

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 12, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills

Deputy Clerk: — Ms. Zazelenchuk, from the standing committee on private members' bills, presents the fourth report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee has considered the following bills and agreed to report the same without amendment:

Bill 01 — An Act to provide for exemption from taxation of certain property of the Crossroads Pentecostal Assembly Corporation;

Bill 02 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The German-English Academy of Rosthern;

Bill 04 — An Act to continue the incorporation of Athol Murray College of Notre Dame.

Your committee has considered the following bill and agreed to report the same with amendment;

Bill 03 — An Act to incorporate the Sisters of Mission Service.

Your committee recommends, under the provisions of rule 58, that fees be remitted, less the cost of printing, with respect to Bills 01, 02, 03 and 04.

Ms. Zazelenchuk: — I move, seconded by the member for Quill Lakes, that the fourth report of the standing committee on private members' bills be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Special Committee on Regulations

Deputy Clerk: — Mr. Koskie, from the special committee on regulations, presents the first report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Koskie as its chairman and Mrs. Bacon as vice-chairman and Mr. T.C. Wakeling, Q.C. of the law firm of McDougall, Ready and Wakeling, as counsel to the committee.

The committee has examined regulations outstanding from 1981 and a total of 251 regulations from 1982, thus completing its scrutiny up to December

31st, 1982. Of this total your committee considered 66 regulations specifically drawn to its attention by counsel, and it sent to regulation-making authorities comments on 34 of those regulations, inviting them to submit explanatory memoranda should they see fit. Thirty-three replies have been received and considered by the committee, with 11 regulations receiving ongoing consideration. Your committee does not wish at this time to draw the special attention of the Assembly to any regulation on the grounds set out in its terms of reference.

Your committee has also had under consideration the by-laws, rules and regulations, and amendments thereto, of various professional societies. Tabled at session on paper no. 35 of the 1981-82 session; on session paper no. 10 of the '82-83 session. The committee reviewed the said by-laws, rules and regulations to ensure that each has proper legislative authority and was in the public interest, with further information being sought with respect to six of the by-laws. Replies have been received from each association. Two of the by-laws will receive ongoing consideration. The committee, therefore, reserves its ratification of the following 1981-82 by-laws until the review is completed: Saskatchewan Association of Architects; Saskatchewan Funeral Service Association. Your committee recommends that the by-laws regulations and amendments of the following professional societies be ratified and confirmed. The list of these societies will be included in tonight's votes and proceedings.

On behalf of the committee, a delegation composed of Mrs. Bacon, Mr. Gerich, **Mr. Thompson**, committee counsel, and the committee clerk attended the Second Commonwealth Conference of Delegated Legislation Committees in Ottawa from April 11 to 15, 1983. Representatives from 26 commonwealth parliaments were present to discuss a wide variety of issues relating to the parliamentary scrutiny of regulations. Reports from the delegates attending the conference were considered by the committee at its last meeting.

The committee wishes to report that it has made recommendations to the Attorney-General for amendments to the Regulations Act, to provide for the correction of printing errors in the publishing of regulations. The Attorney-General reported that the said amendments have been approved, and that legislation to amend the act would be introduced.

Your committee also wishes to report that it has made recommendations to the Minister of Finance for a proposed bill which would provide enabling legislation for regulations governing emergency assistance programs. The Minister of Finance has reported that while there will not be time on the legislative schedule this year to deal with this issue, consideration will be given to introducing such legislation some time in the future. Your committee will be monitoring programs on these issues over the coming year.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the member from Nutana Saskatoon:

That the first report of the special committee on regulations be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to first introduce some people in the Speaker's gallery, and then introduce a gentleman sitting behind the rail. In the Speaker's gallery I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, Mrs. Barbara Olson, wife of the Governor of North Dakota; representative Orlin Hanson from North Dakota; U.S. Consul-General Mrs. Lillian Mullin, from the United States, here from Winnipeg. I want to say that it's indeed a pleasure for us to be able to host them, along with the man that they're accompanying, Governor Allen Olson.

Governor Olson represents wheat, oil, coal, and cows, and international goodwill. The state of North Dakota has many similarities to the province of Saskatchewan, and we're delighted to have him here. Governor Olson is a man who has been very keen on economic development in his state. He is a family man. He is a farm boy. He's a lawyer. He served in the U.S. Army, both in the Pentagon and West Germany. He was eight years attorney-general in the state of North Dakota under a Democratic administration, and he as elected the first Republican Governor in the state of North Dakota for almost 20 years, and that occurred in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, he has shown very sincere leadership in fiscal responsibility, particularly, Mr. Speaker, in slowing the growth of government during some difficult economic times. He's a sportsman, a ball player, a golfer. He was the first governor to invite a premier of the province of Saskatchewan to speak in the North Dakota legislature, and I had that opportunity.

It's my pleasure, as Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, to invite, for the first time, today, the Governor of North Dakota to this legislature. So I would ask everybody to join with me in welcoming a friend of mine, a friend of Saskatchewan's, and a friend of Canada, and a man of international goodwill — Governor Olson and his wife.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join with the Premier in extending a welcome to Governor Olson. I extend a welcome to him in his capacity as Governor of the State of North Dakota, and as an indication of our feeling of goodwill for the people of North Dakota, and for the people of the United States.

I had the opportunity to meet and to know his predecessor, Governor Link, when I had occasion to be with him at a governor conference in Boston, and I would also like to welcome Governor Olson in a personal capacity. I had an opportunity to meet with him when we were attending together a meeting of the Niagara Institute down in Minneapolis something more than a year ago, and we were guests of Governor Quie, and we had some opportunity to spend some time together. I particularly remember that Governor Olson had some difficulties with the hotel, and with the hotel switchboard, who were in earnest pursuit of our Senator, Bud Olson, and in the course of so doing were causing no end of trouble for Governor Olson and his wife.

We join with the Premier in his welcome to Governor Olson and hope that you sir, and your party, will enjoy their stay in our province.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome in the Speaker's gallery 82 people from my constituency, from the town of Martensville, the fastest growing community I understand in Saskatchewan, are here with us today to watch the proceedings. I hope they'll enjoy themselves over the next two days here, and I wish you all join with me to welcome them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Application to Ottawa for Lake Diefenbaker Pipeline

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, having to do with the announcements, Mr. Minister, which have been coming fast and furious from Ottawa in recent days, about Saskatchewan projects which will be financed under the special recovery projects.

Yesterday it was \$6 million for improvements at the Regina airport. Last week it was a few million for expansion of Agribition, and that's great, but there have been no announcements that the Lake Diefenbaker pipeline will receive further funding under this special program. No announcements, Mr. Minister, because there's been no application.

My question is: when will that formal application from your government go to Ottawa so that pipeline may be built?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, we have recently sent a letter to Ottawa indicating that we will be coming with a proposal, some rough outlines of what it is, and as soon as Mr. Schneider returns from his two-week stay in Banff we will sit down with them and we will be there very shortly.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Speaker, a new question. I would remind the minister that you have been telling us that this project is going to go ahead soon since last year, and as Ottawa keeps emphasizing, Mr. Minister, this is an emergency program designed to put people back to work now, and all the money, will soon be gone if you don't get your act together and get your proposal submitted.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: when? Where?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat once more. I have made contact with my counterpart in the federal government. The Minister of Finance has had direct contact with the federal Minister of Finance. The federal people are well aware of the project and some of our expectations. I suppose in terms of time it would be safe to say we'll do it well under 11 years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Speaker. The last statement is the one

accurate time frame that I've heard coming from this government on that pipeline project. Will you not agree, Mr. Minister, that if you don't soon get your application in, the money is going to be gone, and there'll be no money coming from the federal government? Would you not agree, Mr. Minister, if the application doesn't go in soon, there's little point in putting it in?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, we certainly agree that there is a requirement for some haste. We have indicated that to the two cities. We are in the process of finalizing it; it will happen very quickly, and I think it remains to be . . . (inaudible) . . .

SPC Application for Rate Increase

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and particularly to the power corporation's application to the public utilities review commission for rate increases of the order of 22 per cent. I remind the minister that he and his colleagues have been going about the province telling us that many people were streaming into the province and new businesses were opening up.

If this is the case, I remind the minister also that in the application to the public utilities review commission, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation forecasts a drop in electricity sales and a drop in natural gas sales of up to 10 per cent.

My question to the minister is this: in the light of your pronouncements and those of your colleagues that there are going to be new people and new businesses, how can you justify the Saskatchewan Power Corporation predicting a drop in electricity sales and a sharp drop in gas sales?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many factors that determine the demand of gas and electricity. A nice mild winter is one good reason. We will be seeing the increase in demand for power and for natural gas. A lot of the potash mines, we understand, will not be shutting down totally this year, like they did last year. The oil wells are pumping, which they weren't last year. And there'll be a considerable increase in demand for power. But there are other factors besides that, which is weather.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Would the minister concede that the application put in by the corporation, of which he is chairman, had stated the projected sales at a low figure in order to justify even higher increases in electricity and gas rates?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is absolutely no.

