that the loss of that opportunity will indeed be unfortunate.

I also want to say that I personally would like to see the authority have more influence over development within t some portions of the buffer zone, because essentially right now, the authority plays no active advisory role in deciding what kinds of development will take place in the buffer zone. It is simply advised of the proposed development. It is simply notified of them. It does not have a major input into determining whether those developments are satisfactory or not. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in some cases where the control zone is not wide enough and does not protect precious areas of the downtown fully enough. I believe that it's unfortunate that the authority is not able to exercise more control in the buffer zone.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that we still have a requirement on the books for

the Meewasin Valley Authority to have to buy land within a year if a proposed development for that land is rejected by the authority because this leaves the authority wide open to the kinds of land speculators that the Conservative Party is supporting. It leaves the authority wide open to a land speculator coming forward with a ridiculous development for an area, the authority having to turn it down and then the authority being obligated within a year to purchase the land. I think Mr. Speaker, that the authority should have the ability to stop developments without having to purchase the land involved, but only after having established criteria – public criteria – by which that judgment will be made. So I want to say that very clearly the amendments are what I would describe as a compromise, a compromise between those who are concerned that the river valley authority does not have quite the necessary jurisdiction that is required to protect the river valley and those who are concerned that in fact the authority has too much power and too much jurisdiction. What we have is an attempt at a compromise which I am sure all members of the public, other than the 17 members opposite, will realize is realistic and something that attempts to meet the needs of all those concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to sum up by saying that the Conservative Party has said the decision regarding the establishment of this authority, its operation and the establishment of the boundary should be non-political. And what we are seeing now is a clear attempt to establish the boundaries of the authority in a very political way, the most political kind of way you can imagine.

They are turning the establishment of these boundaries into pure politics, Mr. Speaker. They are destroying the entire concept of the Meewasin Valley Authority. They are drawing up these boundaries without any knowledge of ecology, without any effort to consult someone who is knowledgeable in ecology. Here we have a very clear illustration of what the real environmental policies of the PC Party are. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that clearly those policies will be condemned by the majority of people in Saskatoon and surrounding area. I have already been in touch with the presidents of the heritage society and the environmental society in Saskatoon. They have informed me they completely reject the PC amendments, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as many of the community associations in Saskatoon have already indicated their support of the existing Meewasin Valley Authority concept, they clearly must reject the PC amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the PCs to withdraw their amendments. They are clearly not in the public interest and I say, Mr. Speaker, there can be no question about the fact that anyone who is concerned about protecting the river valley will support the government's amendments and defeat the PC amendments. Thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – I think this debate has been a very good debate for a number of reasons. Obviously the issue is an important issue and I think it has, for my part, in any event, as one member very much involved in the whole concept of Meewasin Valley Authority, at least clarified the fighting ground – if I can put it that way.

I think the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) and the member for Saskatoon-Centre (Mr. Mostoway) particularly made illuminating addresses about the effects of the PCs amendments. I think they made an effective argument on the PC amendments and I won't go over the territory too much with respect to the speech

made, particularly by the member for Sutherland just before he sat down, on what the amendments mean. I will have a few comments to make with respect to the amendments in just a moment, because I too want to tell the members opposite that as one member I reject the proposed amendments.

I want, however, to make a couple of remarks in rebuttal to the points raised primarily by the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) this afternoon on the Meewasin Valley Authority.

Mr. Speaker, the one issue that bothers me a little bit just as a technique is, if you will notice carefully, the member for Kindersley never states his position on any particular area. The member for Kindersley (as I think has been unfortunately the habit of the PC Party since they've been in this House for the short duration) argues like this – some people say this and this and that. I'm not saying I'm saying it, some people say this. Or he will say, have the mortgage lenders received a legal opinion? And when you ask where is the legal opinion? How does he know he got the legal opinion? Some people say this kind of a section is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Where do you stand on this? Do you subscribe to those arguments or do you try to defend the arguments? Not a word. And I think this is a very interesting tactic because that indeed is the case.

I do, nevertheless, want to make a couple of points which I think should be put clearly on the record again since this debate is out in the open. The member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) in the Progressive Conservative Party I say should be voting against these amendments in second reading tonight in a few minutes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Obviously you're not going to vote for them because of your amendments. Your amendments effectively kill the entire bill. I'll just tell you in a minute how they do this. Just hang on. I want to speak specifically to the points raised on the section by section arguments that some people (mind you not the member for Kindersley) but some people raise. The member for Kindersley says some people out there are worried that under section 13 of The Meewasin Valley Authority Act there is an unprecedented power. Those were the effect of his words. Because it says the authority may by resolution alter the area of the valley by adding thereto or excluding therefrom with respect to the land. Then he makes a great big argument out of this. Unprecedented and exceptional power – well, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to tell the hon. member opposite this is not the case. It is not unprecedented power. The Wascana Centre Authority, section 12 says:

The authority may with the approval of the participating parties (the same situation we've got) by resolution alter the area of the Wascana Centre by adding thereto or excluding therefrom any parcel of land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that since the member for Kindersley and the Progressive Conservative Party objects to this section in the Meewasin Valley Authority, they equally object to it in this section of the Wascana Centre Authority . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right, the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) says that. That's why I'm saying I want them to vote against this now because I think this clarifies exactly where they stand.

Take the area on improvements. The member says, mind you, not me, but some people are worried about improvement and the high authority with respect to improvements in the Meewasin Valley Authority. Well, I decided to just check this for one moment again to see what the Wascana Centre Authority says about improvements and to . . . and behold I see on section 15:



Any person may apply to the authority (Wascana Centre Authority, I'm talking about) for approval of his proposal to make an improvement within the land.

And then lo and behold I see on section 18 that if it's under \$5,000 (and the bill before it was amended under the Meewasin Valley was \$2,000; here it says \$5,000) you don't need approval. Otherwise you need Wascana Centre approval.

I assume since the hon. member for Kindersley opposes this particular power, he, too, opposes the particular power that exists in the Wascana Centre Authority.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of issue was made out of the question of section 45 of the Meewasin Valley Authority. I don't know, maybe I should sit down and let the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) make speeches and we'll all be a little bit better off. But section 45, Mr. Speaker, I said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I have really got to ask you to call the member for Saskatoon Centre to order because I cannot hear.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Order! I was having some trouble before and I didn't want to mention it. But I was having some trouble when the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) was speaking. I thought what he was saying was relevant and in order but it was being drowned out occasionally. There was some object between me and him drowning it out. I find now I have the same problem. The Attorney General is speaking and it seems I'm getting the same kind of static. I wonder if the members in that general area could keep a little quieter.

**MR. ROMANOW:** – I want to make the point with respect to section 45. I'm not going to belabor this too long but I think you see what I'm saying section by section.

Section 45 of the Meewasin Valley Authority says – this is the section we are amending. I said in my argument it was a specious misrepresentation to argue section 45 prohibited any kind of land transfers. This is the one dealing with public easements, and the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) particularly spoke to that area and objected. Well, I want to tell the hon. member about section 38 of The Wascana Centre Authority Act. This is an act that's been around for many years. It's been around for 17 years as worded. Section 39 is identical to section 45 – we are amending section 45 now to put in . . . similar and it's been interpreted by the courts – section 39. As I said in second reading and I repeat to you now, that is a specious argument. Why are we amending it? Again, we want to try to show to the public that any kind of a concern they have which can be amended to clarify the situation we are prepared to do. That's no good for the PCs. Apparently, it's not good also if the same thing applies with respect to the Wascana Centre Authority. So we'll be assuming a private member's bill is coming to make an amendment there.

Then there's the question, Mr. Speaker, of certificate of title. You'll recall this is an amendment which we are proposing. This is the endorsement of the title. This is the part, Mr. Speaker, I want to very much stress in a moment. This is section 46 in the Meewasin Valley Authority Act which say there shall be an endorsement on title; this land is subject to Meewasin Valley Authority. This is the one which created the whole hubbub and as the hon. member for Kindersley says, some people are worried about this, that it may cloud title, etc., and Wally Hamm and all of his boys out there may be worried about that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I notice by section 40 of The Wascana Centre Authority Act, these words:

Every certificate of title within Wascana Centre shall be endorsed by the registrar of the land registration district in which the land is situated with the following note:

The land herein described is subject to The Wascana Centre Act revised statutes, 1965, chapter 401, section 40.

