

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 13, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

Social Services Policy in Respect to Strikers

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): – Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Koskie). Yesterday, you indicated to the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) that your department had issued no policy directive limiting the benefits that strikers may receive. A Mr. Mike Lucas of your department has indicated that in fact there was such a directive. CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) last night indicated that such a directive had in fact been seen. One of you is not telling the truth. Will you indicate to this House which one that might be?

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Minister of Social Services): – Mr. Speaker, yesterday I indicated to the House the basic policy that the Department of Social Services applies in respect to strikers. I indicated . . .

MR. BERNTSON: – Are you telling the truth?

MR. KOSKIE: – You asked the question, I'll do the answering.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: – Department of Social Services through The Saskatchewan Assistance Act and regulation provides assistance to individuals in need. I want to say that the amount of assistance is determined on the basis of a needs test. Union members are not automatically entitled to assistance . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . just a moment. Nor are they automatically excluded; they also are on the basis of need. I want to say that in respect to the strike that policy is in effect, but I want to indicate to the hon. member that we have at present a very unique situation – unique in the sense the some 1,100 employees from the Department of Social Services are not on the job, the regional offices across Saskatchewan, some nine of them, are being staffed indeed by out-of-scope people. I want to say that what they are providing in the regional offices is indeed emergency services first and I comment them, because I say that for every individual, the first priority of the department shall be to provide full utilities and shelter. I want to say that on that basis . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order, order! I wonder if we can avoid certain repetitious comments which are carried on in the Chamber, which I think are unnecessary and lower the decorum of this Chamber. At least, if the hon. member can restrain himself until the gallery is empty, it won't be so embarrassing for the members of this Assembly. Now, I will allow the Minister of Social Services to continue with his answer.

MR. KOSKIE: – I want to say to the hon. member that the department is primarily providing emergency services and they are indeed recommending to the departments suggestions as to how they can best proceed to provide those emergency services. If you were to call that a directive, I differ with you.

MR. BERNTSON: – Mr. Speaker, it has been so long since I asked the question I forget what it was, so I don't know if he answered it or not.

Mr. Speaker, the minister also indicated yesterday that services were in fact being provided by his department by out-of-scope people. Our sources within your department indicate that it is humanly impossible for out-of-scope people to carry out their duties and responsibilities, such as child protection, juvenile delinquents, etc., etc. Could it be possible that you are not being properly informed?

MR. KOSKIE: – No, I distinctly, in addressing the first question to the hon. member, indicated that the department is in fact doing a commendable job in providing the services. I think it does not behoove the opposition to criticize the outstanding effort that is being provided in that department. Of course they are providing the service on the most emergency basis; on what other basis would you recommend?

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – To the minister – I'd like a concise answer – is there a directive in your department that has come down limiting the benefits to the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strikers?

MR. KOSKIE: – No, there is no directive in the sense of indicating that there will be a limitation. There is a suggestion as to standardization of the procedure within the region as to deal with SGEA, to standardize and to meet the emergency situation first.

MR. TAYLOR: – Supplementary. Has that kind of standardization taken place with other strikes, namely IPSCO (Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation)?

MR. KOSKIE: – Well, I'm glad you asked that question because that was a very unique and different completely, compared to this one. IPSCO was the only group that was out on strike at the time – some 500 or 600 workers. It affected only one region in the province, not all nine regions. Secondly, the full employment of our staff was in place and accordingly, we had the full complement and we were able to deal with it.

SGEA Strike – Suspended Employees

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – I would like to direct a question to the attorney General (Mr. Romanow. News reports indicate that the SGEA has suspended two employees, who commenced the court action. Seemingly that suspension took place without a hearing, without charges being laid against the individuals. Does the Attorney General agree with that type of practice that a union or anybody can, in fact, suspend individuals without a hearing?

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking me for my opinion and with all due respect, I don't think that is within the rules of the House, but I would simply say that is not my job to express an opinion on that matter. I view this to be a responsibility which may ultimately be settled by the court. It is the responsibility of a judicial system if an action is brought. An action apparently has been brought. All of these matters, I am sure, will get full and fair attention and determination in that form.

MR. LANE: – Would the Attorney General not agree, as the minister responsible for the administration of justice, that acts, including The Trade Union Act, if necessary should

be amended to require any suspensions (we require two different organizations now) to have a fair hearing and that the charges be properly laid? The Attorney General is well aware of the requirements of the common law in that regard. Would the Attorney General indicate that the same rules requiring natural justice should apply to trade union members as well as to members of the general public?

MR. ROMANOW: – Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, being a member of the profession, the principle of natural justice as interpreted by the courts applies across the piece to trade union organizations or to other organizations or to governments, whatever the decisions that are taken at law. If this has been a denial of natural justice as the principle is commonly understood by lawyers, there is a proper forum for remedy and a proper forum for relief, which presumably the two or other parties that may be involved, are pursuing. That is not for me to express an opinion on. That is for the judges or for the judicial system of which I think there is adequate repair and remedy available to make the expression of opinion.

MR. LANE: – A final supplementary. Would the Attorney General agree that this particular situation is governed by legislation passed by this assembly, which includes mainly The Trade Union Act which governs many of the aspects of the operation of the trade union movement and its relationship to its own member. That, in fact, there should be a requirement in The Trade Union Act that if any members be suspended, there be a hearing and that the charges be properly brought and those subject to the hearing be fully informed as to the charges against them?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, again I would answer the hon. member by saying that whatever is or is not in The Trade Union Act (and I'm sorry, I don't have the bill in front of me, obviously, and it has been some time since I have looked at it) it is important but not particularly important in the context of the question. The common law remedies which are available to strikers or any people in these kinds of circumstances, remains there unabridged, whatever the provisions of the Trade Union Act are. I recall in my days of practice, now quite a number of years ago, where I was involved in precisely that kind of a civil action, involving trade unions. This by the way was during the period when The Trade Union Act was under the administration of the former Liberal administration of Ross Thatcher. You know they made some amendments in this area as well. I think the question of amendment to The Trade Union Act is to a large extent, I don't mean this in any inflammatory sense, a red herring. The issue is whether or not there is an adequate forum for the airing and the rectification of these grievances given the evidence that is before them. In that regard there most certainly is, as the hon. member will agree.

SGEA Strike – Re Liquor Board

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board. The SGEA strike is creating untold hardships on many citizens of our province and in terms of services, problems for small business and the public generally. Can the minister tell us how much money is being lost daily by the liquor board walk-out and has he determined approximately how much money is being spent in Alberta and Manitoba by Saskatchewan citizens for purchases of same.

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): – Mr. Speaker, first of all, with respect to the member's general comments about the SGEA strike creating hardships, etc., if one confines the SGEA part of that to the liquor board, I wouldn't agree with the hon. member opposite. The licensed premises in this province, the hotels, dining rooms,

etc. are experiencing no difficulties, I believe in terms of receiving adequate supplies of liquor and indeed they have a reasonably good selection available to them. With respect to the general public, they obviously have access to these licensed premises and they also have access to some 135 special liquor vendors in the province who are being provided with some supplies, although obviously closer to the large centres, we have some difficulty in keeping up. So, I wouldn't agree that there is any particular hardship. The Government of Saskatchewan would not be terribly unhappy, I suppose, with the outcome. Obviously, there are losses in revenue. I think one could make a good case that there are probably in other areas equal savings in terms of health care, etc.

With respect to the amount of money being spent in Alberta and Manitoba, I have no idea what that might be. As the member full well knows there are laws which prevent individuals from bringing liquor into this province. I believe the limit is one bottle per individual or a dozen beer or something like that. Anyone bringing in any more liquor than that is breaking the law. I suspect there may be one or two individuals who have done that but we have no way of knowing what that is.

With respect to the losses, I can't give you an actual figure there because a substantial amount of liquor is moving through special liquor vendors and to licensees and obviously, we don't have a calculation of that. I think that while obviously the revenues are important, the most important thing is that we see an end to the strike as early as possible.

SGEA Strike – Re Provincial Deficit

MR. HAM: – Mr. Speaker, I don't think I heard a dollar figure out of that dissertation but my question is now for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski). In November of this year in a news conference, the Premier stated, as closely as I can recall, one of the consequences of the strike could be a reduction of the provincial deficit. Have you calculated the actual deficit to date and are you using SGEA as a scapegoat to balance your budget?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Finance): – Mr. Speaker, I know nothing of the statement that the member refers to and, in fact, I would doubt very much that statement he refers to would be accurate. In reply directly to his question, we have a projection in the present budget announced by the former minister of finance of a deficit of some \$49 million. It is our intention to live within the terms and the outline of the budget as outlined and approved by this House.

MR. HAM: – Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Social Services and/or the Minister of Finance. Have your departments determined the cost of the social services aid to these strikers requiring financial assistance how much will this affect the provincial deficit?

MR. KOSKIE: – No. We have, as I indicated, limited staff, and that wouldn't be the priority at this particular time. We're trying to provide the emergency services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

SGEA Strike – Technical Institutes

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – A question to the Minister of Continuing Education (Mr. McArthur). The SGEA strike has caused the students of the technical

schools and institutes in the province to lose a considerable amount of in-class instruction. Some time ago you indicated to me that you were thinking of methods of extension and compression to make up for the lost time. Are these still your plans?

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): – Yes, Mr. Speaker, the plan I outlined at that time, including compression of course time when the courses resume by extending courses into vacation periods and beyond the normal completion date, still remain in the contingency plans.

MR. TAYLOR: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. No doubt you have had discussions with the administration and technical institutes. What are your plans for the people in the eight-week courses? Are you going to have them repeat their courses?

MR. McARTHUR: – Mr. Speaker, that is something that will have to be determined after the strike is complete and we can review the individual cases of those people and make contingency plans to fit their needs and the needs for training.

MR. TAYLOR: – Supplementary. The nursing program in this province has been compressed from three years into two years, which is a very heavy load. These people will have to write external exams at the end of this year. What are your plans for the nursing students in the institutes?

MR. McARTHUR: – Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the hon. member that we have had a number of meetings with the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association. We are working with them on a co-operative basis to draw up methods whereby those students can complete their courses and be examined and enter the work force on a regularized basis.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary to the minister. Would the minister indicate precisely what plans he has for those students who were taking correspondence classes that are not able to complete them because of the strike?

MR. McARTHUR: – Mr. Speaker, once again, the basic plan is to compress those nurses as much as possible in the time which is available when the staff returns to work. Of course there will be some assignments for marking that will be held up and we will have to move forward and move those as quickly as possible and then work that into the programs the students are taking. But all of that must be worked out when we have the instructors back at work.

Rocanville Employees Association

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Premier in light of the absence of the minister responsible for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan (PCS).

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you now agree with my earlier statements in the House that unfair pressures are being brought to bear on the Rocanville employees association to bring them into line and make them part of an affiliate of a multinational union? I say that, Mr. Premier, in light of the breakdown in ongoing negotiations. I have recently obtained figures that indicate the day-by-day loss of production which translates into a \$2 million loss to the people of Saskatchewan, to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan through PCS.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is dealing with a question based upon a particular set of facts with which I am not personally familiar and I will take notice of the question and ask the minister responsible to reply.

MR. BIRKBECK: – New question, Mr. Speaker, one that he could possibly answer and not take notice on.

Mr. Premier, notwithstanding our disagreement, I wonder with regard to your intentions which related to the Rocanville employees, would you agree that given these tremendous losses to the taxpayers as a direct result of a continued breakdown in negotiations, that your influence, Mr. Speaker, at least with your minister responsible for PCS, in bringing these two parties, the PCS and the Rocanville Employees Association together, would be a responsible and justified action?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I have confidence in the board of directors of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Dealing with the industrial relations at a single mine of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is clearly a matter for the management and the board of directors of the corporation and I think it is not a matter in which the cabinet or the Premier should involve himself at the stage of the game indicated by the hon. member.

Heritage Fund

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): – A question to the Premier. In today's edition of the Leader-Post, Mr. Premier, you indicated that the federal tax increases on gas and oil should all go to the energy fund to help make Canada self-sufficient in energy. Would the Premier now promise the people of Saskatchewan, after having said this, that you will place all of the future non-renewable resources revenue into the Heritage Fund of Saskatchewan?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, first I do not acknowledge the quote from the hon. member in which I am alleged to have said that all of the additional income should go into a fund.