An. Hon. Member: — Well thought out answer.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — New question to the minister, new question to the minister. Does the minister concede, in respect of the application to the public utilities review commission by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, that the Power Corporation is predicting a drop of over 450 of its employees? And if the answer to that is yes, would the minister advise whether or not those employees are going to be reduced by attrition and retirements, or by lay-offs and firings?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Our budget indicated last fall, last summer, that we were overstaffed in a number of areas. We are not going out and firing staff. That's why we

came with our early retirement program. And I'd like to say to the members opposite that that program has gone over very, very well, and it is going to mean the chance of people within the corporation to move up and take over a lot of these jobs. And the morale of the corporation is certainly building very much. The rest of it is through attrition.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister again say whether or not there are going to be any substantial number of firings or lay-offs?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, we are not indicating any substantial numbers of firings and lay-offs. I have indicated earlier that we are trying to do it through the retirement program and attrition. We've built it into a 12- to 14-month period to try and reduce our staff.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, this question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And this concerns the application to the public utilities review commission, and to the justification for the rate increases requested. And I refer to page 2-2 of the application, and to the representation that costs are going to increase in accordance with an increase in the consumer price index of 10 per cent.

Now the question I ask you, Mr. Minister, is: do you believe that the consumer price index in 1983 is going to increase by 10 per cent? And if so, how does that square with the statements by your colleagues that inflation or the consumer price index will increase by 7 per cent or 6 per cent, or some figure approximating those?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Speaker, you can spend months projecting. We started our projections and our budget for 1983 a number of months ago, and at that time we were looking at 8 or 9 or 10 per cent. But the whole exercise is exactly what the public utility review commission was set up for. We have told the truth to the people of Saskatchewan, saying that this is where our Saskatchewan Power Corporation sits. If we are showing a \$13 million loss, even with the increases, total increase, at least we are telling the truth where we're at. But it will be up to the public utilities review commission to decide whether we were right or wrong, whether we are justified in asking for the increases. And if we aren't, I'm sure we'll come with a lower rate of increase.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — One short supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister not acknowledge that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has some responsibility to have regard to the facts when it puts in its application? And does he not acknowledge that any application put in April or May predicting a consumer price index increase of 10 per cent is totally unrealistic, and accordingly the rate increase requested is totally unrealistic?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, we have a number of very competent people working in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and through their research and everything if they felt that it may be 10 per cent, that's what they will put in. And that's exactly what we did and it will be up to the commission to decide whether we're right or wrong.

Fee Increases for Saskatchewan Provincial Parks

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the minister in charge of Parks and Renewable Resources. It has to do with your announcement, Mr. Minister, yesterday, that charges for Saskatchewan's provincial parks will be up substantially this year. The annual pass for park entry will go up by 50 per cent. Daily entry fees will be up 75 per cent. Camping fees in parks are also up 17 per cent for serviced sites, 20 per cent for unserviced sites and 25 per cent for overflows. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is: can you please tell the people of Saskatchewan why your government's own inflation-minus-one guide-lines do not apply to these fee increases?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, it's true that the rates went up. An evaluation was done on the parks. The usage of the parks was there. The price rate, although it went up considerably, is still very, very low. We also brought in new initiatives. We brought in a 21-day campsite, or it was 21 days that you could before reserve a campsite for now . . . Or you couldn't; now you can reserve a campsite for. You also can reserve a campsite, on a draw system, for the whole entire season for \$250 which reduces the daily rate by a considerable amount.

We've also had where a voluntary payments where you went into parks where you can voluntarily pay and it's very, very low on those ones. We've brought in some new initiatives. The prices went up but they're still very low in regards to most other parks across the country, and we feel it's at an admissible level.

Mr. Thompson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what parks where you can reserve a campsite, what parks does this apply to? Could the minister indicate what parks reserved sites apply to?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure which sites they are. I did send out a memo to all MLAs and certainly it was made public. I don't have it with me today but I'll take notice and bring it back.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Speaker, final supplementary. What I would like to know, Mr. Minister: does it apply to all 17 parks?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Speaker, no it didn't apply to all 17 parks. What it applied to was the parks that had the lesser usage, or there was space available we thought could be used. We were very careful in that. We did selective parks because we felt that it was a trial basis. We didn't want to overload any one park and we tried to select the parks out that they could be used within.

Proposed Mine Closures

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier and this has to do with any proposed dealings with the Poplar River Coal-Mine. And I recall to the Premier's mind his comments in the House on May 9th, and I will quote briefly:

Mr. Chairman, no decision has been made to sell the mine as far as I know at this very hour. But clearly I can't rule that out at some point in the future. If an option was presented, and it was in the public interest to do so, then it would be given consideration. But to date, no decision has been made to sell the

mine.

Mr. Speaker, I recall to the Premier's mind the fact that the Souris Valley mine has been closed. Some 30 people have been put out of work. They have not been offered jobs at the Boundary Dam SPC operation. They have apparently — some of them — been offered jobs at Coronach.

My question to the Premier is this: do you believe it is fair and reasonable to offer to miners the prospect of moving their home from Estevan to Coronach to take up employment at Coronach at a mine which you may well sell tomorrow, and which you are giving them no assurance that they'll have a job one month hence?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I was just looking for the letter that I sent the miners, and I could have read it. I don't think I have it with me. But I sent a personal letter to every one of the miners — there was 26 involved — outlining several things. First, that everybody was guaranteed a job, number one. Nobody would be without a job. Number two, that we would do whatever we could to get Sask Power to offer employment opportunities in the Estevan community. Now it may not cover the entire 26, and it only may be a portion of that. But we would do whatever's possible to make sure that that was the case. Three, I said in that letter that if people took the opportunities at Coronach, and given the speculation about the mine, that we would make sure that their employment was guaranteed regardless of what happened to the mine.

Now given those three . . . There were some other things that we guaranteed with respect to . . . They were guaranteed not to lose money on their homes. They were given interest-free money for some time; they were loaned some money and didn't have to make payments for some time. There was a combination of things. But I could certainly, if I had the letter with me, I'd go through it.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, within the last, I would say, six to 10 days. I wrote that letter personally to every one of those men, because I met with them personally and outlined all the alternatives, that nobody loses a job. We will do everything we can in the private and the public sector, and they agreed to look for jobs and provide jobs in the Estevan community. And those that did move would have employment guaranteed and their homes protected.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And my question concerns the employees of the Souris Valley mine who are being displaced — the 30 that we have just referred to. And my question to the minister is this: have any of those 30 been offered employment by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in the Estevan area to date?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the board, I'm not in the personnel department of Saskatchewan Power Corporation. All I am aware of is, just to confirm what the Premier has just said, that no one is to lose their jobs, and I'm sure that the director in charge of human resources in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is on top of it and is looking after it.

Indian Treaty Land Entitlements

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address this question to the Premier. Would the minister . . . Would the Premier, pardon me, please inform this Assembly and the Indian people of Saskatchewan how much money is in this fiscal year's budget for the purpose of dealing with treaty land entitlements?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I just don't have that information. I'll take notice. Perhaps the Attorney-General or the minister responsible can either provide it or get it to me.

Mr. Yew: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, does your government agree that it has an obligation to make good on the land promised Indian people under the treaties and which has not been given to them?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we have met several times with various representatives of the native community, both here and in Ottawa, and we are actively looking after our responsibilities with respect to native land claims, taking it very seriously. We're dealing with it on a regular basis. We have surveyed land. We're doing all the kinds of things . . . I can't recall all the things that are normally done to identify the property, but that process is continuing. And the chiefs that I have met with — which, I believe, are most of them in the province of Saskatchewan, at one time or another — are encouraged by the fact that we are making progress and dealing with it on an effective basis.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the Premier, again. Does the Premier agree then that his government has an obligation to provide the land as soon as possible?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, this government agrees and acknowledges that there are legitimate land entitlements, and it said that all across the country, and it said it here to native people, and it said it to everybody. So given that acknowledgement, we are dealing with it as speedily and as effectively as possible to make sure that it is done right; to make sure that we respect the natives; make sure that we respect third party interests that are involved; and make sure that we respect all the citizens of Saskatchewan. So we are dealing with it as quickly and as deliberately as we can, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Yew: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. If you say that you recognize treaty land entitlement obligations, then why are you putting the entire treaty Indian land entitlements program on hold?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that's true. We deal with it on a regular basis, and I have a native advisory group that advises the minister and I about these things on a regular basis. We have made much progress on much of this land. Now certainly in the months that we have been in government we have had all kinds of activity with respect to native land claims and entitlements, and acreages and so forth, so I don't believe that's a fair statement, Mr. Speaker, that it's on hold at all. In fact it's under very active consideration.

Mr. Yew: — New question, Mr. Speaker. If you have not put the question of treaty land entitlements on hold, then, Mr. Premier, just how many outstanding land entitlements

have you settled since you took office on April 26th of 1982?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know if we've transferred any. I was just reminded that there may have been some transfers in Prince Albert in the Ballantyne Band, but I don't know if there's been any in the province of Saskatchewan. That is not to say that there won't be. I would point out to the hon. member that there has been an awful lot more done from what I can see from the records — at least those that weren't shredded — from the records that I see in terms of native land claims and seriously attempting to deal with that in the last 12 months than there was in the 12 years prior to our taking over.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it's appropriate; I now have this letter that I could advise in some detail to the hon. member. It's four or five points that are specific in terms of what I said to the miners in Estevan. I said the following, that . . .

A Member: — He asked the question. He's giving the answer.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The hon. member asked the question, what I was doing with respect to the miners, and I thought I would just give the details.

