

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 14, 1979

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): – I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to introduce to the Chamber the new chairperson of the advisory council on the status of women. I'm sure that all members will want to welcome Margaret Fern, the new chairperson here to the Chamber and wish her well with respect to her work on behalf of the women of Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Key Lake Board of Inquiry

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Premier in absence of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman). Mr. Premier, I have in my hand this morning an order in council setting up a Key Lake Board of Inquiry. The Premier will know that we have already committed several millions of dollars in this Key Lake project. Could the Premier tell us if this is indicative of future projects where you spend millions and millions of dollars and then call an inquiry into environmental impact of the projects?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, I think that is the conundrum of environmental impact studies wherever they are. Either one has a study at the outset of the project where information on the precise impact on the environment is not available or one has a study when the information with respect to the precise impact on the environment is available. It is not possible to have both, as environmental impact studies are presently structured either in this province or in any other province.

Accordingly all of the jurisdictions in Canada operate on the principle that environmental impact studies shall proceed only after the publication of an environmental impact report which contains precise details. This involves extensive preparation, extensive engineering work, extensive site location work in order to be able to say where the plant would be built, where the foundations would be, where the effluent would be discharged and the like. And accordingly, if the procedures remain and they are in this province and everywhere else, that the public are to know what the project is before called upon to comment on it, extensive work is going to be done prior to environmental impact assessment hearings.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): – Supplementary to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. You have sunk millions of dollars into this Key Lake project and you're committed to it. Would you not agree that the only reason for this inquiry is public pressure generated out of concern for your policy in uranium development and that further this inquiry is nothing more than an exercise in window dressing?

MR. BLAKENEY: – The answer is no on each count. It has been the policy of this

government and will continue to be the policy of this government to have environmental impact hearings on all major projects. The policy was enunciated in our election platforms and has been adhered to.

With respect to whether or not it is window dressing, the answer most assuredly is no, it is not. There are undoubtedly going to be extensive recommendations coming forward from the hearings as there have been at Cluff Lake and as there have been at Poplar River and elsewhere. The recommendations of the environmental impact assessment board have been in the past given close consideration and will in the future be given close consideration both with respect to Key Lake and otherwise.

MR. LARTER: – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier do you really believe that the people of Saskatchewan are naive enough to believe that with you as the referee on environment, you would reverse the decision that's already been made at Key Lake?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I never know for sure how naive the people of Saskatchewan are. I am aware that members opposite frequently overestimate the level of naivete, at least when presenting their election program . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – . . . since I can't imagine what else they're relying upon to have some of the programs I've heard accepted by the public. But I have found the public of Saskatchewan to be other than naive. I have found them to be pretty hard headed and pretty realistic in knowing what's going on.

AN HON. MEMBER: – And they're going to dump you in 1983.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I repeat, I expect the people of Saskatchewan to be pretty realistic and accordingly, I most assuredly dissociate myself from the remarks of the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Chairman of the Environmental Assessment Board

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – New question to the Premier (Mr. Blakeney). Arising out of the questions of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson), the question I suggest, Mr. Premier, is that the public will be somewhat skeptical of this inquiry in view of the proceedings that have transpired this summer and in view of various calls for information that were denied. My question to you, Mr. Premier, is relating to the choice of the person that will head up this inquiry. I suggest to you that along with the skepticism is going to be the fact that you have a former deputy minister, a person who is now practising law in Saskatoon and who is without any question, a close friend of the Attorney General. I suggest does this not lead to further skepticism as to the genuineness of the inquiry into this whole problem?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Wait, Mr. Speaker, let me comment on that in two ways. First with respect to whether or not Mr. Mitchell will be a good chairman. I believe that Mr. Mitchell, when he was an officer of this government, was held in high regard by the people with whom he dealt, not only people within the government circle but of all

political persuasions. He has had a distinguished career in the practice of law in Regina prior to his assuming the post of deputy minister. He practised law with the Government of Canada and he then was deputy minister; he's now back practising law and I think he will be highly regarded.

Secondly, he is in the private practice of law. He is not an employee of the Government of Saskatchewan. I call to the attention of hon. members that there's another environmental assessment board dealing with the question of a uranium refinery appointed by the government of Mr. Clark. I am advised – I'm sure it can't be the case but I'm advised – that the members of it are actual employees of the Government of Canada. If this is so, then it indicates that at least in the opinion of the Government of Canada that persons who are much closer to the government of the day than a person who was a former employee can do an adequate job of environmental assessment. In each case, I remind hon. members, in the case of the refinery the application is a wholly owned emanation of the Government of Canada; in the case of Key Lake, the applicant is a 50 per cent emanation of the Government of Saskatchewan.

SGEA Strike – Health Services

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): – A question to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, you indicated in an interview that the health situation in Saskatchewan was under control and that the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strike did not pose a danger to the well-being of Saskatchewan citizens. As community nurses provide a very specialized type of care to the regions they serve, could you please inform this House as to who is supplying these services in the interim?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): – Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I can't answer the question in any definitive statement this morning, because I am not quite sure to whom you are referring. Are you referring to the public health nurses? Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure to whom she is referring at this particular time. She'll have to be more definitive in her question.

MRS. DUNCAN: – I'm referring to the community nurses who provide preventive and intervention services, drug scheduling, outpatient counselling. I believe there are seven and three-quarters in Regina.

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement. I will direct or I will make the answer available to the member privately or if this House sits next week, I will make it available to her next week. I simply haven't that answer at my fingertips as to who is providing that particular service, but I can assure her that if there are any emergency cases, as I indicated before, we have contingency plans at our fingertips that we could put into effect . . . will you please quit rattling your brains? I can't hear over here.

Mr. Speaker, in my answer to the question from the individual for Maple Creek, I want to indicate to her again and assure the people of Saskatchewan that if there are emergency cases, they can be taken care of. I'm not being made aware that there are any. If she has any particular instances, I wish she'd bring them to my attention, so I can, as Minister of Health, immediately take some action to take care of them.

SGEA Strike – Psychiatric Patients

MRS. DUNCAN: – A new question to the minister. Has your department considered the

stress factor on psychiatric outpatients that the strike has caused and the undue pressures on them? I believe that the three hospitals in Regina, their emergency wards have been swamped with outpatients suffering great stress to the point of being a crisis situation, and your department has done nothing.

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say there is no crisis situation. I am in daily contact with my officials who are in contact daily with the three hospitals in Regina and the Regina Mental Health Clinic. I am told that everything is in hand and I say again, to the public of Saskatchewan, if the critic of health has any particular case that she considers an emergency, please let me know, so that I can take action in that particular instance. If you don't have, please quit generalizing that there is a crisis in Saskatchewan, because there isn't. I am told by my officials, I'm told by the officials of the three hospitals here in Regina and Saskatoon that things are under control. I ask again of the health critic to please give me the specific cases, so that I can carry out my responsibilities in meeting the needs of the people of Saskatchewan in these trying times.

MRS. DUNCAN: – Supplementary. Would you consider it a crisis that one person was brought into the emergency ward of the General Hospital last week, three times, with an overdose of drugs? Is that an emergency or not?

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the member is that naive that she would not think that these kinds of things don't go on every day – every day whether there's a strike or there isn't a strike. Mr. Speaker, from the words that are emanating from the opposition, I sometimes wonder whether I shouldn't have a psychiatrist sitting on that side to diagnose whether they have had overdoses of some kind. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it has affected their upper capacities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the critic again, look, if you have cases please be specific about them. I can assure you and I will assure the people in this House and the people of Saskatchewan that there are no emergency cases. They are being taken care of and if you have cases, I will act on them immediately, but until you have specific . . . if you have specific cases, Leader of the Opposition, give me the names. It is your responsibility to give me those names and I will act on them.

SGEA Strike – Technical Institute Classes

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Continuing Education. You have indicated to me and to this House that you plan to use the holidays to make up for lost time in the technical institutes. Mr. Minister, if the strike should be settled before Christmas, is it your intention to use a portion of the Christmas holidays to start classes at the institutes in Saskatchewan?

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): – Mr. Speaker, with respect to the utilization of the Christmas holidays, that is something that can only be determined when the strike has been completed and when arrangements can be made to utilize the available holidays. At the present time it is simply not possible to make an accurate prediction about whether the Christmas holidays can or cannot be utilized because we do not have the instructors on staff as a result of their being on strike. Discussions will have to be held with them in order to define what can be done over the Christmas holidays if they are back to work during that period.

MR. TAYLOR: – A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Surely, the minister

understands that there are only so many days in the school year that are holiday days, which are basically Christmas, the recess in April or at Easter, and the summer holidays. You are receiving as well as I am, numerous phone calls from students who are wondering whether they should be dropping out of the institutes at this time and seeking employment, or whether they will be able to complete their courses. Will you not sit down and develop a contingency plan and let these students know so that they can make this important choice for their future?

MR. McARTHUR: – Mr. Speaker, the out-of-scope staff who are at work at the institutes will meet with any students who wish to meet with them and discuss possible plans they might make. The hon. member suggests that we should make specific and final contingency plans at this time. I might point out to the hon. member that that is virtually an impossible expectation because we cannot tell exactly when the work stoppage will finish. When we know the exact nature of the time that has been lost, then we can make exact and definite contingency plans.