The second question is that the hon. member knows that all of the non-renewable resource revenue of Saskatchewan now goes into the heritage fund. The estimates indicate this. Indeed part of it is taken out for purposes of general revenue for the general operation of the government, as is true in Alberta and elsewhere. In Alberta they don't bother putting it in. We put it in and vote it out so that the hon. members of the opposition may have an opportunity to vote on it, because we believe in parliamentary government. But we propose to continue the policy pursued by ourselves and the Government of Alberta that part of the revenue shall be used for current purposes and part of it shall be used for purposes of acquiring assets for future generations.

MR. LARTER: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, if you consider that it's a good thing for Saskatchewan resources, Alberta resource funds, energy funds, to go into an energy fund in Canada, why would you not believe that the same holds true for Saskatchewan, that all these moneys should go in and stay there and be a true heritage fund?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, that is already our proposal. Let me be clear. The

Government of Saskatchewan has never advocated – never advocated – that all of the revenue or all of the net revenue, or all of the revenue accruing to the provincial government or that might accrue to the provincial government, should be placed in a particular fund for future energy resources and that none of it should be available for current expenses. That has never been our policy while in office and we have never advocated it. So we may be clear on that.

With respect to the contribution which we are already making, the Government of Saskatchewan or the people of Saskatchewan are making a very massive contribution to federal funds in the form of the export tax on Saskatchewan oil, which now is accruing at the rate of more than \$400 million a year. We believe that the federal government should marshal these funds to make sure that Saskatchewan people and more particularly, Saskatchewan farm people, have available to them in the decades ahead a secure supply of gasoline and diesel fuel.

MR. LARTER: – Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, could you tell the people of Saskatchewan at what year you will have \$1 billion in the heritage fund?

MR. BLAKENEY: – No, I cannot. This requires us to look into the future and to estimate what revenues will be from potash and from uranium and from oil. It requires us to assess what will be voted out of the funds by this legislature in various years. I do not think it appropriate for me to speculate on what future legislatures will vote out of funds which are not yet able to be ascertained, because we don't know what production will be or prices will be.

Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): – A question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy). You had earlier this session indicated that you were prepared to provide us with a contract between the Saskatchewan Grain Car Corporation and the Canadian Wheat Board, and the letters of agreement between the same corporation and CP and CN. Can you indicate at this time when you will be prepared to table those documents?

HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): – Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member, yes we can table the documents and I will table them as soon as I have them available to me. It could be this afternoon or tomorrow. There is no problem.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Supreme Court Judgments

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement respecting today's supreme court judgments on the Quebec Bill 101 and the Manitoba legislation of 1890. This has been a matter of some press and other interest, not only in Saskatchewan but elsewhere. I would like to say that the government has not yet had a chance to study the judgments fully, but from what we now know we can make some preliminary observations. In constitutional legal terms it's difficult to quarrel with the supreme court's decisions in these two cases respecting language legislation in Quebec and Manitoba – Bill 101 in the case of Quebec, and the Manitoba act of 1890. In both cases the court has upheld judgments rendered by the trial and appellant courts in the two provinces.

In terms of the direct implications of today's judgments it seems that the Quebec legislature will likely be able to take remedial steps without great difficulty to validate the more than 200 pieces of legislation that it has passed and given assent to in French only since the enactment of Bill 101. Presumably the legislature will simply re-enact those bills this time in both French and English.

In Manitoba the implications are not yet clear but could be more serious, possibly requiring retroactive passing on both English and French of all legislation currently on the statute books in that province, and the translation of all legislative records, both past and present, into French.

But the broader implications for Canadian federalism are even more significant than the direct and immediate consequences which I have identified. Once again these judgments in the view of the government demonstrate the need to work toward revision of the Canadian constitution to make it more responsive to modern realities. We have to recognize, I think the evolution of language realities in Canada over the last 112 years. What was appropriate in Quebec in 1867 and in Manitoba in 1980 may not be appropriate today, at least not in the same form. Premier Blakeney's government has supported the concept of minority language rights in Canada in the constitutional discussions which have been under way since 1975. We have argued for some form of guaranteeing of minority language rights in the constitution. We will continue to work toward constitutional revision.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – To respond to the Attorney General, the statement made is somewhat ambivalent. Would the Attorney General indicate to me, if he would permit a question, what effect on Saskatchewan's position, in his view, the judgment will have if any, that is, the entrenchment of minority language rights as it pertains to the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, the only comment I can make at this time is to reiterate that we will want to look at the judgment in detail, of course. Anything I say here is subject to legal analysis of the judgment and consideration of it by cabinet. But as a general principle I can only restate the view of the provincial government respecting minority language rights as I indicated in my opening statement. We'll have to take a look at the judgment to see if there are any implications or impact on that.

SECOND READINGS

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved section reading of Bill No. 46 – **An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce second reading of Bill No. 46, amendments to The Meewasin Valley Authority Act. We have here before us today, as I have indicated, a bill to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act. This bill contains the first and major portion of the government's package as requested of us by the Meewasin Valley Authority, to make changes to this legislation. These amendments based on the recommendations of the authority, as I've indicated, demonstrate the government's prompt response to concerns about the act which have been brought to the attention of the authority by some interested citizens and groups. I am confident that these changes will alleviate many of the concerns regarding private property rights, while retaining those provisions which the authority believes are essential for it to be able to get on with the job of preserving and enhancing the natural beauty of land in the vicinity around the South Saskatchewan River.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the amendments in some detail – the amendments which I introduced yesterday and announced that I would be introducing about a week ago – I would like to take a moment or two to refresh the members of this House, the often selective and sometimes failing memories of members opposite, as to the background of the legislation which this legislature passed unanimously last spring to establish the Meewasin Valley Authority.

I wish first, Mr. Speaker, to remind opposition members of the advice which the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) offered to me during the debate on second reading of the bill to set up the Meewasin Valley Authority. He said and I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the debates and proceedings of Hansard for April 23, 1979, at page 1949:

I would suggest to the Attorney General when we are talking about a project that we all agree on that he doesn't get politics too far in.

That was his statement admonishing me or advising me. Mr. Speaker, I can only express my regret that the hon. member for Rosthern and his associates, particularly the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew), have failed to heed their own words of advice to me when the bill was introduced and supported by the PCs opposite. Instead, Mr. Speaker, as we have heard in this House during the last few days, the member for Rosthern and the member for Kindersley (and I identify those two member particularly) have attempted to turn the Meewasin Valley project and the legislation into a football for political purposes, pure and simple.

Instead of taking what I would suggest should be the road taken, namely that of a reasoned and common sense and rational approach to the issue, in my judgment these two members have tried to create an atmosphere of emotionalism concerning the statute. Instead of trying to deal responsibly with their positions at the time the second reading bill was passed, at the time they were talking about the amendments, instead of dealing with the citizens of Saskatchewan and the citizens in the Meewasin Valley area, trying to explain how the legislation works; I say that they sought to impute false motives and, bluntly speaking, Machiavellian designs to the government and all the participating parties in the authority. I'm going to back this up with some quotes from what the member for Rosthern said even as late as yesterday – and last year and four or five days ago – during the debate on the Speech from the Throne with respect to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this position is very regrettable indeed. I say that this kind of petty politicking is not worthy of members of this House. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Meewasin valley project and the act deserve better treatment from members opposite. I ask and I hope that they will reconsider their attitude of disparagement, subtle and sometimes not so subtle, or a very worthwhile and farsighted development that I argue is appreciated, and will be more appreciated by the area residents of Saskatoon and Saskatoon for generations to come, as a testament to the sound thinking and the foresight of the people of this legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I hope, again, that the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) will recall his own words last spring when he concluded that the Meewasin Valley Authority project – these are his exact words, will be a betterment for the people of that area and the community. That's debate in the proceedings April 23, 1979 at page 1950.

And I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that these words were said respecting a bill that had been tabled in printed form and was before the House in printed form for at least several days, if not weeks, before its consideration by the members of this legislature. I can only assume, as I believe all members of the public can only assume, that the members of the opposition, like all members of this House, do their homework in studying the legislation and considering it before they make their judgment calls and their statements on it. One of two conclusions can either be made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm coming to the amendments and why I'm making them. I can only make one of two conclusions, Mr. Speaker. Either they are not giving their attention to legislation, and accordingly saying whatever comes to the top of their heads, or in the alternative they are now trying to play politics with the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) and the people resident. Both objective I believe, Mr. Speaker, are unworthy of members of this House, trying to politicize it.

I regret that the member for Rosthern and some of his colleagues have reversed their position and seem again to have executed that most perfect of all Tory diving techniques called the flip flop. Because, Mr. Speaker, I say the people of Saskatoon will remember, the people of Saskatoon area will remember that the PCs in Saskatchewan wanted to repeal this Meewasin Valley Authority act; they wanted to destroy this Meewasin Valley Authority act. They have sought to destroy the concept of the act, and their flip flop will become a belly flop come the next election in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . who is playing politics? The hon. member for Rosthern asks me who is playing politics . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . O.K., you're asking, but I'll tell you who is playing politics – the member for Rosthern is playing politics, among others. Look, I just gave you the quotations of what he said a year ago. Here's what he says yesterday, page 370: 'Last year some of us in this House had a piece of legislation slipped by us because we didn't see all the ramifications.' That's what he said yesterday, Mr. Speaker. That was his position. I ask the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), and the member for Rosthern when he asks the question who is playing politics, how you judge those two statements? How do you reconcile the statement of a year ago which gives unqualified support to the bill, with the statement that was made yesterday where now he says, trying to slip something by us. What kind of a game is this, Mr. Speaker?

I want to tell you that in the legislature last year, and I'm not going to again belabor the members of the House on this in particular, but I think that this is one good reason why we record the committee of the whole. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we went through this clause by clause. I want to tell you that Mr. Katzman is quoted in last year's Hansard as saying, 2159: 'That's a concern, Mr. Attorney General, that I've asked you about. I suggest that I will take the assurances. Basically what you have said is all anybody can go with. We'll leave it that way.' Section 1 agreed. Section 2 agreed. I draw particularly to the attention of the members of the House Section 41 to 46 agreed. Section 50 agreed as amended. Mr. Speaker – and those are the two sections that I'm going to raise – agreed as amended. No opposition, but agreed as amended on a clause by clause basis and they cannot escape that. Now, I think we could have all expected, as members of this House, that there would be some people who misunderstand the provisions of the bill and who for genuine reasons or other reasons are concerned about its provisions. We see now one citizen group in protest and the money lenders in protest. I think we all could have foreseen that we were involved in this operation. Why doesn't the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) do what I think is the honorable thing to do and say to the members of the groups: look it, I voted for that bill clause for clause. I

supported that bill when it was introduced and read in second reading. I'm going to work for some changes but I do not believe in the repeal of the bill. I believe in what the Attorney General in the province of Saskatchewan and the government of the city of Saskatoon and the R.M. of Corman Park want to do. They don't do that. They don't, Mr. Speaker. Instead they attend meetings. They, (I mean the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman), the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew)) have attended at least one meeting that I know of. In a smiling way, they do it. They sit there and what they do is they feed questioners, question about where the executive director, Mr. Wes Bolstad, last worked.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Where?

MR. ROMANOW: – He worked last as the deputy minister of the Premier – and here the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) is doing the same thing. I say that, Mr. Speaker, is a cheap shot. Those two members were there not defending; they were there not defending the legislation. The member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) says it's politics. I want to tell the member for Qu'Appelle that Mr. Bolstad was hired by the unanimous approval of Corman Park, city of Saskatoon, board of governors, University of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan of which we only hold three out of the ten positions, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Not hired by us but hired by resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: – . . . (inaudible) . . . They want to run him out of the province.

MR. ROMANOW: – Yes. You see, Mr. Speaker, why they are opposed to this bill. You see, Mr. Speaker, they believe that Mr. Bolstad should be the person who is singled out here and not the provisions with respect to the authority.

AN HON. MEMBER: – He is what they call a hack.

MR. ROMANOW: – Yes. You see, Mr. Speaker, I want the member to keep on saying that.

AN HON. MEMBER: – And a cheap hack.

