

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 11, 1981

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to this House His Worship the Mayor of Kamsack, Mayor Phil Mydonick, and sitting beside him is Anne Cherwenuk, a councillor. I would ask everyone in this House to welcome them to this Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, may I join the hon. member for Arm River in extending our welcome to Mayor Mydonick and the councillor. I hope their stay in the legislature is a pleasant experience. I have been wanting to meet His Worship for some time. So, here is my opportunity. Welcome.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, a group of 12 grade 11 students who have travelled to Regina from Fox Valley, which is by no means a short trip. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Rice and Mr. Frank Anderson, and their bus driver, Lydia Sehn. I would just like to inform the members of the Assembly that Fox Valley residents are known throughout Saskatchewan and Canada, in fact, for their ability to play badminton. They have been to many national finals. I would like all members to join with me in welcoming the students today, and in wishing them an enjoyable day in the legislature and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and through you to the members of this assembly, 14 grades 7, 8, and 9 students from the Wishart School, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Mrs. Peters. This class, Mr. Speaker, is enrolled in a course which examines in detail how the legal process operates from the development and passage of laws in the legislature to the enforcement of laws in the court. As part of their program to develop their understanding of the total process, they observed a court session in Saskatoon last week. Today, they are not only touring the Legislative Building, but will be observing the proceedings for approximately two hours. I hope this visit to the legislature today will improve their understanding of how responsible government works. I ask all members to join with me in congratulating and welcoming this group, their teacher and all those associated with this legal program for making the arrangements to enable this group to observe the proceedings in the Chamber today.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly, 20 grade 11 and 12 students from Sheldon Williams Collegiate sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher, Miss Toth. I should point out to the hon. members that these students are taking the law 30 class at Sheldon Williams. A growing number of students in Saskatchewan are studying this important subject in high schools today. I want to welcome the students and teachers to the Assembly and to indicate to them that I will look forward to meeting with them a little later for refreshments, questions and photographs.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Problems of Kamsack

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, question to the minister responsible for urban affairs. This Kamsack question was first raised with you in September of '79. Since then we have had the mayor, and other people with him, in to visit the Premier about it; we have had a petition sent in, that you rejected as being invalid, but which nevertheless demonstrates the concern; and we have had offers to provide both the MLA and the Premier with all the documentation. The MLA has told me and others that he wants to see a judicial inquiry; the mayor wants to see a judicial inquiry; certain councillors want to see a judicial inquiry; many, many of the citizens want to see a judicial inquiry. More recently (as a matter of fact last Wednesday), the Kamsack Chamber of Commerce unanimously suggested a resolution . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think it is understood, and it has been the practice of this Assembly to allow a member sufficient background to be able to have the minister who is answering the question understand the situation. I know it would be deplorable if members carried it beyond that point. I want to just caution the member that we have to get to the question sooner or later.

MR. BERNTSON: — I knew Mr. Speaker would rule in my favor. I was setting out the groundwork for the question. Last Wednesday the Kamsack Chamber of Commerce unanimously endorsed a resolution calling for a full and complete judicial inquiry into the activities of present and past town councils of Kamsack. What is it going to take to get you to act and to call for a judicial inquiry in Kamsack?

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, first of all I ought to correct the hon. member. He made a statement, in starting his question, that we received a petition that I ruled to be invalid. Mr. Speaker, the document purported to be a petition, dated February 19, was tabled in this House by the hon. member for Arm River. I never received the petition. Whoever was responsible for gathering the petition in Kamsack certainly did not direct that petition to me or the government. It was a petition that was tabled, and I draw to the attention of this House that it was dated February 19. Mr. Speaker, under the date of March 27 the Premier received a telegram, signed by the mayor and two councillors, asking for an inquiry. As I have indicated to this House, a few days later one of the persons who gave authority to send the telegram withdrew her name. Mr. Speaker, under section 422 of The Urban Municipalities Act the provision very specifically requires one-third of the members of the council, and two do not constitute one-third of the council. There are seven council members, at least according to my

count. Maybe the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's counting and my counting are different. The other portion of it required one-quarter of the voters. Mr. Speaker, my executive assistant received a copy of a petition — a photostat copy, not the original petition. The petition wasn't brought to me.

There were some people there with the hon. member for Arm River, who was orchestrating all of it (he wants to make a hero out of himself for some reason). They were apparently waiting in the Premier's office where I was in Crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, all of the information, and all the evidence that we have, including today's petition which we received, is being referred to the Attorney General's department lawyers. I met with them last week. We have provided them with all of the material we have. The petition will also be directed to them for an opinion.

Mr. Speaker, my deputy met during the lunch hour with Mayor Mydonick and Councillor Cherwenuk. They discussed the matter of the petition and their request. Purportedly, there is a great deal of evidence and information. I have been asking for information to support their claim. Under date of April 27 (and I draw this again to the attention of the opposition), I wrote a detailed letter to the mayor asking him to document his case. I have still to receive a reply.

MR. BERTSON: — Supplementary question. I think it should be clearly understood that the reason the Minister of Urban Affairs has not been provided with the documentation which he claims not to have received is that they don't trust him. They offered it to the Premier. They offered it to the MLA for Pelly. But the minister, on every bit of information that he was given, either through him or his officials, refused to act. You have known about this since September of 1979. What is it going to take to get this judicial inquiry? You can't slough it off onto the Attorney General.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I think the law is quite specific when it comes to judicial inquiries. Let me read section 422, so that the hon. members know. They are obviously trying to play for the galleries. I quote:

If one-third of the members of the council or one-fourth of the voters of the municipality, petition the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for a commission to issue under the Great Seal to inquire into the financial affairs of the municipality, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may issue a commission accordingly, and the commissioner or commissioners shall have all the powers of commissioners appointed under The Public Inquiries Act. (The Public Inquiries Act is not under my jurisdiction.)

Section 423(1):

If the council passes a resolution, requesting that an inquiry be made into a matter mentioned in the resolution, and relating to an alleged malfeasance, breach of trust or other misconduct on the part of the members of council, commissioner or other officer, servant or agent of the municipality or of a person having a contract therewith, in relation to the duties or obligations . . . the Attorney General may appoint a judge of the district court . . . to do the inquiry.

It must be referred to the Attorney General, not to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Surely,

after all this time, I would have hoped that the members opposite who have been interesting themselves in Kamsack would have taken the trouble to read the statute and advised the people who contacted them, rather than misadvise them on the way things should be dealt with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: — A question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Thank you for reciting section 422. You save me from doing it. Under that act, I'd like to with your permission, Mr. Speaker, quote what the Premier said in the House the other day, when asked a question by the member for Souris-Cannington.

We certainly feel, as the members opposite do, that this is a difficult position which the town of Kamsack finds itself in. We are reluctant, as a government, to interject ourselves into the administration of the town of Kamsack. The member for Arm River has properly pointed out that if 25 per cent of the ratepayers or one-third of the council feel that there ought to be an investigation, there is a procedure open to them. That, so far as I am aware, has not been followed.

Mr. Minister, you were in Crown corporations this morning so there was a photostat given to someone in your office. The mayor wishes to meet with you after question period. Will you meet with him so that he can give you the original? And do you not agree that when there are 572 names on this list in five days and it is still going strong, it is time to listen to the people of Kamsack and call a judicial inquiry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I will agree that this morning, for the first time, we had some real evidence. This is the first time the community has said it wished to have an inquiry, an investigation. It's true that allegations have been made in the past, but this is the first legitimate petition that has . . .

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Mayor of Kamsack is going to ask me for an appointment, unless he asked the member opposite to be his agent, which I doubt very much. I'm sure that at an appropriate time the mayor will ask me for a meeting. I indicated a long time ago that any time the Mayor of Kamsack (or any other village, town, or city) wants a meeting, all he has to do is pick up the telephone, phone my office, and arrange a mutually satisfactory date for a meeting. That applies equally to Kamsack and any other community. Yes, I will be willing to meet with the mayor at any time, and if we can arrange to have a meeting this afternoon, certainly I'll be glad to meet with him. As I have indicated, my deputy has already met with him.

MR. BERNTSON: — The Mayor of Kamsack was in your office this morning to meet with you and understandably couldn't because you were in Crown corporations. Now the question is: will you meet with him immediately after question period?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member for Saskatoon Centre.

Hydrology Research Centre in Saskatoon

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact . . . The hon. member is pointing a finger at me, and I just wonder what for. Is it because I'm exercising my right to get up

and ask a question? Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Continuing Education, and possibly the Minister of the Environment, and possibly the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In light of the fact that many citizens in Saskatoon of all political stripes are asking for representation to be made to the federal government, and in light of the fact that the federal Liberal government prior to the second last election promised a hydrology research centre on the university campus in Saskatoon, and in light of the fact that the Conservative government under the leadership of some gentleman whose name escapes me at this moment decided to ax that move to have the hydrology research centre located in Saskatoon, and in light of the fact that water is a terribly important resource in Saskatchewan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I wonder if the members of the Assembly could be quiet when questions are being placed. Perhaps that will speed up the question and answer period. If they'll give the member for Saskatoon-Centre an opportunity to complete his question, maybe we can get that one out of the way and get back to something that other members think is important. The member for Saskatoon Centre.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of the information that I have provided to the hon. minister, I'm wondering if he could tell me whether or not he would be willing to make representation to the federal government, specifically to the Hon. Mr. Roberts, to see if we can have that hydrology research centre located in Saskatoon as promised by Liberal and Conservative governments in the past?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I regret, as the hon. member does, the fact that this project has not been proceeding. I would propose to discuss this with the president of the University of Saskatchewan when I next meet with him, which will be, I believe, next week. I would agree to propose to him that in conjunction with the university we undertake to make a representation of the type the hon. member suggests.

MR. LANE: — I wonder if the minister would table in this Assembly this afternoon all copies of representations made by the hon. member who just spoke to the minister, Mr. Roberts, on this particular matter. I'm sure copies went to you in your capacity as minister responsible for universities.

Implications of French Election Results in Uranium Industry

MR. ANDREW: — My question is to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Yesterday's results in the French election, which I'm sure you will herald as another victory for a socialist government, could spell some trouble for the Saskatchewan uranium market as Mr. Mitterrand indicated during the election campaign that he is in favor of a slowdown and a general review of France's nuclear power program. Will the minister be making representations to the federal government to lobby for that very important market for Saskatchewan uranium?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — I'm tempted, Mr. Speaker, to leave right now to go see Mr. Mitterrand. I haven't really thought about whether I'm happy or dejected with respect to the results of the French election. We have made representation to Ottawa with respect to the consideration of a federal-provincial tour (if you like) to promote the sale of Canadian uranium and the Canadian nuclear industry. I received today a response from Mr. Lalonde's office indicating that there was some interest in this. They would be looking at it with respect to timetables, etc., so it's under consideration in a general way. Frankly, I haven't had time to discuss with any of my officials what implications there may or may not be with respect to the French election, so I don't have any

particular comments with respect to whether or not we will be making any representation.

As I am sure the member is aware, the election of the French National Assembly comes later on. I'm not sure of the month, but they will be sometime in the reasonably near future. I think one really needs to await the outcome of those elections to know whether there is going to be any significant change in French policy. It is a system of government which is different from ours; there are two tiers of responsibility there.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the U.S. market has softened substantially for uranium, and in view of the recent spill in Japan which is one of the strong markets in the East, and now in view of the potential problem which could result from this French election, would the minister advise the Assembly as to whether he is looking at a review of his total expenditures and investment into the uranium market? Would he look at pulling back and taking the rent royalties as a government and staying as a referee in rent royalties and having no further investment into that industry?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — No.