Mr. Speaker, there was and is private land in the Wascana Centre Authority. I don't know if it is mortgaged or not. This is an identical section we have in the Meewasin Valley Authority. The money lenders of Saskatoon, when they issued their press release saying they wouldn't lend any money because it clouded title, did so either not knowing this was the case with the Wascana Centre Authority where they have lent money, or if they did, were doing it for purely political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. member for Kindersley and the hon. member for Rosthern where the titles of Wascana centre were endorsed – and may I say back in 1962 the Premier was the person who piloted that bill through – there was undoubtedly controversy for the same reasons. It has this provision with respect to endorsement of title as well, I ask the citizens of Saskatoon to ask the money lenders in Saskatoon and the PC Party why it is on identically the same provision that exists in Wascana, when it is being implemented for Saskatoon, that they are threatening to cut off the funds for this provision and have not done so with respect to the Wascana Centre Authority? Why?

Oh, the hon. member for Kindersley says, let's not inject politics into this. Mr. Attorney General, we're just trying to be reasonable people about this. And then the hon. member raises the question with respect to section 53 of the powers, the extra owners for expropriation. Why do you need to go for expropriation, and once you've expropriated why do you have to have all these wide powers of search? Why another police force in there? Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell the hon. member for Kindersley and I tell the members of the House – you know what I was going to say – it's in the section of The Wascana Centre Authority Act the same way. But I daresay you could pick almost any statute in Saskatchewan, be it The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act or wherever an expropriating authority exists (and there are many of them around) and I daresay you might even look at some of the expropriating authorities under relevant municipal legislation and you find, it not identical, substantially similar follow-up powers of expropriation.

If we did away with section 53, if we did away with the Meewasin Valley Authority and its power to expropriate, the city of Saskatoon would still have the power to expropriate and still would have the powers to follow up on the expropriation to which the member objects. And it's in The Meewasin Valley Authority Act. So look at the totality of the 'people concerns' arguments. Look at them. Section 13, alteration of boundary identical to Wascana. Where do the Tories stand on that? Do they want to do away with Wascana, section 13? Sections 15 to 18 with respect to improvements – where do they stand on that? Section 45, with respect to the business of public easements – do they also want to put this twisted interpretation on it? Where do they stand with respect to endorsement and filing of title in section 46, and particularly I ask that question of the money lenders? And what about section 53, the main arguments which are being advocated? Those are the five or six points that we are not sure the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) objects to, but some people are objecting to.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives claim the Meewasin Valley Authority has unprecedented powers. I say that is a falsehood, as I have pointed out. I say they know that to be a falsehood, or if they don't they have not done their homework. They either need to get better legal advice – because the precedents are in black and white on The Wascana Centre Act, and the court cases around that – or are they seriously saying they are going to impair and limit the powers of the Wascana Centre Authority? What is their position in this regard?

Mr. Speaker, I say that any objective observation of those point-by-point arguments has to be rebutted in this area, and I invite them in committee of the whole to rebut them for me – I invite them.

Now I turn, Mr. Speaker, very briefly to the Progressive Conservative amendments – what is the alternative? And why I say – actually after many weeks, several days – when everybody would say the going has been pretty heavy . . . and I don't expect that it is going to be a lot easier there with some people who simply don't want an authority. They will find some reason to argue against the amendments, but in a sense I feel relieved about the position being taken by the PCs, as I said, by these amendments because the fighting ground is at least clear and the choices are clear for Saskatoon citizens.

I repeat again, take a look at the amendments and we will argue then in detail, but they were referred to in second reading by the House Leader, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor). Mr. Speaker, there are four main aspects to these amendments. I had my lawyers, over the supper hour, look at all four points. The first point defines control zone. By the way, I am not going to object on technical reasons because I think the important thing is to get the substance of the debate out. But I don't know, with all due respect, whether it is in order (the amendment) if and when it is tendered, because we don't deal with the control zone in our amendments. But let's leave that on the side.

Control zone means all lands within 92 metres of the river bank or any part of the slope leading down to the river bank where the gradient is in excess of 20 per cent, whichever extends the greater distance measured horizontally from the river bank. Now, Mr. Speaker, part from not knowing legally where the river bank stops or ends – and this amendment doesn't offer us that definition . . . at least the draft by-law we tabled which talked about river bank says river bank as surveyed and registered in the land titles office, so it defines it legally. Apart from not defining river bank, what does 92 metres amount to, Mr. Speaker? I don't know.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** – Approximately 100 yards.

**MR. ROMANOW:** – About 100 yards on a 20 per cent gradient. Now you know something, Mr. Speaker, on this control zone there is a proposed project called, Five Corners highrise. Now on that kind of a gradient on that side, because it is a very steep uphill incline up the river bank, I think on the PC control line we would get up about three-quarters of the side of the river bank to control – maybe two-thirds – but we wouldn't be able to control the Five Corners highrise under those circumstances. We wouldn't be able to control if that was the choice of the MVA, the Eldorado Nuclear refinery operation, something which the hon. member makes a big deal out of conscience – the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). You can't do that now. His amendment says it is outside of the area, if it was to be done. I'm going to come to this in just a moment – the ownership of property.

What the 92 metres does, Mr. Speaker, is strip away everything except, as I have said, about 100 yards from the river bank, wherever the river bank is defined. We have a control zone now, Mr. Speaker, which will be the toughest control zone in the world, when it comes to controlling the chipmunks and the beavers and the squirrels that inhabit that river bank. That's what this amendment does. That's point number one.

The second amendment, Mr. Speaker, is, I find, an interesting amendment because it ties to define . . . Oh, I think there is one other point I should make about the control zone area. I draw this to the legal beagle's attention on the opposite side. They changed the control zone to mean 100 yards – that's from the river banks – but they forget to put in the lateral boundary, and so now, we've got 100 yards from the Alberta border all the way out to the Manitoba border in the South Saskatchewan River bank because there's no conclusion on the boundary. There is under the Meewasin Valley Authority as it's drafted. Now the PC amendments have created more land, albeit all under the control of the beavers and the chipmunks, more land under public control by the PC scheme than even the MVA had – all the way from Alberta to Manitoba. There's no lateral control at the other end. We can control it either way but it will go from Manitoba to Alberta, non-stop, Mr. Speaker. So I think the member for Saskatoon centre (Mr. Mostoway) will be pleased to know that we can go all the way from Manitoba to Alberta and look on either side so long as we go in our canoe and say that's Meewasin Valley Authority and that's Meewasin Valley Authority and that's Meewasin Valley Authority. Boy oh boy, if that beaver decides to build a dam on the river bank, is he going to be in trouble, because we're going to send old Wes Bolstad to check whether or not that beaver got the appropriate approval and the like, you know!

Then, Mr. Speaker, a second amendment deals with the control . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, no with the improvements area. I find that also a very interesting one, because here on the control zone, on the improvements area, what they are talking about here is in effect, removing the ceilings. The way improvements are defined now under our bill, 2,000 or less, you don't need any approval; 2,000 and over, you do. We're coming in today with amendments raising those ceilings. They're taking those ceilings totally out. There's no more ceiling on the improvements. Any improvements you want to make within those 100 yards, of course, you have to receive the approval of the Meewasin Valley Authority. I don't know whether a planner yet has figured out quite how to build a highrise on the edge of the river on the Saskatoon bank. But here might be one someday, who is clever enough and then, this bill may come into play, Mr. Speaker, under their definition of improvement. That's the second, taking away the limits on the definition of improvements. No limitations, no notifications – taken it away.

The third amendment, Mr. Speaker, (and this is the one that the members make a great deal out of and I want to speak to and I want to lay to rest) is proposed amendment 2(q). This one, I say, Mr. Speaker, is unbelievable. This is the rebuttal across the way to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) and my colleague, the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) when they say it's outside the area. They say oh no, look at 2(a). Here's what 2(a) says, 'Meewasin Valley means the area described in Schedule A and any other public land or private land which is placed within the area' (get this, Mr. Speaker, I under line these words), 'with the express, written consent of the participating party or person who owns that land.' We can use the Eldorado Nuclear as an example, (and I'm going back to this, in a minute). Their answer, the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) says 2(q), 2(q). If we adopted 2(q) what would have to happen is the Meewasin Valley Authority would have to get the express written consent of the

person who owns the land, whether it's SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) or Eldorado Nuclear. It doesn't matter, before that land could be taken in to the Meewasin Valley area. Consent. What happens if, using my example, the owner (for my purposes I will say Eldorado Nuclear) says no.