MR. ROMANOW: – Right. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle says that Mr. Bolstad is a cheap hack and I want those words on the record. You put them on the record. You have done all you can do to destroy the concept of MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority). You have politicized those citizen groups that are trying to make genuine change. You have lacked legitimacy to the group of Mr. Hamm because of your connections for political purposes. You do that because the concept that you supported you find, in your short-run political interests, you no longer can support. That, Mr. Speaker, is shameful, shameful for this House and shameful for all the people of Saskatoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I know what the position of the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) and now the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) and the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) is with respect to the MVA. You know, Mr. Speaker, I fully

expect the PCs will oppose the bill in second reading right down the line because it's consistent with their approach. I fully suspect that, Mr. Speaker, they are going to oppose this bill because they believe that in the short-run interests of some of the political problems that have arisen with respect to the bill, they are going to gain more that way. They're prepared to throw their principles on MVA, sell them down the river. That's what they're prepared to do if I may use that expression.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated, as one member of this four-party consortium, that we're prepared to introduce any amendments that the authority submit to us which should be submitted to rectify and appease some of the concerns. I predict the PCs are going to oppose this bill. Because in truth, Mr. Speaker, no amendment that this government or this authority will propose short of repealing the Meewasin Valley Authority will be acceptable to the PCs and their friends. That's the truth of the matter. Mr. Speaker, their friends – I'm going to say a word or two about that with respect to the city of Saskatoon and their friends with respect to the moneylenders and the like but I'm not going to elaborate at this stage in the game. What I'm trying to do here is to mount an argument for reason if I can. The argument that I'm mounting is this. The bill is not perfect. I realize it's not perfect; that's why the amendments are here. I realize that the bill has in some areas been genuinely misunderstood. I believe in some areas it has been genuinely misrepresented. I believe that to be the case. But I don't expect the hon. members to keep putting the government and to keep putting all the participants of that authority – all honorable men – in the category of categorizing individuals as cheap hacks. I don't expect them in the interest of resolution of this – of categorizing people like Bolstad and others, including the integrity of Cliff Wright and the integrity of Peggy McKercher and the integrity of the president of the University of Saskatchewan, who hired Mr. Bolstad in the category of a 'cheap hack.' I don't expect that. I don't expect that is the situation, Mr. Speaker. I don't expect that about a person who cannot defend himself in this legislature, but I suppose that there are not too many things that I don't expect now, coming from the mouths of the PC Party with respect to anything, let alone Meewasin Valley Authority.

This, Mr. Speaker, from a new-look Conservative party with a new leader, a new leader who is going to instil the principles of God, charity, family and the Progressive Conservative Party – that's the new leader we're expecting. What we are hearing is not charitable remarks, but outright malicious slur and innuendo in remarks from the member for Qu'Appelle. Where is the Leader of the PC Party on this? Where is the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party? Why doesn't he tell the member for Qu'Appelle to withdraw those kinds of personal attacks on people who can't defend themselves? Where is the Leader of PC Party standing up for its principles with respect to charity, when it comes to one of their own members running roughshod over the reputations of people just because he doesn't agree with some of their beliefs or otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. member opposite and to the PC members of the caucus, they are going to live to rue the day politically that they attacked personalities and that they attacked the concept of MVA. I guarantee you of that. I guarantee you the Meewasin Valley Authority will be accepted like the Wascana centre Authority and I intend to guarantee this House that I will be telling them in 1983 and for every election thereafter, that if they elect one PC in Saskatoon, he'll work to repeal the MVA and then do away with the concept.

The hon. members laugh. The hon. members laugh, because that's exactly the position that they take; that's exactly the point of view that they have.

Mr. Speaker, I find many areas of political debate acceptable. I suppose that I'm not known as one of the more timid members of this House. I think I've made some relatively hard-hitting speeches, if I may condemn or praise myself – depending on your point of view. And I've taken some pretty hard knocks too. Surely there has to be some limit, surely there have to be some ground rules to debate. There has to be some principled commitment. Somewhere along the line a person who votes, Mr. Speaker, can follow some degree of honor and integrity and say look, all right, the changes are going to be made, rather than continually getting out there in the grass roots of the people and fanning the discontent and using the kinds of accusations that we've heard against individual people. Surely there are some rules of decency in this game. If there are not rules of decency, no basic rules from which we work in the framework of, as legislators, Mr. Speaker, what in the world are we doing here, other than acting like children? That's exactly what we seem to be doing – making statements one years, and turning around and totally denying it the very next day as I've indicated with page 308, or getting up (and I'm looking forward to the member for Rosthern getting up and member for Kindersley getting up) and saying, you misled us and you didn't show us the map. I gave the map to the hon. member. Mr. Moroz was here, (it's right in the record) for the map. Yes, it was. The hon. member is shaking his head – well, I'll show you where it is exactly, on page 2158, and surely this is going to catch up with you, this kind of a position. Here's what Mr. Katzman says on page 2158: 'Well, obviously I should compliment Mr. Moroz because I wouldn't want to compliment the Attorney General for an open government' (referring to the maps) 'because on all their bills we've realized how unopen this government is. But, on this bill I know, because of the other individuals who sat on committee A, that it will be an open bill, not because of the Attorney General.' They wouldn't give it to me even then – the credit. It wouldn't be because of me. It would be because of all the other members on committee A that it's an open bill . . . including the map – the references of the map – and the record shows that. I invite the press – don't follow me; take a look at the record. It's only about three pages – read it. You'll find the whole record. I ask the member and I challenge him and I caution the member that after his remarks if he seeks to misrepresent the record, I'm going to ask him questions before he takes his chair. He's either going, yes, or he's going to be in the position this time around of either being for it and meaning it or being against it and meaning it; he's not going to be able to walk both sides of the street and try to score political points off individuals and concepts because that is the situation that exists here.

Mr. Speaker, I say and I candidly admit, that this bill may have deficiencies. That's why we're here. We're here also because we are responding to the people (not these fellows opposite who have not quite taken us head-on, they wouldn't do it quite that way) people like the river edge authority who have had their objectives clouded by the political intervention of these two people; who I think have therefore, in some way, had their worthwhile intentions undermined by the activities of these two people. Nor am I saying that there have not been some legitimate concerns about some of the act's provisions. That's why, as I say, this bill is before us today. Why didn't you bring them to our attention? Where were you, Mr. Smart Guy? Why didn't you bring them to our attention? You saw them point by point.

I'm simply saying, Mr. Speaker, that there have been some arguments with respect to amending the bill, a bill which needs to be amended, and a bill which would address those concerns and allay them, without emasculating the authority's powers to protect land in the Meewasin Valley and develop it for the benefit of all area residents. I am candidly admitting, Mr. Speaker, the bill that was drafted is less than perfect and I take

full responsibility for that. No piece of legislation drafted by human being ever is, or ever could be perfect, because if it were then only the government would be needed and no one else. Then not only the government but all the participating parties and the member for Rosthern and his friends failed also to note those same blemishes. I make that point. If I lost the blemishes, Kindersley lost them, Rosthern lost them, city of Saskatoon lost them, the R.M. of Corman Park lost them and the university board of governors lost all of those blemishes, because all of them had them out there.

Faults there may be. I say that within 10 days of hearing the submissions, we moved promptly on the recommendation of the authority to correct not all of them, but many of them – the major ones. I remember, Mr. Speaker, the member for Rosthern beginning his remarks last April (and I get a charge out of these words and these are exact quotations, page 1949) by thanking me. The member for Rosthern is thanking me ‘... for allowing me to be part of the planning,’ (I want to mark these words, Mr. Speaker) ‘... of this authority by having some input.’ Those aren’t my words. That’s the member for Rosthern last April on the bill and the planning of the authority, Mr. Speaker. He went on to say, ‘I thank him for being allowed to talk with the consultants,’ (now I’m going to make a point about this and the consultants in a moment) ‘about some of my concerns and taking some of the ideas which I recommended which I now see coming within the program.’ (Debates and Proceedings, page 1949). Those aren’t my words. That’s the member for Rosthern who was in on the planning of the concept. I wish he would tell Mr. Wally Hamm that! Have you told Mr. Wally Hamm that you were in on the concept? Have you told Mr. Wally Hamm that you’ve approved this section by section? Did you, the member for Kindersley, tell Mr. Wally Hamm you were in on this?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the consultant comment is particularly relevant because the consultant is one Mr. Ray Moriyama from Toronto. It so happens that Mr. Moriyama is an international award-winning consultant who most recently has received an award for redesigning and replanning under a similar kind of a concept, Miami Beach in the United States – a Canadian boy. We would have preferred a Saskatchewan boy. We had tenders from everybody but it so turned out that of the applicants, a non-Saskatchewanian, Mr. Moriyama’s application was judged to be the best. Mr. Moriyama is the consultant who drew the boundaries, the very boundaries that the member for Rosthern now says he had a part in talking to the consultant about. Mr. Moriyama is the consultant whose concept was packaged in the bill which was tabled here on the floor of the House – they very same consultant who I am thanked for allowing to talk with the consultants about some of my concerns and taking some of the ideas which I recommended which I now see coming into the program. That’s what he says – working it into it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the hon. member and the members opposite that I sought his advice and I sought their advice in as non-partisan a fashion as I could back in April, February and May. I sought their advice non-partisanly because this is a non-partisan project. Mr. Speaker, even if I wanted to be partisan I couldn’t be partisan because I have to work with elected officials, many of whom, maybe most of whom, don’t agree with my political ideology, from the R.M. of Corman Park, the city of Saskatoon and the board of governors. I have no choice. I didn’t want to eject partisanship then (I do now because you have made it partisan) but I didn’t at that time. I went to speak to the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). I allowed him to partake in the consultations and discussions. I recall the member did raise some concerns. He talked about city parks to me; he talked about the Bessborough Hotel (understandably enough he would be worried about the Bessborough Hotel), but he talked about none of the other matters which are now his concerns and which require repeal of the legislation . . . (inaudible)

interjection) . . . And the record shows what you talked about and you also took assurance that those areas were corrected. I want to make that clear so that he doesn't get up and in his remarks say, oh yes, I talked about it and he doesn't mean to balance the record . . . they were corrected. Because when I answered he then said, I take your word for it, that's fine. The record shows that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to tell this House (I want to make this point as strongly as I can to you, Sir, and to the press and to the members of the House) that all three of the participating parties were consulted about the legislation setting up the authority; all three parties. Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that point. The rural municipality of Corman Park, the city of Saskatoon and the University of Saskatchewan were consulted right from the beginning as the Minister of Municipal Affairs says. I am talking now about the legislation, nearing the end product, the subject of this whole controversy which some of the PCs have whipped up. And, Mr. Speaker, they passed resolutions concurring with the legislation.

Now I am going to table some documents, but before I table the documents proving my point of party support for the act (not slipping something by), I want to read the resolutions into the record, because that's where I believe they should be, in the record.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter dated February 14, 1979, a photocopy of a letter under the letterhead of the Rural Municipality of Corman Park No. 344, addressed to Mr. R. Muir who at that time was the acting executive secretary (we didn't have an authority set up; he was acting on a pro tem basis):

Dear Mr. Muir: Noted below is a copy of the resolution passed at the meeting of the municipal council held on Monday, February 12, 1979. I am forwarding same for your information.

'Resolved that the council of the Rural Municipality of Corman Park No. 344 give approval in principle to the proposed legislation setting up the Meewasin Valley Authority as outlined in the draft of the act as submitted to the council.'

I trust you will find the same in order. Yours very truly, K.H. Jamieson, secretary-treasurer.

That act which was submitted to them on February 14, 1979 is unchanged, Mr. Speaker, from the bill which we are now seeking to amend.

I am going to refer to you another resolution by the rural municipality of Corman Park No. 344 respecting the boundaries and the concept. This is dated August 14, 1979. It's a resolution, and I note this for the press particularly.

Be it resolved that the Rural Municipality of Corman Park No. 344 approves the conceptual master development plan for the Meewasin Valley Authority as prepared by Mr. Raymond Moriyama and the proposed legislation to create a Meewasin Valley Authority including the composition of the authority (I make that point because that is now coming up from the PCs opposite) and the cost-sharing formula.

Certified a true copy of the resolution passed by council on August 14, 1978, K.H. Jamieson, secretary-treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about those resolutions. I don't think that anything could be more bluntly phrased than that. I have not received any resolution since that time, but that's what happens. On the boundaries, we had those as assurances upon which to bring before this House for legislation – the assurances upon which I gave the member, upon which the member approved the bill, the R.M. of Corman Park.

I'm going to read it into the record before I table it. University of Saskatchewan, August 18, 1978, this is to Mr. Gillmore. Mr. Gillmore was the co-ordinator in the first instance.

Dear Mr. Gillmore:

Re: Meewasin Valley Authority

President R.W. Begg requested me to advise that the following motion was approved by the University Board of Governors at its recent meeting.

'The Board of Governors, University of Saskatchewan, approves the conceptual Master Development Plan for the Meewasin Valley project as prepared by Mr. Ray Moriyama and the proposed legislation to create a Meewasin Valley Authority, including the composition of the authority and a cost sharing formula.' (You can see it's an identical resolution which was passed.)