I have pointed out to the member earlier on a couple of occasions that it is not just the holiday periods during the regular term that we are looking at. We are also looking at opportunities for compression within the teaching program. And we are looking, as a last alternative, at the possibility of extending the courses beyond their normal completion date. But all of those things must be worked out when we have a definite picture of what the problem is.

Water Supply Improvement Plan

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): – Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman), but in his absence, I will go to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the proposals of the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw concerning a 12 mile pipeline being installed to bypass Buffalo Pound Lake and perhaps continue on to Diefenbaker Lake, thus improving the quality of water?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have received any proposal from the city of Regina or the city of Saskatoon about their proposed pipeline project. The only knowledge I have of it would be incomplete news reports that I have read. I think it would be inappropriate for me to comment on whether or not I agree with the cities' plans when they have not, so far as I am aware, communicated them to the government or requested any comment or opinion by the government on the proposal.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When they do come with these proposals, when the two cities in intervening areas finalize their proposals, Mr. Premier, would our government lend the cost of the project for 35 years . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! I'll take the next question.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – New question then. I ask the Premier are the people of Regina and Moose Jaw not as important as Eaton's and Chartwood?

Occupational Health Standards – Big River

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): – A question to the minister responsible for occupational health. Mr. Minister, there is a work place in the province of Saskatchewan which I think is in deplorable condition and I would like to know if you agree with these conditions or if you think your department should do something about them.

First of all, the fire-doors are all locked from the inside with eyebolts. It's an indoor work place. The people are required, because of the poor heat, to wear outside clothes. The windows are all covered over and the air situation is very bad. These type of situation, I understand Mr. Minister, are not acceptable by occupational health. Is that correct?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): – Well, I wish the hon. member would identify the particular structure. I presume that is his supplementary. But obviously healthy and safe working conditions are the objectives of the Department of Labour through the occupational health and safety division and we expect under all circumstances that those standards will be met. I wait anxiously for the member's supplementary.

MR. TAYLOR: – Supplementary to the Minister of Education (Mr. McArthur). I would be happy to identify the places. Mr. Minister, this is the kindergarten to grade 3 school in Big River, Saskatchewan in which these conditions exist. The minister of occupational health indicates that they are not the standards that this province wants to maintain. My question to you is, what are you going to do about it?

MR. SNYDER: – I would be anxious . . . if the question was directed to the Minister of Education . . .

Obviously if the discrepancies from compliance with the requirements are drawn to the department's attention, we will be looking into the matter very closely. At this point in time it has not been brought to our attention, to my knowledge. Accordingly, I await anxiously some word from those people directly concerned.

MR. TAYLOR: – Supplementary. I believe the Minister of Education, if he checked his records, would find that this school district has made applications four times for a new school. In this school there are many handicapped students who have to be carried upstairs. Will you, Mr. Minister, before Christmas, visit this school to assess the deplorable conditions that exist there?

HON. D.F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education) Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the school construction plans are developed by the local school boards and then prioritized by the boards and submissions are made to the Department of Education. Then, through discussions with the boards and the regional superintendents, decisions are made about what school projects can be constructed in any given year. My understanding is that the Big River board has placed a priority on this particular school for the coming school year. We will certainly be giving that all of its due attention and serious consideration. As for any plans I might have for visits between now and Christmas, those are matters that I will have to make on my own.

MR. TAYLOR: – Supplementary. New question. The plans have come to the department two times, Mr. Minister, and have been refused. I would again request that you please send an official or yourself to visit this. I think this is a deplorable situation for students in Saskatchewan to be in.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! New question, but I will allow the minister to respond.

MR. McARTHUR: – Mr. Speaker, if I might just clarify. I'm quite confident the regional superintendent has visited this school. I have received information about this school from the regional superintendent and I am confident that it was based on a personal visit.

Bottle Collection Program

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman). Mr. Premier, for some time members on this side of the House have been calling for your government to bring in a bottle collection program similar to that of Alberta. Has your government completed any studies in this regard? Or will you now commit yourself to instituting this worthwhile program.

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister of Industry (Mr. Vickar) to reply. Some work has been done and he will be more familiar with the details than I.

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): – Mr. Speaker, yes, the Department of Industry and Commerce is in the process of studying a program that we can make work in the province of Saskatchewan, but not necessarily based on the Alberta program. That Alberta program, Mr. Speaker, is very rich and I don't think the people of the province of Saskatchewan are prepared to subsidize the program to the tune of about \$5 million to \$6 million.

MR. HAM: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar). Mr. Minister, within your plans would you also consider as a means of employment utilizing the handicapped for the collection of these bottles?

MR. VICKAR: – Well, Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that we have been in consultation with the handicapped people of the province, and we are trying to work these types of people into our program.

Waterfowl Damage Payments

MR. J.W.A. GARNER (Wilkie): – Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy). Mr. Minister, to my knowledge the Saskatchewan Canadian waterfowl damage claims have not been paid yet. When are these going to be paid through the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Board?

HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): – Mr. Speaker, I'm not up to date on payment structure. I assume as soon as the claims are complete, filed and worked through, that payments will be forwarded to the applicants. I suspect it may well be part of the federal-provincial agreement. I know from our point of view it has been signed but I don't know the detailed arrangements following the signing. I assume that's a job for the civil service to pursue, but I'm sure that the applicants will receive their moneys as soon as it is possible to do so.

MR. GARNER: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, these crops were destroyed last September and October and these claims were sent in. They still have not been paid. Mr. Minister, the Saskatchewan crop employees contract expires on December 31, 1979. Now, we're almost through December. If these employees go out on strike – and could be out – the farmers of Saskatchewan will once again suffer, and not receive the money that is duly entitled them. When is your department going to take action and make sure these farmers get paid?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – Well, Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my earlier remarks that from Saskatchewan's point of view we had received from the federal government agreements relating to this particular program. As the hon. member knows, for this year it's a cost-shared agreement. We have signed the agreement. It's the agreement with the federal government, and it's signed for Saskatchewan by both the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Gross) and the Minister of Agriculture. We forwarded that agreement back to Ottawa. The agreement has not been signed as yet by the Ottawa government. Now it has been signed, Mr. Speaker, it has not been returned to the Government of Saskatchewan. Now I think it's legitimate that we wait until we receive the agreement from the Ottawa government before making payment. If we have an agreement, I think the agreement should be honored and I indicated to the hon. member in my earlier answer that as soon as it is humanly possible we'll make the payments to the farmers.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 46 – An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act

Section 1

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Chairman, before we agree to this, I would like to just make my position clear to the opposition with respect to this amendment. I don't believe this amendment be crucial to the validity of the bill. I think it tidies up the bill. I would like to get it through. It will be an amendment to the bill and it will require (if we get out of committee of the whole) leave of the opposition to read the bill a third time later this day. If I could have the undertaking of the opposition that they will give us that leave, based on this amendment, I will proceed with it. If they will not give us that undertaking I won't proceed with the amendment and entertain the amendment because it is not critical to the validity of the bill.

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – I can assure the Attorney General that it is not the intention of this side of the House to try to hold up anything on such a minor point as the year 1979 or 1980. I can give that assurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: – Debate continues on section 1 as amended.

MR. ANDREW: – My first question is to the Attorney General. He made a fair to-do yesterday about the fact that if the Meewasin Valley Authority was reduced in size it would be tantamount to giving approval to the construction of a high-rise apartment building on Five Corners (what is commonly referred to as Five Corners in Saskatoon). Would the Attorney General agree that the city of Saskatoon has the legal power to stop the construction of that proposed high-rise apartment building in Saskatoon regardless of the Meewasin Valley Authority, in the event the Meewasin Valley Authority was not in existence?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I will neither agree nor disagree. I do not know. I have not perused the city by-laws of the city of Saskatoon.

I said in the course of the second reading debate, and I repeat again, that on 92 metres

with a 10 per cent or 20 per cent gradient (whatever the figure is), it is possible the project such as Five Corners could be beyond the reach of the Meewasin Valley Authority.

MR. ANDREW: – Would the Attorney General agree that the legal process is available through The Urban Municipality Act to allow a city to stop that type of construction, that the mechanics are in the laws as they presently exist?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I have not made a study of the urban municipality law with respect to this question. I would presume that a city does have the power to enact zoning by-laws which could affect any kind of property depending upon the nature of the zoning by-laws and height restrictions and the like. So to that extent the answer would have to be, in a very general way, yes.

On the question of the Five Corners, I again take the position of offering no opinion. The matter is before the courts – I think indeed today – and I do not think it proper to comment on that specific example and I won't.

MR. ANDREW: – The second question, Mr. Attorney General. Reading from the commencement of your earlier statements you sort of indicated that these amendments were prompted by citizen's action group concerns about the wide-ranging scope or efforts of this particular legislation. As a result you are answering these concerns by, I take it, these amendments somewhat reducing the power of the authority. That is sort of the position advanced by you, a position advanced to say that we are going to listen to the concerns of these citizens. We are prepared to pull back. We want to find some type of a compromise. Now that seems to be the position being advanced by you. The member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble), on the other hand, says that his position – and I can't quote from Hansard as they are not ready yet – seems to be that quite frankly there should be more power given to Meewasin Valley; that there's not enough as it is now and we should have more power. What I'm simply saying is that I suppose, in the words of another politician, you can't have it both way. It seems that the people of Saskatoon and Corman park are going to be saying, sure we're moving in this direction, but another member of the same party is saying, yeah, but we should be moving in this direction. That is still going to be a concern and I think that is a concern that has to be addressed.