Let's drop Eldorado Nuclear as the example. Let's say the owner is a developer in Five Corners who we think, the people of Saskatoon and area think, is going to despoil the area by a 22-storey highrise and we come to him and he says no. What happens? We're out. We're out by this amendment. Not quite out, Mr. Speaker. We're not quite out because the PCs, I think by accident, let a little loophole (I don't know if they knew about the loophole) because I asked the lawyer again who is talking to listen to this: 'Public or private land which is placed with the area, with the express written consent of the participating party, or' (not and, but or), 'the person who owns the land.' So, I could go to Eldorado Nuclear or SEDCO and say, I want your written consent to own that land. They would say no. I could then go to the participating party, rural municipality of Corman Park, and if they said, yes, I could disentitle any private owner without the interest holder having any written consent at all on the operation. Not and, Mr. Speaker, written consent of the participating party and, but or.

So we have the situation now, Mr. Speaker, where my friend the member for Saskatoon Centre and I when we take this canoe trip this summer starting on the Alberta border, will sort of go down surveying Meewasin Valley Authority land on both sides of the river bank. When we decide all of a sudden we want some land for the MVA that lies within the jurisdiction of the participating party, all we need to do is get consent of the participating party and we can disentitle every private individual landholder. And these boys have the audacity to come to this House and to complain about the powers I've got in the Meewasin Valley Authority Bill? Mr. Speaker, this guy doesn't even get compensated for this. I can enter into a contract with the participating authority and this guy doesn't even know I've got a contract going. He's out – 2(a), that's what they say is the answer to that operation.

And then the fourth amendment, Mr. Speaker – and this is obvious – schedule A is repealed. Schedule A is the control zone. Schedule B is repealed – the buffer zone. Those are the PC amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I obviously can't support that kind of an amendment. And I'll tell you there's another reason why I can't support that kind of an amendment. The amendments before you, Mr. Speaker, are amendments the MVA has requested of the government to implement. I've taken the liberty of making a telephone survey of the heads of those who represent the various partners in the MVA to tell them about this amendment. I have to report to the House, regretfully to the PCs, that I am not authorized, not surprisingly so and thankfully so, to accept these amendments for the MVA.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to close my remarks now in second reading by saying this to the PCs. Don't shilly-shally about voting on third reading. If we accepted these amendments . . . there is only one substantive part of this amendment, that's 92 metres. Forget about all the others. Those are either sloppy drafting or not good thinking legally or pure maliciousness or whatever. Whatever it is, it doesn't matter. Forget about it. The fact of the matter is it's 92 metres. That's the substantive side, 92 metres running from Manitoba to Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, if we adopt this it doesn't matter what power you have or you don't have for an authority at all. You don't need an authority. City of Saskatoon can do that job. That's what these boys are

shouting across from me, city of Saskatoon, city of Saskatoon. Yes, city of Saskatoon can do it. And the rural municipality of Corman Park can do it. And the University of Saskatchewan can do it. The government doesn't own any of the land. Why did we get together, Mr. Speaker? We got together because the three participating people who owned the land in the area said we've got to pool our efforts. We've got to do this in a rationalized and co-ordinated way. We've got to protect the creeks and the nodes and the drainage areas and swamps and Beaver Creek and Cranberry Flats. Anybody who knows that area knows how fragile it is. We've got to get together. We can't say R.M. of Corman Park does this, allows this kind of development; city of Saskatoon say no. City of Saskatoon says yes to this development; university says no to that kind of a development. What kind of a hodgepodge are we looking at? What do you want? Do want a river bank like the Niagara Falls with all kinds of church bells and wax museums and displays built around over time or do you want something which is a monument to the natural beauty of the province and the city of Saskatoon? What do you want? That's the question that's involved.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** – Mr. Speaker, I said when I got up that I'm relieved at this amendment, because if we adopt this amendment you've killed Meewasin Valley Authority. There can be nothing plainer than that. There's no use to regulate, as I say, the beavers that patrol the river bank area. No use. We don't need our authority to do that. Mr. Speaker, I can only therefore conclude as I said in my opening remarks when I introduced this bill that the PCs are opposed to the MVA. That's the bottom line on this. They're opposed to the concept, as the member for Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) and the member for Centre (Mr. Mostoway) described it – the dream – they're opposed to that. And I say to the PCs get up in second reading – we're going to have a standing vote here – and vote against it. You're going to be truer to your own constituents in this area and you'll be truer to us and we'll know exactly where you stand. You can't say as you remember Mr. Taylor came in and said you accept the amendments or we're going to vote against you on third reading. The amendments are central. They strike at the very heart of the Meewasin Valley Authority. There is nothing left. You can totally denude the authority and the boundaries and the reserve areas. That's what those House amendments are proposed to do. And if you believe that's what it should be you've said nothing about the other area; you do not believe in the authority. Make no mistaken about that. And I am saying to the PCs, you might as well be honest and put the cards right up front. You're opposed to the MVA, your comments this afternoon show you're opposed to the MVA. I'm against you on that because I favor the concept of the riverbank and the . . . (inaudible) . . .

I say, Mr. Speaker, to those of the PCs who are out there politicking, the one of two who are clouded by the presence of the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew), the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman), at those public meetings agitating, to those one or two in Saskatoon who have opposed the amendments without even seeing them publicly (that's what happened today); to those, I can never solve their problems because they're insolvable. The only solution for them is to adopt the PC motion. I can't do that unless the people of Saskatoon and the rural municipality of Corman Park want us to do it, which means we've got no MVA.

That's it. Those are the amendments. Those are the issues. I say to the PC boys opposite, have the guts to at least stand behind what you truly believe. I hope, I still hope you're going to make it unanimous straight across the piece. I make that to you now – a plea. If you do, I'm going to ask you to withdraw your House amendments. If you don't, then I

challenge you, let's get the debate defined – vote against this bill. It's going to hurt me to do this (to have you vote against the bill) because I think it's still non-partisan, but it's not me who chose to limit it. Withdraw your amendments, vote for the bill; let's get on with repairing it; let's listen to the public from now until February or March when we come back; let's come in with some more amendments. Let's build in the foundation; let's modify it, but let's keep the dream alive. That's the challenge that's before us today. I support second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division nemine contradicente.

### YEAS – 36

Blakeney	Byers	Solomon
Pepper	Vicker	Berntson
Romanow	Rolfes	Birkbeck
Snyder	Tchorzewski	Larter
Robbins	Koskie	Lane
Baker	Matsalla	Taylor
Skoberg	Lusney	Ham
McArthur	Prebble	Garner
Gross	Johnson	Muirhead
Mostoway	Nelson	Katzman
Kowalchuk	Poniatowski	Duncan
Feschuk	White	Andrew

### NAYS – 00

**MR. SPEAKER:** – When shall this bill be dealt with in committee?

**MR. ROMANOW:** – Mr. Speaker, by leave later this day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – Leave is requested. Is leave granted?

Leave is not granted – next sitting of the House.

**MR. ROMANOW:** – That's fine. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have given an order of business for the members and I would like to just deviate with it and call the Minister of Continuing Education (Mr. McArthur), his items 38, 12 and 13 and pop back up to An Act respecting Security Interests in Personal Property.

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education)** moved second reading of Bill No. 44 – **An act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the privilege to introduce to this Assembly a bill to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to make a few comments on the reasons for bringing forth amendments to significantly and favorable alter teacher pensions and also to comment on the process which led to the presentation of these amendments.

Teachers in Saskatchewan have to date participated in a defined benefit or average earning formula plan which provides pension using a formula based on years of teaching service and salaries received in the years prior to retirement. While the approach has provided relatively good pensions to teachers it has been difficult to determine accurate future costs and to correspondingly calculate contributions required to fund or pay for the benefits of the plan.

In addition, the average earnings formula plan has implicitly discriminated against short-term teachers and those who periodically enter and withdraw from teaching. These groups by the way, Mr. Speaker, tend to contain a disproportionate number of women.