The Board of Governors was most interested in the project and future developments.

N. K. Kram
University Secretary

Then there is the resolution from the city council. I want to say, if I can, there are many areas where I have not agreed with the city council but I do very much appreciate the unanimous support that city council gave to the government, to itself and to all the other parties on Meewasin Valley Authority, just the other day, I appreciate that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yesterday, Monday night, unanimous support. I want to tell you that . . . I don't have a copy of the Corman Park's motion the other day, but what it says . . . that's fine. I am going to say a word about Corman Park in a minute. Corman Park does not pull out of the Meewasin Valley Authority of their resolution. But if they do, if that motion is passed, I put the blame on you two people with respect to the pressures put on the R.M. of Corman Park. I put that on you. I can tell you I have been mailed these resolutions. That's what I have from the R.M. of Corman Park. I have not gotten anything else from Corman Park. I want to tell you something else about Corman Park. I still believe that the rural municipality council of Corman Park will adhere to the original motions, the moment that we show them the amendments which I hope we will pass through this House speedily – pass the amendments and meet with them as planned next week – that they will still re-affirm their support notwithstanding the doom and gloom which the PCs opposite are going to be casting on this bill and this operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read for the record, simply because

it's too long. The motion which was passed on January 2, 1978, by the city council, a committee and the recommendation – well, the members say I should read it. Perhaps I should put it in the record because somebody or other may say that there was a misunderstanding. I want to read it.

Now therefore, the city council of the city of Saskatoon is pleased to advise the Government of Saskatchewan:

1. That it supports the principle of an independent authority, representative of the province, the city of Saskatoon, the University of Saskatchewan, the R.M. of Corman Park to be established to control further preservation and development of the banks of the South Saskatchewan River in and adjacent to the city of Saskatoon, such authority to be established by statute;
2. That should the Government of Saskatchewan see fit to introduce legislation to establish such an independent authority the city council of the city of Saskatoon will be provided with an opportunity to discuss such legislation; (such legislation was given to them by the way in full detail)
3. That the basis of such representation should be three members each from the province, the university, the city and one member from Corman Park; (which is agreed to by all the parties)
4. That the city of Saskatoon is prepared to contribute up to the maximum amount of 30 per cent of 5 mills per annum toward the cost of operation and administration of the authority in the development and preservation of the river bank, on condition that the province, university and the R.M. of Corman Park each contributes equitably toward such costs; (which we have done, the legislation shows that)
5. That the representatives of the city of Saskatoon on such authority shall be appointed on the nomination of the city council of the city of Saskatoon and shall not be removed except by or with the consent of city council.

Your committee at its meeting on January 15, 1979 (I stress this) has had an opportunity to review the proposed legislation pertaining to the authority. While certain items were noted of concern to the committee with attention given to the items, your committee recommends that the proposed legislation on the establishment of the river edge authority be approved.

Recommendation: (a) That council concur in the above recommendation of the committee and (b) the Government of Saskatchewan be advised of the council's approval in this operation.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to table those as part of the record. I think I have three copies of the resolutions which I talked about for tabling. I would ask the pages to table them for the record of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I am trying to make, I think I have made, perhaps to an overkill almost – the point I have tried to make is that the participating parties saw and approved the legislation. This House fully saw and approved legislation and fully endorsed it. The opposition not only saw the legislation and approved it unanimously, but one member had the opportunity which he thanks me for, to contribute in the

development of the legislation and the plan.

It strikes me less than the whole truth, for members opposite to accuse me now of being less than honest, which is what Mr. Katzman did on December 7, 1979, in those words in this debate about the legislation, without remembering these essential facts – less than honest and surely breaking the ground rules of debate with respect to this House and politics.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned as well that the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) should seek to quote me out of context, and I want to put this firmly on record in order to make up a trumped-up, I say, political point. Speaking last Friday in this House he quoted me as saying last April that, ‘While the owners of this property will not be affected in most respects, with the respect to their property . . .’ That is the quote he attributes to me. Mr. Speaker, I say that is a trumped up political point, that is less than a complete quotation and I want to correct the record, lest he use that argument again today. What I said was this, ‘While the owners of this property will not be affected in most respects, with respect to their property, some consequences might follow.’ The member does a disservice to himself and to this House by not quoting to the House, the consequences with which I have identified myself with respect to this legislation, and misquoting me, Mr. Speaker.

There are consequences, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, for the owners of property in the Meewasin Valley . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, if I may, just for a minute, to finish off. There are consequences for owners of the property of the Meewasin Valley. As I said then, Mr. Speaker, there must almost inevitably be, if the authority is going to be able to do the job for which we all say we give our support, inevitable consequences. There is no way to devise legislation that won’t have some consequences for private owners. There isn’t any. If we want the authority to do the job there will be some consequence or other. If the authority will be totally without power to prevent developments which are not in keeping with the concept that the member put his ideas into and which I still support, the concept which all the supporting and participating parties approve, then the authority would be able to do little more, as I have said to the press and otherwise, than to regulate the squirrels and the chipmunks and the skunks and the beavers along the river’s edge.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it might be worthwhile making one comment here from an editorial writer in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, Verne Clemence, talking about the Meewasin Valley Authority, and it says:

It will mean the destructive uses of some highly vulnerable and fragile areas in the river valley can be ended, and that finally the hesitation of city, provincial and rural municipal officials, in policing such areas, can be replaced by action – highly vulnerable and fragile areas of the river.

The extent to which such abuses are documented in an 84 page conceptual master plan . . . is an indication perhaps, of how much such things as the river bank and adjacent natural areas are taken for granted.

There is yet time to save these important natural areas: a unique urban experience, designed to preserve the natural qualities of the resource such as the South Saskatchewan River valley, while at the same time, being able to use and enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough to say we simply want to control the river and 200 feet to the banks of the river. What happens if there is a plant, a chemical plant just 500 feet back that runs some sort of watering or filtration plan into the river and puts it environmentally in there? What happens if just 400 feet back there is a 22 storey high-rise building which is going to be located for example, on the place where the Barr colonists first settled in Saskatoon? Because some private enterprise boys say, well, that's private enterprise, I guess I won the land and I should be able to do it. Does it not matter? Do we not care about the preservation of environments, to be able to give an authority the power to deal with those kinds of objectives? Mr. Speaker, I say that these are important and there will be consequences. It's inevitable unless you want to do away with the authority totally, which is what I suspect the hon. members (I'm still hoping that they will change their minds) will want to do. It's inevitable. Mr. Speaker, I make this point: the authority needs certain powers if it's going to do the job. We can't get around that and they have to face up to that responsibility. But I do say that the authority and the government have agreed that it is not essential for it to have all of the powers that were assigned to it in the original legislation.

The changes that are proposed in this bill will, I hope, clarify some of the sections which have been subject to misinterpretation, perhaps genuine misunderstanding. They will amend sections dealing with improvements in the control and buffer zones and repeal other sections which the authority, under the request by the public, feels now should be amended and removed from its mandate.

Mr. Speaker, let me get into a little bit of a description of the amendments that is more specific. Section 45 of the act has been misinterpreted, purely and simply misinterpreted, to mean that a landlord could not sell, lease or give his land to his spouse or children without the authority's approval. That is a pure, outright misrepresentation. I guess there is not way we can counter that misrepresentation except to clarify and put it totally beyond doubt. And so therefore a simple amendment will make clear that this section refers only to public easements, such as are required for the installation of power lines and telephone lines, and not to the transfer of land under The Land Titles Act.

Section 20 will be amended to specify that only persons who own land or have a legal interest in land may apply to the authority for approval for improvements. I think this is self-evident. The way the bills were previously worded any person with or without interest could make an application. That surely was too wide.

Section 46 of the act regarding certificates of title now requires the registrar of land titles to place a so-called Meewasin stamp on the certificates of title to all land within the valley. This was intended to provide information for the land owner. And I think it was a sensible approach but, due to the opposition and the misrepresentations in some areas, it will now be removed because it has been misconstrued as meaning clouding the title of the owner. To remove any possible doubt or confusion in this area this section will be repealed, with a provision for the registrar to remove the Meewasin stamp from title certificates already processed.

Also to be repealed are section 50, which required land owners to give notice to the authority of a proposal to dispose of land, and section 53-1(b), so that there can be no suggestion that the authority can expropriate land outside the valley. This was one of the arguments which absolutely flustered me when I read it in the newspaper. Somebody picked up on 53-1(b) and said, you know something, the way it's worded

now the Meewasin Valley Authority – and you know that government of Premier Blakeney's – could expropriate land outside the valley and they could get land bank in through the back door. And do you know something – if I may just take a little job at my friends in the fifth estate – that was printed as a credible argument. Now, it's an example of the kind of emotionalism upon which these boys opposite have been trying to capitalize and so in order to eliminate that, we're making the amendment there.

Mr. Speaker, we are also introducing some important exceptions to the provisions regarding improvements in the buffer zones. In the buffer zone, only improvements costing more than \$150,000 will require that notice be given to the authority, more than \$150,000. Members will note that even for improvements over \$150,000, it is only notice which is required to be given to the authority. The authority's approval is not required. In the control zone, home-owners will be able to make improvements requiring an expenditure of up to \$50,000 to their homes without the authority's prior approval. Also in the control zone, owners of farm buildings will be able to make improvements of up to \$50,000 without approval. Other improvements in the control zone costing less than \$10,000, such as (I don't know what it would cost but I'll use it as an example) construction of a farm fence, would also be allowed and permitted without the authority's approval.

Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone would agree it is absolutely essential (even Mr. Hamm says this) that land immediately adjacent to the river must completely protected from untrammelled development. They all say that. Accordingly, a new provision in section 18 will give the authority the power to make a by-law designating an area within the control zone in which the foregoing exemption will not apply. In other words it will be a more MVA kind of control there. The authority intends to pass a by-law, and has given its assurance which I convey to this House, a draft of which I tabled yesterday so the members will see it in black and white, which will give full protection to the area extending about 300 feet or 92 meters from the river edge. That by-law, unless somebody again for political reasons has ascribed some motives which are false, is based on the former city of Saskatoon's zoning by-law which applied to much of the area. This by-law, I believe, will insure the protection and preservation of the area's unique characteristics for the benefit of all residents of Saskatoon and district.

The bill also contains conflict-of-interest provisions requiring that members of the authority, its officers and its standing committees disclose ownership which might place them in conflict between their personal interest and those of the authority.

Finally, there are some slight changes to the boundaries in the act. I want to assure all members these are changes which do not result in the change of the lines. They result simply from typographical errors in the original legislation and nothing else. I remind members as well the authority has agreed – I want to stress this point – to review the size of the area within the authority's jurisdiction. I am asking everyone interested in the preservation and the character of the Meewasin Valley Authority for future generations to make their views known in this area to the authority. I do know the authority has invited interested persons and groups to submit their concerns and proposals in writing to the authority for its further consideration. However, I am confident today's changes will help to resolve many of those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more I could say about this and the way it has been handled by the opposition. Much more I could say about press releases from environmental societies and historical groups and the like that unfortunately have never received publicity in this current controversy. In fact they finally had to resort to putting an ad in

the Star-Phoenix – all of the community associations, everyone of them in Saskatoon Riversdale– supporting the authority. I know the boys opposite laugh at that because it means nothing to them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They are laughing and that's the simple position involved. They believes it's only Mr. Ham (Swift Current) who has any kind of popular support. Well, it may be the hon. member is sick and tired of hearing me. That may be the case, but I want to tell the hon. member at least he hears from me and that's something that we don't with respect to this hon. member except when he's in a seated position. I'm here to talk about the issues which affect the people of Saskatchewan and Saskatoon. I will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker, and no thanks to the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck).

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I could give all of this but there will be no other opportunities to do this. I will have other opportunities as we develop this project in the weeks and months ahead to detail the degree of support and to detail the position of the opposition in this regard – the shameful position of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Rosthern said I had forgotten about the concerns of the private individuals and landowners in the area of Saskatoon and the river bank area. Yesterday he was waxing eloquently. I think someone will have to tell the hon. member for Rosthern and the other members of the legislature on the opposite side that it's a great sounding speech but they should give some thought before they say something because it has a nasty habit of coming back to you when it's in black and white. I can hear the hon. member in my own mind saying yesterday on the adjournment motion that if we adjourn, as the members on the other side are suggesting when they move their motion, they are saying to heck with the people of Saskatoon who are financially in trouble and don't know where they stand on legislation now that it has been brought to their attention. I hope that they won't get up to seek to adjourn this debate and thereby say to heck with the city of Saskatoon and the people as to where you stand on the legislation. I heard yesterday the hon. member saying we should be prepared to correct this – referring to the bill – as best we can to take the burden off their backs. But no, that's not what we're going to do, he said, we're all going home for Christmas, to a New Year's party, paid for by the government of Saskatchewan for the first time, and forget about these individuals. Well, I hope the hon. member here will not seek to adjourn this bill and will not want to rush through to a Christmas or New Year's Even party and forget about these individuals that we are here to deal with.