MR. ROMANOW: – Well, Mr. Chairman, I repeat again it will be a concern only if the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) and the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) and others choose to fan the concern. I say that I did not interpret the words of the member for Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) in the way that the member for Kindersley fashions. The member for Sutherland says that he would personally not favor a diminution of the authority of the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) as proposed by these amendments. That's what I think he says. And his argument essentially is the same kind of argument that I answered or tried to answer in rebuttal with respect to the Wascana Centre powers. I went through all those sections that the Wascana Centre Act has. The member didn't quite say this but his logical conclusion is look, it's worked in Wascana without alienation of private rights or these horrendous things which you and others envisage, why wouldn't it work in Meewasin? It would, he would say; therefore, as a minimum he says, I would doubt in my preferred route. But the member for Sutherland also went on to say – and I make this point absolutely clear and you will recall this – that he views these amendments as a compromise. And as a consequence that was the exact words that he used – he is prepared to accept them, because it's a compromise between what he and others think would be one position and another group of people

perhaps at the other end of the spectrum would present as a contrary position. It's a compromise position.

The government's position is very clear. The government is three seats out of ten. We are in a partnership with Corman Park, Saskatoon City, and the board of governors. We will act in the way that the partnership directs us to act. The partnership has asked us to introduce these amendments. We are acting on behalf of that because we are the instrumentality to implement those requests for amendments. And that is our position. My own personal view is, as a member of the authority, that we will meet with any legitimate interest group or individual to continue to work on refining and allaying concerns and trying to put down the hubbub that I think was created – I won't make my second reading speech again – in some areas maliciously, the hubbub to meet these kinds of concerns. That's the position of the government and it is the position of MVA.

MR. ANDREW: – You make reference often to the Wascana authority. Does the minister have or can the minister provide a comparison, even in rough terms, as to the amount of private property under the Wascana authority as compared to the amount of private property under the Meewasin Valley Authority?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I can't give you the statistic but I would candidly limit that there is an unbalance. There is a lot more private property within the Meewasin Valley Authority as opposed to Wascana Centre Authority. But look, while that's important in terms of the pragmatism of any bill or program, let's not get off onto that fact if the issue is the principle of the legislation. Now the way it was advanced to me yesterday in second reading (I don't want to exacerbate the issue but certainly that's the way it's advocated by some groups in Regina) is it's the principle of the thing – the powers of clouding the title and the right to first refusal and all of that excess of government. In that regard, there is absolutely no difference. That was the weight of my remarks in law and in practice with respect to Wascana and Meewasin. there may be some changes of detail but in substance, the principle remains unchanged and that is the answer that I give. It's true that there is a lot more private property.

MR. ANDREW: – I think the minister would also agree that the substantial amount of private property is probably the cause of more reaction here than there was in Wascana. I mean clearly it's the private landholder or the private farmer who is somewhat concerned. Just to state, 'I suppose get the minister's position clear. I think he indicated yesterday that it was his intention, following the adjournment of the House and prior to the reopening of the House, to meet with various people and he is prepared to modify the boundaries. Is the minister giving the undertaking that he is prepared to reduce the boundaries of Meewasin Valley Authority or is prepared to have the authority look at that?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I want to make this absolutely clear to the member, to the House, to the press and to the public. The minister cannot undertake anything as the minister for the authority. If I did, I would simply override the University of Saskatchewan Board of Governors and their president. I would run roughshod over the city of Saskatoon and their council and I would run roughshod over the rural municipality of Corman Park, their council and their nominee. I repeat this as minister. I will do what the other parties on the authority request us to do. The other parties on the authority have indicated by press release that they are prepared to listen to individual groups and organizations with respect to the boundaries if that is the case. We will be doing that over the next several months, several weeks, whatever the time process is. Obviously, it can't be done overnight. I express that intention. I do that on behalf of all

the parties but I don't do that because the minister is agreeing or somehow I can agree to it. Where I wanted to change or not change the boundaries, there are three other actors in this who would have to make the decision.

The second point that I would like to make is with respect to Wascana Centre. I would like to make it clear lest I confuse the House and the public, when Wascana Centre was passed in 1962 of thereabout, there was a lot of private ownership in that area and the bill passed that these sections (and I've given you the parallel sections) . . . It's true that, as it's developed through a variety of programs and just the natural growth in the city and the evolution, today's circumstances make it not unparallel. But there was a lot of private ownership and still is a lot of private ownership in Wascana Centre though not by the same comparable numbers because of individual lots and houses, that's true. In the Wascana area, there is more country land but it worked under Wascana Centre with everybody's approval and consent and I say it will work with Meewasin Valley Authority given good will on everybody's part.

MR. ANDREW: – The point I was making or attempting to make, Mr. Minister, is that the problem that has been experienced with Meewasin Valley has primarily come from the farming area in the Corman Park area and what the minister is basically saying is that that is the part of the Meewasin authority that sets it apart from the Wascana and makes that analogy somewhat questionable.

MR. ROMANOW: – I'm saying two things: that there's more private land in the Meewasin Valley Authority today than there is in the Wascana Centre Authority and in modelling our MVA bill we tried to take this into account. Maybe we didn't do it perfectly, but we tried to take it into account. The second point that I'm making is that there is a principle running through both bills which is similar and it has worked. And the position you fellows have to take and everybody who opposes the amendments, if there are any, is to address the principle of the issue. Now I realize there's a bit of overlapping here but you can't sort of say well, you know we can draw the boundaries a little bit smaller, the principle of authoritarian government is a good one – they're both concurrent so that's the only point I'm trying to make.

MR. R. KATZMAN: – Mr. Minister, with the statement that you made (not to this question you've just answered but the previous question) that it's a partnership as you indicated earlier, yesterday in second reading I asked the minister if he had a copy of the motion made by Corman park the other day. Now I understand, this is a verbal copy that I received this morning from Mr. Jamieson who is the secretary and I will read the motion itself:

I move for a recorded vote and that the Corman Park council withdraw support of the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) at the end of the fiscal year, unless we have something very concrete from the Attorney General that the act as it now reads has deletions made of some very objectionable clauses and the boundaries of the MVA be brought back to the river edge as intended.

Now that is a motion passed at a duly called Corman Park council meeting. The vote was seven in favor, four against. Do I understand from the Attorney General's nod that he now has a copy of this motion.

MR. ROMANOW: – No, I'm nodding to my pal, Garnet Holtzmann here, my advisor . . .

MR. KATZMAN: – Seeing as the Attorney General does not have a copy . . . with the intended motion of Corman Park, what does this mean to the partnership as the Attorney General called it earlier? If Corman Park has suggested they're out, does that actually mean that at the end of the fiscal years if they don't receive some commitment from the Attorney General, what happens to the MVA? Does it dismantle? Does it continue to go? What happens, because this is one of the partners?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, first of all that is a speculative question which I'm not prepared to answer at this time because the motion, so-called, indicates that there have to be two things: removal of some very objectionable sections and there have to be some boundaries looked at. I'm going to be asking the rural municipality of Corman Park and I hope the MVA does, to give us specific details of these so-called very objectionable sections and we'll see which ones of those we can attend to and which ones we can't. I hope that these amendments will have answered many of the objectionable sections. I will also ask the rural municipality of Corman Park to give us in specific detail what their proposals are with respect to the boundaries and we'll see what their position is there – those that the MVA can adjust to and those that the MVA cannot adjust to. We'll see how it goes at the end of March. I'd like to know where the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) stands. Does he believe that MVA should drop out if we don't satisfy very objectionable sections as the Corman Park resolution says?

MR. KATZMAN: – Mr. Chairman, the question is very simple. I realize, and maybe some members in the House do not, that first of all on January 3 the ratepayers of Corman Park have requested a meeting of the total Corman Park council and I understand, and this is strictly an understanding that I received from one of the people on the Meewasin Authority that hopefully the whole board (which would require the three from the university, the ones from the government and the ones from the city and the ones from Corman park) will be at that meeting to explain the Meewasin in more detail and I commend the board if they do that. I think that's an excellent idea, maybe to explain what's happening.

I also understand that there is an in-camera meeting, going to be held in a very short few days. (I'm not sure of the date, somebody from over on that side can maybe tell me), where behind closed doors, maybe the discussion will take place that the Attorney General just referred to, where the people in Corman Park council will tell them what their objections are and they will discuss it behind closed doors. I'm glad to see that that meeting will be prior to the third, where the ratepayers' meeting is so that there will be answers. But, Mr. Attorney General, with that in mind we now see one of the partners and as I suggest, and this may be basically what we have, the city of Saskatoon, the university and Corman Park petitioning the government to come in with an MVA Act (Meewasin Valley Authority) a while ago which the government agreed to and we have the MVA Act as we now see it. There's a lot of history we can go back to.