Mr. Speaker, a monitoring of the Saskatchewan teachers' defined benefit plan has taken place during the term of office of this government. In this we have had the assistance of the actuarial profession and of the provincial negotiating committees composed of teachers, trustees and public servants. They have paid regular attention to teachers' superannuation in the course of their work.

Over the years it has become clear that major changes would have to be considered to ensure that teachers will be able to enjoy satisfactory retirement income related to their years of service in their chosen profession.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, teacher bargaining legislation initiated by this government and enacted in 1973 has provided the mechanism through which matters of this sort can and have been resolved. Any problems with teachers' superannuation can be, and are addressed in a responsible and co-operative manner through the collective bargaining process involving representatives of the government, boards of education and teachers of Saskatchewan.

During 1978 and 1979 a number of particular problems were addressed by the provincial bargaining committees and were resolved. The terms of this solutions are express in the 1979 provincial collective bargaining agreement. These terms, Mr. Speaker, in so far as they apply to superannuation, are embodied in these amendments. These amendments contain nothing more nor less than the results of careful and effective collective bargaining involving teachers, trustees and government. As such they should be seen by all members of the legislature as worthy of their wholehearted support. They clearly stand as a concrete indication that collective bargaining for teachers can and does work in Saskatchewan. They clearly tell the story of how collective bargaining can work to resolve difficult problems and to face new challenges.

Mr. Speaker, the three parties to the provincial collective bargaining process, of which I have said the government is one, have approached the subject of teachers' superannuation in a carefully considered and responsible manner.

The provisions of the 1979 agreement, as reflected in these amendments that I am placing before this Assembly, provide recognition of:

1. The need to assure Saskatchewan teachers that they will receive satisfactory levels of retirement income;
2. The need to assure taxpayers of this province that the provision of such income will



be financed each year as the liability accrues so that it will not be translated into an unwarranted future economic hardship, particularly at such times in the future when there will be a significant change in the ratio, in favor of the number of people retired to the number of those in the work force.

3. The need to improve the current plan by way of increased contributions by teachers, direct matching contributions by government (something I might add that we have not had to date) and some changes in improvements to the benefit package to benefit current participants who, because of factors such as age and amount of service already provided, have not been entirely satisfied with the current plan.

4. The need to phase into a new pension plan designed for teachers to deal with some of the difficulties that have been encountered in the past.

The new design, Mr. Speaker, brought in through these amendments, may be described as a defined contribution plan based on the principle of pay as you go. It will apply to teachers entering the profession on and after July 1, 1980 and for those in the average earnings formula plan which has existed to date, who might consider it to be worth their advantage to transfer. It prescribes the contribution to be made by a participating teacher and the government on his or her behalf. Pensions will be determined by the total of such contributions, the period of time over which they are made, the investment earnings achieved on such contributions and the cost of various forms of pension available at the time of retirement. Specific needs of teachers that have been met in this plan include:

1. The provision of generally comparable benefits to those received by participants in the defined benefit design;
2. Fully paid-up and therefore assured pensions with no additional cost to be borne by future generations.
3. The provision of pension benefits for each period of service where service is intermittent. This has become an important factor in these times of career and physical mobility and is particularly pertinent to the teaching force, which in Saskatchewan is about 50 per cent occupied by women who statistics how are more apt than men to experience interruptions in service related to various reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I want to outline some of the more specific aspects of these amendments to The Teachers' Superannuation Act. Amendments to sections 4, 5 and 6 of the present act will alter the appointment procedure and the number of members sitting on the teachers' superannuation commission. The new commission shall consist of seven members appointed for five years by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, with three nominees from the teachers' federation, three nominees from the Minister of Education (Mr. McArthur) and a chairman nominated by the other six nominees. The commission will also be in a position to select its own vice-chairman from its members.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the most important contribution this bill makes to the pension needs of Saskatchewan teachers is the proposed creation of the fully-funded annuity plan.

A new section in this bill, section 12(1) will establish the annuity fund on July 1, 1980. Teachers who begin teaching on this date and afterward or teachers who elect to transfer from the existing teachers' superannuation fund will make up the participants

in this plan. Direct contributions towards teachers' pension matched by the Government of Saskatchewan will be made at a rate of 7.5 per cent of teachers' salaries, less required contributions to the Canada Pension Plan with a certain portion of the annuity plan contributions being diverted to a second new fund. Annuity fund contributions by an individual teacher will be no more than 6 per cent of teachers' salaries. Contributions under the annuity plan will grow in value at prevailing investment interest rates. Upon retiring, teachers will be able to purchase annuities reflecting in value their lengths of service and contributions standing to their credit in the annuity plan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention something that is both unique and progressive in this regard. Section 29(g) of this bill states:

That the annuity to which a teacher is entitled shall be determined by tables in the regulations created without regard to the sex of the superannuates.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the first annuity pension plan in Canada, of which I am aware, that eliminates the long-standing sex discrimination of annuity calculations.

Also, Mr. Speaker, sections 48 and 49 of this bill provide for a survivor benefit arrangement under the new annuity plan comparable to that which exists for teachers who elect to continue with the average earnings formula plan to which the existing teachers' superannuation fund is attached. Mr. Speaker, section 12(2) of this bill establishes the second new fund I mentioned earlier – the companion to the annuity fund – to be known as the supplementary allowances fund. The purposes of this fund are threefold, Mr. Speaker:

1. To provide annual cost of living adjustments to those in receipt of annuities.
2. To provide annuities to surviving dependents of deceased annuity plan participants.
3. To help re-establish a teacher who after having left the profession, returns to teaching and re-instates a position in the annuity plan.

Moneys paid into the supplementary allowances fund will come from two sources, Mr. Speaker; those being teachers and the province of Saskatchewan. The basis upon which moneys will be paid into this fund are as follows:

1. Teachers whose combined annuity fund and Canada Pension Plan contributions represent less than 7.5 per cent of salary will pay the remaining amount up to 7.5 per cent into the supplementary allowances fund. This amount is expected to be about one-half of 1 per cent of teachers' salaries.
2. The province will be matching teacher contributions dollar for dollar.
3. When a teacher dies leaving no spouse or dependants or when a teacher accepts a refund of his contributions to the annuity fund, the province's matching contributions in both cases, plus the interest on these contributions, will be transferred from the annuity plan to the supplementary allowances fund.

Mr. Speaker, the joint payment of contributions by teachers and the province into this plan created solely for the benefit of superannuated teachers and their survivors offers a sound guarantee. When teachers retire they will receive all the benefits to which they

are entitled. Also, the government, by matching teacher contributions during the years when teachers are active in their profession, will avoid the risk of having to pay high and possibly dislocating payouts on pension benefits in future years when the number of teacher superannuates is expected to increase dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, this principle of anticipating and laying away funds now for tomorrow's pension needs is also reflected in amendments to the current average earnings formula plan. Section 18 of the bill requires that after July 1, 1980, the province will also match contributions made by teachers into the teachers' superannuation plan. This commitment by the province will better assist in securing future pension benefits for those participants remaining in the average earnings formula plan. Further, Mr. Speaker, section 32 contains an amendment which will reduce effective January 1, 1980, annual cost of living adjustments under the average earnings formula plan from the current level of 100 per cent of the Canadian consumer price index to 80 per cent of this index. All parties to the collective bargaining agreement from which this bill proceeds have acknowledged this change is necessary to reduce the pressures of 100 per cent indexing at current inflation rates. As I have already mentioned, pensions received from the new annuity plan will also be indexed on a fully funded basis.

Mr. Speaker, the title average earnings formula plan comes from the provision of pension benefits based on the average of a specified number of best salaried years in a person's career. Section 29 of this bill has amended this figure downward from six to the best five salaried years which will significantly improve, Mr. Speaker, benefits paid to those receiving pensions from the existing formula plan.

Also, Mr. Speaker, section 14(a) of this bill proposes that teachers having active contributory service to their credit in the province before July 1, 1980, will have two years to decide whether to remain in the average earnings formula plan or to switch to the new annuity plan.

Mr. Speaker, section 28 has been amended such that in addition to creating age and service pension criteria for annuity plan participants similar to those for participants in the average earnings formula plan, it also provides an option to annuity plan participants such that they may retire after 30 years of contributory service regardless of age.