Closure of North Battleford Sheltered Workshop

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, question for the Minister of Social Services. I don't know whether you are aware of this, so I will bring it to your attention along with a question. Dr. Breton, the chairman of the North Battleford sheltered workshop and activity centre has stated publicly that on May 31, 1981, they will have to close the doors on that facility unless there is additional government funding available.

Now there are approximately 42 to 48 participants in this program. Will you tell this Legislative Assembly and the handicapped people in North Battleford that you will personally review this very critical situation before it is closed?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to review what we have already done in this area. On March 26, Dr. Breton wrote to me, indicating that they were having some difficulty with funding. I returned a letter to him on April 21 in which I said that we would have a meeting to discuss the funding policy of the North Battleford workshop and activity centre. On April 30 I received a letter from Dr. Breton in which he indicated that if new funding was not forthcoming, they would be closing down the workshop on May 31.

We have a meeting set for tomorrow at 4 o'clock in North Battleford, at which time we will try to find out if there is some way we can help to alleviate the \$80,000 deficit which has occurred over the past year. I think it is interesting to note that two years ago the workshop experienced a small deficit and last year they had a small surplus. We are wondering why there is an additional \$80,000 deficit in this past year. My staff will be going to North Battleford tomorrow to discuss with the local board whether there is something we can do to help them out.

MR. GARNER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that they do have this operating deficit which operating costs have brought about (by the chairman's own admission), do you not agree that it isn't just a short-term proposal you should be looking at, but a long-term proposal to guarantee that this workshop which is very important, not only to those 42 people but to all handicapped people in

Saskatchewan, will remain open?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, I agree with the member that we should be looking at any possible way to help handicapped people. To that end, at the opening in February when I was in North Battleford, I did announce that a new group home would be constructed in North Battleford this coming year. I think that does show we are concerned about North Battleford and we are doing things.

We also explained to them that the funding we have committed in the past was for 16 people in the workshop. We are increasing it by 15 new spaces, which will go some distance toward alleviating the problem the member refers to.

MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Minister, it's very nice to talk about opening new facilities, but what is the point of opening a new facility on one hand, and on the other hand closing down an older facility which is well-established with participants in it? What rationale is there in that type of decision? In light of the fact that the session will likely be over this coming week, can you guarantee those people in North Battleford that facility will not close?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, if our track record is any indication of what will happen in the future, it won't. We haven't closed any down, and we don't intend to. The 14 workshops operating in the province are working very well, and we anticipate that through negotiations tomorrow we will come to a logical and satisfactory conclusion.

Approved Homes Program

MRS. DUNCAN: — My question is also to the Minister of Social Services. A brief was presented to you on February 17, 1981, by the Saskatchewan Approved Home Operators Society, listing the concerns they have about their working relationship with the government. They also listed many proposals which they feel must be implemented if the approved home care program is to continue to be effective. Mr. Minister, when can the society expect your response as to whether you will be accepting and implementing any or all of their recommendations?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to state to the member for Maple Creek, that we did meet with Mrs. Gaveronski and her group in February. We did go over their brief in some detail — areas such as the respite holiday program where they are allowed to take paid holidays and people will come in and take care of their homes. Moneys which were of concern at that time have been paid out. We are also looking at increasing the funding in that area. I dare say that many of the points in their brief which were explained to us at that time have been taken care of and we will be looking at the other areas in the future.

MRS. DUNCAN: — It is my understanding that so far, Mr. Minister, they have not had a response and they have not seen any indication from your department that their proposals will be implemented. What we are talking about here, Mr. Minister, is the care and well-being of about 1,380 adults throughout the province who would have had to be institutionalized had these people not made their homes available for them.

Mr. Minister, seeing that your government began taking people out of institutions and putting them into a home setting, do you not feel that you have a commitment, not only to them but to the people who run the homes, to see that the well-being of these clients

is a little better than it is, that there is more information given to the operators, more adequate funding for rehabilitative recreation or that type of thing?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, we did have a meeting at which time many points of concern were brought up — one being the pay for the holiday program which operators of these homes will receive. We have in fact paid out the money. So to say we haven't done anything as a result of that meeting is not accurate on the member for Maple Creek's behalf.

On the other hand, the over 1,000 people who are in the approved homes do serve a very important role in the province of Saskatchewan. To that end, we have increased funding and will increase funding over this year and the coming years to express on our behalf the needs and the requirements of the approved homes to improve the care. To say there are no facilities available for the people who stay in those homes, many of whom are senior citizens . . . Under the NDP administration the number of activity centres for seniors, for example, has gone from 20 to 350. I think that is an indication as well of the things we have done in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

North Battleford Farm Implement Situation

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — I apologize to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. My practice has been to send a copy of my statement. Somehow or other I slipped up. My apologies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to announce the steps the government proposed to take to assist those farmers in the North Battleford area who must pay twice for farm machinery purchased from Lukowich and Tetrault Farm Equipment Ltd. The facts in this situation are very complicated. We do not know exactly how many farmers are involved. In fact, I don't believe anyone really knows. In some cases, farmers paid the whole amount owing to the implement dealer and only a portion was transmitted to the financial institution. In other cases, only a portion of the total amount owing was given to the dealer. In other cases, two financial institutions hold notes on the same piece of machinery. We do not know, and no one really knows, how many farmers are involved or how many factual situations there are.

Mr. Speaker, the legal situation is also confused. In *Brumby vs. Guaranty Trust*, the courts found that the implement dealer was not the agent of the trust company and that the farmer must pay the money owing to the trust company even though this amount had been previously paid to the implement dealer. In the *Lindsay* case, the district court found that the implement dealer was the agent of White Motor Credit Corporation (Canada) Limited.

In short, Mr. Speaker, a great climate of uncertainty exists — uncertainty for farmers and uncertainty for implement dealers. Mr. Speaker, we propose to do the following:

1. We have retained the services of Mr. Harold MacKay of MacPherson, Leslie and Tyerman. His job will be to advise us in the best ways to assist these farmers in pursuing their legal rights.

2. I have asked Mr. MacKay to arrange a meeting with those farmers involved and the lawyers to discuss ways in which we may be of assistance. Mr. Speaker, we don't know what the factual situation is and in what way we can be of assistance, both legally and financially, to these farmers. I am hopeful that our meetings with them will resolve these questions.

3. I will be requesting an early meeting with the representatives of Guaranty Trust Company and White Motor Credit Corporation (Canada) Ltd. to discuss this whole situation with them and to ask them, as long-term Saskatchewan corporate citizens, to resolve this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the government will not stand by and see these farmers forced to bear all the financial losses themselves. These farmers have already made payment in good faith for their machinery and we will assist them in determining their legal options and make further decisions from that point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BERNTSON: — I would like to take just a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, to welcome the actions of the minister today and to commend him on his choice as well. Perhaps it's in there and I just wasn't listening when you skipped over it, but I didn't hear anything in your ministerial statement that would indicate that Mr. MacKay will have the power to make recommendations to you as it relates to resolving these financial matters and getting the farmers off the hook. I'm sure that was the intention in any case and, in short, we commend the minister for his actions on this matter.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 104 — An Act to amend The Election Act

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Election Act.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 105 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Legal Profession Act.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 106 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 107 — An Act to establish the Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to establish the Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 108 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act.

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill to amend The Urban Municipality Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and by leave ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 109 — An Act respecting the Assessment of Real Property, Businesses and Special Franchises.

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill respecting the Assessment of Real Property, Businesses and Special Franchises be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 110 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act (No. 3)

HON. MR. LONG: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Vehicles Act.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 111 — An Act to amend The Condominium Property Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Condominium Property Act.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 112 — An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act, 1978

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Crown Corporations Act, 1978.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

Bill No. 113 — An Act to amend the Agricultural Implements Act

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I move that a bill to amend The Agricultural Implements Act be now introduced and read a first time.

Motion agreed to and by leave of the Assembly ordered to be read a second time later this day.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Congratulations to Saskatoon All-o-matics

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I wonder if I could make an announcement which has provincial significance. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Assembly something which I believe deserves some degree of public recognition.

Last fall in Saskatoon the Canadian national fastball championships were held. From the tournament, the Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan team, the Saskatoon All-o-matics, captured second place losing out to the Nova Scotia team. At any rate, the Saskatoon All-o-matics were invited to visit and play in Japan from where they returned last week. They were invited by the Japanese Softball Association which also invited a championship team from the United States. While in Japan on their 12-day tour, the Saskatoon All-o-matics won four, lost two and tied five games, which is a feat of no mean accomplishment.

I should also like to mention that the Japanese were, according to the players and others, very gracious hosts. All-o-matic personnel were impressed with the calibre of fastball, the Japanese people and the friendly spirit exhibited by all.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to mention one citizen, from many, who can be labelled as 'Mr. Fastball' in Saskatchewan. He is a man who has spent much in a variety of ways to have Saskatchewan, and particularly Saskatoon, known as Canada's fastball city. That gentleman is Mr. Don Funk of Saskatoon, owner of All-o-matic Transmission and the fastball team. I would wish, and I'm sure all members present would agree with me, to commend Mr. Funk for his efforts as well as the efforts of the players, the coaching staff and the management of the All-o-matic fastball team.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 104 — An Act to amend The Election Act

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, the bill which will shortly be before us with respect to The Election Act has several changes in it. I would like to attempt to outline those to the House today.

The amendment to section 2 makes provision for automatically adjusting the amounts candidates and parties are permitted to spend. As members will know in The Election

Act which was passed some years ago there were limits set, both at the constituency level and at the provincial level, for expenditures. One of the difficulties with these is that with inflation limits which may have been very reasonable in 1977 (when I believe the act was passed) may not be reasonable in 1983 or 1982 or whenever the next election is held. One of the difficulties in drafting this kind of legislation is to keep it fresh and in keeping with the times.

So, what we have attempted to do here is to index the expenditures which are allowed by both political parties and candidates of the provincial and the constituency level. The formula which we have used is the same one as set out in The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act, except that we have used the consumer price index rather than the industrial composite index for wages and salaries, as that has been deemed to be or thought to be a more realistic number to use with respect to election expenditures.

In trying to drive at where we should be today, prior to putting an indexing formula on it, what we have done is to go back to when the act was passed and apply the proposed indexing formula, the CPI (consumer price index), to what has gone on since 1977 when the act was passed. So what we are bringing it to today is the same as if this act had always been in place. Otherwise, it is an arbitrary choice. I must admit that to members, but any other choice of numbers would have been equally as arbitrary. To argue that it is a good thing in the future, it should have been a good thing in the past, and it is a reasonable place to start.

What this means is that spending limits will change as follows: for registered parties at the general election (this is for 1981), the expenditures will go from \$250,000 to \$327,425; for a by-election in northern constituencies, it will go from \$15,000 to \$19,646, and in southern constituencies, from \$12,500 to \$16,371; for candidates in general elections and by-elections in the northern constituencies, it will go from \$20,000, or \$2 per voter, to \$26,194, or \$2.62 per voter. The per voter thing would apply in the event that you had 25,000 voters in one of the northern Saskatchewan ridings. This is in the event that the population shoots way up. The member for Qu'Appelle will have had some experience in using the per voter calculation rather than the block sum which is allotted to most members because as most members will be aware, he had a very large constituency in which he ran last time.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Successfully.