What I'm asking you, and the way I understand it and maybe . . . I'm not a legal person, and therefore I'm asking the Attorney General who is responsible for law in this province, to give me a legal opinion of the Department of Attorney General, because his deputy minister is beside him. What I'm asking is why the present bill . . . I am told by people on the MVA board, that even if this motion was passed and Corman Park decides to come out that the way the bill is written . . . I'm asking you for an opinion. I don't know the answer; I'm fishing for lack of a better word; I'm fishing, because I don't know the answer. They can't because once they've signed it, by pulling their member off

the thing's still the same unless the board decides to change it. Now, am I wrong or could the Attorney General answer that question?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I am not going to answer that question. I simply take the position that we will see what discussions and negotiations take place. I've indicated publicly before – the member for Kindersley chooses to represent this as a threat; the member for Rosthern seeks to intimate that we should be responsible to public wishes – I've indicated in the past, if the partners do not want MVA and the opposition has mounted that the MVA should not be proceeded with, far be it for the government to foist it upon unwilling partners. I'm not going to answer that question legally because I think legally it's a non-answer. We're talking here about a discussed happy commitment by everybody to a concept, to a dream as the member for Sutherland described it yesterday, and that's the approach that I'm taking, rather than the legalistic approach.

MR. ANDREW: – The question arising out of the statements made by the member for Rosthern – basically I think it is a serious concern, if we are both to be believed that we are genuinely interested in preserving some form of heritage of the river system. I think it's indeed a very serious thing – would be what the council of Corman Park is saying, and I think it's a serious breakdown in the Meewasin Valley Authority and it's not something that simply can be left aside to say that if they go then the system goes – I don't think that is properly right.

It seems to me from reading that motion or from hearing that motion, what they are saying is – look it, we need some changes in this, and to your credit you have brought in some changes to it with regard to some of the offensive parts that they deemed to be offensive parts, that maybe the mortgage lenders deemed to be offensive parts and said we're not going to lend you money – and that therefore became offensive to the farmer that needed a mortgage. As I say, it's to your credit you brought that in. The problem I see is the question of the total area of land and if I can simply elaborate on the intent of the motion that was proposed yesterday by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman).

Perhaps it was belittled as not being properly drafted and I think that is because of the time factor. I don't think that is a meaningful thing at this point in time. What we have to look at is the intention of it. I suppose the intention, perhaps the line of difference from your side of the House and our side of the House, is simply this: what we're saying is that perhaps it would be better where it came to (and we're not firm on the 100 yards or the 92 metres or whatever it might be) . . . but it shows an intention to say, O.K., we're prepared to protect the river edge and the riverbank at this point in time. We're further prepared to listen to the representations of the people as to how far it could be extended outwards. That is the position of this side of the House.

It seems to me the position of your side of the House is that we have the authority out here and we're prepared to listen to the representations to bring it in. that's the meaning of the question that I had relating to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) who seems to say that the authority sits out here now and it's my view that the authority should go out farther. Now, that, in a nutshell, strike me as being what the dispute seems to be about. My question is that it seems quite significant and quite important that in fact Corman Park does not vote to come out of that thing. I think it's very important that be communicated to them.

MR. ROMANOW: – The member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) used the words, this is where the lines are drawn, in his remarks. There is a line drawn between us and the PCs.

Let me put it to you, this way and I'm saying this in a non-heated, non-partisan way. There is no use in getting up in this House and telling me that you are for preserving the heritage of the river and something around the river, without defining where the boundaries are, where it is. It's no use because I can do that too. Somebody, somewhere, has to define the boundaries. We had to, through Mr. Moriyama and the MVA after all the consultation and by R.M. of Corman park resolution, all of which was done a year ago. We did it. And similarly, you fellows have to do it. I hope you've withdrawn it, but you did it yesterday. So, there is a line drawn, I agree. But frankly (I was going to use the word cop-out, but I'm not going to because I have respect for police and what it means) it's a phony argument, with all due respect to you, gentlemen, to say all our amendments intended to do was to indicate a willingness to negotiate the lines because what that amendment does (and you'll agree to that) is to limit it to the 92 metres from the riverbank. That's your position. I could do that easily and we could quell all the popular dissent out there overnight, if we did that. But it would be inconsistent with the general words saying, I am for protecting the riverbank, unless you want the riverbank limited just to the banks.

We take responsibility, all of us do, by what we do in our lives and where we draw our boundaries. We're trying to take responsibility and to adjust those boundaries as a result of some of the misrepresentations that have been voiced. I hope you boys don't take the position that those are our boundaries. I frankly hope that motion does not surface today – your motion. But if you do, then the member for Kindersley is dead right. There is a line drawn between us.

MR. ANDREW: – To follow then, if that is what you're saying, is the same thing then, to return it back to you, that these are our boundaries out here and that's where those boundaries are going to stay? And that's now what is being said. You've made the point that you are prepared as a member of the Meewasin Valley Authority and I would expect that you acknowledge the conflict of people referring to you in your capacity as Attorney General because you are also a member of the Meewasin Valley Authority. That's a common mix-up. What then, precisely, is the difference with you simply saying these are our boundaries here, and we're prepared to listen, and go back to Corman Park? What Corman Park is saying is unless something is done with the boundaries then we're going to get out of the authority. Corman Park is a major player in this authority, and I think the Attorney General would readily admit that. Be they only 1 out of 10 votes they are still a major player because much of the mass of land happens to sit in their authority. My simple question, to get back to that basic question, is: are you prepared in some way to accommodate the council of Corman Park to prevent their opting out of the authority?

MR. ROMANOW: – Well, Mr. Chairman, my answer is going to be two-fold. I want every person to come up with specifics in this operation, because what we've had in this debate from far too many people are generalities in some areas – I do not attribute this to Corman Park, definitely do not – for political purposes. So let's have an end to generalities. I want to see the specifics. Your specific proposal, for my money, is out. I would not buy that as a boundary because it means no control over anything and it does not mean preservation of the heritage of the valley of the river bank, and would entirely defeat the Moriyama concept. I have said, finally, at all times – I have said because the MVA has said – that we are prepared to meet with Corman Park; we are prepared to listen to their concerns. We want to know what it is that changed in less than a year about the boundaries that they approved by formal resolution. Whose arguments are they impressed with? Why has it come about this way? What can we do to alleviate the

concerns? How can we make changes and satisfy their fears and their ratepayers' fears, and still maintain the concept? We're prepared to do all of that, I indicated that long before I came to this House, and I repeat that position. But the position advanced by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) on behalf of the PC caucus – I think it has to be said that we might as well repeal the bill.

MR. ANDREW: – Mr. Attorney General, I still go back to the motion of the people from Corman Park that the boundaries of the MVA be brought back to the river edge. I don't suggest for a minute you make a commitment on that but it seems to me that you are not prepared to say in this Assembly that you would be prepared to make amendments to those boundaries. You simply said that you were prepared to listen. Now, I think the people of Corman Park are going to want something a little more specific than that. I ask you at this point in time, are you prepared to tell the people of Corman Park that you, as a member of the authority, and I would suggest, an influential member of the authority are prepared to make amendments to the boundaries? That's a simple question.

MR. ROMANOW: – I give the simple answer to the hon. member over and over again. I simply say we are committed to listen to their representations for boundary changes, as I just said in the last answer, and implement where possible those boundary changes so long as they do not defeat the concept of the Meewasin Valley Authority. How can I answer any more specifically without knowing where their specific boundary changes are to be?

MR. ANDREW: – To get towards more specifics without getting into give quarter sections – I don't think we would be well served that way – I suppose the question comes up of the farmer who has a quarter section of land that is 6 miles, or 8 miles, or 9 miles away from the river who is simply saying, quite frankly I don't see how my land has all that much to do with protecting the river. That's the concern he has. He is saying why should my land be in the authority? That's the type of thing that you have to address.

MR. ROMANOW: – Well I have that responsibility and I would have liked the member for Rosthern share that responsibility with me and explain to that farmer, I would have liked you to have shared that responsibility with me and explained to the farmer why those boundaries were drawn the way they were. Have you read this report? I don't mean this in any negative way, but have you read it? I don't know. I don't expect the farmer, because he is a busy man, but I do expect legislators to have read the reports. I am only assuming you read them a year ago. I am assuming you approved of the. They were tabled at this wine and cheese party about which you are asking questions.

What can I draw out of that? What more can I answer to this? Have you boys helped me? Have you explained to that farmer, six or seven miles back why those boundaries were drawn? Have you tried? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You have tried, have you? I would like to hear the answers to that. If you have tried and if you will continue to try to explain, to meet with these individuals and to say, here's what it's based on. Let's see how we can work out a compromise for your individual rights of land and ownership. Maybe there will have to be changes. We'll make them if there have to be. I've said that over and over again. But I haven't heard you people say this. The member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) in second reading said, oh, yes, there was a farmer sitting right behind me and in front of me and I told him, that's wrong. I could almost hear him yelling it out over the entire room. That's my objection as a member of the government.