I heard him saying yesterday, that's not what we are here for, Mr. Attorney General. What we are here for is to work on legislation for the benefit of all people of Saskatchewan. When we pass legislation that causes hardship, we should be man enough to stand up and say, hey fellas, we might have made a mistake here, how do we correct it? Let's get down and discuss it. Let's find a way to improve the situation – when we put a hardship on individuals. I say, Mr. Speaker, we have done that. We are improving the hardship that the hon. member says and we're here ready to do business. Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) said, we have shown no concern for the individuals and land holders. I say, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments conclusively demonstrate that the member for Rosthern and the PC caucus is wrong, dead wrong, when we bring forward these amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – He said yesterday on behalf of his caucus: 'I repeat finally and once more, what we are here for is to work on legislation for the benefit of all the people of

Saskatchewan,' well I take him up on his offer, and I challenge the opposition to do exactly what they are paid for lest, somehow, Mr. Devine accuse all of us, I ask people to remember that (of wasting the taxpayers money), because if we're drawing down a salary, they, too, are drawing down a salary. Somehow it escapes me how it is costing us money if we pay the salary today, get the salary today, or get it next spring, we still get the same salary on a yearly basis.

We're here to do the work. And we are going to be here to do the work and we are going to see how many of you boys are here to do with work. We'll see how the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) shows up to do some work. We'll see how the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) show sup to do some work. We'll see if other members show up to do some work. I'm saying to the hon. members opposite we are here to do work. Now look it, Mr. Speaker, I want to move second reading of this bill and I say with all the conviction I can muster that all of the statements that I make in this speech I firmly believe . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear but I wanted to say, and I'm making such a great speech I want to hear it . . . I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I close my remarks by saying that I feel passionately about this project. I feel passionately about this legislation (saying it). I oppose passionately those who call for its repeal – that's killing it. Let's make no mistake about it, if you sign that petition circulating to repeal, you are signing to kill it, not to reconstruct it later but to kill it. We all know that. It's contrary to what everybody has said on the record before. Mr. Speaker, we have something which of precious beauty in Saskatoon and area. I was born and raised in Saskatoon and I'm going to be maudlin for just one more minute to say that the river in Saskatoon has been such an integral part of anybody's life in Saskatoon that to run the risk of besmirching and spoiling it by uncontrolled and unregulated development, land development, in the interest of private ownership, I say will be doing a disgrace to the generations that follow us, for Saskatoon and for the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – As strongly as I believe that I say that there will be additional amendments coming, Mr. Speaker, this spring. The member says Moose Jaw will vote it down. The member for Moose Jaw will have a chance to speak in this debate this afternoon. He will have a chance to speak on that matter this afternoon whether he votes it down. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a chance, a rare chance for all of us to get together in a non-partisan way and do something which is predicated on protection and promotion of the beauty of the environment which is Saskatchewan. That's our chance, not to try to score the points, which I say with some degree of chagrin, the boys have sought to score off me and the government in the last several weeks and the reason for my opening remarks, not to score that. Get up and tell us where you stand. If you're against it fine, let's see what happens. If you are not for us, tell us. Tell us what you think of these amendments. Let's get on with the job of passing the amendments. As the member for Rosthern says, there will be more amendments I'm sure, once we sit down with the community groups and continue to work our way through. We don't know everything. MVA will make mistakes. Bolstad, I think, is doing a tremendous job under the circumstances. All the people are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I have confidence in the rural municipality of Corman Park nominee Peggy McKercher; the wife of a very prominent lawyer and businessman and community leader. She in her own right is. She's elected to council. I have confidence

in the Mayor of Saskatoon and his nominees. I have confidence in the president of the University of Saskatchewan, Bob Begg. I have confidence in the two government nominees – David Keith of the teachers' federation and Don Kerr at the University of Saskatchewan Historical Society and Environmental Society. I don't think these people are going about trying to take over land ownership or to twist the purposes of it. They know the river. They love the river. They understand Saskatoon. How can it be ascribed that this is the motivation.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't a piece of legislation anywhere, at any time that you couldn't pick up and draw some conclusion to its ridiculous, logical extreme. If they show me an opinion tabled by the river edge authority, I can give you that on every piece of bill here. After all, we're only human beings putting down imperfect words in black and white. What we are here trying to do is administer and interpret those black and white words and that's what counts. Don't kill the project before it has a chance to get up and go and do its job. Say that there is something here which is worthy of preserving on a non-partisan basis.

Sure, there will be opposition. Sure, it's going to be difficult, but in my 12 years of government, Mr. Speaker, I have never been involved in anything worthwhile that there hasn't been opposition that we've had to try to meet and achieve. Nothing worthy the effort comes easily. It only comes with some degree of vision and some degree of foresight. Surely to goodness boy, if you tell me on second readings and everywhere what you've told me in private and the resolutions that I've had, at least give me and the government the decency to say that we acted honorably with honorable intentions albeit there may be errors in these sections. Don't score this cheap political point as you've been trying to do.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible for us still to restore this project in a unanimous way. How the PCs vote on the bill will tell a lot. I'm inviting them to stand with us on a second reading vote when it takes place, unanimously, to support these amendments because I think they will show to the people of Saskatchewan and Rosthern that they unanimously support the concept and the legislation still. If they don't, if they oppose it, those are the tough choices that have to be made. I think they will have to live with the political consequences that flow from that and I, too, will have to live with those political consequences as well.

Mr. Speaker, I say these are good amendments. These are amendments that will go a long way to solving these difficulties. I say, Mr. Speaker, we can do ourselves proud by supporting quickly and unanimously these amendments and get on with the job of building a better Saskatoon and Saskatchewan. I move second reading of Bill No. 46.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – The Attorney General seeks to chastise the opposition for approaching the problem as if it were a political issue and then turns around, Mr. Speaker, and devotes the first half of his address to what was done last year. I simply say to the members of this Assembly and to you, Mr. Speaker, what the people of Saskatoon and in particular what the people of Corman Park (whose land is affected by this act) are concerned about is what is happening now and not particularly what's happened last year. And I think really to extend our debate, simply to say, well, you should have done this last year or we should have done that last year – I question whether that has any value to anybody in this particular House. The Attorney General seeks to use that as the vehicle by which he makes his political point.

Now I can say we were present in the House and the Attorney General admits, I think, that these are good amendments, that in fact amendments were required and I suggest that the amendments were required because of the impact of a citizens' action group. And I think as legislators we must take cognizance of the fact the citizens' action group stood up and said, hey, we don't like this. And it's important we, as legislators, listen to what they're saying. I think the amendments here and perhaps further amendments down the road are a result of that and I question the Attorney General's attempt to diffuse this thing or deflect this thing as being somehow inspired secretly in the back alleys by the member for Rosthern and myself, as the people who started this whole thing. I was at a political meeting wherein this statement was made and it was made prior to the opening of this House, and came from a group primarily of farmers in the Corman Park area. This is the statement that was coming from that meeting, Mr. Speaker, and I question whether or not it was the member for Rosthern who was instigating this type of comment. Clearly it was not. What was happening is those people – as you saw them on the television set – one with tears running down his eyes as he was concerned about his farm . . . You're saying the member of Rosthern caused that. What they were saying, Mr. Speaker, is this and I quote:

Mr. Romanow's insensitive and arrogant attitude towards legitimate concerns of Saskatoon and Corman Park residents is itself the greatest danger ever faced by the delicate ecology of the river bank. He has ignored the positive suggestions and overtures of the people who have preserved the river bank for the last hundred years.

MR. ROMANOW: – They have preserved the river bank? Wally Hamm preserved the river bank? I'll show you . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. ANDREW: – Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General rather than take this out of the political forum seeks to ridicule the people involved as being obligated – as though the only thing they are concerned about is their friends that are building the high-rise apartment buildings. The people in Corman Park are not building high-rise apartment buildings, Mr. Speaker. They are concerned about their farmland. They are concerned about the loss of some kind of a right to their farmland, an affect on their interest of land and that's primarily the concern in that particular thing.

The Attorney General, in a very emotional way, speaks about how he was born and raised in Saskatoon and grew up by the river. He has no patent on that. I, too, was born and raised near that same river, perhaps a hundred miles upstream, but that river is important to me and I'm sure it's important to anyone else who has lived beside it. And to think he is the only one (if you listen only to his argument) who is concerned about the river is completely folly. So what I say is sure, maybe we made a mistake last year and I'm prepared to admit that – we didn't, perhaps, review this whole legislation the way we should have – surely that does not estop us now. That we should not be estopped now if we were to follow the argument of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) from making comment on it because if before we did not say it, now you're forever estopped from making a comment on it. That's of course folly. In any legislation – any type of regulation – you're going to make mistakes. Something is going to go by that later the people say we don't like. Clearly the job as legislators is to listen to what those people say. So I, too, agree with the Attorney general that we are not concerned here about a political debate on this total thing.

It is important to listen to the concerns of those people and to look at these amendments and to look at further amendments proposed by those people and then see whether or not we can completely say this total program . . . I make one further comment about the Attorney General. You hear the type of comments; well, if this type of action takes place, I'm going to take it and pull this bill out and we're forever lost. Now is that a responsible way? Everybody is trying to preserve this but some people have a different view. Wally Hamm is not a moneylender and the Attorney General know full well. Wally Hamm to the people in the press works in the university in the soil science department and he runs a small farm in Corman Park. Does that make a guy some kind of a friend of the multinational – building of the high-rise apartments? I would suggest to the Attorney General that perhaps some of the people that sit on the board are a lot closer to those types of people than Wally Hamm is. I question whether this type of debate solved anything in protecting the riverbanks.

So I would at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, want to make reference to some of the concerns. The Attorney General refers to the concerns of the river edge heritage authority (or whatever they are called) as being irresponsible people and concerned only about building the high-rise buildings. I would suggest the legal counsel employed by the river edge authority, people as Doug Schmeiser, former Dean of the College of Law, University of Saskatchewan, recognized as an expert in the field of civil liberties, specializing in civil liberties and in constitutional law, clearly is not interested in the building of high-rise apartments in Saskatoon. Some of the recommendations are the concerns he has.

The Attorney General referred first of all to section 45. The concern of section 45 was by the mortgage lenders. I'm not supporting or I'm not speaking on behalf of the mortgage lenders. They sought legal advice. The mortgage lenders sought legal advice.

MR. ROMANOW: – Who's their lawyer?

MR. ANDREW: – I don't know.

MR. ROMANOW: – Was it Schmeiser?

MR. ANDREW: – No, I don't believe so.

MR. ROMANOW: – Oh, you're taking Doug Schmeiser's opinion on 456. Who is he advising?

MR. ANDREW: – Am I? Who said I was giving his opinion? Anyway, section 45, the mortgage lenders . . . Section 45 reads as follows:

No land or interest in land within Meewasin Valley may be acquired by any person pursuant to The Public Utility Easement Act or any other act without the approval of the authority.

The legal advice granted to the trust companies, to the credit union, whether they were with the banks was this, that that act basically said it would apply to such other acts as The Land Titles Act. Therefore their advice to their client was that we cannot go with that. We cannot go with that because . . .

MR. ROMANOW: – How do you know that? How do you know they give that advice? Where's that opinion?

MR. ANDREW: – . . . without going to that type of . . . This is my understanding. Therefore the mortgage lenders were not prepared to advance money to the people who lived within that control area or within the buffer zone. What that means is that if your house, the Attorney General's house or Mr. Devine's house, or so and so's farm which fall within that, those are the people who are concerned, not about the high-rise apartments. Those people were not able to obtain a mortgage because the lenders were advised not to lend it to them. Now that was their position. That's a legitimate amendment which has to be taken. I throw this to the Attorney General. What is the advantage and what really is the need for section 45 in any event?

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, is basically to take 'other' out and add 'similar to' as the new thing. Now it reads: similar act relating back to The Public Utilities Easement Act. All I am saying is, that this is a good start. All I simply say is to take that whole thing away. What is the meaning of similar as long as similar can be specified? The Attorney General refers to the fact that people overreact to law. But you can't blame a person not trained in the law for overreacting to it. So all I simply say is, refine that down a little bit more. I am perfectly prepared to go along with it.