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Successfully, yes — unfortunately, in southern constituencies the numbers will rise from \$15,000, or \$1 per voter, to \$19,646, or \$1.31 per voter. This would mean that you would need about roughly (at the top of my head) 13,000 or 14,000 voters in a constituency before the \$1.31 per voter would apply. Just as last time you would have to have 15,000 voters or more before those numbers applied, otherwise you use the general ceiling.

Reimbursement for political parties was previously the lesser of \$75,000 or one-third of election expenses. This will be changed to the lesser of \$98,228, which is one-third of the new limit, or one-third of election expenses. So, that is consistent.

For candidates, it has been changed to one-half of lawful election expenses. In other words, if you are allowed to spend (if it was a 1981 election) \$19,646 and you spent it all, you would get one-half of that. If you spent \$50,000, you would not get \$25,000 because that is not a lawful expenditure. You would presumably get one-half of what is lawful. I know that no members in this House would contemplate getting in that difficult

circumstance.

The auditor's fees, which last time were \$250, have been indexed, as well, to \$327. The spending by parties on advertising between elections which members will recall was \$75,000 would now go to \$98,228. These spending limits will automatically adjust on January 1 of each year. We have chosen January 1 because it's the least likely date that we'd be in the middle of an election. In other words, it would cause some difficulty, as members will appreciate, if you adjusted the limits halfway through an election campaign. It's generally thought that we're not likely to be halfway through an election campaign on January 1. July 1 is also thought to be unlikely, but it's not as unlikely as January 1, so that's the rationale for the choice of that date.

There were also some other amendments. Section 2(19) is amended to clarify the rules with respect to making donations through an agent. It will permit prosecutions for violation of this section to be commenced up to 18 months after the date of the alleged offence.

There are some other amendments. The voters' list can be revised on a day other than Saturday. The reason for this is that we now have an act which says that elections can be held on days other than Sunday; therefore, the revision list should be as close as possible to the election date, and Saturday is no longer appropriate.

There is also the removal of the requirement that the voter number must be put on the counterfoil of the ballot by the DRO (deputy returning officer). This has caused some problems in elections where DROs have written it not on the counterfoil but on the ballot, and you've had a whole slew of ballots that have been ruled invalid because they had a number on them — the voter's number. So we are taking away that provision. We don't think it will present us with any problems.

Also (and members opposite raised this, I believe last year), we will be providing blind voters with the option of using a template to mark their ballots. They will still be allowed to have a friend come in and mark their ballot for them, but the template is one provision which will be made, and this is done as well at the federal election. Last time, I believe, was the first time it was used.

Another change is that ballots from incapacitated voters (these are the mailed in ballots) will be allowed to be accepted up to the day before the final count. Again, we don't believe there are any particular problems with this, it gives the incapacitated voters additional time to have their ballots get in.

Last but not least, for those of us in the House, we'll be clarifying the rules respecting the identification that a candidate's representatives may display in the polling place. This is always a problem when you are looking for your scrutineers, and you decide that your fellows are going to have red ribbons, and our fellows are going to have red ribbons, and we all walk in and there are all these people with red ribbons, and nobody knows whose is whose. This will allow a candidate's representatives to have a plain white name tag with their name on it, so that when you walk in you'll know who the individuals are who represent the various candidates. Well, that covers the amendments that we're offering. I would, therefore, move second reading of An Act to amend The Election Act.

MR. LANE: — I note the ease with which we can have a cost of living escalator on election expenses but we can't get one on the government's programs for inflation — a suggestion we made last Friday. Mr. Speaker, I'll have more comments to make when

I've had an opportunity to peruse the bill and begt leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 112 — An Act to amend The Crown Corporations Act, 1978

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is The Crown Corporations Amendment Act, 1981. The bill is one which contains amendments to The Crown Corporations Act. It relates to the operation of the CIC (Crown investments corporation) of Saskatchewan in its role as the province's financial holding company. Members are well-aware that CIC fulfills the role of the financial holding company, not only with respect to 17 of the province's commercial Crown corporations, but it also holds the province's investment in a number of corporations operating in the private sector, such as Ipsco. Amendments proposed in the bill are designed to clarify and assist CIC in its role as a financial holding company. I can give you the amendments it includes.

Section 7 of the bill proposes a new section for the act which will clearly allow payment by CIC of Saskatchewan of dividends to the heritage fund. The proposed section will clarify the ability of CIC to make payments based upon amounts received for individual Crown corporations, which have received equity from the heritage fund as did for example, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. It will also allow CIC to pay dividends to the heritage fund based on the results of its own operations.

Another change is contained in section 6(2) of the bill. Under the amendment proposed in that subsection, CIC will be granted the authority to provide loans and financial assistance directly to subsidiaries of corporations in which CIC has an equity position.

Section 6(2) of the bill is a new subsection which will indicate that, whenever CIC has the authority to provide loans, assistance or direction to individual Crown corporations, those Crown corporations have the power and the authority to accept the loans, assistance or direction. This section does not represent a change in the law, since Crown corporations have operated on this basis in the province since 1947. It has been added simply for the purpose of clarification.

Section 8(1) of the bill prescribes that the annual statements of CIC shall, subject to treasury board regulations, be prepared in accordance with the generally accepted accounting principles. This subsection is simply a reflection of current practices, as confirmed by the report of the provincial auditor contained in the 1980 financial statements of the corporation.

A final example is contained in section 9 of the bill, which will extend the time for preparation and filing of CIC's annual statements. CIC produces a consolidated financial statement, which includes results from all Crown corporations coming under part 2 of The Crown Corporations Act, as well as the results from its other investments. In order to produce such a statement, the individual financial statements of all these corporations must be finalized prior to the preparation of CIC's statement. The need to have the consolidated statement ready for tabling (In accordance with The Tabling of Documents Act) has caused difficulties, both for the CIC staff and for the provincial auditor. The bill will not extend the time for preparation of the statement to April 30, 1981. Members opposite may recall that this type of amendment was

suggested by them during last year's Crown corporations committee meetings.

In addition to those amendments proposed to clarify the authority of CIC, a number of amendments to The Crown Corporations Act are being proposed to make the provisions of the act similar to the language contained in other provincial statutes dealing with Crown corporations. Section 5 of the bill adds a new section to the act, which will make specific references to individuals appointed to the corporation as directors. This change will make the language contained in part two of The Crown Corporations Act similar to that contained in part one and in the majority of acts relating to other Crown corporations.

Section 8(2) will allow the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to designate an auditor, other than the provincial auditor, to audit the corporation in the future, should this be appropriate. This type of section is now contained in the majority of Crown corporations legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed are primarily of a housekeeping nature. They do not represent a change in direction for CIC. The amendments are designed to clarify and improve the operation of the corporation. I believe that they should be supported by members of the Assembly. I would, therefore, move second reading of The Crown Corporations Amendment act, 1981.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, we listened with interest to the minister. We'd like to have a chance to look over the bill in a little more detail. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 107 — An Act to establish The Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased and honored to have the opportunity this afternoon to introduce second reading of a bill respecting the Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan. I propose to be brief in my remarks this afternoon, as I'm aware, Mr. Speaker, that there are many others in this Assembly who might wish to rise and support this initiative, which is being taken through the creation of this Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on March 5 of this year my colleague, the hon. member for Humboldt, the Minister of Finance, introduced the government's budgetary plans for the 1981-82 fiscal year. In the course of that budget speech, the Minister of Finance indicated that, as a government, we were desirous that residents of northern Saskatchewan, and native residents in southern Saskatchewan, would benefit from the economic opportunities that this province has to offer. In particular, Mr. Speaker, it was hoped that there would be a greater participation in the expansion of the small business sector in Saskatchewan.

My colleague went on to state, Mr. Speaker, that the government would establish an economic development foundation which would assist Northerners and natives to participate more fully in the economic growth of this province. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to stand before this Assembly today to respond to the commitments made in the budget speech, and to move second reading of a bill to establish the Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, over the years the two senior levels of government have developed and offered a number of programs which were designed to improve the social and economic circumstances of native people in this province. There is no question in my mind that many of those programs have achieved a high degree of success. At the same time, I am sure that all of the members would agree that a good deal more needs to be done, particularly in the area of long-term employment and entrepreneurial opportunities.

The legislation before us represents a major initiative on the part of the government. When fully operational the foundation created by this legislation will do much to improve the economic circumstances of Northern and native people.

Most members will remember that approximately one year ago my department assumed a major responsibility of economic development for native people. For the most part, this entailed the delivery and administration of the Special ARDA (Agriculture and Rural Development Act) program, and the expansion of our employment opportunities program. At the same time, and perhaps more importantly, this new responsibility entailed the examination and exploration of new initiatives which would enhance and improve economic opportunities for, and the economic circumstances of, this province's native peoples.

The foundation concept is the result of that examination and exploration. Underlining the foundation concept is the realization that by virtue of their history our native people find themselves in very special circumstances. It will take some unique type of initiatives to open up economic opportunities for them and for other Northerners. In particular, Mr. Speaker, it will require co-operation of government, of native and northern people and of the private sector.

The proposed foundation is a unique mechanism designed to facilitate this needed co-operation. We envisage the board of directors of this foundation as having representation from all of those interested groups. Through their interaction, the initiatives to be undertaken by this foundation will be determined. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while the creation for the foundation is an initiative of the Saskatchewan government, I want to emphasize that in its implementation we look forward to it becoming a partnership of all interested parties.

Native people have argued (and quite correctly) that if the development initiatives for their people are to be effective, they must have some say in those initiatives. At the same time, I believe that it is recognized that since natives and Northerners are a part of our society. Therefore, their development cannot proceed in isolation from the larger community.

The various levels of government and the private sector, clearly also, have a major role to play. The act which we have before us recognizes, Mr. Speaker, that there are vast differences between the needs in northern Saskatchewan and those in the southern part. In recognition of this, the act makes specific provision for the creation of two subsidiary corporations to deliver the foundation's programs. One of these will be based in northern Saskatchewan and will respond to the specific needs of people in the North; the other will be based in the southern part of the province and will respond to the specific needs of native people in southern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as a government we recognize that we alone cannot deliver economic development to native groups and individuals, We can, however, establish and put in

place the instruments and vehicles for this development. The foundation proposal before us is such an instrument. I would emphasize again that success in this area can only be realized through co-operation and consultation. As a government, we feel that the Economic Development Foundation of Saskatchewan will provide a focal point for that co-ordination and consultation and will in time be a catalyst for change. With this vision in mind, I am honored to move second reading of this bill.

MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the minister. It is interesting, since the Minister of Finance announced this foundation (and we have been waiting for some details on it since March 5, the date of the budget), that you would wait until this late date in the session to introduce this. Certainly, there are people on both sides of the House and in all parts of the province who agree that the goals which you mention are desirable to bring native residents and northern residents into the mainstream. I do have some differences with the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan over some of the methods used to try to achieve some of these goals.

I would like to look at the bill in more detail, and with that I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 110 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act (No. 3)

HON. MR. LONG: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this afternoon to move amendments to sections 17 and 31 of The Vehicles Act.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Saskatchewan trucking industry, particularly those involved in oil field activity, have voiced strong concern over the ability of carriers to obtain Saskatchewan licences simply through the purchase of shares of existing certificate holders. When an individual or company wishes to obtain a public service vehicle certificate, whether it is in its own right or as a result of purchasing an existing company, applications must be made to the highway traffic board. If, after giving all interested parties an opportunity to be heard, the board finds that public business will be promoted, the request and registration will be issued. However, if the shares of an existing certificate holder are purchased, the new entrant avoids any form of scrutiny. This proposal is intended to ensure that the board has the necessary authority to review corporate takeovers and thus maintain an awareness and control of the concentration of power within the industry and the fitness of its applicants.