An. Hon. Member: — Did you answer? Did you answer?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I can provide additional information, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I said the following: as position equal to . . . Mr. Speaker, a position equal to or better than that which you now hold, or your wage will be red-circled until you get an advance. Number two, job protection against the possibility that the Coronach mine changes hands. Number three, no financial loss on the sale of your home. Homes will, if necessary, be purchased at appraised value. Four, those moving will be eligible for interest-free loans up to \$8,000 repayable over 10 years. Payments would not commence for two years. Five, the corporation will continue to meet with the individuals to discuss individual problems and pursue employment opportunities,

I then added a paragraph on any private opportunities that may come to my attention I'd be more than glad to offer these to the **Hon. Members**.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Liquor Board Pricing Policy

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board, and it concerns a policy announcement under the name of the chairman of the liquor board, dated April 21, 1983, with respect to the manner of purchase of beer. Heretofore the liquor board, in the purchase of its beer, has bargained the price with the breweries on a willing buyer, willing seller basis. The announcement appears to say that hereafter the liquor board will accept any price, as stated by the breweries, without negotiation. Is that a proper interpretation of the new policy statement, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Sandberg: — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed true that the liquor board does not have an open pricing policy in regards to beer and their negotiations with the breweries of Saskatchewan. It's totally in line with the philosophy of the new Government of Saskatchewan that we're not going to interfere in the market-place. The breweries will submit the price that they want for their product; the liquor board will assess that, and it

will be applied. It's totally in line with our philosophy; we're not going to interfere with the market-place.

By the way, the province to the east of us, which is . . .

An. Hon. Member: — A good government there.

Hon. Mr. Sandberg: — Yes, in bed with the former government here, has indicated that they're going to a similar policy, if I may quote from a *Leader-Post* article of April 6th:

That the proposed changes taking place, Manitoba drinkers will be paying different prices for similar brands of beer sold by the three breweries in the province of Manitoba.

So they're doing the same thing as we're doing now, as Alberta is doing, as British Columbia is doing, and Ontario.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. During question period today, the Premier, in answering a question from the member from Cumberland . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. That will come under orders of the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Premier, in answering a question from the member from Cumberland, having answered the question that was asked, referred back to another question that had been asked previously by the Leader of the Opposition and quoted a letter and added to an answer that had been completed earlier. And I wonder if this is now a rule of the Assembly, that ministers will be allowed to go back to previous questions that they haven't taken notice of and add to their answers. And I would like a ruling on that, because it seems to me that the rules of question period were broken today, and I would like a ruling on that.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that if Mr. Speaker takes the opportunity to review the record he will see clearly that the Premier in fact offered to provide the information when the letter was made available to him. His first opportunity was when he completed answering the question from the member for Cumberland, and I think it's clearly not out of order at all to take the opportunity while you're on your feet to answer the question when the information is provided to you. And I would ask Mr. Speaker to review the record and bring in a ruling at his earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: — I will take the opportunity to review the record, and I'll bring in a ruling tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance:

That this Assembly do now recess in order to hear the address of our distinguished guest, Governor Allen I. Olson, of North Dakota, and to reconvene at the call of the Chair.

Motion agreed to.

The House recessed to hear the address of Governor Allen I. Olson.

Governor Olson: — Mr. Speaker, Premier, the Hon. Grant Devine and the Hon. Allan Blakeney, Leader of the Opposition and Hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly. It is indeed an honour for me to address this distinguished body as a part of the gracious Saskatchewan hospitality that is being accorded to your North Dakota visitors. We are pleased to repay a visit to our state by Premier Devine, his lovely wife Chantal and Deputy Premier Eric Berntson. They were our guests last December, at which time Premier Devine spoke (as he indicated) for the first time to the North Dakota Legislature.

And I'd like to digress for just a moment from my prepared remarks to say how much, as a former trial lawyer and now a participant in the constitutional democracies of the United States . . . the question period. We in the United States, in our federal process as well as our state governments, tended to approach the real issues obliquely and indirectly, through the media usually, and clearly . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Governor Olson: — . . . never with the opportunity to directly confront the issues. And I say this as sincerely as I possibly can: that it is refreshing and I would submit to all of you that it would be refreshing for all of our leadership in the American constitutional democracies to share the kind of experience that I have with you today. I loved it.

It is a pleasure, as always, to visit our Canadian neighbours. North Dakotans, I think you will find, have a special feeling for Canada, especially its western provinces. For those of us who have lived near the border, this is particularly true. My growing-up years were spent on a farm about six miles from the North Dakota-Canadian border, near a town by the name of Sarles. I won't press you with details about those years, but I will tell you the memories are pleasant and every time I visit Canada, whether it be Saskatchewan, Manitoba or some other province, I recall with great fondness those memories and associations that involved Canada and Canadians.

One of the reasons I can do that, to be sure, is that we are a people who have more in common than the differences suggested by an artificial boundary. We are neighbours who share a common cultural heritage, a common historical heritage, a common economic heritage, and due to our geographic location, a common relationship to the continental East of both of our countries.

We are neighbours who produce food for the rest of the world. We are, as author Joe Garreau puts it in his book *The Nine Nations of North America*, part of the bread-basket. The bread-basket is, according to Garreau, where you will find the most prodigiously successful agriculture the world has ever known, and, in fact, and according to this author, the entire North American continent's need for wheat can be met by Saskatchewan, Manitoba, North Dakota, Kansas and Oklahoma.

We are practical, pragmatic, hard-working people who know the value of a way of life which exists nowhere else in the world. We work hard to keep it that way. We are, it seems to me, problem solvers who would just as soon do it ourselves. That's part of what this trip is about, and part of what Premier Devine's trip was about last December — exploring our common ground, and where we find differences or mutual problems, to set about working on them — set about working on them and not wait for a solution to help that may never come from Washington, D.C., or Ottawa.

One prime example of how the people in this bread-basket area are willing to work together is our agreement to establish the Saskatchewan-North Dakota boundary advisory committee. The creation of this forum represents a concrete step toward real influence on public policy, on international, national and regional issues that are of mutual concern. An issue such as the Rafferty dam in south-eastern Saskatchewan now has a specific forum for discussion by the respective governments and the interested parties. I daresay that had there been a Manitoba-North Dakota committee, the sensitive issues that now seem to divide that province and my state may have been resolved, or at least not politicized to the degree they may have been. And please take note that I did not officially discuss the Garrison diversion project.

Another example of how we are working together to deal with common problems is the exchanges which have gone on in the agricultural, scientific and academic communities regarding the scourge of the northern plains, leafy spurge. North Dakotans have met with their counterparts in Saskatchewan relative to this issue, and we encourage the continuation of these worthwhile efforts. Continued incursion of this damnable weed on the range lands of our province and state must be stopped. We appreciate that Saskatchewan has taken the lead in this important area. We will work with you and support you in your good efforts.

Agricultural research is another area where mutual co-operation and exchange can benefit us both. In the just-concluded session of the North Dakota Legislature, I submitted an austere budget with reductions in almost all spending research. The reason for this special attention is quite simple, and I would suspect quite well understood in this wonderful province.

North Dakota is first and foremost an agricultural state. It always will be. There may be rather extensive deposits of oil and coal, but the basic industry is agriculture, and agriculture should be considered a national treasure in both of our countries. To help preserve this treasure, I believe, is an obligation we all carry as political leaders. The North Dakota Legislature, by accepting most of the recommendations in my executive budget, increased by 13.2 per cent the general fund support for the North Dakota State University Extension Division, located in Fargo, and its experiment stations which comprise the core of our research facilities and programs.

We know that agricultural research is important to both North Dakota and Saskatchewan. Co-operation in this key area of our respective economies will benefit us both, even though we are in, and always will be in, friendly competition for sale of our basic agricultural products.

While agricultural research is important, so is support of farm and ranch families, especially those who are just getting started. For several years we have provided for the beginning farmer loan program through our state-owned Bank of North Dakota. The program was reorganized this year to strengthen this opportunity to provide funds for

low-cost loans to beginning farmers. The obvious purpose is to help them avoid the staggering cost of capitalizing a new farming venture as well as to weather those initial lean years when the interest payments seem to eat up whatever profit may be realized.

I know Saskatchewan also provides help for its beginning farmers, another indication of the similarity of our interests and views, notwithstanding the international boundary. And I wish to assure you that, as a number of you have apologized for the weather in Regina today, it made Bob and me and the rest of my party feel right at home. I understand that it's a front that had its origination on the south side of the international boundary, although the media again recognizes it as a Canadian Arctic front.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Governor Olson: — In this somewhat remote region of the North American continent we are together perceived as a frontier. But if we are, then the opportunity exists for us to avoid the mistakes and problems which plague our older relatives to the east. And therefore, we can maintain an attractive, healthy quality of life.

Saskatchewan and North Dakota can lead by example in our respective countries. In fact, we are now. We have taken a first step with the establishment of the boundary advisory committee, and our friendly exchanges can't help but deepen the respect for each other that already exists. This will show the way to other initiatives, I believe, and believe very strongly.

Your Premier Devine brought an optimistic message to North Dakota last December. It is an optimism that North Dakota has also, and rightly so. And with that, I must say to you again, thank you for the opportunity to be here, to talk with you, and to say again that I sincerely wish that we had the opportunity to have the question period in our system of government. Perhaps that's an export, Premier Devine and Leader Blakeney, that you can develop without any competition whatsoever from the United States of America.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker reconvened the House.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

INDIAN AND NATIVE AFFAIRS SECRETARIAT

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 25

Item 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Mr. Newton Steacy, associate deputy minister; Graham Powell, executive director, Indian affairs; Walt

Charabin, director of native affairs; Steve Brant, director of Indian affairs, and Harold Danchilla, administrative analyst.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I shall have a few specific questions about these estimates. But first I would like to make some general points.