I would like to close by saying once again, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the opportunity of introducing these amendments into this House. They are a significant step forward in terms of superannuation and benefits for teachers. They have been supported by all of the parties to the collective bargaining agreement, and I have no doubt, they will be supported by all members of this House. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to put forth a few comments on this teachers' superannuation bill. I think first and foremost, I would like to remind the government it was the Saskatchewan teachers who, for many years, worried about the unfunded liability of the existing plan. I see the government has come forth with a new idea on a money accumulation plan or MAP as it's known in the teaching circles.

I think this was rather a drastic change in superannuation thinking that the teachers had to wrestle with in the last year. I think it was a very serious concern in their negotiations. In checking with teachers, I think they have accepted this idea. There are certain things about the plan I think are commendable and I do not hesitate to let these be known.

One of the things I think the teachers were concerned about was the coverage for dependent children and disability allowances. The minister has spoken on these. I think the coverage that has been extended to this is acceptable to the teachers of Saskatchewan. I was happy to hear him mention there was no sex discrimination in the act, because as we all know, a good many of our faithful teachers in Saskatchewan are females and are doing great service out there in the classroom.

I do wonder, personally, about the two-year limit on transferring from the existing superannuation plan to the money accumulation plan. I don't know the reason for this. If the money accumulation plan turns out to be the better of the two plan I cannot see the reason for limiting the teachers in their period of transfer. I, in being a teacher and a taxpayer in Saskatchewan, want to see a fair and equitable superannuation plan for our teachers. I don't think the teachers have figured out at just what point of service it is most advisable for a teacher to opt for the money accumulation plan. I would think, Mr. Minister, we wouldn't want to close these doors. If it's more beneficial for teachers to move to the money accumulation plan, I don't see the necessity for the two-year period in which you have to make that move.

Other than that, (I have checked with teachers throughout the province) to have it indexed to the cost of living, I think is an acceptable situation. I think the bill finds acceptance within the teaching ranks and I would support the bill.

**HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services):** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this bill, simply because it is related to pension plans and I have a deep interest in pension plan. I think the teaching profession is to be commended in terms of the fact that they're willing to take a hard look at their pensions and become more realistic in their approach. The old teachers' plan, if I may refer to it as such, was a unit benefit plan which obviously gave them a pension at the end of the term of service related to a formula. The formula, of course, is based on four basic facts. Any actuary who draws up these types of pension plans look at mortality, at interest rate accruals on which he makes an assumption, at an escalation of wages over a long-term which again, is a guess, an educated guess, and at terminations. The key in all these pension plans is the number of terminations that occur. Frankly, because the teaching profession is pretty well paid in this province (and I'm sure the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) will agree with me) fewer and fewer teachers have been leaving the profession and that creates an increasing problem with respect to a unit benefit type approach. I might just give you a quick example to illustrate. I took a teacher who started to teach at 18. If that person taught for 35 years he would make contributions to the old teacher's plan for that period of time and would be retiring, of course, on the formula. Working that out on the basis of a \$10,000 average (and I realize teachers' salaries are appreciably above that at the present time, but you have to go back a long way in terms of the formula), that teacher would end up with a pension of about \$7,000 a year. If the formula found the wages increasing very rapidly in the latter end of that teacher's teaching career, obviously the pension would be up a great deal. If the salary doubled, you could get into \$14,000 or \$15,000 bracket in terms of pension. However if that's occurring you obviously run into grave difficulties in terms of the financial costs related thereto.

I took the liberty of working a similar situation out for the teacher who happened to go into the money accumulation plan. If that was available to that teacher from the start of the teaching career, that person would accumulate (on the basis of that same amount of salary over the same period of time) a pension of (based on current annuity rates and no one can know exactly what they will be in the future) about \$1,400 per month or around \$16,800.

I noticed the member of Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) raised the point with regard to transfer. He said why would you only give two years time? The key question here is that the person must make the transfer in the earlier years to get the major benefit under the money accumulation. He has to have his money in there for a long period of time to really get the results. If you leave it open for a longer period of time – and people delay and they will delay – if you had it for 10 years there'd be people coming after you had closed it off and say, I didn't make the decision soon enough; I wanted to get in. You have to make it a short period. We did the same in the public service superannuation set-up. We had criticism by people coming to use and saying why did you only allow one year's time? I notice the teachers are allowing two year's time. But you simply cannot permit the person to make that choice over a long period of time or you defeat the motivation and the end result in relation to that type of pension.

I want to make one quick comment if I might with respect to the cost-of-living index. I note the teachers agreed to reduce the cost-of-living index from 100 per cent to 80 per cent. I think that's being realistic looking at the facts of the situation as it now exists, but I would suggest if we continue with inflation rates in the 10 per cent category or more, it will have to be reduced again. It is totally impossible in the long run, if you look at pensions to index them at more than four per cent cost-of-living index over any prolonged period.

I again commend the teachers for being realistic. All of these things have to be done on an evolutionary basis. They cannot take away from any person the pension rights they already have. You must do it on an evolutionary basis. You will gradually move away into the new approach which is obviously much more realistic in terms of the funding approach. Thank you very much.

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education):** – Mr. Speaker, I want to close debate and a couple of brief comments. I want to acknowledge the statement the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) has made with respect to the major change that has taken place here. It is quite true there has been a substantial and major change made. I think it is extremely commendable that the teachers have participated in negotiations leading up to this necessary change. I agree with the hon. member that it was a difficult kind of decision for them to make. Their participation was certainly highly commendable. We certainly were pleased with the successful completion of these negotiations that have led to the introduction of this new plan in association with the existing teachers' superannuation plan.

Certainly, it is true pensions will continue to be bargainable with the teachers and so a couple of the concerns the hon. member mentioned, certainly can be addressed in the future should they prove to be problems with respect to the operation of this plan. We do believe on all sides, however, that it is a good plan, that it will work extremely well. I think everyone is now looking forward to now seeing it put into place and made operable.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education)** moved second reading of Bill No. 17 – **An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to introduce the bill to the members. While the amendments proposed through this bill to The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act are neither numerous nor complex, they do represent a significant improvement in teacher's life insurance provisions and a substantial increase in the financial commitment this government is prepared to make to the group life insurance needs of teachers of Saskatchewan. It's therefore, with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I introduce these amendments into the House.

Every year the provincial collective bargaining agreement between the boards of education and the Premier and the teachers of Saskatchewan produces the terms upon which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski) under section 4 of The Teachers Life Insurance Act, establishes life insurance packages with the life insurance companies for Saskatchewan teachers. For the 1978-79 insurance year between September 1978 and August 1979 there were four levels of term insurance coverage between \$15,000 and \$30,000 for which teachers were eligible.

Levels of coverage were based upon four annual teachers' salary ranges, three below \$20,000 and one above \$20,000 per year. Under section 6 of the act, the province paid premiums on the first \$7,000 of insurance coverage and the teachers paid premiums on the remainder. During the 1978-79 school years, therefore the average teacher earning over \$20,000 was covered by \$30,000 of life insurance whose total premium cost was \$52. The government's pay-out for the first \$7,000 of coverage was about \$12 or 23 per cent of the total premium cost and the teachers was \$40 or 77 per cent of premium cost.

The latest board of education-government-teacher collective bargaining agreement concluded in June, 1979 has altered significantly the provisions of the teacher insurance package and also the level of the government's share of premium costs. During the bargaining process there was a review done of the insurance coverage levels in place elsewhere in the public and private sectors and what has been agreed to is not out of line with current trends in this area. Effective September 1, 1979 the ranges of coverage and the salaries governing eligibility have been reduced from four to two, and the levels of coverage have increased as well.

Last year's minimum level of coverage of \$15,000 has been increased to \$30,000 and has been available effective September 1, 1979 to all teachers earning less than \$20,000 annually. Also, Mr. Speaker, the new maximum level of coverage for all teachers earning \$20,000 or more has been increased from \$30,000 to \$50,000 effective September 1.

Further, the government proposes by amending section 6 of the act (and this is very significant) to increase effective September 1, 1979, its share of premium costs from payment on the first \$7,000 of coverage, as was the case last year to 50 per cent of the total premium costs in this insurance year.