Number two as it relates to section 19, which was offensive in the sense that people again were concerned about the fact that under this authority, they would require the approval of the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) if they were to make any improvements at all to the property which was located within this large area. The Attorney General often has made reference to the fact that we are talking about a program parallel to the Wascana Centre Authority. The big difference, however, is the fact that some 260-270 square kilometres of private land, primarily farm land, is also involved here. So there is clearly a distinction, clearly a difference between the two.

The concern was that to obtain that approval you would require approval to do virtually anything you wanted, whether it was well-founded or not, the people honestly believed that. That's the question which we have too fact. So the Attorney General, in an attempt to modify those, cuts the \$50,000 restriction or limitation on it. Fair enough. That hopefully will diffuse some of that. But, he goes further in subsection (3) and notwithstanding whatever he said, that the authority can make by-laws to allow itself not to be covered by what he had just previously proposed. That strikes me again as a further move by this government of abdicating their legislative responsibility. Surely what we are taking about here are amendments to this given act and to propose those amendments to avoid the problem and then simply allow the same problem to come about by regulation or by-law you've solved nothing. You've solved nothing about the concerns of the people that this particular act is going to unduly and unfairly affect their property. I say simply, why do you need that delegated power and that little clause subsection (3) of section 19?

Subsection 13(2) is the other concern that is not affected by this given legislation and was raised by concerned citizens. What subsection 13(2) said was that the authority made by special resolution altered the area of Meewasin Valley by adding thereto any parcel of private land within the geographic area of the participating parts. In other words, the interpretation to be placed on that was basically this: that the Meewasin Valley Authority had within their power, by passing a special resolution of the 10 people involved, to take in any further property belonging to the residents of Corman Park. The people of Corman Park objected to that and all I simply say to the Attorney General is, if they object to that type of legislation and there is nothing in there, there is no intention to expand it, to take their rights away, then why do you have to have that act

still saying that? What's the need for it? If you need further land to develop on the maps, why not simply make an application or change it within the gamut of the changes that he is proposing? Why do you need that all-encompassing power to go further, to expand further outside the gamut of the represented people, outside the gamut of the people concerned? Simply passing a resolution by the Meewasin Valley Authority allows them to draw their maps larger and larger and larger. And that includes the whole of the city or the whole of Corman Park. All I say to the Attorney General is if he is genuine in that concern, then remove that type of legislation and that too will go towards alleviating the concerns of the people of Saskatoon and the people of Corman Park.

The Attorney General then makes reference, I believe, to section 46 and what section 46 does is cause concern. I'm sure the Attorney General from his days at the practice of law appreciates the concern raised by farmers or the ire raised by farmers when unbeknownst to them they get a notice in the mail that they have a charge against their property and are unaware of what it says. You say it's not a charge but they believe it to be a charge and perhaps, if you interpret the legislation the way some people can interpret the legislation, it in fact does become a charge. I simply say that again creates the problem in the minds of those people. I take it he has appreciated that and said, all right, we'll take that particular thing out of the act and the concern the people have is that in effect it was a charge. I suppose if the point is made it is not a charge then there is no need to have it in the first place. If it is a charge and I would suggest and it's arguable that it is a charge, then really we're solving nothing by simply eliminating the right to caveat the property. If it's not a charge it doesn't have to be there. I agree with you. But if there is a charge and that's the moot point and that's the legal point that someday has to be determined, then why are you taking it away? I suppose you are left with something less than you had before in the sense that now there is not notice. So that becomes a technical, legal question and I suggest it is something that has to be looked at and determined.

Section 50 of the act, Mr. Speaker, is again a section that was objected to by the people as being one that dealt with the property and disposing of it. I think the Attorney General and to his credit, has acknowledged that as being a concern of the people and has withdrawn it as I say again. I think we can clearly get along without that and that is indeed a good amendment.

Section 53, 1(b) is, I suppose the situation where again people can read many things into the legislation. Basically what that did was allow the authority, without the consent of the owner, to enter upon and take and expropriate, with the approval of a participating party, any land situated outside the Meewasin valley Authority. What that gave to the Meewasin Valley Authority if they so desired, was the right to expropriate outside. Now the Attorney General will make the point that well, people are reading too much into this. My question to the Attorney General is, why did you need that there in the first place? Why do you need an expropriating power to go beyond your authority at this point in time? It strikes me that's the root problem of the whole thing. Why did you need that particular expropriating power?

To go on then to section 53, subsection (2), I suggest that what we're talking about here is the right of the authority. I'm sure the people here are cognizant of the fact that people are afraid of expropriation. Surely anybody who has been involved in it and knows that you have to treat expropriations with a great deal of care because if you don't you simply create that problem of somebody superimposing. That's just common

sense. What we're talking about is an attitude and the manner of doing things. Here they see an authorization and somebody can say, hey, these policemen that they're creating can just come on to your land without notice of anything else, and I say why do you need that? What's wrong with The Expropriations Procedures Act? Why do you need that particular clause in the act? So it's those types of clauses that are in the act that are creating the problem. I simply say – we're not quarrelling here – I'm sure the Attorney General doesn't need section 53 subsection (2). It is not a must for the act, and if it will solve the problem and make people so that they are not concerned about the act, then why do we need it? It seems to me that's what we're creating a problem here.

So without being that critical I wish to make a couple of other suggestions before taking my seat with regard to, perhaps some concerns that could be had and for perhaps further changes that could be made to put this act in such a way that it becomes acceptable. Then everybody can get on with the concern of protecting the river's edge.

One of those is the boundary changes. Obviously I think the attorney General has acknowledged that the boundaries are part of the problem. How do you tell the farmer whose land is perhaps 15 miles away from the river, part of this large area of Corman park that somehow his land is required to be in here to preserve the heritage of the river when it's 15 miles away. That's a difficult thing for a person to understand. And all I say is that perhaps if we take the river edge authority and bring it back to the river, whether it's 100 yards or 500 yards, or 2,000 yards, but 15 miles is going a little bit to the extreme as to whether or not you are going to protect the river 15 miles away. Those people want to see that, and I think the Attorney General, if I've heard him right, is prepared to say that hey, we will in fact listen to this and we will listen to the representations made and we are prepared to redraw the boundaries. I think if you do that and if you make that commitment to the people of Saskatoon and Corman Park a lot of your trouble is going to be gone on the Meewasin Valley Authority, because that is indeed what they are mostly concerned about. So if you make that commitment, I'm sure that we can all go out of here together.

Another concern that people have expressed is the need in the act for the right of an appeal, a right to appeal from the authority, Mr. Speaker, O.K.? I suggest to the Attorney General that the meeting he had me spotted at, that both Mr. Bolstad and Mr. Kristensen (1) said at that meeting that they believed it was important that the act be changed so that an appeal process was in fact developed into this. Now the amendments have come down without that appeal process. I suggest there is another concern the people have of this total process.

Next, Mr. Speaker, is the question of representation on the authority. Now surely that should be open to question. What the people of Corman park are saying, what the river edge people are saying is this: 95 per cent of all the private property lies within the R.M. of Corman Park – 95 per cent of all the private property, and they have one vote in ten. Their belief is that somehow that doesn't seem to be fair, that somehow there's not a proper representation there. It's important that this appear to be a democratic process, that people had a democratic input into it, and that various interest groups perhaps be represented in some such form. We would take no exception with the fact the city of Saskatoon would retain its three members, three voting members on it. The Government of Saskatchewan seems to be concerned that they have their three members on it and the university. I question whether that is the concern which the people are facing. I think it is something which the legislature can look at, perhaps we have a fair representation by the people of Corman Park. That's not a political thing. Surely if they want to have more input and feel they have a better input, well they

should.

The other concern expressed (and I don't take credit for this one myself) has basically been this: the representation of the people of government. Somehow I suppose the people of government have to have senior cabinet minister in a position on this authority. The question comes up is it really the place for the Attorney General? Should it be someone other than sort of the chief person who looks after the ensuring of fair rights, etc., for law? Should it not be somebody else? Perhaps the member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Dyck), why shouldn't he be on it?

Another concern expressed I believe warrants consideration, warrants consideration without a simple smirk would Wally Hamm support this or not support this? I have heard this advanced from some people at the university. The line goes like this: does the Meewasin Valley Authority somehow affect the autonomy or the independence of the university? I think that is a legitimate concern . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I didn't suggest it was the university. I suggested somebody in the university raised it. The Attorney General seems to say that because you are not a member of the university's organization or power, somehow you have no right to say whether or not this interferes with the independence or the autonomy of the university.

The final point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is basically this: The Attorney General is great at making the point that the only people who are concerned are the people who want to build high-rise apartment buildings. I throw this to the Attorney General; he doesn't want and nobody else wants 40-storey or 25-storey apartment buildings scattered along the river. Nobody suggests that; nobody from this side suggest that. What I say is that there is one other building going to be within the Meewasin Valley Authority. That is the proposed Eldorado nuclear plant. So the Attorney General is there. The Meewasin Valley Authority of course are the people who, through this act, clearly have a right to determine whether that can be there or cannot be there.

MR. ROMANOW: – Where do you stand on this?

MR. ANDREW: – Just a minute. I ask the Attorney General whether or not he is prepared to tell the people of Saskatchewan what his position and where the position of the Meewasin Valley Authority is on that? I'll be prepared to say he will not say that.

MR. ROMANOW: – We don't speak for Meewasin.

MR. ANDREW: – You speak for Meewasin. He is one of the senior people, obviously the senior person on the Meewasin Valley Authority and he stays quiet on it. He makes a great to-do, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that the high-rise apartment is going to spoil the river and not a word is said about the Eldorado nuclear plant. The refinery beside the river is not going to be a problem for the ecology of the river, according to him in his silence on this subject. He asks what other people stand for. I challenge him to put his position to use as to where he stands on that. Having said that I suggest to the attorney General that I, too, am not out to destroy his Meewasin Valley Authority . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Oh, he can laugh at it. What we want to do is protect the river. As I say, I lived and grew up on that river every bit as much as you did. Perhaps it wasn't in the city of Saskatoon but it means every bit as much to me and anybody else who grew up on that river that it has to be preserved. I am not against it being preserved. All I am saying is that we must recognize people are not happy with the way the legislation is. I think we have to have representation from those people and I challenge the Attorney General to make all his

comments about Wally Hamm about how bad a guy Wally Hamm is. I challenge the Attorney General. Has he even talked to the man? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's it. He has never talked to the man and then he turns around and says, oh, there's the problem. I say just as the Attorney General says, let's take the politics out of it. I'm not prepared to make politics from this. I'll make the same commitment he is prepared to make, Mr. Speaker, and if we can walk away from here with amendments that are saleable to everyone, then surely we have solved the problem. We have listened to the people and as members of the legislature, we have done our job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): – I can't help but think when I heard the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) say that his only intention is to protect the river and he repeated that a number of times when he was addressing the press and not this Legislative Assembly – but when I look at the order paper and I see the questions he's asked, in particular one of them, some of them are quite in order I would suggest. The one is about a detailed statement of all the moneys paid to the architect regarding the preparation of the plant for the Meewasin Valley. The other one asks details of all costs incurred in the promotion of the Meewasin Valley project including the costs of the wine and cheese party at the Legislative Building around the time that the bill was introduced in 1979. Another one asks for another contract and a copy of the contract. Another one is a detailed statement and I won't repeat all that, as it's there for everyone to read. Then I stand here and I listen to him say his only purpose in rising, proposing and speaking about amendments, the whole bill and the amendments before us, is to protect the river. I am wondering what the wine and cheese party has to do with protecting the river in the Saskatoon area?

I also wonder, Mr. Speaker, when he says that we should review legislation. That is absolutely correct. But it appears to me, from what I've been able to read in the press (and I've kept a pretty good clipping on this because we happen to be involved in Moose Jaw as well as Saskatoon) that he's not interested in reviewing the present legislation. He is interested in decimating it completely. There is no question in my mind whatsoever about that.

He talks about the political area. If this hasn't become political then I fail to recognize what politics is all about. We talked about the boundaries and he suggested that it's not necessary. It is necessary or he has to be concerned about the types of boundaries. Surely he realizes that when the authorities are set up, the boundaries are part of the bound volume and as such they will be part and parcel of that authority.