Some days ago, during debate on the act to establish this Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, my colleagues, the Leader of the Opposition and the member of Shaunavon, raised some fundamental questions, as well as I, during the introduction of Bill 31. The minister admitted at that time that there had been, but there had not been any prior consultation with the duly elected representatives of Indian and Metis organizations.

He also admitted that his government's overall policy approach toward native economic development had not yet been completed. This is understandable, Mr. Chairman, since such a comprehensive strategy cannot be prepared in a hurry, and cannot be prepared at all without the fullest consultation, I say the fullest consultation, with the Indian and Metis people themselves, in their communities. But we have had ample opportunity, Mr. Chairman, over the past year. Over the past year we see just how this government has approached issues of vital concern to Indian and Metis people.

Mr. Chairman, I have looked in vain and the people of Saskatchewan have looked in vain for any acknowledgement of this government, for any acknowledgement by this government of the increasingly desperate situation facing native people — those in the South as well as those in the North.

This Tory government, Mr. Chairman, pretends to be concerned about job creation because Saskatchewan's real unemployment rate is up above 11 per cent. Well, the Tory members opposite should know that so far their policies have been absolutely nothing for native people seeking work, native people whose present unemployment rate is as high as 85 per cent, or even higher in many other areas of this province. I am particularly concerned about those very remote, isolated communities that we have in this province.

This Tory government, Mr. Chairman, pretends to be concerned about job creation, but do the policies of this government address the major economic issues? Do they address the need for economic development of native people? I say, no. Do they address the need for training? Again I say no. Do they address the high unemployment statistics that we have in native communities? And again, I say no.

This government does not understand, Mr. Chairman, that native people do not want simply more money, more hand-outs, more paternalistic control from the provincial government. What they want, what they need, is respect for their own democratic institutions and organizations, and more effective use of public financial assistance — not welfare, but training for jobs and economic development. A policy approach that will recognize collective community interests; an approach that will provide an economic base; sound investments in job skills and economic independence, not another five generations of welfare and high unemployment, incarcerations, social problems — an approach which will enable our people to make a full contribution to the Saskatchewan economy as productive workers, paying taxes and not collecting welfare.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Saskatchewan, including the Indian and Metis people, have now had a full year to examine the Devine government. They have had a full year to examine its priorities and its policies, and to see just who is that benefits the most from this government. The priorities have become clear, and so are the winners — those who win big because of Tory policies — the multinational oil companies, who have received tens of millions of dollars in royalty reductions, a free gift . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I see I've hit some fairly sensitive spots with the members in government. Those tens of millions of dollars in royalty reductions — a free gift from the Tory administration to the multinational corporations. That's what it was. The foreign-owned potash companies — more big winners. The big eastern corporate interests, like the insurance companies and the breweries — all big winners.

It is also clear, Mr. Chairman, that there are many, many people who are suffering from this government's policies, the ordinary people who are losing out because of this government. Those people are Northerners in general throughout this province working men and women, those most in need, most vulnerable to the pressures of recession, native people, disadvantaged organizations, minority groups — those are the big losers. They certainly aren't part of the winners.

Mr. Chairman, the central fundamental test of a civilized society is the extent to which it responds to those who are most vulnerable, the way it helps those in need to help themselves. This government, Mr. Chairman, is failing that fundamental test. It has consistently, from the very beginning, focused all its attention on the big corporate interests in Toronto and New York, and has refused, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the needs of those here in Saskatchewan, those here in Saskatchewan who need help, who need help in order to help themselves.

For one year, over a year, the Devine government misled the people of Saskatchewan. Now the Devine government is betraying the people of Saskatchewan themselves. And these estimates, Mr. Chairman, and the government's policies toward Indian and native people is simply more evidence of that betrayal.

I'd like to go on, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the estimates, and I will have some specific questions with respect to vote 25, page 49, under item no. 2 and under item no. 1 which has a wholesale of funds appropriated with no specific indication of where that money will go with respect to social, cultural, and economic programming for the people of this province, pardon me, for the native community of this province.

And I would like to begin my questioning, Mr. Chairman, with respect to that section. Just where are the budget allotments for building a major economic base for the native community?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'm sure the hon. member would like to have on the record, and before the public of Saskatchewan, in fact, the truth to the allegations that he has made. We made it abundantly clear that this government believes that the native leadership is now at the stage that we can in fact get away from the paternalistic approach that your government takes — of which you are a full participant — to one of actual economic development, and that is the shift that we are making. Let me answer first your allegation which happens to be totally wrong, about a lack of consultation. Sixty-eight bands responded and were consulted with regard to our position on economic development; 75 per cent of those bands indicated a position and 50 of the 51 bands, or 98 per cent that responded, support the government's economic development strategy. So don't tell me we didn't consult because we did consult and we consulted

the Indian people across this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — When we talk about a redirection of funding back to the bands and down to the people, we consulted with the bands again, 68 bands, and more than 70 per cent of those bands support the government's redirection of funding back to the bands; 83 per cent of the bands, 68 that have replied, 83 per cent of the bands responding, support the secretariat. So don't tell the people of the province that the Conservative government hasn't consulted because it has. The Saskatchewan Association of Friendship Centres and the Saskatchewan Association of Native Women —now I'm sure you don't want to hear this — Saskatchewan Association of Native Women have agreed to the consultation process undertaken, agree with the establishment of the secretariat.

Let me talk about economic development because if there's ever a significant failure of the previous NDP government, it's on the fundamental question of economic development for our native peoples. During the fourth quarter of our first year in office, the government authorized the expenditure of \$378,000 in economic development. This total, which was spent in only one quarter, that is, the last three months, is 52 per cent of the amount that the previous government spent on economic development for the native people over the last seven years. That's the record. Those are the facts. And I take a look this year when the economic development at the band level in the 1983-84 budget will be over \$2 million. That is approximately three times what your government spent in seven years. We will do three times that amount in one year. And if the bands that have been asked to come forward with proposals for economic development increase that amount, assuming they're actual expenditures or programs that are feasible and workable, I'm sure that that amount will be surpassed.

So I suggest to the hon. member that when you talk about not consulting, the record shows that this government has in fact consulted, and the Indian people supported.

Secondly, when you talk about no economic development, more funds are being spent by this government in one year than you did in seven — far more, far more effort by this new government to try and solve some very fundamental problems. You gave the usual NDP diatribe about the multinationals — the multinationals your former leader, if I recall, Tommy Douglas, sitting on the board of Husky Oil, which is a multinational. You're just as married to them as anybody else.

So I am frankly a little tired, because the hon. member hasn't talked about the additional \$50 million being spent on training schools by this government so that the people of this province can get the needed training that was ignored by the previous government. I don't hear you talking about the new cancer clinic in the city of Saskatoon, and for the first time that a government in this province is going to spend approximately \$1 billion, \$1,000 for every man, woman and child on health care — record expenditures. Record expenditures this year on education.

So you can talk all you want, but I'll tell you what you don't understand. What you don't understand is that we have 12 years, 11 years, of you hating the private sector, declaring war on the private sector, and we've got to try and get these people back in to create jobs, and when we have a situation where this government is the only province in Canada that has increased employment in the last year, increased the work in the labour force in the last year, then I suggest to you that your statements are not accurate,

that your statements don't really have the ring of truth.

So I suggest that you recognize there is some difficulty in economic times, and I would really like to see you stand up and justify your program, which in fact meant that native people were thrown money and go out and build a house. And I don't care if that house is worth \$40,000 or \$50,000; if you want to spend \$150,000, go ahead. That was your attitude. And you talk about paternalistic. I don't think you can find a more paternalistic approach than what you have in fact given to the native people of this province. So I'll sit and argue with you all day long, and debate with you all day long, but don't try and tell the people of this province that the direction that we are taking, and the increase in funding, and the increase in program funding this year will be 13 per cent — 13 per cent increase in program funding . . . So I suggest to the hon. member that what he said was less than accurate, that in fact the commitment of this government is one where we're going to now try to get economic self-sufficiency for our native people.

And you're critical of the fact that we haven't come out with a grand scheme yet to solve all these problems. I'll be the first to admit that. I'll be the first to admit that we probably won't solve the problems in my lifetime, but I suggest . . .

An. Hon. Member: — You won't, that's for sure.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The hon. member says I won't — I'll be the first to admit that, but I do suggest to the hon. member that at least our direction is a far more effective way of trying to get some economic self-sufficiency to our native people.

I also have indicated, and I have made it clear on numerous times in this Assembly — for some reason you're not listening — that in fact we have, and are developing, a comprehensive economic development plan for native peoples. We are hopeful that there will be significant economic activity at the band level. That's where the jobs are needed. That's what we are trying to accomplish. So I would really hope that . . . Perhaps it's time you quit playing politics with the native people, and give this government credit for what it's doing, and secondly some support in changing the direction away from the social-planning, paternalistic approach of your government to one which will try and get economic self-sufficiency for our native peoples.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Chairman, the member for Qu'Appelle, the Minister of Justice, can go on and on giving me his expert talk, seeing as how he had all the experience for the past good number of years behind either bench on either side of this House, in the position to do something about the social and economic problems of the native community. He can give me some slick conversation and remarks and arguments, but I don't buy them because no government has been able to resolve the problems that the native community have faced.

I haven't got the education, the expertise, or the experience of this legislature, but I have the experience of my own native background, so I would advise the Minister of Justice not to give me any slick tongue with respect to my native community, to my native background, and the poverty that I grew up in. I would sincerely hope that you put into practice what you preach, Mr. Minister.