A recent court decision suggests, Mr. Speaker, that the current wording of sections 17 and 31 are inconsistent with the highway traffic board's delegated federal authority under the Motor Vehicles Transport Act of Canada. The proposed amendment will also correct this.

Mr. Speaker, the other important amendments I wish to make this afternoon see the need for changes to sections 13, 86, 247 and 248 of The Vehicles Act. They result from the recent decision by the Supreme Court of Canada that subsection 238.3 of the Criminal Code was unconstitutional. That part dealt, Mr. Speaker, with driving while disqualified. The new legislation will put in place effective measures to remedy the problems created by the supreme court decision. It is, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government to administer justice that is appropriate to the offender but does not as a side issue create hardship for others.

The principal thrust of this legislation then will be to separate the driver from the

vehicle. The vehicle may be his own or, in some circumstances, it may belong to someone else who may knowingly, or otherwise, permit a disqualified driver to use it. If, of course, another party knowingly permits a disqualified driver to drive his or her vehicle, then that party is also liable under the act. Briefly, Mr. Speaker, section 13 relates to the courses to which offenders may be sent, and section 86 refers to those changes which are to make appropriate references to offences which formerly came under the code, but are now offences under The Vehicles Act. The old sections 247 and 248 are repealed.

The new section 247 deals simply with the new definitions. Section 247(1) describes the offence of driving while disqualified and prescribes the penalties. Section 247(2) refers merely to the technical evidence required to prove driving while disqualified. Section 247(3) deals with failing to pay the fine, or failing to attend a prescribed course. It also permits the cancellation of the registration of the vehicle, and provides for any refund of the registration to go first to the court to be paid against the fine.

Finally, this section deals with the non-resident and, in effect, removes his right to drive in Saskatchewan under the 90-day provision allowed under section 65 of The Vehicles Act, if that driver fails to meet these requirements imposed upon him or her subsequent to conviction for this offence in Saskatchewan. Section 247(4) provides for impounding for failure to pay fines upon third conviction. Section 247(5) makes provision for a judicial appeal which may result in the staying of the routine procedures.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, section 248 makes it an offence for any party knowingly to permit a disqualified driver to drive his or her vehicle. It may be argued, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is either too tough or perhaps not tough enough. In response to either comment, I would refer to my earlier remarks, relative to the government's desire to separate the driver from the vehicle. This legislation, I submit, Mr. Speaker, makes adequate provision for the achievement of that end. Mr. Speaker, I would now respectfully move second reading of An Act to Amend The Vehicles Act.

MR. TAYLOR: — I'd like to take a look at this. There are quite a few changes the minister was discussing so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 109 — An Act respecting the Assessment of Real Property, Businesses and Special Franchises

HON. MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of this bill, An Act respecting the Assessment of Real Property, Businesses and Special Franchises. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, partly originates from the division of the previous Department of Municipal Affairs into two separate departments, rural and urban.

In order to maintain assessments in an efficient and equitable manner between all municipalities, it was decided that the assessment function would not be divided between the Department of Rural Affairs and Department of Urban Affairs. The Assessment Act passed by the legislature at the '79-80 sitting provided for an interim independent assessment commission to be known as the Saskatchewan Assessment Authority. The legislation will also create the Saskatchewan Assessment Appeal Board. I will deal first with the assessment authority.

It will be the duty of the Saskatchewan Assessment Authority to provide assessments to all municipalities, both rural and urban, in the province of Saskatchewan. The assessment function is one which our government considers to be of utmost importance. Our government, being mindful of the rights of the individual, is ensuring that each ratepayer will be required to carry only his or her fair share of the tax burden — not any more, just a fair share.

The assessment provisions of this legislation are basically those presently contained in the municipal assessment act. We are including in this legislation a right of entry section to permit an assessor to make fair and accurate assessments. There is also provision to guarantee the confidentiality of the information obtained in the evaluation process.

I noted a few minutes ago that this legislation also creates the Saskatchewan Assessment Appeal Board. The duty of this board will be to hear all appeals against assessments which may properly be brought before it. The assessment appeal board will replace the present Saskatchewan Assessment Commission. In order to ensure a more equitable and efficient appeal service to local government and the individual ratepayers, this legislation will provide for an appeal board consisting of not less than three members, one of whom will be the chairman. There can be more than three members. The present act limits the members of the appeal board to only three; they are not full-time positions and a number of appeals may place considerable demand on the appointed members at any one time. Therefore we are proposing that permission be in the act to appoint more than three persons.

Other than the change of name and the number of board members, many of the provisions in the act are similar to those now exercised by the commission. Perhaps we can go into the detail of this bill more thoroughly in committee. I think once the members have seen the bill they will recognize that other than establishing the board and changing the appeal process, many of the provisions are similar and identical to what they have been. I think they will find it easy to review the bill. Should they have any difficulty with a particular section, I will be glad to consult with them.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, I was handed these notes which are pertinent to this bill last Friday. I thank the minister for giving them to me ahead of time. It certainly helps to speed things up. I read through these notes over the weekend and as far as I see there is nothing wrong with this bill. I also handed copies of this bill to several councils. I see no problem with it, but the councils will get back to me today or tomorrow with their interpretations of the bill. So at this time I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 111 — An Act to amend The Condominium Property Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, before moving second reading of this bill, I would like to first point out to the House that the essential purpose of the amendment is to provide the Saskatchewan municipalities and cities with the power to approve or disapprove of conversion of apartment buildings to condominiums under a corporate

share or lease agreement. The problem addressed in the amendment is one where a corporate structure for each apartment in a block would be created. A share structure would be prepared based on the square footage of each suite and with each suite having allocated a certain number of shares. The shares would then be offered for sale to the public with the residing tenants having first option. The corporation would then lease the suite under a 75-year lease agreement to the share purchaser for his own residence or for renting to someone else.

At the present time this type of structure does not fall within the definition of condominium under The Condominium Property Act. Therefore municipalities do not have the power to approve or to disapprove of this type of conversion, as they do in the case of an ordinary condominium conversion. The proposed legislation rectifies this situation by requiring that the purchase of shares under this type of arrangement be conditional upon the condominium plan being registered under the act. The plans must be approved by the relevant local municipal authority in order to be registered.

The city of Regina recently passed a resolution requesting an amendment to deal with the conversion. Consultation with the officials of Prince Albert and also Saskatoon indicates support for this particular type of amendment.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of an Act to amend The Condominium Property Act.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, my critic for this position is tied up at this time so, therefore, I would like her to have a chance to look over the minister's words. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 113 — An Act to amend The Agricultural Implements Act

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — I am pleased to move the amendments to The Agricultural Implements Act (1981). The hon. members will recall the statement before ministerial statements, which relates to the North Battleford situation. I report to the hon. members that so does the legislation. The legislation attempts to address the situation from now on — our statement dealing with farmers who are caught with having paid and perhaps being forced to pay.

This legislation comes forward at this time to clarify an important point of law, a point of law which, until recently, the lawyers and financial institutions felt was settled. The point of law is that if a financial institution accepts payments from a dealer on an assigned contract, the dealer is the agent of the financial institution. Let me attempt to explain.

In this day financing is a fact of life. Every article of personal property capable of being financed to enable its purchase is the subject of financing. This is especially true with large-priced items or large-ticket items like farm equipment, where financial institutions offer interest free periods and thereby make it economically advantageous for a farmer to finance, at least for the interest free period.

It is the usual practice when an item of personal property is bought on time or, in another word, financed, for the dealer to assign or sell the security agreement for a financial institution — a bank, credit union or a finance company. As soon as the

financial institution gives notice of the assignment to the buyer of the item, who is also called the debtor, under the security agreement, the buyer is required to make all payments directly to the financial institution. Before the notice is received by the buyer he may make payments to the dealer but after the dealer receives notice that the contract has been assigned to the financial company, if the buyer makes payments to the dealer, he does so at his own risk. If after the notice has been given the buyer makes payments to the dealer and the dealer does not forward the payments to the financial institution, the buyer remains liable to the financial institution for the payment made to the dealer.

The only exception to this simply stated rule is that if the dealer is the agent of the financial institution, then the buyer may make the payments to the dealer without impunity. It is here that the law must be clarified. It has always been the opinion of the financial and legal community that if the financial institution accepted payments from the dealer, then an agency relationship was created. The amendments to The Agricultural Implements Act ensure that this is the law, at least in the area of agricultural implement financing. The amendments provide as follows:

1. That an implement dealer who assigns a security interest remains the agent of the financial institution to which the security agreement has been assigned until notice of the assignment is given to the buyer.
2. The notice required to be given to the buyer must be sent separate from the security agreement by registered mail.
3. If the financial institution accepts the payment from the dealer, the dealer becomes the agent of the financial institution until the financial institution gives a new notice by registered mail.

We feel that this amendment balances appropriately the rights of the financial institutions and buyers of farm equipment. It is expected that these amendments will be welcomed by the farming community. It is an important area of the law and well worth the consideration of this Assembly, particularly in light of the past experience.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of The Agricultural Implements Amendment Act, 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the minister's comments. I think probably this is a bill that we on this side of the Assembly can support. However, since the bill has just been introduced, there are some groups I would like to discuss the ramifications with and hopefully, I will do that shortly. We should be able to proceed with our end of passing this legislation, probably tomorrow.

In light of that, I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 105 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, the main portion of this bill consists of changes in the procedures for handling complaints about and disciplining lawyers. The benchers

of the law society consider that disciplinary procedures are inadequate to handle the volume and the type of complaints which are being made. The changes proposed in the bill have been developed at the request of and in close consultation with the benchers. Briefly, the changes are as follows:

1. There will only be one basis for complaints — conduct unbecoming a barrister and solicitor. Conduct unbecoming is defined broadly and gives the society considerable scope to regulate the conduct of its members. This is similar to the situation in Alberta.
2. There will be a separation of the investigative and the judicial functions of the discipline committees. All the benchers will be members of the discipline committee. When a complaint is received, the chairman or the first or second vice-chairman of the discipline committee may set up an investigation committee. The investigation committee may recommend that the complaint go to a hearing committee. Its members cannot serve on the hearing committee or participate in the determination of the penalty. If the hearing committee finds the member guilty of conduct unbecoming, the discipline committee determines the penalty.
3. The appeal period from a decision of the discipline committee will be reduced from six months to 30 days. Lawyers will not automatically be reinstated pending appeal, but will have the right to apply to the court of appeal for the reinstatement pending the final disposition of the appeal.
4. The discipline committee, the investigation committee and hearing committee will have the right to suspend a lawyer pending the investigation or the hearing.
5. The discipline committee will also have the right, as a penalty option, to impose conditions under which a lawyer must practise if he is found guilty of conduct unbecoming.

There are other amendments not related to the complaint and disciplinary procedure.