I think we share responsibility here because we passed . . . I just don't think that the

media, I'll be very frank with you – well, I'll withdraw that – the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix did have a full page map and explanation of the concept and I withdraw that. I think that was a fair explanation. But the electronic media in Saskatoon has just simply ballooned every imagined concern about the boundary – 15 miles out, why is it covered in there – no one has even looked at this. I don't know what this represents, \$100,000 of costs. We'll know when the answer is ordered next spring. Just right out the window. I voted for it but to heck with it.

I really say there have to be some ground rules to political debate, some ground rules, lest we all lose credibility. I think the way the debate is taking shape there is a tremendous loss of credibility here.

MR. J.L. SKOBERG (Moose Jaw North): – Mr. Chairman, and the hon. members for Rosthern and Kindersley, if they followed through the process that established all of the authorities we now have in Saskatchewan, which are only two . . . but as I mentioned yesterday, the authority that I am particularly concerned about is the one in Moose Jaw. I could look across at the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham). I'm sure that he and the people would like to have a Swift Current authority. That was established over many, many years of discussion with the municipalities. It was established with committees being set up to represent the rural areas surrounding Moose Jaw – the rural area of Baidon, the rural area of Moose Jaw and the municipal council of Moose Jaw. The input that has been available to them through that area is very evident. And that's exactly the same as what happened in the establishment of any authority to this date.

All I am suggesting to those opposite, if I hear them right and it is rather difficult, is to find out whether or not they believe there should be a buffer zone. If I understand what they are saying correctly, they are saying the riverbank or the river edge, only. When I read in the paper about the river edge authority, edge tome means the edge of the river and no buffer zone. If you do not have a buffer zone, you have no authority. You must have the authority. All the information we had, before this was voted on last year, brought into effect and proclaimed, was evident to anyone who wanted to take the time to read it. I, in particular, being vitally interested in our project in the Moose Jaw area, watched and read everything I possibly could. We set up the advisory council, the advisory board, then the management board which in effect was a political board – those representing the R.M.s and the city of Moose Jaw and the two from the government side. But what I am really saying to those opposite, particularly to the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) and the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) (and as the Attorney General has said over and over again), you can't have it both ways. Either you agree with the concept of a buffer zone within the boundaries of the authority, or you have no authority. You have to have some controls on the usages of both the buffer and the control areas. It appears to me that neither the member for Rosthern or the member for Kindersley have any knowledge whatsoever of what the buffer zone is all about, because that's the crux of the whole legislation, to have an authority set up with some authority to govern the boundaries and that includes both buffer and control areas.

I would particularly urge those two opposite and the PC Party to realize that there has been public input. We have had ample public input in Moose Jaw and we are going to have more public input – 200 copies of the proposed boundaries, the proposed Wakamow authority will be distributed. We will have public meetings and that then will set the stage for drawing the set of boundaries.

Yesterday, as I mentioned, we did have that meeting and we do have the boundaries now defined which will go to the public for discussion, including the buffer zone. that could be where the negotiations take place on the buffer zone in fact.

It appears to me those opposite are not interested in even recognizing the fact that there has to be that buffer zone and there has to be some authority to govern both the buffer and control zones.

MR. ANDREW: – My question is back to the Attorney General. I suggest that perhaps we can resolve this total debate if the Attorney General at this point in time is prepared to say this: Is the Attorney General prepared to make recommendations to the Meewasin Valley Authority, that the Meewasin Valley Authority between now and the spring session of the legislature, entertain representations by the people within either the control zone or the buffer zone, prepared to hear and if necessary act on representations as to the lines of the boundary. Will the Attorney General make that commitment to this Assembly so the people affected have in fact a vehicle by which they can advance their arguments as to why their land should or should not be in the authority and be prepared to make some recommendations on that? Will the Attorney General give that assurance?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I repeat again to the hon. member, I am in no position personally to give that assurance, because I am but one person out of ten. Even the other two government nominees are non-elected people and are not associated with the government. They are individuals from Saskatoon and are who have exhibited a long-standing history in the involvement of Saskatoon and area. David Keith owns some property and Don Kerr owns some property – the Saskatoon landowners who have an interest in this.

I can say, however, that the Meewasin Valley Authority has already indicated that it has taken steps to originate meetings with concerned citizens and individuals over the next little while to try to meet their concerns.

Now that is the position of the Meewasin Valley Authority and I concur with that position, but I do not want it implied that the Attorney General has the power or should . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well you intimated that and I certainly won't undertake that kind of an operation.

Similarly, I would ask the hon. member and the member for Rosthern, will they give us an undertaking in this House that they will do all that they can from now until the spring session to explain to those citizens and organizations the maps, the concepts, the legislation and explain to them that the powers are no different than the Wascana Centre Authority; that the Wascana Centre Authority has worked well. Will you undertake to do that for me from now until the legislature meets in the spring?

MR. ANDREW: – To answer you question. I will certainly undertake to make representation to talk with people bearing in mind there are perhaps other functions and events which one has to do other than spending one's total time on the Meewasin thing, but I am prepared to make the commitment that we would do what we have in our power to ensure that in fact the Meewasin Valley Authority does not come apart and things go for nought. I can certainly give that assurance.

I cannot give that assurance to the Attorney General that we would not represent, or

listen to, or entertain, or be prepared to entertain the idea that part of the land presently there does not have to be there. It strikes me that we are still in a situation of developing a program over a long period of time and the whole thing at this time is to make sure it gets going and develops from there. I can give the Attorney General that assurance, and all the assurance I ask from him is that he be prepared to listen to the representations, primarily of the landowners, and be prepared to entertain amendments to the boundaries. That is the simple request and it strikes me that isn't a hard request to make.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, he has made the request; I made the answer. But I am going to tell you how I view these votes coming up today. You may not view them this way but this is how I am going to view them, because we are going to call for standing votes on each and every amendment. I just warn you on that. You guys have to decide what you are going to do on each every amendment. It is going to be a standing vote. And I will view these amendments as amending the bill as it stand. That's how I will view this. When you vote for the amendment you will be voting for the amendment and for the bill which it amends. That's the logical flow from that. And we will see when you people make your decisions as to how you vote, how you will handle the situation from here on in. Frankly, I tell the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor), I'm sorry that I can no longer rely on the verbal assurance. These mean nothing from the members opposite on this particular bill. Accordingly, I regret to advise the member that I need that kind of an assurance and the residents of the R.M. of Corman Park will want to know exactly where members stand on the individual areas.

MR. ANDREW: – The Attorney General again attempts to swing the total thing into reading into all of the votes . . . He seems reluctant to give any assurance that he is prepared to entertain representations on changing of boundaries, and that is what I read for exactly what he is saying. After repeated questions he is not prepared to say, look, I am prepared to listen to the representations of farmer A and farmer B and farmer C. He is not prepared to say I, speaking as a member of the Meewasin Valley Authority, am prepared to entertain that if it makes sense and if that is the way we have to go, then I am prepared to make a change in the boundary. That is all the assurance that we are seeking.

Now he takes that and simply twists it around and say that on each motion we are going to have a standing vote and if you don't vote this way in the standing vote, then I'm going to say you are doing this or you're doing that, or you're doing the next thing. I ask you, what are you doing, in taking that approach, for the R.M. of Corman Park? I think they are very concerned. They are a local government; they are a small local government; they don't have a barrage of this or a barrage of that. They stated very clearly that they are concerned about this thing and that if changes are not made, and if the attitude is not there, then they are going to opt out. (And the member for Sutherland can sit and say, well you're going to do this or you're going to do that.) If we are not in the Assembly prepared to give that attitude, we are the people who are endangering the potential of Meewasin Valley Authority. And I say that I am prepared at this point in time to listen to those representations.

As for making statements that you say are inflammatory, I will not make those statements. I will speak in favor of that. I am prepared to make that move in order to resolve this dilemma, but it doesn't appear that you are. You are not prepared to make that one simple commitment that you are prepared to hear the representation of that farmer, and if he has a valid representation, then you as one member are prepared to make some changes to the boundaries.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, the Meewasin Valley Authority will meet with the rural municipality of Corman Park. That has been indicated over and over again. I hope to be at that meeting. I support the decision of the Meewasin Valley Authority to meet with the Rural Municipality of Corman Park. I am willing as a member of the Meewasin Valley Authority to listen and if I'm persuaded, to talk in favor of recommended changes to the boundaries. But I will not undertake on my own to speak unilaterally for the other partners, as you suggest I should. We'll work out our relationship with the rural municipality of Corman Park. But in the meantime, we want to work out our relationships with you boys here in the forum, in the legislature, on the amendments. We'll worry about Corman Park. They passed that motion without any meetings with anybody in the Meewasin Valley Authority, to the best of my knowledge – certainly none with me and certainly none with other members of the Meewasin Valley Authority with the exception, perhaps, of Peggy McKercher who sits in a dual capacity as a division counsellor on the R.M. of Corman Park and as chairperson by nomination.

I would like to know the history behind that. I would like to know why it came about. We'll straighten that out. I'm optimistic, very optimistic, that the R.M. of Corman Park, given the vote – 7 to 4 – especially given that relative closeness, that those problems will be worked out. I will not be put in the position that the member seeks to put me, of being the boss of all bosses by saying I will agree to the changes or I will do this, or whatever, without the other partners. Now that's the position the member seeks to put me in and that's a wrong position to be in. This is an independent agency, as I repeat again, of which I have one, or working the worst design, three out of ten votes.