You talk about an economic development plan, and I'd like to question that economic development plan. I'd like to request an answer with respect to the former

administration. The former administration had \$15 million in low-interest loans to people of native ancestry, etc., and \$6 million in grants. Now are you telling me, and the native community, that this \$2 million that you have earmarked for this fiscal year will resolve all of the economic problems of the native community?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We have attempted to find a total, and it's one of the difficulties from the system that you had established — of the left hand not knowing what the other left hand is doing., if I can use that phrase — were you didn't have any central co-ordination and you didn't know what you were carrying on. But our total through all departments and what it looks to be in terms of expenditure on natives throughout the province this year will total approximately \$125 million.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to argue against Bill 61 or the estimates that we have in front of us, but seeing as how the Minister of Justice quoted a figure of \$125 million that will go to the native community, I wonder if the minister would be able to provide me with the figures for the programs that he has an intention for this \$125 million.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We will supply you the full list of all the programs.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. With respect to the budget allotment indicated on grants to Indian and native organizations, \$3.6 million: I wonder if the minister might also give me information with respect to what amount of funding he expects to provide to the native organizations.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I apologize to the hon. member. The figure that I gave you of 125 was for this year and our first year. We approximate \$65 million on all programs this year. We will supply you the details. It goes across all departments so we'll supply them to you.

Abandoned districts — if I can give you the allocation of the expenditures in subvote 1, or subvote 2, I'm sorry, which will be other than administration which is the figures that you want. Abandoned districts, economic development, \$2,072,000; policy development, \$112,350; land entitlement, \$119,900; Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, provincial liaison, \$35,000; communications, 6,000; Saskatchewan Indian Women's Association, 96,3008 for a total of \$2,441,550. To AMNSIS, \$846,180; Wehta Matowin corporation, \$101,650; Saskatchewan Association of Friendship Centres, \$175,000; Saskatchewan Native Women's Association, \$96,500; for a total \$1,219,330. Between the two that should total, I believe, the subvote 2, \$3,660,888.

Mr. Yew: — Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, were you quoting this fiscal year's allotment henceforth, or were you quoting last . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . This year, eh?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'm giving the proposed expenditures for this fiscal year coming up, and that should detail all of the items in subvote 2.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. As I understand it, you will provide me with a copy of that breakdown.

With respect to this last year's estimates, Mr. Minister. I wonder if you could provide . . . Or you may not be able to, but however I'll put the question to you. I wonder if you may provide me with respective figures for the last fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes, I'll have to pull them for you, but I will supply them to you.

Mr. Yew: — I just want to add also, Mr. Minister, that this fiscal year's figures will be of prime importance, more so than the last year's estimates that you have.

To go on with the estimates, Mr. Minister, with respect to the land entitlements, how many transfers have been completed? How many outstanding land entitlements have been completed in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — As I have advised the Assembly before, there has been none, and we indicated the reason. The Saskatchewan formula which had been in existence since 1976 set out a quantitative formula for treaty land entitlement settlements, based on the population of the Indian bands as of 1976. It is this government's view that it may make it easier to obtain settlements if we can develop a qualitative, as opposed to a quantitative, entitlement formula.

Secondly, if we continue, in our view, with the quantitative formula — that is, so many acres per treaty Indian — we run the very serious risk of continuing the problems that exist today. That is, our Indian people were given poor lands under the treaties; they were given unproductive lands in most cases under the treaties. And the initial reaction of this government to the Saskatchewan formula is that if we continue that way that it will just simply continue a very bad system. We don't see the value of continuing to have the Indian people being given unproductive lands. So as I have mentioned, and have explained in this Assembly before, we want to go back and analyze whether we can develop a qualitative so that the Indian people will get better quality land, and more productive land, rather than the proposed system.

As I explained to the Leader of the Opposition the other day, we had hoped to have that policy formulation and proposal ready by Christmas. Unfortunately, the Government of Canada, at the request of the FSI, had been unable to supply the government with the treaty land entitlement data which allowed them to come up with a formula, to where they were today. Subsequent to, if I recall, February, just a week or two prior to the constitutional conference, the federal government did submit its data to us. So as I have advised the Leader of the Opposition in questioning the other day, with that delay we would hope that we would have a proposal for consideration and discussion this summer. That is our objective.

I apologize to the hon. member. The target date is October.

Mr. Yew: — I understand Mr. Minister, that you have had just very recently some pretty fruitful discussions with native organizations. I have here in front of me a meeting — a report on the meeting that you had with AMNSIS, and I commend you for that. I understand that there has been some progress made in respect to both parent native organizations, and I simply commend the efforts made by your department.

But further to that, I also admit I did try to rake you over the coals a bit with respect to your relationship with the native community. I said that based on the fact of very negative press clippings that I have here that led me to believe that there exists friction between your department and parent native organizations. As well, I have had the experience of being very frustrated with former administrations. When it comes to the social, cultural and economic conditions of the native community, it is downright frustrating, it is downright . . . It's really disgusting, you know, when it comes right

down to it, you know, the inaction that has been given, and the lack of recognition given to the native community, in terms of our struggle to become self-dependent and become as productive as other people in this society.

So with that, unless my colleagues have additional questions I would wish we can go ahead with the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, I suppose I was raked over the coals. I apologize for having defended myself to the best of my abilities. But sometimes, as the hon. member has just indicated, the press headlines can give an altogether different implication than perhaps the body of the article, because I see the headline in the Regina *Leader-Post* of Friday, April 29th: 'Friction between Natives, Government Appears to be getting Hotter.' And then I look down on the . . . When they go to one of the prominent native leaders, the head of AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan), Mr. Jim Sinclair, he says:

The problems AMNSIS is facing with the government are no worse than disagreements with the former NDP government.

So, I suppose one could have put a headline which said: 'Problems no Better, no Worse than with the Previous Government.'

I think, in fairness, and I believe the hon. member will agree with me, that the use of publicity is a fair and legitimate and sometimes necessary use by many organizations when they're speaking on behalf of their people and fighting for their beliefs. I believe that we will have, as a government — as I'm sure you expected, and I believe you acknowledge — continuing differences with native organizations and many other organizations. And that's a function of their role. It's also a function of the government to try and maintain its policy and take the direction that it believes best.

So I've indicated to you that I don't believe that there is a ready solution to some very serious problems. And I don't for one minute question the motives of the previous government. I don't for one minute, because I believe you made a sincere effort to deal with some very serious problems. I suggest to you that our government is just as sincere in trying to deal with very serious problems. We'll have differences on approach. And that's what this forum is for — to debate those differences. And I'm sure you'll come forward with suggestions over the next 15 or 20 years while we're in government that are positive suggestions. I can assure you that positive suggestions will get a very fair hearing and fair consideration. And I hope that you will use your position and keep that in mind because we do not in any way attempt to belittle the problems.

We're aware of the seriousness and the magnitude of the problems. We're aware of the need for different types of responses to those problems. I hope that the direction of direct economic development, the band level, that the increase in training facilities and the efforts for economic development will have some success.

I will be the first to indicate that we will never, in my view, or at least not, as I said, in our lifetime, solve all the problems. But I don't question your motives, your government's motives. I hope you don't question ours. I hope the argument, the debate, continues on differences in the way we're trying to solve these very serious problems.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Minister of Justice must have been reading the book called *Psycho-Cybernetics* or *The Power of Positive Thinking* when he suggests that they will be in power for 15 to 20 years. However, I do appreciate his comments with respect to the concerns that he's raised with regards to training and education, economic development, land entitlements.

I am at the service of the native community and I have tried to keep an ongoing relationship with those various organizations out there. And I would expect that henceforth we will have close discussions; perhaps at times we'll differ in points related to various programs.

I just, at this point in time, commend the minister for some of the suggestions that he's made that they will try to tackle those very dire problems that we have in the native community. With that, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister of Justice, and I suggest we go ahead with the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I thank the hon. member. I will have forwarded over to him, perhaps as early as this afternoon, a tentative schedule of the district workshops on economic development that we're proposing over the summer. And I can advise you that some of the field workers are in the North at present, in Fond-du-Lac and Stony Rapids, at the request of the chiefs to try and respond to some of the concerns. I'll send those over to you; you may find them of value.

I would like to thank my officials at this time for their help and assistance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Chairman, I ask for leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce to you and to this Assembly, a group of 48 students from the Osborne School and their teacher, Mr. Malec. They've travelled a fair distance today through the storm we're facing. I'll be meeting with them later. I'd ask you to join me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (continued)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

INDIAN AND NATIVE AFFAIRS SECRETARIAT

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 25

Item 1 agreed to.

Mr. Yew: — I would like to join the Minister of Justice in thanking his officials and the minister for the way that they have responded to the questions posed to them by the opposition. Thank you.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 25 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — I'd like to thank the minister and his officials.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RIGHTS BOARD

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 31

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes, I'd like to introduce Mr. Glen Hamilton, director of Public and Private Rights Board.

Item 1

Mr. Shillington: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you would supply us, in writing if you prefer, with the salary of the now chairman of the Public and Private Rights Board.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes, we'll supply it in writing.

Mr. Shillington: — When you are answering that, would you also give us a list of the expropriations which have been mediated by the board? I assume it usually isn't an extremely lengthy list, but if you could supply that as well, I really think that's all we need.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 31 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

SURFACE RIGHTS ARBITRATION BOARD

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 37

Item 1

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes, I'd like to introduce Mr. Bob Bews, chairman of the Surface Rights Arbitration Board.