I then listened to him talk about having more representation on the authority itself. I wonder if he realizes who actually is participating dollar-wise in that authority. Because in my opinion, the people who have the say should be at least those people who have the money in that particular authority and the representatives who are sitting on that authority happen to be the ones who are also contributing to the overall operation. The reason that I am suggesting it – and I am very, very concerned about the type of attitude of the member for Rosthern and the member for Kindersley and others and some of the observations made opposite – is that Moose Jaw has voted against the Moose Jaw River Valley Authority which we recognize now as the Wakamow River Authority. Moose Jaw itself has voted against that. I heard and the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) mutter across the way that Moose Jaw City Council went against it. He said the press told him. Perhaps the press (and I doubt if they did) should recognize the fact that is not the truth, in fact.

The Wakamow policy and management committee met this morning, here in this building, the entire policy and advisory committee. I would like to advise those opposite that there is no intention, whatsoever, of the two R.M.s – the R.M. of Baildon and the R.M. of Moose Jaw – and the municipal council of Moose Jaw, to withdraw from any proposed authority that we now have in mind. I might say that this has been going on for about a year and a half or more. My colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) from Moose Jaw, is the chairman of that committee. I have been put on that committee by an order, representing the area of the city. There are two members of council including his worship Mayor Taylor and Alderman Norys, on that committee. We have representation from the R.M. of Baildon and the R.M. of Moose Jaw. I would like to suggest to those opposite that if they think they can decimate the Wakamow River Authority by the type of actions they are taking, they're badly mistaken.

There's no question in my mind that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his department have done a tremendous job preparing not only the ground work for the Meewasin authority, but also the ground work for the authority that we have down in Moose Jaw, The Wakamow authority to be proposed. I can also say that those people, along with the management committee which I have just named, have had a goodly number of meetings and to think for one minute that they can use the unfortunate experience of some politicians in the Saskatoon area who are going to try and decimate that particular authority, I think they have another thought coming.

We in Moose Jaw have watched very, very closely the establishment of first, the Wascana Centre Authority here in Regina and now the Meewasin. I would like to ask the hon. member for Rosthern whether he would stand up and say I am prepared to decimate the Wascana authority to the people of Regina. I'm wondering whether or not he's going to stand up and say that he is prepared to say to the people of Saskatoon that the Meewasin authority is not necessary. I'm wondering whether he would go to Moose Jaw and tell the Moose Jaw people that we in Moose Jaw, and the surrounding area, are not entitled to an authority similar to the Wascana and the Meewasin. We are modelling our authority on those bases.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am more than disappointed in seeing some of the amendments that are being proposed. There's one in particular and that's the right of first appeal. I understand that they have to be floated and they will have some input. There's no question in our minds in the Moose Jaw area and at the meeting this morning, that that right of first appeal for the authority is a necessary part of any authority in our particular area. First refusal. The whole area that bothers me in this regard is that if we do not have the right of first refusal, then how can we constructively put together a decent authority? If we do not and cannot have some control over a buffer zone, we're going to end up with highrises along the border of the control area in such a way that will darken the valleys and the streams that we're vitally concerned about. It's very easy to talk about a 30 foot or a 300 foot buffer zone or controlled area. It's very easy for the member for Regina to sit opposite and laugh and not worry about highrises along a stream or a valley. But the fact remains, that political expediency just ain't the way to look at a situation such as this.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that I would be remiss if I did not at least congratulate the mayor and the city council of Moose Jaw for standing firm and not even being concerned about what is happening in Saskatoon on the political area. I am suggesting that the mayor and the city council and the administration have put together a plan that the people of Moose Jaw and the surrounding area can be proud of. We have all the

clippings. We know what has happened. I am saying that I am disgusted and it is repulsive to say the least, to have to now see the antics of those opposite deliberately trying to destroy something that all of us should really want for our community.

When I pick up the newspaper of December 12, I see here the Wakamow participation rescinded for time being. If anyone read that article you would think the rural municipalities of Baidon and Moose Jaw had really said they ere going to opt out of the authority before it even begins. As of 11:45 this morning, there is no question on the part of both of those rural municipalities and on the part of the city of Moose Jaw that the authority shall proceed. It shall proceed along the lines that there will be recognition of public input and that has been done. For those opposite to now say there hasn't been an opportunity for public input, I think they should be ashamed of themselves to say the least.

Another area that really bothers me somewhat is the fact that if we are really interested in planning for the future, then we must have that type of an authority. We must have an authority that can plan the valleys and the streams that we do have, and they are limited in our province, but that authority must at least have some authority given to it so it can authorize certain areas of development.

I have seen zoning by-laws; I have seen zoning changes. I have seen delegations and lobbies go to municipal councils and change the minds of a municipal council, but if there is an area of and put within the boundaries of an authority, at lest then the authority shall have the jurisdiction to manage that in an orderly way.

Each and every one of us recognizes that the Meewasin Valley Authority did have and has a plan of development for their particular area. That is their business. That is the business of the people involved and the business of the authority that has been elected from the people appointed. I would also say that in the overall picture the communities will have the input into what shall happen. We have asked in our area. We have asked for public input as to what my go down there. I am sure exactly the same applies in the Meewasin area at this particular time, but all I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, at this particular moment is please, those opposite, don't suggest for a moment they are not playing politics because there is no question in the world that they have used a certain group of people in the Saskatoon area who may have reasons of their own for trying to destroy the authority before it has a chance to really be born. I'm suggesting to them that it just won't work.

In Moose Jaw, we have right now, the type of people and the type of organizations involved that want to contribute, and all this is doing now is setting this province back many, many decades of years. And I am suggesting to those opposite, if they want to do a service to their constituents, do a service to their province, then let's not try to use particular interest groups for their selfish purposes. That is political expediency and not political honesty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): – Mr. Speaker, yesterday at this time I was not sure if we would be discussing this bill, and I'm glad we are. Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, I am man enough to admit that I might have made a mistake in this House in some of the areas that got by us, but I'm also man enough to stand up and say, now let's correct the things that are wrong. It has come to our attention that that is our duty.

Let me first suggest the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew), as a lawyer, can understand the legal jargon and has been speaking about the legal jargon. It's interesting to note that earlier when the Attorney General was moving his motion on the seconding speech, he indicated in it some of the comments were made by myself a year ago.

One of the specific comments I would like to speak about is the comment that I had some involvement in speaking to Raymond Moriyama. Let me enlighten the members of the House about that discussion and I'm certain you can talk with Mr. Moriyama if you so wish. Some of you may know I was very involved with the Saskatoon Boat Club, which operated on the South Saskatchewan River for many years. It's interesting to note the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) indicates that I capsized. You know he may not realize it, but I did while the Idylwyld freeway was being built, have a canoe of mine get caught between the pilings as they were working and be destroyed. I had to swim out. So, he may have known something that nobody else in the House knew.

Mr. Speaker, the conversation which I discussed, and I referred to last years indicating I had some input, was the flow of the South Saskatchewan River and my experiences with the sandbars and the terrain and the movement with them along the edge of the river. I was pleased to see in the final draft that some of the areas I had mentioned to Mr. Moriyama were recognized and were concerned with their protection. I must repeat again that my comments to him were strictly and it can be checked, I'm certain, with the river itself because of my involvement with the Saskatoon Boat Club for many years.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard many comments in the House about the criticizing of this particular issue. I suggest to all members the issue is we have a piece of legislation before us. It is not totally up to the par we all thought it was. Somebody has showed us some shortcomings. It's interesting to note the members across the table say who. One of the people who has indicated the shortcomings is the chairman of the Meewasin authority, Ms. Peggy McKercher. In a press conference she held following a meeting of the I believe it's called The A Committee and the Attorney General can correct if I'm incorrect on that statement of the people appointed, the 10 people. She indicated they were asking the government to make some changes. The Attorney General referred to those changes earlier when he was upon his feet talking about the amendment we are going to be debating on the Meewasin authority better known as Bill 46. She indicated there were some areas of concern that must be cleaned up immediately.

She has indicated to me that if it wasn't for the problem of the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strike these notations of the titles would have been removed as the Attorney General is suggesting today in his amendment. I'm glad to see that people of responsibility and I refer to Peggy McKercher are suggesting there are changes needed. She's not being political; she's acting as the chairman.

The Attorney General refers to a meeting or a large gathering of people which myself and the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) attended. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Attorney General was invited to the meeting or not. I know I received no formal indication and no formal invite to the meeting. The only reason I know of the meeting was that a gentleman who is now an R.M. councillor called me and asked if I was going to this meeting. I said to him, what's the meeting about, and he told me and I said, yes, I will go down and listen and that's what I did.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the concerns of the people as I want to do. They made

statements in many different areas and showed their concerns. Unfortunately, the chairman, Mrs. McKercher, was not able to attend because of some family . . . but the vice-chairman was there – a gentleman from the university, and Mr. Wes Bolstad. At the start of the meeting – and I'll refer to the meeting – we saw the film that most of us as members have had the opportunity to see on the Meewasin authority which was then followed by a presentation by Mr. Bolstad in which he outlined some of the past involvement and some of the things that were happening. The meeting by the way, for Mr. Speaker's information, was called by an R.M. councillor who represents an area near the leisure-land area. She was the councillor. She called the meeting. To my knowledge, I don't believe it was the Meewasin . . . I'm not sure what the name of the group is, Mr. Attorney General, that Mr. Hamm represents. It was called by a councillor of the R.M. of Corman Park. Mrs. Teichrob who called the meeting, asked the people (I'm referring to Wes Bolstad and the chairman of the Meewasin) to be there. They were not on the . . . Peggy could not make it; the vice-chairman came. The vice-chairman indicated . . . in a statement he made when some of the people commented to him that they were concerned about certain aspects and powers. Some of the people said, why did you put this on my title? Why is the stamp there? Why is it under liens and so forth and so on. The answer – well, we had to indicate somehow it falls in the Meewasin Authority area. There was another question from the floor – why did it go on the front of the title? Why didn't it say such and such a piece of land falling in such and such a township in the R.M. of Corman Park and also falling within the Meewasin authority rather than put it where there were liens and so forth?

Therefore, people said, hey, I own that land clear and free. There is nobody I owe money to for that land. Why have you my title stamped which indicates I owe somebody, that somebody has a claim on my land? So by putting the stamp on where the caveats go, automatically the people (who aren't lawyers) said what does this mean? The question in my mind and the question I asked Peggy McKercher and Wes Bolstad of the Meewasin office one day was, why didn't you put it on the front rather than with the liens? They said, well, we thought that was the place it was to go. And that's what they did.

Hindsight is an excellent judge and that's what we are using today. We're discussing a bill with some hindsight. It's interesting to note through the maps – by the way the two maps I am holding were given to me by the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) and when I refer to the maps I guess I should refer to the attorney General's statement earlier bout maps. And if I remember part of his speech what he indicated about maps was that if he unrolled them here they would go out the front door of the Legislative Buildings. I'm going by memory on that and I could be incorrect, but that's another statement that goes to maps.

Looking at these maps, this map is a little larger than the map that I had last year to look at used in this Chamber other than one that was rolled up in a tube . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, just a little short of the front door. In it, it indicates something I guess I missed last year, that land – for the Speaker's benefit, it's out near the airport area of Saskatoon – doesn't seem to be joined in any way to the city of Saskatoon, yet falls within the city of Saskatoon. It is covered in the area of control. I didn't realize that, Mr. Speaker, until I received these maps. Maybe it's because I missed something when I was checking the other maps in the book.

The member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) indicated earlier the vast amount of land that falls within this authority. The member for Moose Jaw, when he spoke about how they

in their area wish to protect and nurture their idea and vision of something like the Wascana Authority, indicated they needed powers and so forth to make it work. The Attorney General referred to a petition being circulated. At this point I do not have a copy of it and for the benefit of the member for Moose Jaw . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . which part of Moose Jaw? For the benefit of the member for Moose Jaw who spoke before, not I have not signed that because I haven't even seen it in the final draft, so how can I sign it? But let's get back to the impassioned speech made by the Attorney General as we got into this debate. He referred to politics and so forth, I suggest the only one today that has really made . . . I might have made a very passionate speech yesterday to keep the House in session so we could deal with these amendments as we are doing today. I'm glad to say we're still here and going to deal with them, and hopefully, cure the problems – the immediate problems. It's also interesting to hear the Attorney General indicate for the first time, not the member for the opposition but the Attorney General, now they will reconsider the size of the authority. It wasn't myself or the member for Kindersley – it was the Attorney General.