1. The number of the benchers from Saskatoon will be increased from three to five, and the dean of law will be added as a bencher.
2. The amendment will make it clear that the old benchers serve until the first convocation after an election.
3. The law society will be able to charge the actual expenses of an audit of a lawyer's account, and not be limited to a fee of \$1,000.
4. The law society will be required to set up a trust account for money which has sat in a lawyer's trust account for three years where the lawyer cannot pay out the money to a person entitled to it.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate that we will be supporting the bill after the tremendous rhetoric of the member opposite swayed us doubters. No, I simply would like to say that, frankly, I would commend the actions of the law society in this

regard to other organizations that are self-disciplining bodies, because this is a considerable advance over any other profession in the province of Saskatchewan. I'm sure the minister will agree. It's going to allow the lawyers to discipline members who do not keep up with the changes in the law or their profession. They must show the skills in that regard. That's a very difficult area to discipline members in any profession, but it's a requirement that simply is long overdue.

Again, I would hope that other professions that are self-disciplining would follow the leadership of the legal professional in this regard, to ensure the highest degree of professional standards. Again, I believe it is long overdue, Mr. Speaker, and we will be supporting the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. ALLEN: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to introduce some special guests?

I am delighted this afternoon to introduce to the members, particularly those members who may not have had the pleasure of meeting her before, a distinguished former member of this Assembly, Marjorie Cooper Hunt, who is seated in the Speaker's gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN: — I remember Marjorie as a member here when I was a page. I was always impressed by the forcefulness of her arguments and the kindness that she showed to everyone she came in contact with. She's accompanied today, Mr. Speaker, by her husband, Wilf Hunt. Wilf's the one on the end, and we are delighted too to have with us Wilf and Marjorie's granddaughter from Toronto, Beth Hunt. I know all members will want to join with me in welcoming the Hunts to the Assembly this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 106 — An Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act.

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed to The Summary Offences Procedure Act do not effect any substantive changes to provincial criminal proceedings, but are aimed at clarifying the procedure before the courts. The amendment to section 2(c) of the act is required as the previous game act has been repealed and replaced by The Wildlife Act.

Prior to 1972, section 3 of the act read substantially the same as the proposed amendment to section 3. It is considered advisable to adopt the Criminal Code procedure to provincial offences as such may apply from time to time, rather than to continue to limit our adoption of the Criminal Code procedure to specific dates as is now the case. This will aid the courts and the public as consistency in proceedings will follow in the courts.

Where the province wishes to opt out of any Criminal Code changes which may be effected in the future this can be accomplished by amending the act or the regulations.

The reference to 722(9) is deleted from the provincial adoption of the code procedure as this section allows the court to request a report on a person's financial circumstances where the court is considering putting the offender in jail in default of a fine payment. There is no provincial method of obtaining such a report and therefore the provincial court has requested that this provision not be adopted for the provincial offences.

Many of the matters now dealt with by way of summary offences tickets are heard before justices of the peace, rather than the provincial judges. Therefore, it is considered appropriate that these justices of the peace have the same authority as provincial judges to grant adjournments and issue warrants for failure to appear. The proposed amendments to sections 10 and 11 will accomplish this. These amendments are drafted as retroactive to cure any jurisdictional problems which may exist among the justices of the peace who have exercised the authority to adjourn the proceedings based on the misapprehension that the statute gave them power to do so.

The amendment proposed to section 12 is intended to clarify the intent of that section. In 1979 this House implemented the summary offences procedure to allow persons to pay off a fine levied under provincial legislation by the approved program of community service work. In such a way it is hoped that the offenders will learn to serve and appreciate their communities. As the word 'person' may, by statutory interpretation, also include corporations and as a community service option will not directly affect the corporation, it is felt to be undesirable to extend the fine option program to corporations. Therefore the legislation is being changed to clearly indicate that the fine option applies only to natural persons.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move that an Act to amend The Summary Offences Procedure Act be read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 95 — **An Act respecting the Stabilization of Returns to Beef Producers in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I notice everyone today seems to preface his remarks with the comments that it's a pleasure to be on his feet to talk about this legislation. I don't find it a particular pleasure to be on my feet to talk about this bill, because it is poor legislation. It's legislation that we don't need; it's legislation that we never have needed and it's the sort of patchwork legislation that the beef industry in the North American continent has been plagued with, not only by your government but by a variety of other governments. It is a patchwork, it does not get to the problem and, I repeat, is legislation that over the long run is more of a detriment than any sort of an asset.

I think it's ironic that an industry, namely the beef industry, has never asked for any degree of government assistance other than some minor isolated pocket which makes up less than 1 or 2 per cent of the industry. Basically, the beef industry has asked government to stay out of its affairs. History has shown, certainly in the last 10 years, that government intervention into the livestock industry has done nothing but bring about chaos and has solved little. In fact, it has created more problems than it has ever solved.

I point to the hog industry. You will recall some years ago that the Government of Saskatchewan one day informed the hog producers that they had a marketing board. The hog producers weren't exactly lobbying at the government's doors for a marketing board. They weren't exactly beating down your doors in the legislature to say, "Give us a marketing board." Oh, there were some groups who were, granted. The NFU (National Farmers' Union) was beating down the door. Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was going their tacit support. But the Saskatchewan hog producers, as a body, never ever approached you about a marketing board.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What?

MR. THATCHER: — I hear a "what?" from the deputy minister at that time. I hear a "what?" of surprise from the deputy minister at that time who shepherded that infamous legislation through. I defy you to stand up and tell us that the Saskatchewan hog producers asked for a marketing board. I defy you to stand up and give us the names, dates, and places of where they ever did that. But I guess we are on a different bill. You were probably the worst, most politicized deputy minister. You started the trend of making one of the most prestigious public service positions in government into what every minister ever since has been — a hack. It has been a political position.

Mr. Speaker, what were the results of your incursion into the hog industry? Well, the number of producers dropped very dramatically. The number of hogs produced dropped dramatically. Production all the way across the board dropped dramatically on the altar of orderly marketing — the altar which the government across the way will sacrifice anything to.

Mr. Speaker, the livestock industry, and particularly the beef industry, has been plagued by government programs, which have simply not worked and have compounded the issue throughout the past decade. No government in Canada has had quite the political courage to tackle the cattle industry head on and say, "Here's a marketing board." There has been lots of talk about it. There has been lots of probing around the centre and lots of fencing. But no government has really had the nerve to take the livestock cattlemen on front and centre and bring in a marketing board. Part of the reason for that is despite the philosophy of this government in eroding the electoral power of rural Saskatchewan and despite this government's avowed intention to turn the bulk of the constituencies into urban seats, cattlemen still have some political clout in this province. Many an NDP seat out there with a certain shift in the right spot could suddenly end up in the PC camp.

If I may return to the bill briefly, I would suggest to the people opposite that this is not (and I repeat is not) a stabilization bill. This is a backdoor approach to a marketing board. It is not a stabilization board or a stabilization plan. It will no more stabilize the cattle industry in the province than the western Canada grain stabilization plan has stabilized the grain industry. Does somebody want to stand up and tell me that

stabilization plan, put forward with such great fanfare two or three years ago, has stabilized anything? Does anybody want to stand up and tell me that? Hardly; they take the money from the farmer, and when it is politically opportune, they pay it back at a rate of return, so far, of about minus 10 per cent interest. That's what that one has been.

This bill doesn't even go that far. This is a marketing board, a voluntary one to be sure. If it were to remain voluntary, who would care? There comes the crunch of the whole thing, a question of credibility . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I say to the member for Saskatoon, who probably hasn't been outside the confines of the asphalt jungle in Saskatoon, we're now talking about things that go on in rural Saskatchewan. While certainly your comments are always well taken, and certainly always well-received in this Assembly, perhaps when you are into an area that really isn't the apex of your expertise, you could just remain silent for a few moments, even though it does pain you. However, if it amuses you and turns your crank to sound like the village idiot, by all means continue. You are not bothering me. I think you are bothering your own people more than you are me.

Mr. Minister, were this thing to be voluntary, who could care less? Those of us in the cattle industry absolutely couldn't care less if you leave it voluntary. But the fact of the matter is that we don't believe it will stay voluntary at all. Your past track record tells us and it tells the livestock industry that you cannot be trusted. The hog people couldn't trust you. The cattlemen don't trust you.

That is not to say that we don't have problems in the cattle industry. We have some severe problems, but this stabilization plan, this marketing board, will solve absolutely none of them. As I indicated a moment or two ago, if it were to stay voluntary, set it up. You wouldn't get very many clients into it anyway. What do the traditional cattlemen care whether it is there? Your track record indicates clearly that you can't be trusted. Your track record indicates that we can't take your word. Your track record tells us that about one year after the next election (if, by some miracle you still happen to be the government) cattlemen would wake up and find themselves with the same sort of disgusting marketing board that the hog producers have found themselves with. That is the concern of the cattle industry.

At this point in time you have virtually no support in the country for your program. The Saskatchewan stock growers who represent by far the largest segment of the beef cattle industry have said, "No, we don't want it." . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well now, the member across the way says, "Baloney!" I invite the member for Redberry to check with the stock growers (and based on the assumption that you have learned to use a telephone) phone Maple Creek and ask for the secretary-manager, Mr. Parent. Ask him what he says. The Saskatchewan stock growers want no part whatsoever of this bill. The Saskatchewan stock growers, who represent far and away — as a parent organization or through their affiliations — the vast majority of the cattlemen in this province say, "No."

Ironically enough, there's another little group which has been very vocal against this bill. Again, they are a pretty small group but none the less they are opposed to it from different reasons. That group is the NFU.

Those are the two extreme ends of the political spectrum (or economic spectrum, I suppose) — the stock growers on the right hand, and the NFU on the left hand, and they are both against it. Tell me who is in favor of it. Basically it's the cow-calf group and their unpaid membership of 32 people. That's who you have in your camp.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to tell you that things are all wonderful in the cattle industry because they're not, and they are certainly compounded by the drought. They are compounded by problems for which this government has shown an inability to assist with. They are compounded with low water tables for which this government across the way will not give assistance to do something as basic as digging a dugout, or digging out a spring or deepening an old one. These things have never occurred to this government.

Then we have all sorts of market conditions. It is simply not rational logic that you can somehow create a utopia in the province of Saskatchewan isolated from the rest of the world. There are dangers in this bill that go far beyond this legislature . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well now, I'm going to tell you, if you don't get impatient. If you just relax, you will get it piece by piece. Since we don't have many people over there with much knowledge much less expertise in the livestock industry, I'm trying to go slowly and keep it simple so that even the grade 3 level can understand what I'm trying to say.

Mr. Speaker, no one who knows anything about the industry can ignore the basic fact that the beef cattle industry is an international one on this continent. In other words, we are tied in to the situation on the North American continent and we have two choices. We can either have a free movement of beef across the 49th parallel and have access to a market of about 260 million, or we can close off our borders and have access to about 22 million. Now, those are our alternatives. Let me tell you that not every producer, and not everyone in the United States, is exactly thrilled about the Canadian beef that comes into the United States.

Last fall we heard comments about the volume of slaughter steers coming into Canada from the United States, and there was some talk that this should be curtailed. That kind of talk showed a total lack of understanding of the entire beef situation. At the time the slaughter steers were coming in, the Americans were the only ones who were keeping our cow market alive, because at that time about 85 per cent of our cows (slaughter cows) were going south of the line. The only way the cattle industry can function is with the closest thing we can achieve to complete freedom of movement across the line. This is a basic and it is essential to the cattle industry.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, not every person in the United States is exactly thrilled about the movement of Canadian beef into the United States. Many livestock groups, particularly in the northern states, are lobbying constantly with their congressmen and their senators to do what they can to close the border to Canadian beef. They have vowed many times that if Canada ever starts subsidizing their beef that will be the excuse they need to close the border to Canadian beef.