Mr. Shillington: — About the same questions — salary and other benefits of the chairman, members of the board with per diem rates, and thirdly, list of disputes in which the board has adjudicated.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — If you'd like that in writing, I can supply you with part of it now, and I'll get the rest over to you. I can list the board members for you. W.A. Bowes, Gull Lake; R.J. Gallaway of Estevan; Leonard Dahl of Kindersley; Alfred Friesen of Midale. I'm sorry. The members are W.A. Bowes, R.J. Gallaway and Leonard Dahl, and R.A. Bews, the chairman. New members as of February 23, 1983 are Ms. Bonnie Holtby of

Marshall, Saskatchewan; Mr. Nat Davidson of Estevan, Saskatchewan. I'll supply you with a short biography of each if you wish and the other information that you requested.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 37 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I'd like to thank Mr. Bews, before he leaves, for his assistance.

The committee reported progress.

Hon. Mr. Sandberg: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave at this time to introduce some visitors to the Assembly.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Sandberg: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure at this time to introduce to you, and to members of the Assembly, a group of young visitors. They are a group of some 50 boys and girls who are members of Sea Cadets of Canada. Approximately half of them are from HMCS Unicorn of Saskatoon, which is right in the heart of the best -constituency in the province — Saskatoon Centre. The other half, I'm pleased to report, are from Nova Scotia and Halifax. They are accompanied by Lieutenant Commander Greg Kryway, the commanding officer of the cadets at H.M.C.S. Unicorn in Saskatoon. And I must explain, Mr. Speaker, that there is a difference in time between Nova Scotia and Saskatoon, but I submit it must be two months — at this time of year it's really March 12th in Regina, not May 12th, as you've probably ascertained from the weather out there.

So, on behalf of myself and the members of the Assembly, we'd like to bid you a very warm welcome to this Assembly and to Regina. We hope you enjoy your visit here, and I'll be meeting with you a little bit later in the rotunda for pictures and refreshments.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I would move second reading, or at least discuss bills 27, 28 and 29 together, if that's agreed.

The two bills, very briefly, are simply reductions in the statutory funding of the three urban parks that are in place. In the instance of the Meewasin Valley Authority, the funding at the present time is shared forty and one-third per cent by the Government of Saskatchewan, thirty and one-third per cent by the city of Saskatoon and twenty-nine and one-third per cent by the University of Saskatchewan.

Effective this year the government has decided to reduce the MVA statutory funding level by 20 per cent. The proportionate sharing by the participating parties will not change. The 20 per cent reduction requires an amendment to the MVA act to provide for the calculation of the total annual funding on the basis of four mills rather than the

present five. That is essentially the basis of the change in the Wakamow Valley — excuse me, of the Wascana Authority.

The Wakamow Valley is slightly different, in that the sharing is: the Government of Saskatchewan 40 per cent, the city of Moose Jaw 60; and in that case, the RM of Baidon is required to contribute \$1,500 annually at the present time. In that case, the mill rate reduction will be from 2 mills to 1.6 mills and the contribution of Baidon could be as low as \$1,200. In essence, Mr. Speaker, the reasons behind the reduction are simply one of priorities. In times of restraint, this government felt that there were a number of areas where we could make changes without affecting the programming to any great degree. The capital programmings in most of these urban parks will continue. Consequently, the decision was made and it's a matter of priorities. The urban park program simply didn't rate as high as the cancer clinic and a number of other items that are obviously higher priorities. And consequently, I would move second reading of bills 27, 28 and 29, of bill 27.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct some remarks to this bill, and as the minister introducing the bill has indicated, the bills, 27, 28, 29, are very, very similar in principle. And I propose to direct my remarks to all three bills, if I may, and in this way save a good deal of time of the House. And I am going to indicate that I will be opposing the bills and I will be opposing the bills on two grounds . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the Minister of Agriculture is asking me to make some proposals as to where savings could be made so as to make these bills unnecessary and I'd be very happy to do so. I attempted to do so with respect to some of the estimates, indicating that I thought some salaries could be reduced. Indeed, I made proposals for salary freezes, but those proposals did not meet with much favour from members opposite. They prefer to seek cuts in other areas, and in my judgement these are inappropriate areas to seek cuts.

I want to point out what the consequences will be in dollars, for the park authorities concerned. The bills will substantially reduce the funds available. In the case of the Wakamow Valley authority, reduce the funds available from 167,000 to 97,000, thereabouts. In the case of Meewasin, reduce the funds from about 1,005,000 to 753,000, a cut of more than a quarter of a million dollars. And in the case of Wascana, if my calculations are right, a cut from 927,000 to 776,000, or a cut of about \$151,000. These are in the provincial contributions. This seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be in keeping with the low priority which this government puts on parks and park development. We noted that there were other funding cuts — an earlier abandonment by the government of park development projects, which were not as far along, in Swift Current and Prince Albert, and now a cutting back of these three urban parks which are, in the case of Wascana, well established, but in the case of Meewasin and Wakamow, still at the formative stages.

I would oppose but could understand the argument put forward by the minister with respect to Wascana Centre suggesting that a cut there might not be as damaging as elsewhere on the grounds that it was a well-established park authority, but that is certainly not the case with either Meewasin or Wakamow which are very much at the formative stages, very much need all the money they can to get their projects under way, and very much need to have the security of planning which goes with having a statutory source of funds. And accordingly I object, and object on the grounds that these parks ought not to have been the subject of cut-backs. This is not to suggest that the payments to them should have been increased over and above the formula. But the formulas were not rich formulas. They provided near base funds, and the cut-backs are

of no large number of dollars in a budget of well over \$3 billion.

Each of these parks has been well patronized by citizens, not only in the cities concerned, but elsewhere. This is particularly true of Wascana Centre which is a well-established park, but was becoming increasingly true of Meewasin as it made it, went out of its way to become a park which was a people park, and which accordingly attracted a good number of people. The Wascana park is undoubtedly the heaviest patronized park in Saskatchewan, and Meewasin and Wakamow were fast developing a clientele of people who looked to them for healthy and inexpensive recreation. This was particularly true of people who were on limited incomes in cities, who find it relatively more difficult to go to the lake as some of us tend to do, and therefore use these city parks as their centre of recreation in the summer.

So I object on the grounds that money should have been available, and certainly was available, as is indicated by very major tax cuts in other areas, to provide additional less than half-a-million dollars which would have been necessary to sustain the statutory funding which these parks previously enjoyed.

But, Mr. Speaker, my primary objection is the manner in which the government has done this. They have done it in a unilateral way. They have done it in a manner which is a straight breach of faith with their partners. And if that is not true, then I know the minister will, when he closes this debate, make it very, very clear that the same formalities with respect to the change in these acts was observed in this case as was observed when the acts came into existence, and when the acts were amended in any material respects.

I don't think that's true, because I think the government did change these acts. It did propose these acts without the formal consent of their partners and, at least in one case, was over the objection of a major partner. I think that that is highly undesirable in the development of these parks.

A little history on the development of these parks would, I think, illustrate my point. I'm going to take some time, Mr. Speaker, to outline the history of these parks, not in detail in the sense of the conceptual planning of them, but in some detail in the sense of the manner in which the legislation came before this House.

The parks are all, all three, the result of a number of stages. Someone had the idea or the inspiration. There then was the decision made to involve other partners, and the discussion among the partners. Then there was the joint development of the concept, the detailed negotiations of how the parks should be organized and financed, the ratification of the deal by the partners concerned, and the passage of the legislation.

And to remind hon. members, the partners in Wascana Centre are: the city of Regina; the University of Regina and the province. The Meewasin in 1979: the city of Saskatoon; the University of Saskatchewan; the RM of Corman Park; and the province, subsequently changed by legislation to remove the RM of Corman Park as a partner at their request. And Wakamow, with the city of Moose Jaw, the RM of Baildon, and the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to review the origins of the legislation which governs each of these parks, in sequence. I will take the Wascana Centre Authority first, and will attempt to outline for the House how that bill came before this legislature in 1962. And I could do

it from memory, but I think it better that I outline what was said by me when I was introducing this legislation as the minister responsible in 1962. I will quote from portions of my speech in order to give the background so that members will know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I have had some suggestions, but knowing the capacity for reading of some hon. members of this House, I think I'd better outline it so that they will be able to hear it. First, I said:

It is a project which has been developed jointly between the Government of Saskatchewan, the university, and the city. Because it has been a joint project, there has been a considerable amount of public discussion with respect to it — public discussion emanating from the deliberations of the city fathers of Regina, from the deliberations of the University of Saskatchewan Board of Governors, and to some extent, from the deliberations carried on by the cabinet in Saskatchewan.

I went on to say:

I think it might be of some interest to the House if I gave members some review of the negotiations which have gone on during the past year between the three participating parties.

And then I went on to outline how an A committee, or a policy committee, was appointed; and a committee of officials, or a B committee, was appointed. I pointed out that an executive director, Mr. Allan Gillmore, was appointed; and a chief planner, Mr. Minoru Yamasaki, was appointed.

And then I brought the story up to November of 1981, and I said that during November and December, some drafts of legislation were worked upon to see whether we could evolve an authority which might be able to guide the development of this area in a manner which would provide for the flexibility which will certainly be necessary but at the same time, preserve the elements of a plan which the participating parties would approve.

I pointed out that the city of Regina named three representatives: the then mayor, Mr. Baker; and aldermen Peart and MacPherson. The university named three representatives: Drs. Spinks, Riddell, and vice-president McEwen; and the government named five representatives, Messrs. Lloyd, Turnbull, Erb, Williams and Blakeney.

And then I went on to talk about the officials who were appointed. I dealt with this matter further as follows:

Then a rapid series in negotiations ensued between the city council and the government, the board of governors of the university. (And as I have said) each group was rather thoroughly conversant with what was in mind, so that there were relatively few difficulties.