The average teacher, I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, now has \$50,000 of term life insurance coverage at a premium cost of \$87 but because the government will be

paying one-half of this bill, or \$43.50, the teachers' cost will only have increased by \$3.50 or about 9 per cent, and this in order to receive 66 per cent more coverage. The government's pay-out on behalf of this teacher, however, for group life insurance will have increased from \$12 to \$43.50 or about 265 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance under section 4 of this act, has also established with the insurance companies, in accordance with the terms of the collective bargaining agreement, a new accidental death and dismemberment benefit. The annual premium cost of this provision is 36 cents per \$1,000 of coverage and the ranges of coverage and salary levels governing eligibility are the same as those for term insurance. The average teacher will pay about \$18 annually for this provision and will receive \$50,000 of accidental death and dismemberment coverage. The province of Saskatchewan is not cost-sharing premium payments on this provision. The second amendment worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, relates to section 8. Currently under section 2, a school board has the option of deducting from a teacher's salary his or her life insurance premiums in one lump sum or in such instalments as the board wishes. New subsection 2 of section 8 will eliminate the above option and will require that the board deduct premiums in 10 equal instalments from September to June.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if I were a teacher in this province, I would be I think, extremely pleased with the heightened level of security these amendments provide for me. I would also appreciate the modest increases in the cost of the package to me when measured against the new level of insurance coverage. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to place these amendments before you in this House. I am sure they also will be supported by all members.

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

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** – Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments regarding the bill. First of all, I say it's long overdue. The increase in the coverage for teachers – I'm glad to see it has arrived, \$50,000 life insurance – I think is a very welcome type of coverage for teachers to have. I am happy to see the addition of the A.D. & D., (accidental death and dismemberment) the accident clause. I think this is something we've looked for for a long time. I think the 10-month instalments is a good idea, because many teachers in this province are paid on the 10-month basis. It certainly is easier on their pocketbooks than having it all taken off at one time.

I noticed the minister said the cost was 50 per cent funded by the treasury. I think that is acceptable to the teachers. However, I did notice that in the A.D. & D., it's 100 per cent paid by the teachers. My question to the minister would be if the government could see it's way clear to fund 50 per cent of the basic insurance, why not go a little further, show your appreciation for the teachers of this province and fund the A.D. & D. at 50 per cent also?

**MR. McARTHUR:** – Mr. Speaker, in closing off debate, I would like to say that I am pleased to see the hon. member is favorable disposed to these amendments. I certainly agree with him. I think they will be a vast improvement in the position of teachers in terms of their group life insurance.

The hon. member made reference to the possibility of government contributions to the accidental death and dismemberment insurance. I can only say to the hon. member

these amendments are the result of negotiations with teachers during the course of the collective bargaining process. I would not presume to speak for teachers as part of that process. Certainly, there is a possibility teachers may, at some point, propose such a change and of course, it will be bargained in the normal fashion.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education)** moved second reading of Bill No. 18 – **An Act to regulate Private Vocational Schools.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is pleasure to introduce and speak to this bill respecting the regulation of private vocational schools in Saskatchewan. This new bill addresses the very important questions of educational quality and standards within the private vocational and trade schools in this province.

I should mention at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that this proposed act had a predecessor, The Trade Schools Regulation Act. In many respects, Mr. Speaker, this new act, when passed, will update the application of that previous legislation. But I will also do more, Mr. Speaker. It will also make the whole process of setting and regulating standards within the private vocational trade school sector more responsive to the needs and the overall public interest.

Our province, Mr. Speaker, is entering a new decade of exciting and challenging development. Among other things, that new decade will see ever-growing and ever-expanding opportunities for our young people. New opportunities and new jobs will abound. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan will see the creation of well over 13,000 new jobs a year during the coming decade and certainly likely more – over 13,000 new jobs for the young men and women of Saskatchewan who grew up in this fine province.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, an additional 8,000 jobs per year will be opened as our seniors in our work force reach retirement age.

Now what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that all young men and women completing school in this province can and will make their career plans confident that the job opportunities they need and want will be right here in Saskatchewan. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, job opportunities will, in each year, be in excess of the number of young people able to fill those jobs with the result that substantial numbers of young people will be coming into this province from outside in order to take advantage of the opportunities here.

Now to those of us on this side of the House, that creates an exciting challenge. We believe that we must rise up and meet that challenge. Our young people today, Mr. Speaker, are making their career plans confident that they can and will take their training in Saskatchewan and settle down to permanent jobs and a happy family life here in their home province. Our young people are confident, Mr. Speaker. They are excited and challenged. Fortunately they are putting the lie to the nonsense which we hear coming from the new Leader of the Saskatchewan Conservative Party. They are not listening to his urgings that they leave this province. They are not listening to his ridiculous claims that other young people are leaving this province, a claim totally disproved by all the figures and statistics which are available.

The imaginative ramblings of the new leader are silly and would be pathetic were it not



for the fact that it is a clear attempt to exploit the thoughts and hopes of our young people for political purposes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. McARTHUR:** – We, on our side of the House, find that kind of political opportunism abhorrent. But fortunately, Mr. Speaker, all of the data and statistics reveal clearly that the Tories and their so-called new leader know nothing about what is happening in this province.

All of the statistics and figures and studies illustrate the optimism and excitement with which young people look to the future in this province. They reflect confidence, confidence in individual and family opportunity, confidence in the social and economic developments in this province, confidence in the political future of this province. So, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon all of us to reply to that confidence and optimism positively and not negatively in the style of the Tories.

This includes the very best of educational and training opportunities for our young people. We must support and acknowledge the individual initiative being shown by your young people by providing to them the kind of training opportunity which they need and which they deserve.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am now moving forward with a series of new measures in fulfilment of the responsibility we owe to our young people. This bill reflects the first of many important measures which will be undertaken in the coming months in order to improve and expand post-secondary training opportunities for young people in this province.

There are many important needs which must be fulfilled and we must move forward to meet those needs now and in the months and years ahead.

An important part of my plans and this government's plans will be directed toward vocational and trades training. New industrial development and new resource development means we need many highly trained people, some within the traditional job skill areas, and some with wholly new job skills unique to the new developments.

I will be speaking more in the months ahead about specific steps that will be taken on many fronts in this regard. I want only to say at this time that private vocational training institutes and schools will play a part in meeting those needs – probably not a big part but not an unimportant part either. And thus, Mr. Speaker, in preparing ourselves for the decade of the 1980s and the demands that that decade will place on our post-secondary institutions, we will update and modernize our legislation governing private vocational training institutions. We must provide the assurances to our young people that the training they receive in this province, regardless of its source, is of the highest standards. We must reward their confidence and excitement with positive and responsible steps and not, Mr. Speaker, with the irresponsible negative claptrap totally devoid of program we hear coming from the new Leader of the Conservative Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. McARTHUR:** – So I turn, Mr. Speaker, to the specifics of this bill. I should say at the outset that we are in no way extending controls over private vocational schools with

this act. We will, Mr. Speaker, be improving the quality and standards of education provided in those schools. This act will confer no new regulatory authority on the government and it will add no new regulations governing the operation of private vocational schools. In general, the scope of the powers and regulations contained in the old trade school act were considered satisfactory. So what were the shortcomings of the old act? Well, first the terminology was badly outdated. And second, the old act did not contain adequate provisions for public input into the whole practice of setting standards and regulating operations – and that, Mr. Speaker, the latter one, is a serious shortcoming in my view. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we must have an open process of regulation that draws on the knowledge and experience of those people who operate these institutions, of people in industry and of many other knowledgeable people in the public.

The private vocational schools regulation act then is in many ways a recasting of The Trade School Regulation Act, an act which had undergone no significant revisions since its promulgation in 1965. As the hon. members will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the area of trades training (as it used to be known) has undergone considerable change since this period. Not unexpectedly, the terminology of the old trade school act has become dated in some respects and obsolete in others. It is necessary, therefore, to update the terminology of the act to make it consistent with present day practice. Perhaps the most significant semantic change which is being made is to replace the term ‘trade’ with the term ‘vocation’. The previous act used the term ‘trade’ and attempted to define the term by means of a lengthy list of examples, including such standards as plumbing, bricklaying, carpentry, cabinet making, plastering, painting, etc. While the examples just cited are indeed trades, the potential range of occupational training programs which may be offered in institutions regulated by this act go far beyond such conventional notions of what constitutes a trade. In order to bring the act into conformity with current usage, and indeed, to provide it with the flexibility in this respect for the future, the word ‘trade’ is replaced by the term ‘vocation’. I would draw to the attention of the hon. members the definition of vocation that appears in section 2(d) of the bill, before this Assembly now. There vocation is described as the skill and knowledge requisite for employment in any of the occupations included in the alphabetical index of occupational titles in volume 1 of the Canadian Clarification and Dictionary of Occupations, 1971, and more particularly described as a vocation in that publication. In this way the definition is related to a system for classifying occupations, which is not only current but also regularly revised and internationally recognized and which will fully encompass all forms of vocational training in the province.