Mr. Minister, this is one of my very large concerns with this bill. Are you providing that element in the United States with the excuse they need to close their border to Canadian beef?

You cannot build an island; you cannot solve our difficulties in Saskatchewan unilaterally. Maybe Pierre can act unilaterally but you cannot. The sad fact of the matter is that we are subject to world forces in the beef cattle industry. One of those things is the supply of offshore beef and the impact it has on our North American market.

I respectfully point out to you, Mr. Minister, that a meat import law has been proposed

in the House of Commons for many years. We're now seeing the second administration which has attempted to bring it in. It was written, I believe, by the former Clark government. Now, Mr. Whelan is attempting to bring it in basically unchanged.

Mr. Minister, what that meat import law does is to regulate the amount of offshore meat in terms of historical consumption and in relation to market demands. I suggest that you could probably do more for the cattle industry by telling your federal cohorts in Ottawa that you would like them to support this meat import law.

I note in the Saturday evening paper of the *Leader-Post* that this meat import law faces a very rocky passage through the House of Commons. One of the reasons which is being enunciated as to why it is going to have a difficult time is the position of the New Democratic Party, which has suggested that this meat import law may very well raise the price of beef to consumers.

Now, Mr. Minister, I think that if you want to help the cattleman, and I accept your sincerity as being genuine, I urge you to talk to your federal counterparts in Ottawa. Tell them to get this meat import law through. That law will do far more for the cattle industry (the cattlemen in western Canada) than the legislation you are proposing today in this Assembly.

I suggest to you, more as a cattleman than as an MLA, that this is bad legislation. It has ramifications down the road that could be horrendous in our relations with our neighbors to the south as far as the free movement of cattle is concerned.

Again, I repeat, we have two choices in this country — lock ourselves into a market of 22 million, or have access to a market of about 260 million — the combined population of both countries. I suggest to you very clearly that the long-term interests of Saskatchewan and Canadian cattlemen are better served by having access to the most affluent market in the world — namely, the United States.

I suggest that anything which may jeopardize that position is bad legislation. But, then, I have to add the other — why I'll oppose it and why everyone on this side of the Assembly will oppose this legislation. It is not what you call it. It is not a stabilization plan. It is a voluntary marketing board. It is a voluntary marketing board, which I can't question. I can't question the right of anybody to set up a marketing board on a voluntary basis.

But, Mr. Minister historically (since 1971 under the Blakeney government) the livestock industry cannot trust your government. We do not believe it will stay voluntary. On that basis I will oppose the bill.

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of Bill No. 95 and to tell the hon. member for Thunder Creek that I am pleased to get up and support this bill even if he isn't.

As a member for a rural constituency, a constituency where beef production makes up a very important part of the farm income, I wholeheartedly support the move toward stabilization and orderly marketing for beef producers.

Since I was elected in 1975 it has been one of my priorities to see that legislation like Bill No. 95 is enacted to protect the beef producers in our part of the province.

Both my constituents and I were extremely pleased to see that the stabilization plan was announced in the budget speech. It is just another example in a long list of the New Democratic Party's passing legislation which is in the best interests of most farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, my constituency, as you know, is in what is known as the parkland belt of Saskatchewan. The farms are of small and medium size. Often, beef cattle are kept because the income from grain sales alone is not sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living for the family. When there are low quotas, as there has been in the past, and the farmer needs money for his day-to-day operations, it is handy for him to be able to load up some of his cattle and take them to market.

When cattle can be sold for a good price, producers such as those in my riding make an adequate income. But when the price plunges to depressed levels, such as those between 1974 and 1979, those same small producers take a real financial beating. Raising beef changes from being a profitable diversification and a worthwhile means of using some of the by-products from grain farming and a good method of land utilization into an economic disaster for hundreds of farm families.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about the huge well-established ranching operation or the feedlot owner who operates on a corporate scale. Many of them profess to like the completely unregulated free market for beef. Why shouldn't they? They can afford to withhold their cattle from market for a longer period of time when the price for beef is down; they can afford to wait and play the market to their best advantage. This new stabilization legislation may . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Have you ever tried to keep a finished steer around for a year? Have you ever tried to keep one of those?

MR. BANDA: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member would just listen, he would understand why we're supporting this legislation. This new stabilization legislation will not attract a great many of those producers. But I know that on the smaller and on the average sized mixed farms in my constituency and all across the province, there are beef producers who have worked all their lives to make a go of it, only to see the unregulated free market rob them time and time again of a fair price for their product. They will welcome this new stabilization plan, and I predict they will support it because it's a good plan.

Mr. Speaker, for many years, we in the New Democratic Party have advocated a national plan to stabilize beef marketing. A commission or a board functioning on the national level would make much more sense, when you think of the amount of both live and slaughtered beef that crosses provincial borders. But Ottawa has resisted, and Saskatchewan producers were of the opinion that they could wait no longer, so we are proceeding with this bill setting up a provincial plan. Beef producers have suffered for a long time under the so-called free market system and its cycles and fluctuations. I recently looked up some figures in a publication put out by Agriculture Canada, called *A Livestock Market Review*, and this is what I found. We'll go back a few years just to point out what has happened.

In the year 1930, the average price per cwt. of beef sold by producers at the Saskatoon stockyards was \$5.55. Just three years later in the depression year of 1933, the

average had dropped to \$2.25/cwt., and beef prices remained very low throughout the depression. It was not until 1941 that cattle once again sold at the Saskatoon stockyards for the 1930 level of \$5.55/cwt. The cattle prices of the Saskatoon yards then jumped quickly to an average of \$9.05 in 1943, and over the next two years the price was down well under \$9, only to rise again in the late '40s to about \$15/cwt.

Early in the 1950s, cattle prices soared to average over \$20/cwt all the way up to an average of \$27.71 in 1951, Mr. Speaker. That 1951 figure is an important one because it demonstrates the tremendous difficulty beef producers have had in trying to plan for the future. Just two years later in 1953 cattle prices were cut in half at the Saskatoon yards again, from a high of \$27.71/cwt in '51. Cattle prices plunged to just over \$13 during the years between '53 and '56.

The fluctuation continued, Mr. Speaker, all through the 1960s, up to \$20.15/cwt. in '62, down to \$17.10 in '64, and back up to \$26.65 in 1969. It was only in 1971 that the average price producers received for their beef at the Saskatoon stockyards once again reached the mark of 1951. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what you think, but I believe any system that forces farmers to wait 20 years to get a good price for their product is a system that should have some changes made to it.

Again, in the early 1970s we saw cattle prices rise quickly, up to an average of \$31.99/cwt. in 1972, and \$41.45 in 1973. Then, as usual, the bottom fell out of the market and prices came crashing down to a low of \$29.17 in 1976. Now prices did not recover to the 1973 level at the Saskatoon yards until mid-May and that was through 1978. Prices since that time have risen to a high of just under \$75/cwt. during 1980, and are on the way down in the first quarter of 1981.

Wild fluctuations in cattle prices make it difficult for beef producers to do any kind of sensible planning. They are almost always completely at the mercy of the market forces, which not only rob them in most years of a fair return, but at times actually drive some producers right out of the cattle business.

Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1975, it was estimated that there was 1.304 million head in the Saskatchewan beef cow herd. But with cattle prices at extremely low levels in the middle 1970s, a massive sell-off of the provincial herd took place. By July 1, 1979, the Department of Agriculture estimated that just 1.5 million head remain. Hidden in those figures, in that drastic reduction in cattle numbers are countless hundreds of hardship stories for small beef producers, and many family farm-sized economic disaster that should not have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, what amazes me is that the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan continues to defend a system that plunders the pockets and the bank accounts of the beef producers and the mixed farmers of this province. The PCs, with their narrow-minded view of all economic questions, have decided that since the large ranchers and the corporations and the feedlots make a fine living with the present free market system, that that is what we should have. If those interests would support the PC Party who are opposed to this completely voluntary stabilization program, then I guess their little messenger boys over there that sit opposite have to oppose it, too.

Forget that the program makes sense, Mr. Speaker. Forget that it will be worth millions of dollars to smaller and medium-sized beef producers across the province, and forget that one farm organization after another has endorsed the program as a good thing. I'll list them because the stock growers is the only group that's opposed, and they are in

such low numbers that it doesn't make any difference. The Tories will forget all of that and oppose the beef stabilization plan, because it's the kind of economic legislation that they simply hate to see passed into law.

The bill gives average farmers some clout in the market place so that they can better compete with the big operators. It allows average people some measure of control over what they will receive for work that they do. It will help keep the small family farms viable and those things are just simply unacceptable to the Conservative Party. Why is it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when you bring in a program of fairness and justice and good economic sense no Tory could possibly endorse that kind of thing? There's just no way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say for my part and for every beef producer in my constituency that I wholeheartedly support this bill and I'll be very pleased to vote with the majority on this side of the House to see that it's passed and put into law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. JOHNSON: — This act is an act which I find very interesting in a number of ways. One of the things that is of interest to me is that it is an act that comes about after the development of a stabilization plan by a number of groups that represent what I believe to be the major cattle producers in the province. It has occurred after the implementation of SHARP (Saskatchewan Hog Assured Returns Program) and the effects which that had on pork production in the province.

The beef producers, who are having the same type of agricultural problems, looked at this particular program and realized that it was necessary if you were going to maintain beef production in the province. They asked for this particular type of legislation. It did not occur, Mr. Deputy Speaker, overnight. They came to the conclusion that they should go in this direction over a number of years.

I have taken the opportunity, as I believe very few members of this assembly have, to attend meetings of the Western Canadian Cow-Calf Association over that period of time as they developed the policies that brought about this bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I am going to be supporting this bill. I think it shows that the programs and policies which the NDP government has put into place have proven to be effective and are liked in the agricultural community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

YEAS — 27

Blakeney
Kaeding
Gross
Mostoway
Shillington

Pepper
Snyder
Rolfes
Cody
Prebble

Allen
McArthur
MacMurchy
Koskie
Johnson

Smishek
Skoberg
Thompson
White

Tchorzewski
Banda
Cowley
Chapman

Baker
Vickar
Nelson
Miner

NAYS — 15

Berntson
Duncan
Rousseau
Pickering
Garner

Thatcher
Lane
Swan
Muirhead
Andrew

Birkbeck
Taylor
Hardy
Katzman
McLeod

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 100 — **An Act to amend The Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act** be now read a second time.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I guess we have another bill for which we can thank the Minister of Agriculture. It is not enough that we have to move into the regimentation of the past bill, but now we see the Department of Agriculture reduced to where it has to steal money from the producers. It is reduced to where we have to see the Department of Agriculture legitimize the thievery of \$90,000 to \$100,000 of producers' own money. What more can I say? It's absolute, legitimate thievery of producers' own money — money which producers have voluntarily put into a fund for use as they saw fit.

What is this money earmarked for when the government gets its hands on it? Will it be administered by the producers who put up the money/ Will it be administered by the producers who put forward the money in a voluntary checkoff? Heavens, no! It will go to a board that this government has put representatives on, put consumers on, put people on who don't represent producers at all — splinter groups in the livestock industry who have no base of a membership other than one or two people who have a political loyalty to the New Democratic Party. That's where this money is going. I think it typifies the contempt, scorn and determination of the Blakeney government to bring a strong-willed group of individuals to heel for no other reason than that they do not support either the political or the economic philosophy of the New Democratic Party — the government of the day — over this bill.