We (that is the Government of Saskatchewan) prepared a statement of the principles which were to be included in the legislation, and these were sent out on January 11th and discussed with the various authorities. On February 9th, we had what amounted to a formal meeting of the A committee — the policy committee representing the university, the city and the government — at which the principles of the draft legislation and the draft budgets were considered in detail and were approved. Following this draft legislation, the

refined draft legislation along these lines was repaired, and early in March a draft copy of the act was sent to all members of the city council, to all members of the A and B committees, to all members of the university board of governors, and to some other officials. The city council considered the draft, approved it in principle, specifically approved the financial sections (And later on I indicate that some changes were made at the city's request and they approved that.)

It is not possible, I think, to draw any act which is perfect, and I am confident that this act will disclose many difficulties and shortcomings in the years to come. But I think it is a sound act, sound in principle. It was arrived at on the basis of consultation and negotiation between three participating parties, and I believe it represents the widest possible unanimity of view on the appropriate structure and duties of the Wascana Centre Authority which it establishes.

Now, this is how it came into effect, Mr. Speaker, in April of 1962. And for more than 20 years, this deal struck by the city of Regina, and approved by the city council of the city of Regina, this deal struck by the then board of governors of the University of Saskatchewan, and approved by them, and this deal struck by the Government of Saskatchewan has existed and has never been breached, unilaterally by any one of the parties. There has been no unilateral change. It has been a deal which has existed and continued to exist.

We now have a government which has decided to tear up that deal of more than 20 years standing, and to bring in a different financial arrangement without the same amount of negotiation, without the same amount of agreement, without the same amount of consultation in depth.

I pointed out, at one point in these remarks more than 20 years ago, that I think we can look forward in Saskatchewan to developing a centre here at Wascana which will be a source of pride, not only for the citizens of Regina but for all the citizens of Saskatchewan, just as this Legislative Building on these grounds have been a source of pride for all our citizens. And I think that's happened. I think it's happened because the city and the university and the government have walked hand in hand, because they have not disputed, because they have resolved their differences in the board of the Wascana Centre Authority, and because they have made deals and stuck to them.

And we now have a government which has decided that it's not going to stick to its deal, and it's not going to renegotiate its deal. It's going to impose arbitrarily a new deal. And if I am wrong, if in fact the minister has the resolutions of the board of governors of the University of Regina, which agree to these changes, then we have not seen them, and I invite him to make them available to members of this House. But I think he does not have them. And I think therefore, that he is acting unilaterally. He is acting differently from the way that the act came into existence, and accordingly, in my judgement, he is acting wrongly. I think it is regrettable in the extreme that the government has chosen to dishonour the agreement made in good faith 20 years ago and honoured at all times since that time.

I now turn to Meewasin. I turn to Meewasin. And I want to outline the basis upon which Meewasin came into existence. I will not burden the House with a very, very long explanation but I want to outline it in specific detail, and I am now quoting from the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Romanow, the then attorney-general, who introduced this

legislation on April 23rd of 1979.

In closing, I would say that this act is a result of lengthy and detailed negotiations and discussions with the city of Saskatoon, and may I say, people within the city of Saskatoon, interested groups who have participated, the University of Saskatchewan, and the rural municipality of Corman Park. It is patterned after a success story, the Wascana Centre Authority, but modified to the specific situation of the Saskatoon and Corman Park area. All three local parties — that is the city of Saskatoon, the University of Saskatchewan, and the Corman Park area — have by official resolution endorsed this legislation . . .

And I want to repeat that:

All three of the local parties — that's the city of Saskatoon, the University of Saskatchewan, and the RM of Corman Park — have by official resolution endorsed this legislation and joined with the government in anticipation of its becoming law, so that the Meewasin Valley Authority will be a reality.

Once again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the formal consent of all of the partners to the legislation. Subsequently difficulties arose. The RM of Corman Park had a different thought, and I will come to that in a moment. But let me remind all hon. members that this legislation met with the approval not only of the government of the day but also of the opposition of the day — at least some of the opposition of the day. And may I quote the hon. member for Rosthern, at *Hansard* on page 1949 on April 23. I will quote briefly from what he said, but it goes on this way:

Mr. Speaker, the bill is lengthy. First of all I would thank the Attorney-General for a year ago allowing me to be part of the planning of this authority by having some input. I thank him for being allowed to talk with the consultants about some of my concerns and taking some of the ideas which I recommended and which I now see coming within the program.

Now that gives an indication of the way that this program was developed. It was developed in consultation with local people, with the MLAs, but the member for Rosthern a swell was involved because the hope was that we could have a park project which was endorsed by everybody and was not a matter of party controversy or inter-municipal-group controversy. Nobody can suggest that there was anything but total agreement when this bill went through, and resolutions are on file to prove it, and I think no one disputes it.

Subsequently, as I've indicated, some second thoughts were had in the RM of Corman Park, and they suggested major changes, and major changes were made — but again, with the full consent of all the partners. And I think no one denies that. With the full consent of all the partners — and there has been no unilateral change, no unilateral change. And that's the point I want to make — no unilateral change.

And with respect to Meewasin I make the point that at every stage every partner agreed. They may later have changed their mind, but at every stage every partner agreed.

Now I come to Wakamow, Mr. Speaker. Wakamow, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has a slightly different origin, but not appreciably different. Wakamow came because of a desire by

the city of Moose Jaw to develop their river property, their heritage, and they approached the Government of Saskatchewan. And I will not, I think, give the full history of Wakamow but I will quote one or two things which give the flavour of the origins of Wakamow.

In 1978, the city of Moose Jaw presented a brief to the provincial cabinet, and I'll quote very short portions from the brief.

We solicit the support of all for this far-reaching concept of flood control and parks development in the Moose Jaw River valley. Mr. Premier and members of the cabinet, we need your help. We suggest that there be a joint effort of the government and the city under a legal authority.

Now this was in 1978. It came to pass in 1981, but I give you the origins of it: the first proposal by the city of Moose Jaw that there be a park development under a legal authority.

And some of the further development is outlined in *Hansard* on March 19th, 1981, in the remarks of the minister introducing the bill, the Hon. Mr. Snyder, the then-minister of labour. And it indicates the desirability of having a park authority. And among them, it makes it possible to have an intermunicipal body with key implementation powers, and so on.

Then, to give further indication of how this particular authority was dealt with, I quote:

The Wakamow plan as first presented at a public meeting in Moose Jaw in May 1980, almost a year ago, and followed by a two day drop-in centre at City Hall . . . During the summer of 1980, the city of Moose Jaw staff presented the Wakamow plan to various service clubs . . . (and it was distributed to every home in Moose Jaw). Furthermore, the material was sent by certified mail to those landowners who happen to reside outside the city of Moose Jaw (whose property might be affected).

A meeting with the valley land owners was held in mid-September for the specific purpose of explaining the principles . . .

I think it has to be said, Mr. Speaker, that all of these actions have to represent clear evidence that the provincial and municipal partners in the Wakamow project have worked hard, exceedingly hard, to ensure that the project is known and that it is understood by Moose Jaw residents. The government and its municipal partners believe that the people of Moose Jaw and area are eagerly awaiting. The Wakamow Valley Authority Act, so that the implementation of this exciting long-term project can begin . . . To sum up, the province, at the request of the city of Moose Jaw (and I'm still quoting, Mr. Speaker) the province, at the request of the city of Moose Jaw, and in co-operation with the rural municipality of Baidon No. 131, has developed legislation for a river valley authority, unique to the Moose Jaw situation.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this project was a matter of agreement between the municipalities concerned, the RM and the city, and the province of Saskatchewan. No doubt that there was total agreement at every step.

And I now want to quote very briefly from some remarks in *Hansard*, on page 1175, March 19, 1981 of the Hon. Mr. Muirhead, or the hon. member, Mr. Muirhead, the then-member and still-member for Arm River. And he says, and I quote:

Today the member for Moose Jaw North and Mayor Taylor, some other guests and I had lunch together, and discussed this for the first time. I was able to ask some questions which will definitely help us to proceed with this bill much more quickly. I asked some questions and I was informed that the city of Moose Jaw unanimously supports this bill, as do the municipal councils. My concern was that even though the councils were in agreement and passed it, sometimes people come along after and show concern. I was informed there had been public meetings and there have been no objections.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else a government could do to gather support for a bill other than to get the formal support, in this case of the city of Moose Jaw and the RM of Baidon, and to take some steps to inform the opposition and to have them meet with the mayor, in this case of Moose Jaw, and satisfy themselves that there was a total agreement on all counts. And I don't believe anyone can review that history without reaching the conclusion that these were deals struck, and that once the deal was made it was incorporated in legislation, but not before.

And I say to the minister on no occasion has any change of substance been made in any one of those acts without the consent of the partners. And I say this is not true of these acts. I have not seen any evidence of consents by the city of Regina. I have not heard of any resolution, or that it has been presented to them as requiring their consent. Nor have I heard that with respect to Saskatoon or Moose Jaw.

I have noted that the Moose Jaw City Council formally expressed its displeasure with the way the provincial government handled recent provincial cut-backs to the Wakamow Valley Authority. Council unanimously supported a motion which protests that the government gave no notice of intention to cut back its grant to the authority. Clearly, in the opinion of the city of Moose Jaw, a breach of faith. Clearly, in the opinion of the city of Moose Jaw, a breach of faith. Obviously, if it were thought to be something solely within the purview of the Government of Saskatchewan, the city council would not unanimously protest the action. They would not think they had status to protest the action. But they do have status to protest the action because they are part of the deal, the deal which is being unilaterally broken by the government opposite and I think that is unfortunate.