The other significant changes in terminology involves the replacement of the term trade school by the term private vocational school. I would draw to the hon. members’ attention section 2(b) of the new act which defines private vocational school as a school or place in which instruction in any vocation is offered or provided by classroom instruction, including institutes of applied arts and sciences, the provinces, two universities, or any schools or courses of instructions maintained under any other act. This definition clearly describes those institutions to which the act was originally intended to apply. Certain sections of The Trade Schools Regulation Act provided for the levying of fines upon persons or institutions failing to comply with its provisions. As I mentioned the act has not been revised since 1965, and as a result the dollar amounts specified in connection with these fines have been rendered virtually meaningless by the inflation which has taken place since that time. The maximum penalties associated with offences under the act have been adjusted in the new act to bring them into conformity with current dollar values.

Finally, I would draw to the hon. members' attention to section 5 of The Private Vocational Schools Regulation Act. This section which provides for the appointment of an advisory board is a new section without precedent in our old legislation. The addition of this section provides the minister with the authority to establish an advisory committee on any matter respecting the administration of this act. I would expect that the authority being granted to the minister here would be utilized in the following way. In cases where it is necessary to establish minimum standards for institutions wishing to be registered in conformity with this act, or where for any reason it becomes necessary to develop additional regulations under this act, the minister will be able to call upon the knowledge and experience of individuals from the private vocational schools themselves or from the public for which such schools provide training. In this way the minister responsible for administration of the act will have access to the opinion and advice of persons most concerned with and most affected by the act in question, namely the institutes themselves, the industries affected and the public. This will ensure that the institutions remain the highest possible standards and that standards are developed with the fullest consultation of interested parties.

Mr. Speaker, I close off with those remarks. I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 16 – An Act to regulate Private Vocational Schools.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** – Mr. Speaker, I must start out by saying how disappointed I am to hear the recent remarks of the Minister of Education. We had discussed two bills earlier this evening in a most gentlemanly and statesmanlike fashion. I had assumed that maybe this Minister of Education would have the same high profile as some of those who have served in the past. I remember last year when the then Minister of Education – and I was the critic – conducted estimates in this House. One of your civil servants who had served for about 30 years in your government said that was the highest level of discussion he had ever heard. I'd hoped to continue on the same plane but unfortunately my new Minister of Education is living up to what I said about him the other day in the House. He lets his political philosophy blind him when he gets down to the issues. Now he comes on and condemns our new leader as to his views on education and his view on youth.

Well, I would say, first and foremost, our new leader has helped more students in Saskatchewan than you have today. He has a very good reputation at the University of Saskatchewan. He's a man who believes in youth. I was shocked to hear you open with this kind of statement and then for you to express your concern. My friend, this is rather ludicrous at the same time when the students of Saskatchewan are out of the institutes in the province because of a strike.

I've been urging you, for the last three weeks, for the last month, to do something about this. You stand in this Assembly, my friend, and express your concerns for the students of Saskatchewan. I want to know about some of your concerns and I asked you today in the House about your contingency plans. And what does he tell me, Mr. Speaker? He says we'll wait and we'll talk about it when the strike is over. Now he says he's going to use the holidays, one of the holidays coming up is Christmas. If by some act of God this strike should be settled within the next few days, are you going to have these students observe their Christmas holidays in the institutes? They would like to know this, because it affects their plans. You also have come out with some loans. You said, I'll give them loans regarding their education if they're cut off from their manpower. Well I

want to tell you, Mr. Minister, the reason that they were on manpower was that they didn't qualify for the loan in the first place. I would like to know if you do have the Christmas spirit and if you're going to make the loans forgivable as you did hint you might do. So it rather makes me concerned when I hear you stand up and lambaste the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, a man who has a record of helping students, when you, the Minister of Education (Mr. McArthur), are doing nothing to get the students of this province back into the technical schools. So when you talk about these things my friend, have a little bit of action.

Now, anyway, getting on to your bill of the private trade schools, vocational schools, I have had an interest in this. I think there may be some merit in this bill if it isn't too shaded with your political philosophy which seems to be creeping right into the education system of Saskatchewan. I can tell you I'll do everything with my power to keep it out of the education system of Saskatchewan, but I would like to study this bill. There are many things I have to look into. There are a few items there that I want to talk to the people of Saskatchewan about, which I'm afraid you refuse to do. So therefore I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Leave to adjourn debate negated.

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** – The House Leader of the opposition has requested leave to adjourn debate because this bill is a substantive new program and there were certain political areas touched upon by the Minister of Education. A lot of them seem to be in conflict with the intent of the act. It's a little surprising when we have something such as an act dealing with a vital segment of education, where the minister has to come in and politicize the same bill. It makes one wonder and I'm sure that the people of Saskatchewan as well are going to wonder what the real intent of the bill is.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** – The press will see it.

**MR. LANE:** – Obviously one could proceed on this, Mr. Speaker, but the colorful language and the coloring of the intent of the bill, as given by the minister, is going to make not only the opposition question what the real intent is. I'm sure when we take this bill to the general public over the next few months, that they too are going to be wondering. So I'm going to beg leave to adjourn debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – The member is out of order in requesting adjournment because you can't ask for adjournment unless there's been an intervening speaker.

**MR. LANE:** – Well, I could keep talking for some considerable time, if I keep my remarks to the remarks made by the Minister of Education (Mr. McArthur) and in fact I repeat again that it is a little strange for a minister of education to come before this Assembly.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – If I might just raise the point of order. I'm interested in having this clarified. Am I not correct in saying that when the hon. member makes a motion to adjourn debate and resumes his seat that he has lost his entitlement to speak?

**MR. SPEAKER:** – The member of Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) did not make that motion because it was out of order, therefore it can't be counted as being in order, so therefore he continues to speak.

**MR. LANE:** – Again, it's a little sad, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education . . . you know we have a rule of law before the courts of equity that in order to obtain equity you must do equity and you don't appear before the courts of equity with dirty hands. And here the Minister of Education had the gall to stand up here tonight and tell this Assembly that the particular bill is vital. At the same time as he stood here over the last couple of weeks and talked about so-called contingency plans he had for the students affected by the strike. He had zero; he had nothing. And one of the groups that has really been affected by the strike are the students. That has been well documented by the opposition, Mr. Speaker. It's a strange concern the minister has, that tonight he wants to talk about this particular bill, get it through the House, ram it through the House tonight and in fact, not take the same speedy action when it comes to concern about the students who are affected by the strike.

We have detailed students who are taking correspondence courses, severely affected, and the same minister doesn't have the concern for them. We have the students in the technical schools – we have raised the concerns . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** – I want to take this opportunity to caution the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). The previous speaker was discussing the matter of the strike and technical schools. He was very close to being out of order because the subject before the House is An Act to regulate Private Vocational Schools. I just want to take this opportunity because the member for Qu'Appelle is getting into that area as well, and unless he relates what he is saying to the bill . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order. Unless he relates what he is saying to the bill which is An Act to regulate Private Vocational Schools, I would have to rule him out of order.

**MR. LANE:** – Mr. Speaker, I assume I have the same latitude as the minister did when he referred to the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and matters of leaving the province. I'm sure that Mr. Speaker would want me to address myself to the same issues raised by the Minister of Education (Mr. McArthur). In fact, Mr. Speaker, the politicization of the particular issue here I think was unwarranted and uncalled for. I'm sure the Minister of Education right now regrets most sincerely what he said because in fact the Minister of Education probably underneath that verbiage has a bill that's worthy of deep consideration by the public of Saskatchewan. We in the opposition would like to give the public that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether it was a valid bill worthy of consideration or whether it's just a political weapon in the arsenal of the government opposite.