MR. SKOBERG: – I would just like to add one short word. When our authority is established in the Moose Jaw area and it's an independent body as the Attorney General has just said, if a politician from whatever side of the House, stuck his nose into that authority and committed himself and committed the authority to do certain things, I would take the hide off that politician whether it be the Attorney General or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) or whoever it may be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SKOBERG: – I look across at the member for Rosthern who is sitting there (the member for Kindersley has left). I look at him and I think that if you were asked to commit an authority that you were or are a member of, or if you were appointed as a member of a commission which has wide-ranging representation and you then, as a politician sat in this House and said I shall commit that commission or that board or that authority to do certain things, you should be completely thrown out of the authority or the commission for committing that particular body.

the argument that I hear now is that you're asking the Attorney General, not as a member of the authority, but as the Attorney General, to commit himself to hear representation from the R.M. of Corman Park. I again repeat, two R.M.s in the Moose Jaw area are now concerned about the buffer zone. But they have not withdrawn from the advisory group. They are making representation and their people shall make representation to the R.M. I would think that the R.M. of Corman Park would direct their communication to the authority. I presume that has been done and not to a mouthpiece of this Legislative Assembly to try to make political hay out of it.

I look opposite, now that the hon. member for Kindersley is back in, I'll remind him. He sits on the law society, I presume. I would ask him if he could commit the law society to

do a particular thing if he were on the executive of that society. I think it's a good analogy. I'm asking you now, (and I'll use your own simple case again) the hon. member for Moose Jaw-South, Gordon Snyder, is on the advisory group at this time. If he, before going to our committee (the advisory and management committee) committed us to something, he wouldn't last very long. They know opposite that's exactly the truth and that's the way our system works. I think it's disgraceful that I stand here and listen to some of the arguments put forth – particularly by the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) who is allegedly of a legal mind – that I listen now to him ask the Attorney General (Mr. Roman) to commit the authority which is an independent body. You must have heard all about local autonomy, all about municipal affairs, all about the way you set up boards and commissions to ask a single person on that particular board, commission, or in this case the authority, to now say this is the way it shall be, to ask that he commit himself and commit the authority. It's utter nonsense and he knows it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: – Mr. Attorney General, after a long bit of rhetoric from both yourself and the member for Kindersley, we got down to the nitty gritty of the commitment that was being looked for. When you indicated that the board would be hearing representations and I made my comments about the meetings that I referred to earlier – I first must accept the challenge of the Attorney General which he made to me personally. If he would like a list of people whom I have spoken to in order to find out what I said prior to this debate about the Meewasin, I would be prepared to give him some of the names that I have on record. I suggest that the Attorney General has made an additional commitment, not as the Attorney General but only as one individual. The understanding of the position of a board that he sits on is that they will listen to presentations from people concerning amendments to the bill. Included in that particular statement he suggested including the land area, the land mass affected in both the buffer and the control zones. What we are discussing, Mr. Attorney General, is that we now have a commitment of a forum to understand and I assume (and it's an assumption I make) that next March we will see additional amendments on some of the other areas. Representation may be made to the board and they may come back and ask for changes. With that we now have certain amendments before us that are crucial and must be handled to stop hardship on individuals until next March. I think that's a credible position where we all must be in and not get into the partisan politics side of it. I suggest that we have a problem and we're going to handle these problems now. But then as far as the rest of the area's size and so forth, we will be handling them hopefully in the spring or after presentations have been heard. that kind of commitment I am glad to see. It's unfortunate it took so long to get here and we could not be going through clause by clause study of this bill by now. But we have a commitment. I think it's a commitment that the people affected will be heard. We in the House will now correct the hardship clauses that are in the Meewasin authority and the other clauses where we may or may not agree, or land where we may not agree, will be handled at a later session. Am I correct in understanding the position we're all in now?

MR. ROMANOW: – No, you're incorrect. I want to make this totally, absolutely clear. I'm sorry to belabor the patients of all members, especially perhaps ours, but we may as well get the ground rules straight now on everything – on the amendments, on the bill and my role.

The Meewasin Valley Authority has publicly committed itself to public meetings and private meetings with individuals. I support that position. I voted for it on the Meewasin Valley Authority and I report. But don't get me in the position of making my commitments and then representing it to the public as some sort of an extraction from me of reluctance that I was hereby prepared to do that. That is a misrepresentation and a misunderstanding. You are extracting nothing from me. I am agreeing to meet as a member of the Meewasin Valley Authority; my partners and I report what the MVA has agreed to do and if the MVA decides to recommend changes in boundaries and if the MVA decides after the representations there should be further section amendments, there will be. I make that commitment. But don't get me into the kind of situation that it's some sort of an extraction because that is a total misrepresentation of the situation this morning. I've been taking that position since 10:30 this morning and I repeat it again.

MR. KATZMAN: – Mr. Attorney General, you just said exactly what I said – maybe I didn't use legal jargon but we now have an understanding that the MVA is going to look at all these problems and will in its wisdom make recommendations to the government to handle problems. I assume they have met and made recommendations to the government and that's why we're seeing the amendments. I assume they've said to you, hey, there is this wrong area; we need it corrected. And the government has said fine; we'll bring the amendments. What you're saying to us now is if the MVA board get together and does these meetings and is prepared and decides to make recommendations wherever they want to go that you will be prepared as a government to bring it in before the House. Am I reading that correctly?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, the member said we now (that was the exact word that he said) we now have a commitment based on this here – that's the word you used. That is false. You had that commitment before the House even convened two weeks ago by the MVA issuing the press release to that effect. You got nothing out of me this morning. That's the MVA making that commitment and I support the MVA in that so don't get out there paddling your politics that the Attorney General had to be extracted to get a commitment to meet. The Attorney General rejected the ideas to meet. Don't get me into that kind of a position because I'm making my position abundantly and absolutely clear. It's the MVA who's agreeing this way and I'm but one party – one-third of the party in this regard. And that was always the commitment and I said it at second reading so if you want to pursue it, we'll pursue it. If you want to let it drop, let it drop but that's the position that the MVA has always committed itself to. We are meeting. We'll be meeting; we'll be studying; we'll be recommending changes to the bills, perhaps even changes to the boundaries. That's for the MVA to decide and if they ask us to do that the government will be pursuing that in consultation with our partnership. That's not my commitment now; that's been the commitment of the MVA for the last 10 days or two weeks.

MR. KATZMAN: – I accept what the Attorney General has just said. We now have it clear on the record and I assume, Mr. Attorney General, the reason we are here is to pass or to make changes in the bill as recommended by the board which you will be bringing forward as the Attorney General. Am I correct in that statement? The amendments we are about to see are because the board made changes – I'm referring now to the press release you referred to. You say that in a press release they said they would be looking at these other areas.

MR. ROMANOW: – These amendments come to us from the MVA.

MR. KATZMAN: – Mr. Attorney General, could you tell me the two dates (I don't know if you have them) of the meetings, both the closed-door meeting – I know of the one. And do you know if the board has been invited to the meeting on the third like I'm told – I've got it by grapevine not by fact – so is that correct?

MR. ROMANOW: – I don't know if the board has been invited to the meeting on the third. I may not be able to be there on the third because of other commitments but there is a meeting sometime next week with the rural municipality of Corman Park and the MVA at which I will be present.

MR. KATZMAN: – You say next week in camera. Am I correct, a closed meeting?

MR. ROMANOW: – I don't know what the nature of the meeting is. Personally, I favor a meeting where it is in camera with the R.M. of Corman Park. I think more work can be accomplished and more discussion of details and positions can be done this way than through the glare of television lights.

MR. KATZMAN: – Mr. Attorney General you are saying a meeting will be held. Hopefully at the meeting you have with Corman Park you will be able to explain, or the board will, the concerns which have been raised which caused the motion I referred to earlier? That's the whole intent I assume of that meeting, to get it all out and clear, so everybody knows really what they're talking about; because in your earlier statements you seemed to indicate that you are not sure if they went through the total package and studies it or if they didn't. You referred to the black book; you weren't sure if the members had studied that from one end to the other before they voted. Therefore with this meeting you could maybe go through the thing and explain all the differences and the proposals and the bill. We're not sure if they've read it or not. You made reference to that a little earlier in your speech.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I will make this point one more time. I don't know what I can rely on other than black and white. We have a resolution which I tabled in second reading which says, from Corman Park, that they approved the conceptual master development plan for the Meewasin Valley Authority project that was prepared by Raymond Moriyama. That's the black book we're talking about – they passed that resolution. I can only assume that they are people who do their homework and know what they're passing resolutions on. That's what I'm faced with – about a year ago. Now, if you have to go through the boundaries description and the report again, yes – I don't know if it will be on their agenda. But I did not say that we're going to explain to the board; they're adult people. They've read the concept; they passed the resolution and I'm going to treat them as adult people and we'll see what the meeting produces next week.