I call it thievery, stealing and everything else. I can only express to you, on behalf of the legitimate cattlemen in Saskatchewan, the contempt, scorn and disgust that the Department of Agriculture so richly deserves. We will oppose the bill.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

YEAS — 27

| | | |
|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Blakeney | Pepper | Allen |
| Kaeding | Snyder | Tchorzewski |
| Baker | Skoberg | McArthur |
| Gross | Rolfes | MacMurchy |
| Mostoway | Banda | Vickar |
| Thompson | Cowley | Cody |
| Koskie | Shillington | Poniatowski |
| Prebble | Johnson | Nelson |
| White | Chapman | Miner |

NAYS — 15

| | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| Berntson | Thatcher | Birkbeck |
| Duncan | Lane | Taylor |
| Rousseau | Swan | Hardy |
| Pickering | Muirhead | Katzman |
| Garner | Andrew | McLeod |

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 103 — **An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act** be now read a second time.

MR. ANDREW: — I have just a few comments on this matter, Mr. Speaker. I understand the reception of this bill by those involved in Corman Park has been reasonably favorable. We agree that the legislation is probably in place, the MVA can proceed and the residents of Corman Park feel they are not being dictated to by the government in particular, but by the Meewasin Valley Authority. I have nothing else to say, Mr. Speaker, other than I will be supporting this amendment to the Meewasin Valley Authority.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this bill for just a few minutes. I should warn members that the Attorney General closed debate on this bill and wishes to speak on it. Since he isn't here. I will be adjourning debate on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He agreed to let it roll.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Then I will certainly not be adjourning debate so that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland can speak on it. But I do know that the Attorney General would like to close debate on it.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am in favor of this bill. There is some reluctance on my part to be supporting it, but I will be. The reason for that is (as all members on this side and I am sure all members in this House believe) that when a duly elected jurisdiction such as the R.M. of Corman Park changes its mind, rightly or wrongly, the wishes of that jurisdiction should be respected. Of course, this government has always respected the wishes of jurisdictions such as rural municipal councils. That is exactly what this bill will be doing — respecting the wishes of that particular council.

I do want to say a few words with regard to a meeting I had. First of all, I will preface my remarks by saying that I have always been in favor of the original bill and, to some extent, in favor of the amendments we passed in this House probably a year ago which

watered down the bill quite a bit. I want to report on a meeting I attended.

I had the pleasure or the honor of speaking on behalf of the provincial government. It wasn't organized by the provincial government. It was organized by a group of local people in Saskatoon on the west side. There was representation there from the city — one of the aldermen. There was representation, I believe from Corman Park and the University of Saskatchewan. I spoke in one sense on behalf of the provincial government. At that particular meeting, there were a lot of people from both sides of the fence. The people were either turned off by the bill or turned on by it.

I do want to report that at that particular meeting it seemed to me that there was one particular individual (and I am not going to name names) who somehow seemed to have the wrong impression. Now, I don't know how he had the wrong impression relative to the repercussions of that bill, but somehow he did. It seemed to me that when he was speaking at that particular meeting, he conveniently or inconveniently forgot some of the truths embodied in that particular bill. I might also add that when the going got a little tough, this individual decided to walk out of the meeting. Be that as it may, I stuck around, and we did get the feeling of the crowd. The crowd was basically made up of people from Saskatoon who have generally speaking supported the bill right along. There was a contingent from Corman Park. At that time, and at all times, I have appreciated the feelings of the residents of Corman Park, because at one time they were my constituents, in the old Hanley constituency. I will get back to that meeting in a little while.

I want to say a few words with regard to what the hon. member for Kindersley stated a little while ago (probably on Friday; I don't know whether he mentioned them today). It seems to me that he was saying that there was a feeling of mistrust on the part of the people of Corman Park that somehow the provincial government was in there trying to worm its way into a position of control, control, control. Nothing could be further from the truth. I simply ask hon. members to look at the record. In all honesty, has the provincial government done anything in the past to foster this mistrust from the people of Corman Park? Has the city of Saskatoon (which was mentioned by this individual that I mentioned a while ago who attended the meeting) done anything to the residents of Corman Park so that they, in turn, could say, 'Well, we mistrust you?' I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Saskatoon has not done anything in that regard to make the people of Corman Park distrust the city of Saskatoon or even the university, which is involved here.

No, the relationship between the city and the people of Corman Park has always been a good one and the relationship between the people of Corman Park and the Government of Saskatchewan has always been a good one. But one individual . . . I appreciate his position and I appreciate that he has the right to form an association, a group and to fight this bill tooth and nail. I appreciate that and I never denied him the privilege of doing that. However, I did perhaps deny him some of the tactics which he used and again I'll have to refer back to that particular meeting.

That meeting clearly had a distasteful flavor about it. It certainly left a distasteful flavor in my mouth, the flavor that this is a land grab by the provincial government — almost as if we were taking orders or instructions directly from Moscow. The hon. member wants to say something. I would hope that he wouldn't say, 'You do,' because I somehow feel that we, as Canadian citizens on this side, are just as good citizens as you are on that side. I'm not saying better, but I'm saying that in our own way we are just as good.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Saskatoon certainly broached this whole matter. In fact, it was the city of Saskatoon which approached the provincial government after there were some negotiations or some broaching of the whole matter with Corman Park Council and the University of Saskatchewan. It was city council that broached this matter with the provincial government; it wasn't the provincial government that did the broaching. Certainly the citizens of Saskatoon are in favor of this and the citizens of Saskatoon are looking to the future. The citizens of Saskatoon, in looking to the future, want an area where they can enjoy the beauties of nature. But I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Saskatoon at no time wanted that for nothing; they were willing to pay. At no time have the citizens of Saskatoon ever wanted that land, which was encompassed in the Meewasin Valley Authority originally, to be detrimental to the citizens of Corman Park.

It was reason that they wanted and they said, 'Here is something that we want. Let's sit down at the table and discuss it.' But I'm afraid that there were one or two individuals who got carried away with emotionalism and started off a chain of events which saw everybody sorry that they were involved in the thing in the first place with the exception of the city of Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that the people of Saskatoon and the residents of Corman Park are going to have to pay dearly in the future in order to acquire land so that the people of Saskatoon and the citizens of Corman Park can enjoy themselves in the future. There are many examples and cases in eastern Canada and the eastern United States where they are paying dearly. They are literally paying an arm and a leg for property and land where people can enjoy nature. Now, I'm not suggesting for that reason that anything be rammed down the throats of the citizens of Corman Park. As I've said before, the council's wishes must be respected.

It is with that in mind that I, reluctantly but appreciating the council's concern and the council's resolution, will be supporting the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: — Mr. Speaker, I want to address the major changes which this bill will bring about, namely the removal of all privately owned land in Corman Park from the Meewasin Valley Authority. I believe the provincial government introduces this bill with very good intentions, seeking to respond to the democratic, expressed wishes of the people of Corman Park to opt out of the MVA. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think our government on this side of the House is making a mistake in introducing this legislation. I believe there was another route that should have been followed instead. It would have responded to many of the concerns expressed by Corman Park residents and would have, at the same time, provided protection for the most fragile and important natural features of the river bank. In a few moments I will outline the option I believe ought to be followed.

First, I want to comment on what the implications of this legislation will be. We should have no doubt about the implications of this bill, Mr. Speaker. This legislation, if passed, will destroy a large part of the concept of the Meewasin Valley Authority. That concept was the preservation of the beautiful river valley, both within the city of Saskatoon, and outside the city for some 20 miles on either side. The concept recognized the fact that the river valley within and outside Saskatoon is a regional resource which needs to be protected for the benefit of all residents in the region and

for the benefit of future generations. This legislation effectively destroys that concept and that is the reason I am most oppressed to see it introduced into the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation means that there will no longer be any real protection for any of the most fragile areas of the river valley outside Saskatoon which are not publicly owned. Some natural, wooded areas along the river bank which ought to be preserved will almost certainly be cleared. Important archaeological sites, unless designated under provincial heritage legislation, are likely to be lost. The MVA offered the potential of providing staff and resources to act quickly to identify and designate valuable archaeological features. The province, while having some resources to offer in the area, will not be able to act nearly as quickly, and as a result some valuable sites, as I mentioned, are likely to be lost.

The ability to protect important natural features along the river bank such as the cathedral bluffs or Tipperary Creek will be greatly reduced unless some level of government buys those properties or unless the rural municipality of Corman Park acts to protect those areas, an action which I do not hold out high hope for. The legislation also removes protection of most of the high banks, river terraces, and river edge vegetation which make the South Saskatchewan River the beautiful resource that it is.

In addition, the removal of the MVA from all private lands in Corman Park means there is very little in place to check the development pressures building up in some parts of the river valley for rural residential development at the edge of the valley too close to the river. The ability we have to protect the few pieces of virgin prairie which still exist around Saskatoon will be greatly reduced. The ability of the Saskatoon region to protect prime agricultural land and develop irrigation projects in areas with prime potential is also reduced by the removal of the MVA from all privately owned lands in Corman Park.

Of great importance is that the plans for introduction of a pollution by-law to protect the South Saskatchewan River from the pollution it has suffered from in the past decade is now down the drain. The MVA not only had the potential to control pollution in the river, but also (and equally important) had the potential to control pollution into many of the small streams and natural water bodies which lie close to, or eventually run into, the South Saskatchewan River.

These are just a few of the many contributions I believe the Meewasin Valley Authority had the potential of giving to the Saskatoon region. Some people argue that the rural municipality of Corman Park could just as easily control some of these developments and that the provincial government, through the Department of the Environment or the Department of Agriculture, could act to prevent pollution or protect important natural features. This may be true in theory, Mr. Speaker, but it is highly unlikely to happen in practice. This has been partly borne out by the fact that the river valley's importance has been recognized for decades, yet few of the by-laws and public policies required to offer protection were ever put in place. With a few exceptions, such as the new heritage legislation, very few of them are in place today.

Those who argue that the province or the rural municipality can offer the necessary protection miss, in my view, the original arguments for establishing the Meewasin Valley Authority in the first place. These arguments encompass several principles, three to which I want to make reference.

One was that the problem of protection needed to be approached on a regional basis

since the river bank is a regional resource. The Meewasin Valley Authority represented a regional body which, I believe, had the potential of being able to do that job rather than the job being handled by a number of bodies which had limited jurisdiction over certain parts of the region.

Secondly, the job of protection needed a substantial amount of money and resources. These resources needed to be applied to the task of protecting the river valley. The rural municipality of Corman Park, the city of Saskatoon, or any provincial government department, do not have the resources in and of themselves to approach the task of identifying key resources to be protected and to undertake the task of protection and beautification in a co-ordinated manner. But the Meewasin Valley Authority as a regional body with special funding from the municipalities, the university and particularly the provincial government had the potential to do that job. Now that potential is being drastically reduced.

Thirdly, one of the other important, original arguments for establishing the MVA was that by their very nature most municipalities, given the functions which they perform and the concerns which they must have for building up their revenue bases, tend to be fairly pro-development in their approach to governing. Thus, there was a need to counterbalance this tendency by establishing an agency on which all concerned municipalities and the university were represented, but where the focus and function of the staff and of the funding were to develop policy which would protect the fragile resource without having to give primary consideration to the building up of the tax base.