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition):** – Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** – I want to apologize to the member. I may have lead the member slightly astray. I believe I said an intervening speaker and I should have said an intervening proceedings. It doesn't matter how many speakers there are, but if there was an intervening proceeding such as an amendment or a move to adjourn the House, then the member would be in order to again seek the adjournment of the debate. So the position we're in now is that the Leader of the Opposition has the floor, he has moved to adjourn the debate and I'm going to declare that out of order. The member still has the floor. I will recognize the member for Yorkton.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton):** – Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in the great concern

shown for the students of Saskatchewan by the members of the opposition. I'm very interested in the great concern expressed by them when they were talking about legislation that was to be brought forth at an earlier date – yesterday, for example. I believe the member for Qu'Appelle stood up and said there's nothing of importance within this House to be discussed. That was the general tenor of his remarks. There's nothing of importance here. In fact, he said there's only one piece of legislation that meets the criteria of being an important piece of legislation. That I would like to quote. That shows, Mr. Speaker, the interest these people have in the students of the province. I would like to give you a direct quote of the member for Qu'Appelle.

There's only one bill that meets the criteria set out by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) and that is The Personal Property Security Act, and this is going to take some serious study.

Now then, when it comes to dealing with the students of the province of Saskatchewan, he said it's unimportant. We don't need to take the time of this House; we're wasting the taxpayer's money by coming here to discuss it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, if the mouth from Moosomin wants to take over and talk, let him go at it. Mr. Speaker, I think this shows the extent of the interest of the members opposite, even in what they consider to be an unimportant bill. Maybe we should give them time to consider what they have to say and what they consider to be an unimportant bill. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** – Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** – I ask the indulgence of the members for a few moments. I understand the member for Yorkton (Mr. Nelson) asked for the adjournment of the debate. It would appear, as I said earlier, that we had to have an intervening proceedings. An intervening proceeding is something that can be entered in the journals. Now, I'm going to advise the members how we can move on with the business of the House. I'm going to declare that the member for Yorkton cannot ask for the adjournment of debate because there has been no intervening proceeding. If the member (and we'll assume that the member for Yorkton is out of order on that and still has the floor), the member for Yorkton could ask for the adjournment of the House. That could be passed or defeated. If it was passed we would all go home. If it was defeated, that is an intervening proceeding. Then someone could move the adjournment of the debate. So I leave it up to the member for Yorkton whether he wants to move the adjournment of the House or not.

**HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education):** – Mr. Speaker, I would close off the debate on this bill by pointing out once again as I pointed out in the debate, that it indicates the concern of this government, the very real concern for the vocational training needs of the young people of this province. The young people are staying in this province in vast numbers. They are needing the kinds of vocational training opportunities that these private institutions, as well as our public institutions, can provide. This act will modernize the licensing and regulation of the private trades training schools, the vocational training schools. The provisions are not substantially different, as I mentioned before, than those that were contained in the earlier act. I would recommend to the members that they get a copy of the earlier act and compare it when we go into third reading, because they will find that the differences are not all that great. There is a provision for more public input and I think that is important.

Mr. Speaker, with that I'd like to close the debate.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – In the light of certain developments tonight, this is an historic night in Canada. We got the Meewasin Valley Authority bill read unanimously. What I'd like to do is to committee of the whole. These are very, very short bills which the opposition has indicated they're prepared to let go through with relative ease and then we'll adjourn the House. So can we go to committee of the whole and whip off these bills in just two minutes?

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

### **Bill No. 17 – An Act to amend The Municipal Hail Insurance Act**

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Section 2 agreed

Sections 3 to 7 as amended agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **Bill No. 1 – An Act to amend The Attachment of Debts Act**

#### **Section 1**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** – I've just got the one question seeing as I doubt very much whether I'm going to be able to get into the second reading debate on The Exemptions Act. Why was it so pressing when there were no amendments to The Exemptions Act to extend the amount of the exemption which seemed to be needed as much as this significant change to The Attachment of Debts Act?

**HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** – I have an answer. It just came to my mind. The answer that I would give you is that the law reform commission is, as I indicated in my second reading speech, doing a study of this entire area, attachment of debts and exemptions. They reviewed the levels and they felt that this was the only bill which was so serious down in Canada it had to go up.

**MR. LANE:** – I wonder if the Attorney General wouldn't mind submitting to me in due course the report of the law reform commission because I would think that for example, such things as private primary residence and what not, certainly are not very high. But other than that, if the Attorney General would respond, I wonder, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. ROMANOW:** – I want to give you the information, but I want to check it to make sure I'm not giving you something I shouldn't be give you. I have a letter here from the law reform commission re attachment of debts and addressed to the co-ordinator of our policy and legislative programs, Mr. Scratch, who is sitting beside me, and he sets out the argument for doing it for the attachment of debts. I would like to just check it before I commit myself.

**MR. LANE:** – If you're making an amendment here that there should be similar amendments in extension of the exemption – I see no consideration of that, but if the Attorney General has an answer and would supply it, it's not worth holding up the

business of the House. I am going to suggest to Mr. Chairman that we will take the balance of the bill as read if the Attorney General would consider and submit the information if he can.

**MR. ROMANOW:** – One House amendment that the boys are working on right now . . . same year, the year is the date, there's no need to change there. I will try to get this to your privately in the mail and I will try also to answer why not others because I think that's a very good point. We may have to come in the spring with others.

**MR. ROMANOW:** – There's an amendment seconded by . . . that section 1 of the printed bill by striking out 1980 in the second line and substituting 1979.

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Sections 2 to 4 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill with amendments.

### **Bill No. 2 – An Act to amend The Attorney General's Act**

#### **Section 1**

**MR. LANE:** – Mr. Chairman, is the only House amendment the date? Take that bill as read.

**MR. ROMANOW:** – I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Gordon Snyder, that we amend section 1 of the printed bill by striking out 1980 in the second line and substituting 1979.

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Section 2 agreed.

Strike out section 3.

The committee agreed to report the bill with amendments.

### **Bill 24 – An Act to amend The Administration of Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons Act**

#### **Section 1**

**MR. LANE:** – If the Attorney General would permit a question and it's only a peripheral matter: is the law reform commission studying the whole question of the necessity of The Homesteads Act? It strikes me that with the changes to the married persons property act, substantively it perhaps is an anachronism given the recognition that the married persons property act gives. Would the Attorney General advise if the law reform commission is in fact studying it or if they will consider the repeal of it?

**MR. ROMANOW:** – Mr. Chairman, I'm advised the Department of Attorney General lawyers are indeed reviewing it as opposed to the law reform commission. In the light of the married persons property act I cannot tell you what we will expect specifically with timetable, other than there may be something for the spring session. There may be. It's



a very complicated area. But we are working it out within the department.

**MR. LANE:** – Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General would do me the courtesy of checking that with your solicitors and perhaps if the information can be supplied to me about what the concerns may be of the considerations.

**MR. ROMANOW:** – We'll get you a letter in due course, or a memo – whatever we can give you, so that you can get an idea.

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill with amendment.

### **Bill No. 3 – An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act**

#### **Section 1**

**MR. ROMANOW:** – I will move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder)

That section 1 of the printed bill be amended by striking out 180 in the second line and substituting 1979.

**MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley):** – The question as it relates to clause (3), am I in order to ask at this point in clause (3)?

Concern was expressed, striking out the words 'in permanent full-time positions'. Does this then have that act apply towards the part-time positions, with that amendment?

**MR. ROMANOW:** – Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I am addressing myself directly to the member's question because I may not be understanding it. The way it has been explained, the existing definition of 'employee' and the exiting definition has in there the words 'permanent full-time positions'. What we are doing here is making it a requirement that service provided must be continuous for a period of six months. The two interpreted views, namely, permanent full-time positions and six-months are in complement with one another and the proposed amendment is going to correct that to mean that you have to be in service for a continuous period of six months.

**MR. ANDREW:** – As a part-time employee or as a full-time employee for that period of six months?

**MR. ROMANOW:** – Full-time.

**MR. ANDREW:** – That was the only concern with all parts of the bill.

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Section 2 agreed.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Section 4 as amended agreed.

Sections 5 to 13 as amended agreed.

Section 14 and 15 new sections agreed.

Section 16 to 18 as amended agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill with amendment.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:44 p.m.