MR. ANDREW: – One further question to the Attorney General and this is by way of a broad question of principle, and I don't want him to take it and read it again as a political attack on him. My question is simply this, when you come to the framing of these types of authorities or these types of commitments, do you think that it is in the best interest when it's perhaps getting into this type of thing, where someone who is also a senior member of government is appointed as that representative of government? What I'm talking about is the fact that you are on this board – does that not lead to perhaps the politicalization of this to a degree that maybe it wouldn't have, if that hadn't been the case?

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I flatly reject that innuendo. I do because the Wascana Centre Authority has the senior cabinet minister for Regina on it, the hon. member Walter Smishek. The Wakamow proposal authority will have on it the senior cabinet minister for Moose Jaw, the hon. Gordon Snyder. It's only logical that the Meewasin Valley Authority should have the senior cabinet minister for Saskatoon. The argument that I got in the early days was, Roy, you have to give your attention to this because it's going to require a push in cabinet and it's going to require a push in treasury board. Someone's going to have to make the changes in the legislation and you're a Saskatoon boy, you were born and raised there and you know all of that. That's the argument I got. The member for Rosthern got up last year and he congratulated the members of the A committee; they're great guys, he knows me personally. The business about Bob Mitchell in question period today and my personal friend Don Ching – well, I want you to know that I have one other personal friend. It's the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) and by gum, he really influences me too, as you can see by this debate. So I'm saying to you – because again I'm just in the mood these last couple of days – you don't fool me, member for Kindersley, when you say, don't take this personally, Mr. Minister, I'm not believing this myself, but don't you think that with your approach on the board some people might object? – it's a shallow, superficial politicization of the thing. It is exactly the kind of thing you are trying to promote and I don't buy it. You can make that argument if you want, but if you are looking at it fairly, there is absolutely no basis for it when you have Mr. Smishek and Mr. Snyder and the other authorities.

MR. ANDREW: – I want to make very clear the position of this side of the House with regard to procedure. Now the Attorney General has set his rules (not according to how the rules of the House work), but he has set his rules as to how he is going to interpret what anybody else does or what anybody else says. He doesn't have the right to make that interpretation.

The vote which is going to be coming from this side of the House (and I will explain it to you) is that in view of the fact that we have, and that the people of Corman Park now have (and this was not clear to the people of Corman Park before), a right to make representation to Meewasin Valley Authority as it relates to boundaries and as it relates further to other things, we are not prepared to simply stand up here and vote against this bill so the Attorney General can run around the country and say the Tories are against Meewasin Valley Authority. That's exactly what he want us to do. So I make it very clear to the people we support, Meewasin Valley Authority, that we support the rights of the people in that Meewasin Valley Authority to make representations with regard to their concerns about their property and the effect of the Meewasin Valley Authority on their property rights. They should be given that assurance. Given that, perhaps some of the amendments as advanced here have cured some of the problems. We are prepared to support those. But we are prepared, at that point and for that reason, to withdraw the motion advanced by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) to show our good faith and to vote with the government on the motions presented by the Attorney General. That is the position, so that is not twisted, so that he can't go out and simply twist this thing around and say we are against Meewasin Valley Authority. By way of explanation, if he has his right to explain his interpretation, then we have our right to explain our interpretation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, as an aside, when I was first elected in 1967 I occupied a chair in the second row there and I came in full of vim and vinegar as a

young politician with 'an interesting future.' I made one little mistake, which in those days the press gallery pounced on and just seized. I made the mistake of making all of my speeches to these boys and they kept on smiling back to me and the whole routine. I will never forget an article by a man called Mel Hinds now viewed by the people whom you represent as a lackey, but I believe still one of the most integrity-filled journalists in Saskatchewan, who tore a strip of skin off of me like there was no tomorrow. I have that article.

AN HON. MEMBER: – You still do it.

MR. ROMANOW: – I still do it – well we will see whether I still do it. I tell you, if I do it I don't do it by this kind of a . . . (inaudible) . . . routine. You speak however you want to, but I will tell you if you received press articles such as I received you would have stopped the practice ten months ago or a year ago and I still hope you will learn a little lesson that in the end result they will devour you.

Now I make the point with respect to the question of this vote. Mr. Chairman, if these boys opposite vote yes for these amendments, the amendments of The Meewasin Valley Authority Act, when I meet with the R.M. of Corman Park and when I meet with Wally Hamm, the MVA and everybody else, I'm going to say that the Progressive Conservative Party voted for the bill with these amendments, the bill including schedule A – that's the boundaries and the control. That's what I am going to say. Are you going to weasel out of that? Because I'm going to sit down and let you know whether or not you're going to weasel out of that. Because I want to be able to say that my political opposition is with me, step by step, on the boundaries, on the approaches and the changes, subject to the comments I have made. That's what I want to be able to say and that's the purpose of these amendments. I'm not going to take another chance on you boys walking both sides of the street.

MR. ANDREW: – Just one further statement from the Attorney General and that is subject to the comments he has made that the MVA has advised him and through him to this House that it is prepared to hear representation from the people involved.

MR. ROMANOW: – I want you to take this just one step further. If the MVA meets, listens and recommends no or little change, what will be your position?

MR. ANDREW: – It's something or a hypothetical question in view of this whole situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Chairman, I just simply say that they are not trustworthy on this, but we're going to put them to every vote on this and you interpret it the way you want to interpret it. You're right. But that is what this means. This is not a game. This is the legislature of Saskatchewan. You're elected to cast your vote on a bill with amendments to which the principles and the schedules are set out. That's what this is. And I'm telling you, that's the way I'm going to interpret it and that's the way it's going to have to be represented to all of the parties.

Section 1 as amended agreed on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 40

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Robbins	Baker
Skoberg	McArthur	Gross
Shillington	MacMurchy	Mostoway
Banda	Kaeding	Kowalchuk
MacAuley	Feschuk	Byers
Vickar	Rolfes	Tchorzewski
Matsalla	Lusney	Prebble
Long	Nelson	Engel
Poniatowski	Lingenfelter	White
Solomon	Berntson	Birkbeck
Larter	Taylor	Ham
Garner	Muirhead	Katzman
Andrew		

NAYS – 00

Section 2 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 40

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Robbins	Baker
Skoberg	McArthur	Gross
Shillington	MacMurchy	Mostoway
Banda	Kaeding	Kowalchuk
MacAuley	Feschuk	Byers
Vickar	Rolfes	Tchorzewski
Matsalla	Lusney	Prebble
Long	Nelson	Engel
Poniatowski	Lingenfelter	White
Solomon	Berntson	Birkbeck
Larter	Taylor	Ham
Garner	Muirhead	Katzman
Andrew		

NAYS – 00

Section 3 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 4 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 5 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 6 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 7 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
----------	--------	---------

Snyder
Baker
Gross
Mostoway
Kowalchuk
Byers
Tchorzewski
Prebble
Engel
White
Birkbeck
Ham
Katzman

Kramer
Skoberg
Shillington
Banda
MacAuley
Vickar
Matsalla
Long
Poniatowski
Solomon
Larter
Garner
Andrew

Robbins
McArthur
MacMurchy
Kaeding
Feschuk
Rolfes
Lusney
Nelson
Lingenfelter
Berntson
Taylor
Muirhead

NAYS – 00

Section 8 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney
Snyder
Baker
Gross
Mostoway
Kowalchuk
Byers
Tchorzewski
Prebble
Engel
White
Birkbeck
Ham
Katzman

Pepper
Kramer
Skoberg
Shillington
Banda
MacAuley
Vickar
Matsalla
Long
Poniatowski
Solomon
Larter
Garner
Andrew

Romanow
Robbins
McArthur
MacMurchy
Kaeding
Feschuk
Rolfes
Lusney
Nelson
Lingenfelter
Berntson
Taylor
Muirhead

NAYS – 00

Section 9 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 10 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 11 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 12 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Garner	Muirhead
Katzman	Andrew	

NAYS – 00

Section 13

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): – Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to take the time of the House. I just want to make a very brief remark on this section. I am going to be supporting this section but I do so with some very serious reservations and I think that this section is an illustration of the kind of compromise that is involved in considering the amendments that are being made here.

On behalf of those who are concerned that the authority's powers are going to be weakened to the point where it will be a much less effective vehicle for preserving the River Valley, I just want to say that this section essentially gives the authority the power to be notified in the event of any proposed land transfers. It also gives the authority an opportunity to exercise a right of first refusal and an opportunity to enter into negotiations to purchase land in the event of wishing to acquire it prior to other parties. I certainly would be willing to see that right of first refusal given up. I would much prefer, however, to see the authority retain the power to be notified in the event of a landowner's desire to sell land so that the authority might have an opportunity to enter into negotiations to acquire that land. This way the authority, to keep track of land transfers, is going to have to spend a considerable amount of money and time down at the land titles office to see what kind of land transfers are taking place and it is also going to lose opportunities to purchase land through ordinary negotiations that might otherwise be possible if this section was retained. However, to ally the fears of local landowners and, as I say, to reach a piece of legislation that will be acceptable to all in the Saskatoon and surrounding areas. I am going to be supporting this amendment. Thank you.