Every effort was made, and with a remarkable degree of success, to carry the agreement, to bring along the agreement of the people who were involved in the Wascana Centre Authority, Wakamow and Meewasin. I will concede that with Meewasin, there was some second thoughts, and these were dealt with — and these were dealt with. And they were dealt with by agreement — and they were dealt with by agreement, and when the minister stands up and complains, he ought to tell this House whether or not he has agreement for these three bills, and my bet is he does not. My bet is that he is acting unilaterally. My bet is that he's tearing up the deals and he is acting in a way which is a breach of faith with the city of Saskatoon, with the city of Regina, with the city of Moose Jaw, with the two universities, and with the RM of Baidon. I say that that is most unfortunate. I say it's most unfortunate, both with respect to the future of these parks, and with respect to the future of the dealings of this government with the municipal authorities who make agreements with them.

These acts were not solely the acts passed by this legislature. These acts were confirming deals. These acts were not thought to be amendable by the unilateral act of this legislature, except in some extreme measure, where the legislature always has the authority to act. It was not thought that the Government of Saskatchewan in the course of making up its budget, and in the course of trying to find another \$400,000 or so, would be free to tear up three deals which were inscribed in statute, solely because they had been enshrined in statute.

I think that's what they've done. I think it is a very, very improper act — one which will have far more far-reaching consequences than is now appreciated. Much of the success of these parks has been that they have had a core funding which allowed them to plan on a long-term basis.

An. Hon. Member: — I give up; we'll pull the bill.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — The member for Cannington may have no interest in Wascana Centre Authority or Meewasin or Wakamow. And he is entitled not to have interest since he has very few constituents who perhaps frequent those parks. None the less, Mr. Speaker, there are a great number of citizens in this province who do have an interest in Wascana and Wakamow and Meewasin, and I think that we ought to say something for them, even though they do not come from the particular constituency represented by the Minister of Agriculture.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, that the success of these parks, certainly of Wascana, over more than 20 years has been due in no small part to the fact that they could make long-term plans and knew they had a minimum amount of money they could count on, because it was there in the deal confirmed by statute.

Now that has been removed. We have no reason to believe that next year, or the year after, the government may not decide again, unilaterally, to change the financing basis of these parks. The ability to make long-range plans, which is the very essence of park planning, has been hampered and eroded. I think that this will have, as I say, consequences far greater, far greater than the reduction in the financial allotment which is provided for this year.

For those reasons, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing all three bills. More particularly, at this time I oppose the bill which is before the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition commenting about the Meewasin authority in Saskatoon, quoting my old speeches. I don't deny them. I also comment that some of us learn by our mistakes and are willing to change our ways. And it's interesting to note . . .

An. Hon. Member: — They've changed their ways. They're sitting over there now.

Mr. Katzman: — Yes, they are sitting over there. But it's interesting to note that when a very, very large percentage of the people in Corman Park were finally given a vote on do they or do they not want the MVA, the overwhelming success, opposed to that, the former attorney-general called them radicals because they didn't agree with him. He

then agreed to changes. He says, basically what he said to you people in Corman Park, 'I've taken both your legs and both your arms, but if you agree I'll let you have one leg and one arm back — if you agree to what I'm going to give you.' They had no choice but to accept because you're better off with one leg and one arm than no arms and no legs.

So they agreed to it. So agreement by blackmail is not always total agreement. You're accepting something rather than get nothing. And that was the way those amendments were agreed to in this House. And their opposition was forced to stand up and vote item by item — otherwise, nothing. Either we'll let you have a little or you get nothing. And that was the attitude of your government when you were premier. And that's the reason the attorney-general and all those Saskatoon members are basically missing today.

So on MVA don't ever tell me agreements. Mr. Summerfeldt and the council agreed to a principle. I agreed to a principle. The words and the final line of what was there were not agreement with the total principle of the idea. And you paid the price in Saskatoon, with our people of Saskatoon in the Corman Park area voted 'no' to your idea, strongly; they got changes, but they got changes on one condition — they were allowed one leg and one arm if they gave up the other arm and the other leg. And certainly they had to agree because it was better than nothing. And that's the way you treated them. So don't ever give me the line that MVA is totally acceptable in the Corman Park, because it isn't, because of the way it was done.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this topic, two or three again relatively brief comments. From what I heard the Leader of the Opposition say, I think he indicated he was making two points. The first was that he opposed the act because of the financial reduction that it would incur — and usual scare tactics. He tried to imply that since the Wascana was widely against, that it would disappear because of this cut. That's certainly not true. The programs that are in place will continue. Other ones will continue as well. The gates will be closed. And all three park programs will continue to operate.

The other point, about the lack of consultation: I will accept a portion of that. I think, however, that one thing that can be drawn from all that is in fact the need for reorganization within government, something we have started, something we will continue with, and we will try to put these things on a footing so they operate. The problem of course was we simply accepted their structure which had different ministers responsible for each one, and yet the parks being funded out of my department, in the case of two of them at least, I did have informal consultations with the city of Saskatoon, with the executive director of Meewasin, I think someone you're familiar with. We had consultation prior to it, in fact. The consultation, in this case, did not take place between the partners of the other two parks. And I think it's more or less a matter of organization than anything else — an oversight, if you will — and we will correct that problem.

Finally, to a couple of comments to support the comments of my colleague from Rosthern. It's interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition argue that the introduction of the Meewasin Valley Authority was a model of consultation, if you will. I can tell the Leader of the Opposition, the former premier, that in Saskatoon it was considered to be a very heavy-handed approach. As my colleague said, it was something that was agreed to in principle, and then it was simply, in the initial stages, a drawing of the Wascana act, which didn't fit the requirements. It was, because of public pressure, because of the reaction of the opposition, it was redrafted twice in order to

get it into a form that was in any way satisfactory. I think, in all honesty, Meewasin is now on track. It appears to be, certainly within the city of Saskatoon, realizing some success.

What we are proposing here, to repeat once more, is simply a matter of priorities. It will have some but little effect on the programming of the parks. It is something that we will look at and continue to evaluate. And in the future, if it is needed, we will look to the previous levels if we think that is something that has to be done.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of the points I've laid out, I move second reading of Bill No. 27.

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 later this day.

YEAS — 37

Birkbeck	Taylor	Andrew
Berntson	Muirhead	Hardy
McLeod	McLaren	Katzman
Currie	Duncan	Schoenhals
Smith (Swift Current)	Boutin	Weiman
Tusa	Sutor	Sveinson
Sauder	Glauser	Meagher
Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Hopfner	Martens
Rybachuk	Young	Gerich
Domotor	Maxwell	Embury
Dirks	Hepworth	Myers
Zazelenchuk	Johnson	Baker
Dutchak		

NAYS — 8

Blakeney	Thompson	Engel
Lingenfelter	Koskie	Lusney
Shillington	Yew	

Bill No. 28 — An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading of Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

YEAS — 39

Muller	Birkbeck	Taylor
Andrew	Berntson	Muirhead
Sandberg	Hardy	McLeod
McLaren	Katzman	Currie
Duncan	Schoenhals	Smith (Swift Current)
Boutin	Weiman	Tusa
Sutor	Sveinson	Sauder
Glauser	Meagher	Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Hopfner	Martens	Rybchuk
Young	Gerich	Domotor
Maxwell	Embury	Dirks
Hepworth	Myers	Zazelenchuk
Johnson	Baker	Dutchak

NAYS — 7

Blakeney	Thompson	Engel
Lingenfelter	Koskie	Lusney
Yew		

Bill No. 29 — An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The Meewasin Valley Authority Act.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to this bill, I have said virtually all I want to say on it under the debate on Bill 27. I simply wanted to make clear something which may not be clear to all hon. members, that this bill was introduced pursuant to a resolution of the RM of Corman Park, which approved the bill in precise terms and which had a copy of the bill attached to the resolution. So if there's any suggestion that the agreement of the municipal council was in principle, that I point out that it was to the precise wording of the act. I know that no hon. member wished to leave any other impression, but I simply wanted to make that clear, that the RM council and the other people had approved of it in its precise terms.

Mr. Speaker: — It's my duty to inform the Assembly that the hon. member is about to exercise his right to close debate, and thereafter all members will be precluded from speaking. If any member wishes to speak, let him do so now.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, very briefly, in response to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, I think it is safe to say that the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the citizens of Corman Park with the Meewasin Valley Authority could be clearly demonstrated by the fact that they have since voted almost 90 per cent to withdraw from that authority. And in fact, that that council . . . One of the reasons for the defeat of the majority of the members of that council — I believe there's one left of that council — can be traced in many respects to this bill, I simply wish to clarify that.

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 — 39

Muller	Birkbeck	Taylor
Andrew	Berntson	Muirhead
Sandberg	Hardy	McLeod
McLaren	Katzman	Currie
Duncan	Schoenhals	Smith (Swift Current)
Boutin	Weiman	Tusa
Sutor	Sveinson	Sauder
Glauser	Meagher	Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Hopfner	Martens	Rybchuk
Young	Gerich	Domotor
Maxwell	Embury	Dirks
Hepworth	Myers	Zazelenchuk
Johnson	Baker	Dutchak

NAYS — 8

Blakeney	Thompson	Engel
Lingenfelter	Koskie	Lusney
Shillington	Yew	

The Assembly adjourned at 4:56 p.m.