Let me suggest to the Attorney General . . . He seems from his seat to be adding. It was a press release – I guess that's one I missed, Attorney General. It hasn't arrived at my desk yet. I'm glad to see you are now going to accept from the people of the area – I refer to the council of Corman Park, the council of the city of Saskatoon, and I assume, the group that Mr. Hamm represents – their concerns about the total project and its effect on the people of Saskatoon. It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General makes the comment about the one meeting that was held that Mr. Andrews and myself were at but he makes no reference to another meeting held by another councillor who has not taken his seat but was elected in the last election in the area. He makes no reference to the meeting he called where I was not present. Neither was the member for Kindersley. That was a meeting called by the people, a councillor again in the area, to discuss what has come to light on the total project. I go back to it just because of references made earlier by the Attorney General to a year ago, the comments that I made in the House, which indicated partisan politics. I was referring, and let's get it back in context, as the Attorney General suggested to me about one of my comments – that I had left off the last three or four words. I suggest to the Attorney General that was not intentional.

On April 23, 1979, (page 1949 for the Attorney General's information, near the bottom of the page) I made comments after the Meewasin authority was released, about the plan, that a portion of the land which the Eldorado nuclear plant was acquiring options on fell within the authority's responsibility. Immediately I was chastised in the press by the Attorney General for playing politics. I was quoting a fact. I was chastised politically. He took the first political shots. And the Attorney General opened the first political shots in this debate. Several days later he agreed that the statement I had made was correct. I assume he was suggesting that that was the end of the political portion of the debate between the government and myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Did he apologize?

MR. KATZMAN: – The member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) asks me if he apologized. You know, I don't recollect an apology from the Attorney General either in the press or in this House that, yes, I was right on those comments and that he was man enough to admit I was right. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General made the statement and I quote the words. He said that this bill is less than perfect. He refers to the original bill, I agree with the member, and that's why we're here discussing amendments today. And as I said earlier, the member for Kindersley referred to the legal jargon which he and the Attorney

General can address as long as they so wish, but let's talk about the human aspects.

Let's talk about the people, the people affected by this legislation and their concerns. If you, Mr. Speaker, or the Attorney General had been at either one of the two meetings that were mentioned by myself earlier, you would have heard the concerns of the people, the misunderstandings of the present rules. If the Attorney General had had the pleasure of sitting beside me at the meeting, he would have been there while one person told a farmer sitting across the table that you can't even put in a fence post without permission for the thing. I turned to the section in the Meewasin authority that I had with me and said to the gentlemen, that's nonsense. Here's what the act says, read it for yourself. It says it depends on a . . . there's a value there. It was \$2,000. I was glad to hear, as the chairman has indicated to me, they were thinking of raising that \$2,000 to a higher level. I'm glad to see today that the Attorney General in his way of bringing in amendments has suggested a much higher level than even I expected. That's an interesting situation. I think that maybe either directly or indirectly, the people at that meeting have to the Attorney General. I'm not sure if I compliment the Attorney General or the Meewasin authority which has 10 people sitting on its board, of which he is one.

I think we should also note – the Attorney General says, don't give me any credit, give me all the brain. You know, I wonder how he feels personally because in checking this very closely, and I wasn't sure of it until the other day, he lives in the controlled area. No? Buffer zone. This map isn't clear then. O.K., he lives in the buffer zone. I'm certain the Attorney General, as a member of the committee, has totally done his duty, not with personal feelings to his own involvement living in the area, not at all showing any bias. Now I sincerely believe that, even though the Attorney General indicated, and the reason I'm making this particular comment, that some people in Saskatchewan have made comments I think are totally unfair to people like Mr. Cliff Wright. I'm totally disappointed with people who make those kinds of comments about a mayor for which I have very much respect.

Mr. Attorney General, let's go back to some of the comments made by some of the people at the meeting held in Saskatoon that was referred to by the Attorney General. Some statements were very, very exaggerated, in my opinion. Some statements, where some people were asking for clarification of what does this mean and what does that mean were legitimate concerns. In some cases, I would comment that Mr. Bolstad had the answers, or as he said, in some cases I was not there when that was decided, and therefore, the vice-chairman was able to throw some light on those particular issues.

A lot of people walked away with good feelings as result of some of the comments made by the gentleman who represents the university on the Meewasin authority board. He said he would do his best to get answers back. If any of them would give him specific question, he would reply in writing. Mr. Bolstad with the same thing. In fact, I was a little surprised at one comment that was made. It was that if you bring me that particular offer I'll sign it right now and you don't have to wait for 14 days. He indicated that the act called for 14 days but they were doing it much more speedily. He was complimented on that, but then he was asked then why do you need it? There were people making comments and the Attorney General referred to one of them, about why do we need another way of taking land? The city has the authority now. Corman Park has the authority, so why do we need additional ways?.

It was interesting to note that the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) was commenting on that particular issue when he spoke earlier. Mr. Speaker, some of the other things that the people spoke about were the wiggly lines that were shown down

in the area which I would call the Pike Lake low road area, and how it ran through fields and yards and so forth, and they were concerned that this was the specific plan of how this road would run. Some of their fears were lessened when they explained that that's a concept, that isn't exactly how the road will run. That is a concept, and therefore, obviously we would consider using areas that are presently roadways, causing the least amount of disturbance upon private land.

Another one of the issues brought forth at that meeting, and I don't think any of these people were planted to say these things, or make these comments that I'm referring to, was from a gentleman who was talking about irrigation. He had been doing some work on irrigating, and had spent so many thousands of dollars to prepared his land for irrigation. Hoping he could expand his operation he had put in large capacity pipes that were needed at the time, with the understanding he would be able to increase his acreage of land he is planning to irrigate. He indicated how much better his crop is now that he is watering it versus when he wasn't. Therefore, he was concerned. Who does he apply to? The act says one thing, and somebody else said something else. Well, Mr. Bolstad informed him he would give him a reply in the next couple of days but assumed it would be through the same process as it has been, the Department of agriculture. Well, the gentleman of course was waiting for an answer and I don't know what the answer was or if he has received one to date.

The Attorney General during his comments and as I say, maybe I didn't receive the press report which indicates you are going to look at additional land . . . you know, Mr. Speaker, very often I'm tempted to get in a debate with the Attorney General but sometimes the best way to handle this situation is ignore the comments and stick to the topic we are discussing – better known as the Meewasin authority. You know, today I received, Mr. Speaker, just a few moments ago, the explanatory notes for Bill No. 46. Yesterday we received the bill for the first time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I cannot resist the comments from the member for Duck Lake (Mr. Hammersmith). If he remembers correctly, and I think at this time I can correct the record. I said it is unfortunate and in the context – not the exact words; I will not be able to quote . . .

I was stating that while there was pressing business affecting people that we should handle, should we go home? That was the comment I made, Mr. Speaker, the comments that were made at that meeting I have passed along to the members of the Assembly. I am hoping that within due course, in time the Attorney General indicates, we will hear the concerns of the people that were at those meetings, and the concerns of the people affected by this legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the concept of a river edge authority, however, we believe the people who are directly affected must have their rights respected. To this end we will indicate our support for the concept of a river edge authority. We will be introducing amendments which we believe will respect the rights of those affected and restore confidence of those affected by the river edge authority. If these amendments are not accepted, if these substantive amendments are not accepted or ones of similar intent, we will be voting against the bill in third reading. We believe this clear statement of principle is not only applicable to Meewasin but also to any other river authorities introduced by this government or future governments. To reinforce the principles we believe in, I hereby table the amendments for the consideration of this House.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon-Centre): – Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this bill. First of all I'd like to make some remarks in relation to remarks made by the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) and also the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). I can very well understand why the member for Kindersley certainly doesn't want to look into the past because if he looks into the past he'll find out the bill was introduced and if he looks at the present he'll find out we have introduced amendments and that should be a pretty good indication that in the future there will be, if necessary, further amendments made. And that's I think a show of good faith to the people. He also mentioned something about Eldorado. I don't really know what the problem there is with you fellows. If you're so terribly concerned with Eldorado Nuclear I would imagine that you have by now sent hundreds and hundreds of telegrams to your Prime Minister, Prime Minister Clark, because after all it does come within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

In Ray Hnatyshyn's constituency – well, I like Ray Hnatyshyn as an individual and I'm not going to drag in names like you people have and I'll be getting to that in just a minute. I said, as an individual I certainly like Ray Hnatyshyn. He and I get along very well. I disagree with him politically and he disagrees with me politically but we certainly respect one another. But I want to say one thing – when the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) got up, I don't know what . . . have the standards for law school changed recently, Mr. Attorney General? I don't know but I tell you after that pathetic talk you gave I wouldn't really want you to draw a pail of water let alone draw up a will or some sort of an agreement. Because it was a pathetic case and I can well understand because you don't have as much direct concern – although I certainly agree you have concern. But you wouldn't have as much concern say, as possibly the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). You're talking about the citizens action group and I certainly commend people for getting together and expressing their views. But I'll tell you I don't commend political hacks who are out to do hatchet jobs – who are out to say well, look, we don't want to shore up this legislation, we don't want to make changes but you know if the foundation is weak or something like that, let's not get a new foundation but let's blow up the whole building. I maintain there have been some political hacks around and I say you fellows have been involved pedalling your cheap, political bias – trying to get a few votes and I tell you, you may gain a few votes in the short term but in the long term you're going to suffer and you're going to suffer dearly. But if you don't care about your children and our grandchildren and the kind of environment they're going to live in, that will rest on your consciences and not on ours.

Now to pick out a man like Wes Bolstad and to do a hatchet job on him when he can't defend himself is, in your usual manner, despicable. The man is a respected member of the community. He's doing his job. He's the executive director and he works under the authority of the Meewasin Valley Authority. If you want to kick anybody, kick the members of the authority . . . (inaudible) . . . Well, yes, the Attorney General says, kick the Attorney General around. I would sooner see that than see you people kick the members of the authority around and the various organizations and institutions that they represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – Let me tell you one thing. When you talk about Wes Bolstad being a political hack you're simply saying that the president of the university, the Mayor of Saskatoon and the Reeve of Corman Park don't have good judgment and we maintain that they do have good judgment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – Now the hon. member says something about information relative to mortgages – no mortgages being available. Money is not being made available relative to situations on the riverbank or within the area. What I would like to ask you is where did you get your information? You certainly didn't tell the House where you got your information. Do you have an inside?

AN HON. MEMBER: – Wes Bolstad.

MR. MOSTOWAY: – Well, I would certainly agree with you that Wes Bolstad is a good man and if he thought that his board would want. But why get up and stand – you're a lawyer here and you're supposed to know a little bit about law and a little bit about argument – why get up and make that kind of a statement and not indicate the source of your information? I maintain that there are some shady motives for that kind of nonsense.

Now, he says something about the by-law making power of the authority. Well the authority wants that kind of by-law making authority on the recommendation of the various institutions and organizations that they represent – the city, the university and Corman Park. If you're questioning those jurisdictions, well fine, Let that rest on your conscience, not mine.

Now they're talking about university autonomy. I know a number of people at the university including some of the people who are involved in administration and I've never, never heard anybody even suggest that university autonomy might be threatened by the legislation by the Meewasin Valley Authority. I can think of one individual who has employment with the university. He may feel that something is threatened but I can assure you that the president certainly doesn't feel that way. I think that we, on this side of the House, respect the president of the University of Saskatchewan. I say that you have somebody probably employed by the university and I wouldn't dare to presume as to who that might be, although I could take a stab in the dark. I would probably be correct but that kind of nonsense simply should not be allowed in this House and I would ask the member to apologize.

The gentleman was talking about a highrise. Let me assure you that (I don't know if you're talking about the highrise at Five Corners or close to Five Corners in Saskatoon) my constituents who live in that area have a very direct concern relative to the possibility of a highrise being built at that particular location.

The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) admits a mistake and I give him credit for something that he made a mistake. Now if I made a mistake too and I went around paddling political bias, going to meetings and not saying anything (and I know this to be the case) . . . No, he never lied and I would not ever suggest that he did. But I would suggest that I know some people who thought that he remained strangely silent when certain issues came up, issues when he could have enlightened the people who attended that meeting. I also suggest you had sort of an obligation to say, well, is there somebody from government present, particularly in light of the fact that you want to criticize government. Did you make that move? Did you suggest to the person or person who called those particular meetings that perhaps somebody from governments, from cabinet, possibly the Attorney General or one of the private members be present? I don't think you did.

December 13, 1979

The gentleman talks about Mrs. McKercher, certainly a woman that we greatly admire and respect, and Carol Teichrob and the mayor. He drags in the mayor there and then he says but I have great respect for him. Well, let me assure you we have a lot of respect for the Mayor of Saskatoon also. You don't have a monopoly on that. He runs a good ship and I think all the aldermen are of top notch quality also.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call it 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.