Section 13 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 40

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Muirhead	Katzman
Andrew		

NAYS – 00

Section 14 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 40

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins

Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Berntson
Birkbeck	Larter	Taylor
Ham	Muirhead	Katzman
Andrew		

NAYS – 00

Section 15 as amended agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Andrew	Engel	Poniatowski
Lingenfelter	White	Solomon
Berntson	Birkbeck	Larter
Taylor	Ham	Garner
Muirhead	Katzman	

NAYS – 00

Section 16 as amended agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 41

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur

Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vickar	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Andrew	Engel	Poniatowski
Lingenfelter	White	Solomon
Berntson	Birkbeck	Larter
Taylor	Ham	Garner
Muirhead	Katzman	

NAYS – 00

Section 17 agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 40

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Snyder	Kramer	Robbins
Baker	Skoberg	McArthur
Gross	Shillington	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Banda	Kaeding
Kowalchuk	MacAuley	Feschuk
Byers	Vicker	Rolfes
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
White	Solomon	Birkbeck
Larter	Taylor	Ham
Garner	Muirhead	Katzman
Andrew		

NAYS – 00

Section 18 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill with amendment.

Bill No. 44 – An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Section 2 as amended agreed.

Section 4 to 46 agreed.

Section 47 coming into force agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 17 – An Act to amend The Teachers’ Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

Section 1 as amended agreed.

Sections 2 to 5 agreed.

Section 6 coming into force agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

The committee reported progress.

THIRD READINGS

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

He said: I would like to move third reading of this bill but before I do, I know everybody is anxious for lunch (nobody is more anxious than I am), but I do want to make three or four minutes of observations about this bill.

I first of all want to say that the legislature – when it gets down to doing work as it has done in the last two weeks, in my judgment, with respect to the debate and certainly with regard to the amendments we have passed – performs a very valuable function for the people of Saskatchewan. I frankly do not subscribe to accusations by some that the fall session is a waste of time. Because I think the passage of this bill with its amendments and the debate puts a lie to that kind of an accusation which is advanced by those who really don’t know how the legislature operates and the kind of spirit and mood which can move the House to accomplish achievements. I think this is the case which we have done here and I think have done it quite well.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to see the Conservative opposition withdraw their proposed amendments, totally, with respect to the boundaries. I am especially happy about this because apart from the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman), I think it is a plain fact that we see there is no Saskatoon member on the PC side. I could only draw the conclusion that the advice to the PC caucus, on the intentions and the will of the people of Saskatoon and area, would come from the member who would be a member, the present Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, Mr. Devine who comes from Saskatoon.

I can only ascribe these amendments which were withdrawn and proposed as the Devine amendments – Devine amendments through the caucus. Because he lives in the city, he knows what the community wants. I can only assume that he must take responsibility for the actions of his caucus in the introduction of the amendments and I hope that it indicates a change in attitude on his particular part.

Some members of the press have said to me that Mr. Devine has told them outside the House that we could have accomplished 90 per cent of the things of the Meewasin Valley Authority if we had accepted his amendments – the 92 metre amendments. I want to say in very quick summation on the third reading that a short, quick inventory would indicate if we adopted the Devine amendments, these features of the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) would be excluded: as a small example, Oxbow Lake, Moon Lake sanctuary two miles from the river edge; Beaver Creek area; fragile land on the approach to Cranberry Flats, the area prone to slumping; Beaver Creek. We would have excluded Diefenbaker Park; Gordon Howe Park, Kinsmen Park; North and South Park; Rotary Park; Victoria Park; Meewasin Park; Archibald Park.

We would have excluded the university land. Sutherland Beach node; we would have excluded Forestry Farm; we would have excluded the proposed Five Corner highrise at Broadway and University Drive – Mr. Speaker, this is the information I have received from the people who have surveyed the 92 metres, where the proposals are in operation. If the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) disagreed, I ask him in third reading to tell me if he really does want to put the Devine amendments forward – Edison Ravine; Tipperary Creek, including the Medicine Wheel; park terraces; rifle range recreation area; much of the downtown south concept of the downtown core of Saskatoon, involving the A.E. Cole generating area; linkages to other parks within the city of Saskatoon, including the proposed pond at the University of Saskatchewan; Cathedral Bluff Lake, Cathedral Bluff itself and the proposed experimental village of Clarkson, Saskatchewan, as a short list.

Now I just want to indicate that because I asked my officials since last night to say what would have happened if we had excluded it. And you will now know why we and the other partners so strongly opposed the boundaries which are drawn in this area.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I take my place before I move third reading, I should like to comment on what I consider to be the very shoddy performance of the money lenders of Saskatoon during the course of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bolstad met with the money lenders during the course of the debate and the objections raised by the money lenders related to the question of clouding of title, section 46. This is an amendment we have dealt with in third reading. The money lenders said, section 46 might cloud the title and might put into question where the mortgages so-registered against title would stand on a legal basis.

Mr. Bolstad sought to assure the House (assure the members of the House at that time) that section 46 would be removed. Mr. Speaker, I say that was a shoddy performance by the money lenders of Saskatoon. I say it was a shoddy performance because they knew that The Wascana Centre Act, with a considerable amount of private ownership when it was established in 1962, and still private ownership in 1979, has virtually the identical provision in it that I read during second reading yesterday – the section which we are now forced by the kind of blackmail tactics by the money lenders to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the approach by some of the association members of the money lenders was tantamount to nothing more or less than holding up the residents of Saskatoon within the control area to ransom, when they knew doggone well the legal aspect of the endorsement on title as witnessed by the precedents that have acted elsewhere in section 46 in the Wascana Centre Authority.

O.K., Mr. Speaker, those are bygone days. We have now amended that section. The endorsement is no longer there. We have made other amendments. I expect the members of the association to show their responsibility to this plan – because I believe that notwithstanding the resolution they are responsible individuals and are a very important organization in our society – to say that the objections have now been overcome and that they will co-operate with the Meewasin Valley Authority and those who work within it to get on with the project of developing the river bank. I expect no less from the money lenders, especially in the fact that the amendments in the first instance were not needed and they knew that they were not needed.

Mr. Speaker, we have acted by these amendments to remedy those problems and I think I am entitled to expect, and the government is entitled to expect, and the people of Saskatoon are entitled to expect (forget about the individuals of the authority), the cooperation and the support of the money lenders in this operation. With that approach, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly would welcome, I am prepared to meet with him as a member of the authority if the authority so requests, and get on with the business of beautifying and protecting the river bank and the surrounding area in Saskatoon as responsible citizens of the community.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREW: – I just wish to make a few comments in reply. Number one, I think it is clear that the people of Saskatoon indeed do wish to protect the river and I don't think for a minute that it has been a case of people trying to take the concept of protecting the river away. Now that's obviously a vehicle by which you can deflect. I don't wish to get in at this point to further rolling along in the debate. The Attorney General made one specific reference and that was to the member for Rosthern's amendment. Just to clarify what was in fact said: 'the amendment was hurriedly drawn', and we take that as a criticism of us. But the amendment which was drawn was a close area to the river, granted, and it was amended from or drawn from the proposed by-law as submitted by the Attorney General. It also included all public lands and there is no question that the city of Saskatoon is in favor of this, Mr. Speaker. All the public lands referred to by the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, were in fact public lands that would under the proposed amendment, have fit in.

Be that as it may, the important thing for this Assembly today is that we go out of here in a situation where we support the concept of Meewasin Valley Authority, that we support the protection of the river. The other thing I think we made clear and I think the important thing as the result of this, is the impact the citizens' action group can have on this Assembly. It is important that we all remember that. Perhaps if it's 3 or 4 or 10 or 40 people they are not listened to because there are so many of them; but here it was a vocal group, 300 to 400 people, and they made their point. As legislators it's important that we always stay cognizant of that fact, that we are here for those people and we are not here for ourselves. I think if we look at that we go out – sure there have to be more

amendments perhaps to this bill, perhaps not; sure there have to be perhaps amendments to the by-laws, perhaps not, but those people have to have the right to be heard and that's what this system is all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, bill read a third time on the following recorded division nemine contradicente:

YEAS – 37

Blakeney	Pepper	Romanow
Robbins	Baker	Skoberg
McArthur	Gross	Shillington
MacMurchy	Mostoway	Banda
Kaeding	Kowalchuk	MacAuley
Feschuk	Byers	Vickar
Rolfes	Matsalla	Lusney
Prebble	Long	Nelson
Engel	Poniatowski	Lingenfelter
Solomon	Berntson	Larter
Taylor	Garner	Ham
Muirhead	Katzman	Duncan
Andrew		

NAYS – 00

ROYAL ASSENT

At 1:20 p.m. His Honour the Administrator, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the bills presented to him.

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)):

That when this Assembly do adjourn at the end of the sitting of the day on which this motion is adopted it shall stand adjourned to a date set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government and that Mr. Speaker shall give each member seven clear days notice, if possible, by wire and registered mail of such date.

Motion agreed to.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, sorry, perhaps just . . . on behalf of the Premier and the government's side, all the members on our side wish you, sir, the Clerk and his staff and the members of the opposition and even my friends in the press a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – On behalf of the members of this side of the House, I would like to also wish you, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, the members of the press, and the staff a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:25 p.m.