Those were three of the important reasons for establishing the Meewasin Valley Authority in the first place. Those three reasons, in my view, are still very valid today. They're strong arguments for making the case that the R.M. of Corman Park, or any one provincial department of government in and of itself, is not going to be able to do the job which needs to be done.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the need for an agency such as the Meewasin Valley Authority is greater today than it was at the time it was set up. That's another reason I'm depressed to see the legislation being introduced into the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one additional opportunity that will be lost by the removal of the R.M. of Corman Park's participation from the Meewasin Valley Authority. That is the opportunity for the people of Corman Park to have an input into the way the river bank in the city of Saskatoon will be protected and developed. The opportunity is lost for the citizens of our rural area around the city to have any say about how Saskatoon's river valley will develop.

Since I represent a city riding, I'm obviously not speaking on behalf of the Corman Park people, but I expect that many rural people, near Saskatoon, are anxious to see the river bank in the city preserved, and are concerned about how the south downtown project will be developed because they will be making use of these amenities from time to time themselves. The city is part of their environment, too, just as the rural area is part of the environment of the people of Saskatoon.

I believe there is a very strong argument to be made for the principle that the river valley is a regional resource and that all parts of the river valley, whether inside the city of Saskatoon or several miles outside of the city, are a resource of importance and concern to all residents of the region. Certainly the voices and concerns of the people of Corman Park need to be heeded and respected by this government and by all residents in Saskatoon. Much has already been done to try to meet their concerns through previous adjustments to Meewasin Valley Authority legislation. The boundaries of the MVA in the rural area of Corman Park were massively reduced last year to one-quarter of their original size. The general powers of the MVA to hold up or restrict development were clarified and very much reduced. Yet the opposition to the MVA continued to mount.

Ironically, the opposition to the MVA continued to mount from two somewhat different groups and for two very different reasons. The River Edge Heritage Association, headed up by a Mr. Wally Hamm, opposed the basic principles behind the Meewasin Valley Authority to begin with. Many members of that association were more interested in being able to develop their land in any way that they saw fit. If there was an opportunity to subdivide land in a prime and beautiful area of the river, they were more interested in seeing that sort of initiative taken than they were in seeing the river valley protected. They naturally opposed the establishment of the Meewasin Valley Authority and have been fighting it ever since.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, another group's support has also been lost by the Meewasin Valley Authority. I believe that is a group of people in Corman Park who sincerely wanted to see the river valley protected and who were upset and discouraged by the failures of the Meewasin Valley Authority to take the steps required to protect the river valley. Of course, the two important test cases over the last year and one-half have been the Warman refinery issue and the proposal for a uranium refinery to be developed very close to the river's edge.

Secondly, the failure of the Meewasin Valley Authority to take a stand on that refinery, one way or the other, disappointed a number of people who originally supported the objectives of the Meewasin Valley Authority in Corman Park. This was due to the failure of the Meewasin Valley Authority to take the steps required to ensure a proper environmental review of the Saskatoon Chemicals plant before major expansion took place.

I think those two actions, ironically, have cost the Meewasin Valley Authority a lot of support in Corman Park from people who originally supported the principles of the MVA. And so we see a situation today in Corman Park in which both the original supporters and the original opposers of the Meewasin Valley Authority combine to oppose the continued existence of the MVA. That's a fact that makes me very sad, Mr. Speaker, very sad indeed.

Now I emphasize again that I think the government introduces this legislation with good intentions, seeking to respond to the democratically expressed wishes of the people of Corman Park. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that in fact only 115 residents in Corman Park actually have land right now within the Meewasin Valley Authority. The rest of the people who voted in the recently held referendum do not hold land within the MVA. While I have no doubt about the rights of the 115 people to have a paramount say over the future of their land, I feel that beyond that, in many ways in principle, the people of Saskatoon ought to be just as strongly heard on this issue as the people of Corman Park who don't own land within the MVA, because they are all affected by the future

protection or lack of protection of the river valley.

I want to outline, Mr. Speaker, in the second half of my remarks, what I think would have been a better alternative to this legislation that at the same time, I believe, would have responded to the wishes of many of the people in Corman Park. What I would personally have wished to see is a proposal that would have removed most of the powers of the Meewasin Valley Authority from Corman Park, but would have retained a minimal set of powers that I believe are essential for the long-term protection of the river bank itself. I emphasize the 'river bank.'

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the powers that ought to have been retained in the rural municipality of Corman Park are four in number. First of all, I believe that the MVA ought to have retained the power to prohibit new construction within 150 yards of the river bank. Secondly, I believe that the MVA ought to have retained the power to protect and prevent the destruction of natural vegetation within 160 yards of the river bank. Third, I believe that the MVA ought to have retained the power to regulate or prohibit sources of industrial pollution and landfill sites if those are located within one-half mile of the river bank. And fourthly, I believe that the MVA ought to have retained and clarified its power to protect and to prevent the damage or destruction of archaeological sites within one-half mile of the river bank.

So, in other words, Mr. Speaker, they are protection of archaeological sites and heritage sites within one-half mile of the river bank, ability to regulate sources of industrial pollution and landfill sites within one-half mile of the river bank, and ability to prohibit construction and protect natural vegetation within 150 yards of the river bank. Mr. Speaker, what would this have accomplished? This, I believe, would have done two things. First of all, it would obviously for most purposes have drastically reduced the boundaries of the Meewasin Valley Authority even further. That's responding to the democratically expressed wishes of the people of Corman Park. On the other hand, it would have retained the ability of the Meewasin Valley Authority to undertake crisis management and protection along the river bank. Mr. Speaker, I would have suggested that these powers which I have just outlined be retained for a period of perhaps three years until the people of Corman Park can come together and decide how they would like to protect the river valley and the river bank.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of Corman Park want to see the river valley protected. I fear that this legislation removes all vehicles for providing that protection.

I want to close by outlining what this small protection zone that I have suggested in the House today would do in terms of protecting the river valley. I make the suggestion of 150 yards after a careful assessment of the area which the Meewasin Valley Authority encompasses. These are the things which I believe would be accomplished by this 150-yard protection zone.

1. It would protect the most important natural features along the river, such as cathedral bluffs and Tipperary Creek.
2. It would protect all of the high banks along the river, and almost all of the areas along the river which are subject to sloping.
3. It would protect, in most areas along the river valley beyond the high banks, an area from 50 to 75 yards back.

4. This 150-yard setback zone would provide protection for the river terraces and for the river edge vegetation.
5. It would provide protection for quite a bit of the virgin prairie which is left around the city of Saskatoon.
6. Especially on the west side, where there is considerable development pressure, a 150-yard protection zone would retain access to and along the natural features of the valley to ensure that rural residential subdivisions do not take place on the edge of the river valley, as they are otherwise likely to do.
7. A 150-yard protection zone would provide MVA with the opportunity to assist in irrigation projects and would provide areas along the river which have high irrigation potential.
8. A 150-yard protection zone would allow the Meewasin Valley Authority to regulate a lot of the gravel operations along the river valley and prevent destruction within the river valley due to inappropriate gravel operations being undertaken.
9. The provisions which I mentioned with respect to pollution, and protection of heritage sites within one-half mile would provide the authority with the power to control pollution directly into the river, bodies of water near the river or bodies of water which flow into the South Saskatchewan River.
10. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the provisions I suggested would continue to provide the MVA with the power to clean up landfill sites where action is very much needed along the river. It would allow the MVA to regulate pollution from sources such as Saskatoon Chemicals.
11. It would provide the Meewasin Valley Authority with the ability to protect important heritage sites and archaeological sites near the river.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the provisions which I have suggested have not been adopted by the government. Yet, I can understand that the pressures which the province is under are such to make this extremely difficult at this time. I want to thank the Attorney General for his efforts over the last year and one-half in arguing for the preservation of the Meewasin Valley Authority in Corman Park. I want to thank him as well for all the household meetings he undertook in an attempt to defend the MVA when very few others were.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the course which the government is following now is the wisest course. I believe that the wise course would have been the course that I outlined. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government's position, given the demands upon it from Corman Park, is an understandable position. Nevertheless, I think it is a highly regrettable position. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I have about 15 minutes to speak on this. I suggest we start after supper.

Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Attorney General, let me first say to you that last evening I had the pleasure of spending several hours at the MVA office, with their officials, going through this legislation. We discovered some errors. They agreed to check all the locations

indicated, which they did this morning. They are notifying you (I don't know whether or not they have yet done so) of the recommended House changes which they will recommend in the bill. The errors are totally accidental in each case. Reading maps is sometimes difficult and occasionally they have the words 'east' when they should have 'west' and 'north' when they should have 'south.' There were others. I think they have put private land in not intending to.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would have to thank the Attorney General for bringing in these amendments. The people in Corman Park had a vote, asked for these changes, and finally have them.

If the Attorney General has a copy of the bill in front of him I would like him to turn to it, please. Page 14, schedule A, 2(s) reads '. . . all that portion of the northwest quarter.' That should be the northeast corner, otherwise you are taking private land. The following two are correct.

Moving over to number 7 of the bill, there is an error in definition of land. In 7(a) you have 'southwest quarter.' It should be southeast quarter.

On the other errors, I will either make House amendments or you will be notified of them. Mr. Attorney General, I don't care who makes the House amendments as long as they are correct and private land isn't in it. That's what it's all about.

The other comment I have, and I assume again that it is a draftsman's error, is the R.M. of Vanscoy is now included in this bill. That happens under section 5(b), where the map reader read the wrong information and has put part of Vanscoy in the proposal rather than Corman Park.

The area which concerns me, Mr. Attorney General, is the river bank and the edge. That definition is constitutional law. I'm not sure how you go about getting the authority to include it or not. I'm not really going to worry about it because you are going to have to argue that under the constitutional bit.

Mr. Attorney General, I will be looking for changes in the draftsmen errors, and I would suggest that on page 3, where you suggest 'consult with the R.M.,' I would suggest it should be 'agreement with the R.M.' I would suggest rather than saying, 'Mr. R.M. we are going to do this,' that you should at least say, 'We want to do this; will you agree with us to do it?' But you seem to say that you're going to tell them that's that, and consult, but that doesn't mean that they approve. I would suggest you get some kind of agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand and rebut the Attorney General for hours, but my caucus members won't allow me that privilege. Let me wind up my comments by suggesting that the one concern I have still with this whole project is that the people be allowed to use the river for irrigation, and that there be no hesitation on that problem; second is that the people in Corman Park will be listened to (as they have been here), and get the changes they have asked for. I have been asked, mainly by one councillor from the R.M. of Corman Park, to thank the Minister of Rural Affairs for his assistance in conveying the concerns of the council to the Attorney General, the same as I conveyed the concerns of the council to the draftsmen. I pass their thanks along to Mr. Kaeding for his work.

Mr. Speaker, on that note of co-operation, hopefully the Attorney General will have

May 11, 1981

nothing to say; we will get into committee of whole tomorrow, pass the amendments and solve the problems in Corman Park re the MVA.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

YEAS — 31

| | | |
|-------------|----------|--------------|
| Blakeney | Pepper | Allen |
| Kaeding | Snyder | Romanow |
| Tchorzewski | Robbins | Skoberg |
| McArthur | Gross | Mostoway |
| Byers | Cowley | Koskie |
| Poniatowski | Johnson | Lingenfelter |
| Long | Nelson | White |
| Solomon | Berntson | Birkbeck |
| Duncan | Taylor | Muirhead |
| Katzman | Garner | Andrew |
| Ham | | |

NAYS — 0

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.